



**Department of Natural Resources**  
Wayne A. Rosenthal, Director



**State of Illinois**  
Bruce Rauner, Governor

# ILLINOIS FOREST ACTION PLAN:

## A STATEWIDE FOREST RESOURCE ASSESSMENT AND STRATEGY

*Version\_4.0\_April\_27, 2017*

as Prescribed by the Food, Conservation, and  
Energy Act of 2008 (2008 Farm Bill)

Checklist for Statewide Forest Resource Assessments and Strategies requirements of the 2008 Farm Bill  
**The State Assessment and Strategy must be submitted to the USDA Forest Service, with this check list signed by the State Forester.** Federal review will focus on the requirements as outlined in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (2008 Farm Bill).

State: Illinois

Approved by the State Forester: \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*\*\*\*

**Statewide Forest Resource Assessment Includes:**

- The conditions and trends of forest resources in the state ..... Yes  No
- The threats to forest lands and resources in the state consistent with national priorities ..... Yes  No
- Areas or regions of the state that are a priority..... Yes  No
- Any multi-state areas that are a regional priority ..... Yes  No

**Statewide Forest Resource Strategy Includes:**

- Long-term strategies to address threats to forest resources in the state\* ..... Yes  No
- Description of resources necessary for state forester to address state-wide strategy\* ..... Yes  No

\*Can be presented in a strategies matrix with columns for (a) programs that contribute, (b) resources required, (c) national objective it supports, and (d) performance measure(s) that will be used for each strategy.

**Stakeholder Groups Coordinated with for the Statewide Assessment and Strategy:**

Note: this could be identified in the body of the documents or as an appendix.

- State Forest Stewardship Coordinating Committee (required)..... Yes  No
- State Wildlife Agency (required)..... Yes  No
- State Technical Committee (required)..... Yes  No
- Lead agency for the Forest Legacy Program (if not the state forestry agency) (required) ..... Yes  No
- Applicable Federal land management agencies (required)..... Yes  No

**Other Plans Incorporated in Statewide Assessment and Strategy:**

- Community wildfire protection plans (required)..... Yes  No
- State wildlife action plans (required)..... Yes  No
- Other ..... Yes  No

**Forest Legacy Assessment of Need (check the one box below that applies)**

- Previously approved AON remains unchanged and is incorporated by reference
- OR**
- Required AON components are included in the Assessment and Strategy (Note: AON elements will be evaluated outside the assessment and strategy certification process)

**Deemed to be sufficient (all requirements met)**

Comments:

**Not deemed to be sufficient\* (missing one or more requirements)**

\*Indicate Corrective Action(s) Necessary to Meet Sufficiency Requirement:

Certified by Regional Forester/NA Director: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name Date

**DECISION BY THE DEPUTY CHIEF FOR STATE & PRIVATE FORESTRY**

Approve \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_

# Table of Contents

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	ii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
<b>THREATS TO FOREST LANDS AND RESOURCES</b> .....	4
CURRENT CONDITIONS AND TRENDS .....	22
PRIORITY AREAS: ILLINOIS/DNR FORESTRY DIVISION .....	44
PRIORITY AREAS: MIDWEST REGION .....	55
PRIORITY AREAS: NATIONAL .....	63
<b>STRATEGIES FOR FOREST LANDS AND RESOURCE</b> .....	69
PRIORITIZATION OF STRATEGIES .....	74
LIST of APPENDICES .....	81
REFERENCES .....	82
<b>APPENDIX</b> .....	87

## Acknowledgments

**We would like to acknowledge and sincerely thank the following for their assistance and participation in the content and assembly of this Illinois Forest Action Plan.**

**Thanks to the Illinois Forestry Development Council** (Council) for their support, comments and revisions of this Illinois Forest Action Plan. The Council consists of 23 members representing the Illinois General Assembly, the Governor's office, state and federal agencies, universities and a host of organizations that have an interest or stake in Illinois forests, forestry, forest products, forest industry, urban & community forests, forestry education or forestry-related natural resources. The Council is also represented with private forest landowners and farmers, the Shawnee National Forest supervisor, and the DNR State Forester. The Council originally met on April 30, 2010 to provide input, review, and approve the state's first IFAP. The Council in 2012 authorized Urban Forestry and Forest Stewardship sub-committees to meet, review, and make significant updates and improvements to this plan coordinated through the IDNR statewide program managers and the USDA Forest Service.

**Thanks to the Illinois Department of Natural Resources** (IDNR), Division of Forest Resources for their assistance and coordination of stakeholder groups to develop and review this plan. The review and input also included that of the Illinois DNR Division of Wildlife Resources, Division of Farm Programs, and the Division of Natural Heritage.

**Thanks to the USDA Forest Service, State & Private Forestry Branch** who provided leadership and technical resources across all of the core forest resource issues and forestry disciplines of concern to state forestry agencies. This Illinois Forest Action Plan includes, as the first Appendix, the updated and current USDA Forest Service Forest Legacy Program, Illinois Assessment of Need to authorize, guide and continue to implement important forest conservation and easements.

**Thanks to Eric Holzmüller, John Groninger** and other faculty and staff of Southern Illinois University, Department of Forestry Carbondale, IL who authored the original Statewide Forest Resource Assessment and Strategy (May 20, 2010) document now referred to as the Forest Action Plan. This IFAP update and expansion by the Illinois Forestry Development Council and the Illinois Division of Forest Resources is built on their original work.

**Thanks to all Illinois active forestry leaders**, active foresters and authors of references cited in this plan. Significant portions of documents, research, and plans found as references were either directly incorporated or referred to in the making of this and the original Forest Action Plan. Documents listed as references are part of this plan as Appendices due to their importance and relevance. Please take the time to read the Appendix.

## Introduction

Illinois' forests offer remarkable benefits that may or may not be familiar to many of our Illinois residents. While the role trees play in providing materials for building homes and for wood products are readily apparent, most individuals do not understand the role that forests play in simultaneously protecting the soil and preserving the quality of our air and water. The relationship between our forests and the preservation of biological diversity or presence of animals and birds is as equally important. Illinois forests facilitate and play a vital role in a wide variety of outdoor recreation and aesthetic pursuits throughout the state. These interactions of the forests of Illinois and other natural resources range from quite simple to extremely complex and require ongoing scientific efforts. Most Illinois forests can provide these commodity and conservation roles, functions and outputs with care and management

Forests occupy about 15 percent of the state's surface area. Illinois' forests are home to 61 percent of the flora native to Illinois and 75 percent of the state's wildlife habitat. Forestry-.the science and skill of analyzing, nurturing, tending and protecting forests.-is actively practiced by degreed foresters within Illinois within state, private, federal, academic and other organizations or businesses. In Illinois only Southern Illinois University at Carbondale offers an undergraduate B.S. degree in forestry accredited by the Society of American Foresters. A number of other scientific and biological disciplines and organizations promote the study and management forests on state, private and federal forestland in Illinois – particularly the University of Illinois.

The historic, pre-settlement landcover in Illinois was once 40 percent forest! Forests ranged from dense mesic forests to open forests and savannahs and covered about 14 million acres. Settlement, farming and land development eventually reduced Illinois' forests to a low of less than 3 million acres. Today, Illinois' forests have expanded and re-grown to over 5 million acres - all of which is important and critical to people's future health and well-being and essential to Illinois' natural, biological, and physical environments.

This document takes a look at our current forest resources and forestry as whole across Illinois. It identifies facts, trends and threats as well as priorities, opportunities, and strategies for the future of Illinois forests. This document is critical in explaining the priceless forests and forest resources that help balance the human impacts and human advances in this natural world. The document is inspired by the USDA Forest Service and state forestry departments throughout the U.S. The Illinois Forestry Development Council, guided by the Illinois DNR, serves as the state's Forest Stewardship Coordinating Committee. The Council and its committees has reviewed this document to assure it meets the purpose intended. The IDNR values the partnership and working relationship it shares with the USDA Forest Service and its State & Private Forestry branch as well as the Council's concerns for the forest resource across Illinois.

## **Primary Partners for Forestry and Illinois Forests:**

Association of Consulting Foresters (ACF)

Chicago Wilderness (CW)

City of Chicago, Dept. of Forestry

Chicago Region Trees Initiative

Great Lakes Commission

Headwaters Invasive Plant Partnership (HIPP)

Illinois Arborist Association (IAA)

Illinois Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts (IASWCD)

Illinois Audubon Society

Illinois Consulting Foresters (ICF)

Illinois Department of Agriculture

Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR)

    IDNR Office of Lands & Education

    IDNR Office of Resource Conservation (ORC)

        Division of Forest Resources

        Division of Wildlife

Division of Farm Programs

Division of Natural Heritage

Division of Fisheries

Illinois Forestry Association (IFA)

Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA)

Illinois Farm Bureau (IFB)

Illinois Forestry Development Council (IFDC)

Illinois Green Industry Association (IGIA)

Illinois Invasive Species Council (IIPSC)

Illinois Landscape Contractors Association (ILCA)  
Illinois Tree Farm System (TF)  
Illinois Nature Preserves Commission (INPC)  
Illinois Walnut Council (IWC)  
Illinois Wildlife Society  
International Society of Arboriculture (ISA)  
Kaskaskia River Stakeholders  
National Wild Turkey Federation (NWTF)  
Natureserve  
Northwest Illinois Forestry Association (NIFA)  
Openlands  
River to River Weed Management Cooperative  
Society of American Foresters (SAF)  
Southern Illinois Prescribed Burn Association  
Southern Illinois University, Department of Forestry  
Society of Municipal Arborists (SMA)  
The Morton Arboretum  
The Nature Conservancy (TNC)  
Tree Care Industry Association (TCIA)  
Trees Forever  
University of Illinois, Department of Forestry  
University of Illinois, Extension Service (UI Extension)  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
USDA Animal & Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS)  
USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)  
USDA Forest Service (FS)

## Threats to Forest Lands and Resources

At the present time in Illinois, 2017, there exist a number of important and significant threats to the present and future forests and critical forest resources here. Illinois forests, and all they provide and offer, are critical to everyone's future. Identified below and discussed throughout this document are seven issues that so significantly impact the forests across Illinois and their use, enjoyment and benefits that the surrounding concerns, issues, trends and facts are considered serious threats to the resource and its social and economic functions. The Illinois Wildlife Action Plan strategic plan and strategies of the Division of Wildlife Resources (Appendix XX) also identifies a number of common threats and challenges facing forests.

The threats identified for Illinois's forest resources represent a composite of numerous, past consensus from natural resource leaders, researchers, practitioners, industry owners, land owners and scientists through stakeholder activities sponsored by the Illinois Forestry Development Council (IFDC) over the last 30 years. Forest assessment factors, trends, and concerns were also identified by IDNR and the Division of Forest Resources, statewide forestry stakeholders, and partners. Significant stakeholders and partners include the Illinois Forestry Association, Forestry Extension, forestry schools and universities, the USDA Forest Service and Natural Resources Conservation Service, soil & water conservation districts, the American Tree Farm System, the state's Urban and Community Forestry Committee, county governments, arboretums and scores of individual Professional Foresters as well as other conservation organizations, foundations and committees statewide.

The seven most significant threats to Illinois forests all share high priority and importance. It is important for the state's future forest health and sustainability to promptly mitigate, solve or reverse these threats listed and summarized below. Addressing all seven threats simultaneously is an optimal present and future strategy for the State of Illinois and its citizens, economy and five million acres of forest resources. Historically, opportunities to facilitate, affect, or apply solutions to any one of these threats have been rare. Opportunities to address threats are not frequent and not always predictable and so any opportunity to address one or multiple threats is considered a priority.

### **Assessments & Analysis yield that these are the seven primary, most significant threats and concerns for the present and future forest resources of Illinois:**

- \* Oak-Hickory forests are threatened!
- \* Large forest blocks are disappearing!
- \* Forest health threats are increasing!
- \* Forestry professionals are too few!



- \* Forest industries and mills are shrinking!
- \* Urban and community forests face extreme pressures and challenges!
- \* Forestry funding and significant other threats exist!

### **Oak-Hickory Forests Are Threatened** (Threat #1)

Oak/hickory forests are the predominant forest type on the Illinois landscape. The broad range of tree species and the structural variation within these forests contributes to their importance as a reservoir for biological diversity. Home to a number of mast-producing trees, many wildlife species are dependent on oak/hickory forests for the food and habitat they provide.

With an average of fewer than 45 seedlings per acre of forest land, oaks represent a small component (7 percent) of the understory (*Figure 1*) of our forests statewide. Of all oak species, white and black oak seedlings are the most abundant, occurring over three times more often than red oak seedlings. Elm, ash, and maple have substantially more seedlings per acre than oaks. Similarly, oak saplings (which average fewer than seven saplings per acre of forest land) are far less abundant than other hardwood species. Regeneration of oak within oak forests is poor (*Figure 2*). On average, the ratio of oak to non-oak species is 1 to 13 for both seedlings and saplings.

Illinois' oak resource is characterized by numerous large, mature trees and a comparatively small sapling/seedling component. Decreases in the frequency of beneficial disturbances, including timber management and prescribed fire, have contributed to suppression of oak seedlings and an increase in the abundance of non-oak seedlings and saplings. With an understory dominated by non-oak species such as sugar maple and with relatively few oak saplings available to move into the medium-diameter classes, it is likely that there will be a successional change in species dominance. Oak stands may eventually be dominated by more shade-tolerant species such as maples. With a largely mature oak resource, the future of oak in Illinois is uncertain. Maintaining a healthy oak resource will be dependent on successful seedling regeneration and sapling development, processes presently not functioning adequately across most forest acreage.

Many of the oak dominated forest types are presently in decline due to a legacy of management that emphasized little disturbance and either no timber removal or highly selective removal of valuable timber. Reintroduction of fire into Illinois forests is increasingly gaining recognition as a key component of maintaining desired ecosystems. However, additional disturbances are also necessary under many circumstances. Any meaningful statewide strategies geared toward addressing declining tree species diversity must implement prescribed canopy, sub-canopy and understory disturbances of foresters and land managers.

Significant contributing factors to the biological successional processes are statewide and localized invasions of exotic-species and other certain trees, shrubs and plants. Invasive-exotic species affecting woodlands are one of the number one resource concerns from most states and State Foresters from the eastern US; north or south. The presence of European buckthorn, bush-honeysuckles, tree-of-heaven, privet, stilt grass and kudzu are only a few examples of species that occupy and/or shade an understory inhibiting oak seedling individuals or seedling cohorts to survive. Bush-honeysuckle appears to be the iconic species for Illinois due to its quick take-over and persistence in forest understories once it is established. Publications and lists discussing exotics are available to forest managers and the public. Most all invasive-exotic species making current forestry/conservation publications are important factors to oak. The elimination and management to control invasive-exotic species must occur to sustain and promote oak.

A long history of excellent markets for quality white oak and black walnut logs has contributed significantly to the reduced presence of oak in a majority of forest stands due to unplanned and unregulated harvesting favoring cutting only the best trees or the most valuable species. White oak trees are much more difficult to regenerate naturally than walnut and require many years of seed crops of acorns from ample numbers of mature seed trees. Landowners who do not consult a Professional Forester to specify scientific, forest health and productivity decisions to designate proper harvest trees for cutting are likely to experience a timber buyer or cutter removing only or all of the best trees. Prevailing forestry silviculture dictates that cutting all of the worst specimens and poor species each time a harvest occurs yields a continuous higher quality, healthier and more profitable forest which can be sustainable over generations. The DNR Division of Forest Resources estimates only twenty-five percent (25%) of timber sold involves Professional Foresters while seventy-five percent (75%) of sales and harvests of timber on private lands lack professional advisement or involvement.

Oak in our forests, in general across Illinois as summarized above, are affected by both biological processes or lack thereof and by human or livestock processes initiated by landowner, resource manager and government decisions.




Figure 1—Number of seedlings (A) and saplings (B) per acre of forest land, Illinois, 2005.




Figure 2.—Number of seedlings (A) and saplings (B) per acre for oak and non-oak species on oak and non-oak forest types, Illinois, 2005.

### **Large Forest Blocks Are Disappearing** (Threat #2)

Forman (1995) defines fragmentation as “the breaking up of large habitat or land areas into smaller parcels.” This results in a loss of interior forest and an increase in edge habitat, which has many negative effects on the remaining vegetation and wildlife. Some of the harmful consequences of fragmentation are a loss of biodiversity, increased populations of invasive and nonnative species, and changes in biotic and abiotic conditions (Haynes 2003).

Fragmentation occurs naturally from disturbances such as wildfire, wind, and flooding, or as the result of human activities such as conversion to agriculture or urban development/sprawl (Haynes 2003). Analysis of fragmentation within Illinois classified, 81 percent of area as non-forest, 17 percent as forested, and the remaining 2 percent were identified as “water/barren land” (Figure 49). Further breakdown of forested area shows that 7 percent were classified as interior forest, 7 percent as edge, and 3 percent as patch, implying that forest land in Illinois is heavily fragmented. The majority of interior forest land is concentrated in the southern tip of the State, or in riparian areas along rivers. The remaining landscape contains a high proportion of edge habitat and many small, isolated patches of forest land. This type of fragmented landscape lacks the continuous forest habitat required by many species of plants and wildlife, and can result in loss of biodiversity and even extinction (Forman 1995). While edge habitat may benefit certain species, it also has many negative effects, such as increased predation of bird nests and prey species (Heske et. al., 1999), and declines in native plant and wildlife populations (Collinge, 1996). Short-term forestry practices such as a regeneration opening or a silvicultural clear-cut are not fragmentation if a forest canopy of new growth replaces the older canopy.

The process of fragmentation is accelerated when more and more people seek to purchase tracts of forested land. Greater numbers of people owning ever smaller tracts of land leads to a condition called parcelization. The average forested land holding covers 21.5 acres; 68.6% of landowners own less than 15 acres. Research shows that owners of smaller parcels are typically less aware of traditional forestry extension programs and less likely to manage their woodlands. While these small woodlots can certainly be attractive to live on, they are often too small to manage effectively and can be too small and too isolated to function as a healthy forest ecosystem. Urban areas within Illinois also progressively grow larger as each year passes significantly affecting adjacent natural resources. Growing, expanding urban areas is a phenomenon known as *urban sprawl*.

In March 1991 (Collins & Buhnerkempe) identified only 40 large forest blocks over 500 acres in size. They are mapped on the DNR biotic database. That size block is the threshold wildlife biologists often use and protecting these and creating new one remains an objective in the Illinois Wildlife Action Plan. Those 40 blocks are of these blocks remain in the database but there is no mechanism for regular confirmation. The DFR is examining the reports off the database for the last date inspected to confirm suspicion that fewer of the mapped large blocks exist today.

### **Forest Health Threats Are Increasing** (Threat #3)

Multiple factors affect forest health, particularly exotic invasive plants, insects and pathogens. Exotic invasive plants are a major concern because they alter natural plant communities and processes, threaten biodiversity, and contribute to a decrease in sustainability, productivity, and wildlife habitat. Preliminary data of FIA plots shows that exotic invasive plants are widely distributed across Illinois. Aggressive shrub species, such as bush honeysuckle, Morrow's, Bell's, and amur honeysuckle, autumn olive, and thorny multiflora rose are just a few of the many common invasive shrubs in Illinois forests. The familiar woody vine, Japanese honeysuckle, while valued as deer browse, replaces native plants in all forest types over a wide range of sites. Exotic insects and pathogens can often cause greater mortality than native insects and pathogens because some plants do not have any natural defense mechanisms to protect themselves from attack.

Forest health threats are often non-biotic or are a biological condition that threatens forest health. Dense, over-stocked forest stands and grazed forest stands, for example, have poor growth and low vigor and thus low productivity making them highly susceptible to secondary stressors such as other insects or disease. Damage from floods, ice storms, wind or livestock grazing without remediation are also examples of forest health issues in Illinois. The forest health threat from just bush honeysuckle is enough to change vast amounts of functioning healthy forestland to unhealthy.

Many current and active forest health conditions in Illinois serve as good examples of serious threats to our forests. Three of the biggest potentially harmful exotic insects include Gypsy moth, (*Lymantria dispar*), Asian long-horned beetle (*Anoplophora glabripennis*), and Emerald ash borer (EAB) (*Agrilus planipennis*). It is worthy of notation that many statewide non-native, invasive tree species problems (and many tree diseases) are first introduced in urban areas, threatening both the urban forest and eventually spreading to rural forests. (American Forests, 2016)

Currently gypsy moth, which was first reported in Illinois in 1973, has only become established in northeastern counties of Illinois, and there was little discernable defoliation between 2001 and 2005. Asian long-horned beetle, which was reported in 1998 also in northeastern Illinois, is believed to be eradicated from Illinois in 2008. Emerald ash borer was detected in Michigan in 2002 followed by Indiana then Illinois in 2006, Missouri in 2008 and states beyond in all directions outward through United States and Canada. Ash trees attacked by EAB show no resistance to the insect and typically die within three to five years after attack. Ash is an important component of Illinois' forest resources and an abundant species in woodland and riparian forests. Ash was also historically widely planted in urban and suburban streets, parks and areas until 2010. At that point Illinois contained approximately 170 million ash trees in the forests and rural landscapes plus another 30 million trees in cities and towns. The entirety of Illinois' ash resource faces imminent mortality from EAB (*Figure 3.*)




Figure 3.

Sudden Oak Death (SOD) affecting oak species and Thousand Cankers Disease (TCD) affecting walnut are disease complexes originally found in the western US now potentially threaten Illinois. If these two diseases increase to epidemic levels the forest health threat and eminent changes will be significant. Currently SOD is rare and thought not to be present in Illinois. Sudden oak death is caused by the fungal-like pathogen *Phytophthora (P.) ramorum*. Susceptible species include a variety of oaks, Douglas-fir, and rhododendron spp. (O'Brien et al. 2002). Established populations of SOD are known to occur only on the west US coast; however, transportation of infected nursery stock has introduced the pathogen to nurseries in a number of eastern and southern states. All Illinois samples collected during the survey period tested negative for SOD. TCD has been found in the Midwest and its actual affect in Illinois forests is yet to be determined. The value of existing walnut as well as the normal regeneration of walnut for the future values will be in jeopardy. The Illinois Department of Agriculture has established a walnut quarantine restricting and affecting walnut tree parts imported into Illinois.

Diseases caused by pathogens include oak wilt and Dutch elm disease (DED) still persists. The need for monitoring, assessing and managing forest health threats in Illinois has never been greater. Oak wilt, caused by the fungus *Ceratocystis fagacearum*, continues to be an important source of oak mortality in Illinois. All species of oak are susceptible to oak wilt, but the disease occurs more frequently and progresses more rapidly in red oak species. The incidence of DED continues to increase each year. Forty-five counties in Illinois reported moderate to heavy elm

mortality in 2005. The IDNR and its forestry division remain in need of a full-time forest health specialist to direct an active statewide forest health program to benefit all forests and all people of Illinois.

**Forestry Professionals Are Too Few** (Threat #4)

Trained forestry professionals and technical staff of the IDNR Division of Forest Resources are responsible for the bulk of the state’s forestry expertise and outreach to landowners, for tree nursery operations, for providing information and assistance to communities managing urban forests, and others needing their technical and practical advice. Lack of access to state forestry professionals seriously affect Illinois residents who own forested property within the state, for those who enjoy and visit Illinois’ forests and natural areas, and industries that rely on a steady flow of raw wood material. The critical issue at hand is the State of Illinois lacks a sufficient number of qualified experienced professional staff within the DNR to meet the forest management needs of its citizens and of the state.

In fiscal year 2006, the Illinois state appropriation to the IDNR represented a 22% reduction from FY 2004 and a 28% reduction from FY 2002. Staff reductions have been exacerbated by retirements. Early retirements in 2002 and subsequent budget cuts to IDNR over the past several years have reduced the Forestry Division’s professional, technical, and clerical staff by 39%, 67%, and 86% respectively. In the early 2000s five regional forester positions had foresters staffed and today, in 2016, only one regional forester exists. Currently, there are only 16 district foresters maintaining and operating field offices with virtually no clerical assistance. Two of those field office foresters have additional administrative and executive duties not allowing full attention to landowners, forests or the active consultants. Only one urban forester, who is an administrative program manager, is staffed for the entire state. Strategic planning dating back to the 1990s established called for additional districts to the historic 22 field districts and urban forestry field staff.

Commented [RFS1]: Stated below in better format

Illinois’ Division of Forest Resources foresters are required to support consultants in approving management plans, management practices, and other critical habitat in addition to mandated environmental projects. Consultants for prescribe burning, timber stand improvement (TSI), and management plans are at times not available or not interested due to low rates, or inconsistent monetary incentives of the IDNR Forestry Division. It is essential that state IDNR foresters are in place to support the activity of consultants and to help consultants serve the forests in the best interests of the resources and those landowners who truly (90%) control the resource. The DNR Office of Resource Conservation the Farm Programs Division administers three other significant statewide conservation programs significantly tied directly to forestry. Those programs are Illinois IRAP, CREP, and CSP; which are the Illinois Recreational Access Program, Illinois Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, and the Illinois Conservation Stewardship Program. These programs employ two foresters and a number of biologists yet they too are operating under-staffed and need additional field staff and foresters for field work for landowner needs, obligations and requests.



Illinois ranks 5<sup>th</sup> in the nation in terms of population and ranks number one in the nation for local units of government with 6,963 and is one of the top states for number of municipalities. Illinois has over 1,300 municipalities in 102 counties. Yet, Illinois Urban & Community Forestry Program only has one dedicated full time equivalent administrative position. Surrounding states with fewer local units of government, municipalities and citizens have had from five to ten dedicated urban and community forestry staff for the last couple of decades. In the central United States region, the state average is four dedicated State Urban and Community Forestry foresters. Illinois, where 88% of the citizens live in municipal areas, will require increased dedicated urban and community forestry field staffing. Efforts need to be made to increase the staffing level of the State Urban and Community Forestry Program and thereby strengthening program delivery opportunities to the local levels.

#### **Illinois Forest Industries Are Shrinking** (Threat #5)

Forest product producers and manufacturing firms comprise a small but important part of the State's economy, particularly in rural counties. The U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis reports that the relative contribution of paper and wood products manufacturing to the 2003 Illinois Gross State Product has followed national trends in the manufacturing sector and declined 0.5% (\$2.5 billion current dollars). The 2004 Illinois Statistical Abstract reports that in 2002, Illinois forestry, logging, wood and paper manufacturing employed over 40,000 people, while agriculture and forestry support activities over 12,000, and furniture and related products manufacturing over 20,000 people. The forestry, logging, wood and paper manufacturing categories combined had a total annual personal income and earnings value of \$2.1 billion in 2002. A 2012 economic impact study authorized by the IFDC and conducted by Mississippi State University showed forestry and forest products in Illinois represent \$23 billion dollars in annual value.

Nearly all of the primary wood-processing facilities in Illinois are sawmills processing state-grown logs. Wood processing facilities and sawmills in surrounding states of Wisconsin, Iowa, Missouri, Kentucky and Indiana also process a significant amount of Illinois grown logs. Collectively the mills offer Illinois woodland owners an outlet to sell timber and provide jobs in some of our state's rural areas. The demand for wood products is likely to increase, placing a greater demand on the state's forest resource. An important consideration for the economy of Illinois' is that Illinois primary wood-product markets, industries and mills retain and expand their ability to process the industrial logs and round-wood harvested here - leading to value-added production within this State. Currently, almost one-third of the industrial round-wood harvested in Illinois is sent to other states for processing providing much less benefit to the Illinois economy. Additionally, there is currently no market for standing small diameter timber (less than 10 inch trees) and few economically feasible options to collect this material if harvested in thinning operations. Current forest management practices, which often prescribe removing the small diameter trees from a forest stand in thinning scenarios, assume the prescribed trees will be culled without removal from the forest.

Overall, the number of sawmills within Illinois has decreased in size by 72% since 1961. This loss is partly attributed to higher workers-compensation rates, utility rates, and business taxes compared to neighboring states. According to the Illinois Sawmill survey of 2005 there were 150 working sawmills compared to eight years later, in 2013, when only 75 existed. This 50% reduction in mills over 8 years is estimated to be closely related to the recession which began in 2007 by which this country is still recovering. A fact that exemplifies the need for more Illinois forest industries is that during the closing and idling of half of the Illinois mills in the last decade the amount of timber harvested from Illinois forests has remained constant and at the date of this publication is increasing.

### **Urban and Community Forests Face Extreme Pressures and Challenges** (Threat #6)

Urban and community forests occur in nearly all communities throughout the Northeast and Midwest, from the most urban to rural. The benefits of trees, forests and other green infrastructure contribute to the quality of life in all Illinois communities. In an integrated approach, most states urban & community forestry programs seek to help protect and maintain existing tree cover; implement best management practices; and engage local officials and the public in planning, sustaining, and improving forest resources in and around cities, suburbs, and towns. (NASF 2016).

The quality and quantity of the Illinois urban forests is in jeopardy. Since 1990, there has been approximately a 7 percent increase in municipal lands statewide. Increased urbanization is outpacing reforestation efforts and most community's ability to manage urban forests. There is a substantial need to further practices and policies which can sustain and improve urban forests. The urban and community forest itself has multiple ownerships, multiple stake holders as well as neighbors. These interests need to be coordinated to mobilize effective forest management responses during natural disasters, emergencies or insect and disease epidemics. Management strategies for urban forestry desperately need to be integrated at all levels – state and local government, regional planning, environmental organizations, and citizen-based groups.

Our urban forests face pressure and challenges from four separate but intertwined threats: a shortage of technical and financial assistance for communities, invasive species impacting the urban forest canopy, low levels of species diversity, and a lack of statewide inventory information and analysis.

#### ***Shortage of Technical and Financial Assistance for Communities***

Since 1991 IDNR has provided funding to cities, villages and towns through the 50/50 cost share Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Act grant program. These cost-share funds helped countless communities develop tree ordinances, establish local programs, inventory trees, and develop management plans. The results of the inventories helped local municipal managers and foresters fight for better budgets, sustain a safe tree environment for citizens, and manage healthy, sustainable forests. These funds have also been used for tornado re-leaf projects with tree planting and other reforestation projects in our communities. The state uses the USDA FS

federal Urban and Community funds provided as state core funding for this grant program. Since the state does not allocate or authorize the flow of those funds, the grant program is currently not getting funds to the local level. Since community forest canopies have thinned and the health and integrity of our municipal forests have been compromised the lack of forestry funding remains a great concern to urban forests.

In addition, there is a discrepancy between the growth and development of local urban and community forestry programs in the northern part of the state compared to the southern part. “Northeastern and Central Illinois seemed to have greater growth in the areas of dedicated staff, the number of positions, and formal education or training. “It is apparent that smaller communities and especially non-Tree City USA communities are still struggling to get educational and technical information to manage their local forest resources” (Sass 2010). 15% of Illinois communities are Tree City USA accredited. This makes Illinois third in the nation for TCU participation. However, more communities could be reached if there were dedicated urban forestry field staff. Illinois uses federal funding for this program and lacks dedicated state funding for financial and technical outreach to local units of government for urban forestry program deliver. As our rural areas are converted to urban areas the need for staffing to assist municipalities in sustaining the existing trees and integrating protected green spaces into a built environment becomes greater.

**Commented [RFS2]:** Changes made but not tracked for some reason. Statement about TC vs not is deleted because it is outlined below in management section

### *Invasive Species Impacting the Urban Forest Canopy*

In an ever expanding global environment our local urban forests are being exposed to new invasive species in the form of insects, pathogens, and plants. These pests can have a significant impact on the urban forest in a number of different ways from impacting tree health potentially leading to death, crowding out preferred species in natural areas, or redirecting limited resources. The latest in a long line of invasive species Emerald ash borer (EAB), a forestry pest imported from accidentally imported from Asia, present an excellent and current example.

EAB is currently a significant and eminent threat as a pest that is causing communities to treat, remove, and replant trees thus increasing the need for funding (Hauer, 2016). Many communities have limited forestry budgets and because of the EAB epidemic they are now diverting their spending from tree planting and tree care to ash tree removal. According to Hauer and Peterson, 2016, “In places with EAB, the tree and stump removal rate was 32% compared to 20% in states without EAB. Budgets for tree watering, public education, safety training, and fertilization also declined in response to budgets allocated for EAB.” Those urban and community forests not getting a full management regime, annual tree care or needed reforestation during the intense tree removal of ash are in jeopardy. The safety of our citizens becomes at risk due to cut backs in tree trimming budgets which facilitate reducing tree risk and increasing tree integrity in the forest.

### ***Improved Species Diversity is Needed***

One of the simplest and most cost effective means to minimize the impact of invasive species is to diversify the species of trees planted in the urban forest. Unfortunately, when funding for urban forestry programs needs to be redirected for invasive species management, often one of the first items cut or reduced is funding for tree replacement. In these cases, replacement can be left in the hands of untrained professionals. When this is combined with the fact that the local nursery industry is also frequently impacted financially by the same pests, the result can be the overall health of the urban and community forest is not usually considered when the tree gets sold or planted as part of the urban forest. “The future of our urban and community forests is dependent upon what is being grown today by our nursery industry. If the nursery industry is not diversifying their stock or is not watching for invasive species, the future of our urban forest is compromised. Our future urban forests are what the nursery industry is growing today.” (Hildebrandt, 2016). Dialogue is critical to educating and changing consumer behavior and enabling nurseries to grow a more diverse population of trees while at the same time still sustaining their business. Without continued education and outreach targeting the green industry, municipal leaders, and citizens our communities’ urban forests will be at risk of another epidemic of similar proportions to the Dutch elm disease or EAB. This issue seriously impacts our existing and future urban forests and rural forests that surround them.

### ***Lack of Statewide Inventory Information and Analysis***

There currently is not a detailed statewide urban forestry inventory and assessment of the tree canopy and tree resources within the municipal forests of Illinois. It is essential to establish this baseline data in order to create urban and community forest goals and management strategies. A statewide level inventory is needed since most of the research we have is conducted only in the Chicago region. Even the establishment of the new Urban Forest Inventory Assessment implemented by the USDA Forest Service across the nation (Urban FIA) focuses on only the Chicago and St. Louis regions. Due to the geography and demographics of Illinois; urban and community plots are needed in central and southern Illinois sites for more useful data and findings.

Commented [RFS3]: Said in paragraph above

### **Forestry Funding and Additional Significant other Threats Exist (Threat #7)**

Threats to the forest resources such as those outlined and the actions practical to mitigating these threats are inter-related and do affect each other. The last primary, significant threat is a group of important, historically-documented and still current concerns to the Illinois forest resource that are difficult to categorize individually. The lack of permanent forestry funding (Threat 7a.) summarized below is among the most significant of all the seven statewide threats within this action plan and most significant within this threat.

### **7 a. Lack of Permanent Forestry Funding**

Illinois has failed to generate or legislate permanent funding for forest and natural resources conservation and remains in great need of doing so. Forests are so critical to the environment, quality of life and the economy of Illinois and this country that a specific legislative or voter backed funding mechanism to guarantee steady and expanded funding to the state forestry division within the DNR to directly support protecting and sustainably managing all forests within Illinois. Lack of investment into forestry agencies, forest resources management, and other forest resource conservation protection negatively affects all forestry sectors including mills, forest landowners, professional services, and the universities forestry programs. The forestry outputs and services from Illinois forests is currently estimated to be very low relative to the amount of forested land having technical management plans. The forestry outputs and services from our forests is also currently estimated to be very low relative to the total amount of forested land existing in Illinois. Seventy-five percent (75%) of forested ownerships in Illinois over 10 acres in size are not managed nor have professional technical recommendations (*Figures 4*). Within the 25% of owners having 10 acres or more forest that do have written technical plans by a professional - too few are fully and actively engaged in full implementation. The forestry division managers and foresters estimate only 30% of ownerships having formal plans make reasonable efforts or are actively working toward full implementation. There are not enough state service foresters, state program foresters or consulting foresters to assure all existing technical forest management plans are implemented. The lack of permanent dedicated forestry funding remains one of the most significant threats to the forest resources of Illinois. Permanent funding for forestry could dramatically increase the output of rich functioning wildlife habitat, forest products into the economy, clean water and protected soil, recreational opportunities and all other services and benefits forestry provides to all citizens of Illinois and beyond.

### **7 b. Reforestation/Afforestation**

Reforestation and afforestation (reforestation) in Illinois has always been important based on the fact the state was once 14 million acres of forest and today is only 5 million acres. That once forested land is in various uses today and some is permanently “developed”. Marginal farmland in Illinois, by definition, rarely exists because nearly all of our agriculture soils produce a regular crop. Relative to the excellent production and yield on most of Illinois farmland, soils are often referred to as “marginal” in that they can produce better, more profitable alternate crops such as timber, orchards, grains or grasses than corn and soybeans. Hundreds of thousands of acres of “marginal” agriculture fields having relatively poor corn and bean yields continue to be farmed which would be much better suited to forests and forest management. Additional rich farmlands that once were forested remain environmentally sensitive. These exist mostly along the larger river systems throughout Illinois and continue to be farmed. For purposes of soil and water conservation and environmental quality they should be reforested. The CREP program estimated nearly 250,000 acres of that riverine land in the Illinois River watershed alone. Approximately 400,000 acres of historic natural forests remain grazed and degraded. Those lands are in need of

livestock restriction and reforestation and restoration as well. The Illinois Wildlife Action Plan notes critical need of state wildlife is the reforestation of over 300,000 acres to new forest state-wide. The significant need for additional reforestation for wildlife habitat, for soil, water & atmospheric conservation, for recreation and timber production and a host of other functions is not being met and continues to be a threat to the forests of Illinois.

### **7 c. Alternate Forest Management Objectives**

As a demographic, farm and non-farm forest owners most often fail to assign realistic value to the timber in their woodlands. Historic and current surveys show timber proceeds and timber management is not a top reason most forest owners hold their land, yet; most owners of most tracts do actually harvest timber at some point. These same owners fail to understand, in general, that timber and most all other forest management are inter-related. Realizing the objectives of aesthetics, wildlife, environment, or recreation, for example, are dependent on the same healthy vigorous forest that produces the eventual timber income (*Figure 5*). The threat to the forest resource is those landowners who have non-timber ownership and management objectives often do not seek out a forester. Professional Foresters are equipped to deliver any desired future condition for almost any landowner. A wide range of alternate forest management objectives are very commonly heard by foresters who continue to work closely with other natural resource specialists to address a wide range of desired conditions such as habitat requirements, forest health, and various environmental outputs of particular forests. Forestry perceptions of landowners concerning their need for forest management, or for engaging a forester to deliver comprehensive forest management, is a growing threat to Illinois forests and statewide forest health. The threat is realized by still high percentage of unmanaged and degrading forests. Both alternate and traditional management of Illinois forests needs to be channeled through Professional Foresters to manage individual forests and achieve robust, stand and landscape-level environmental outputs.

### **7 d. Lack of Support for IDNR Owned Nurseries**

The IDNR Forestry Division's Nursery Production Program sources, integrates, and produces native genetic materials for forest planting and reforestation. The program also provides stock for urban forest and other land-covers such as prairies, savannahs and wetlands. The need for native plant materials for restoration and reforestation is currently threatened by a pending shutdown of the IDNR Forest Nursery Program due to current statewide budgetary constraints. A nursery shut down would threaten critical and mandated reforestation and habitat restoration projects and a potentially impede financial revenue resources to IDNR's forestry division. The Illinois state nursery has huge potential, due to prudent planning and actions of the nursery staff and leadership, to expand production of high-demand materials such as native herbaceous plants, prairie grasses and pollinator species as well as native genome stock for the robust Illinois nursery industry. When fully operational the DNR Forest Nursery program can grow 6 million hardwood tree seedlings annually which can stock 12,000 acres of land to new, young forest

stands each spring with the guidance of a Professional Forester or contractor. A desired healthy Illinois landscape ensuring quality forests requires the state nursery to continue to produce high quality, genetically sound stock to a level to support that annual reforestation, habitat restoration, and establishment of native plant species throughout Illinois.

**7 e. High-grading/Degrading Forests with Unplanned Harvests.**

Excellent markets for Illinois white oak, black walnut and other fine hardwood logs has contributed significantly to degraded forest stands due to unplanned and unregulated harvesting favoring cutting only the best trees or the most valuable species. Landowners who do not consult a Professional Forester to specify scientific, forest health and productivity decisions to designate harvest trees for cutting are likely to experience a timber buyer or cutter removing only, or all, of the best trees. Often, unscrupulous timber buyers misrepresent themselves as forestry professionals to make a deal favoring themselves, the buyer. In most cases where woodlands are degraded - usually driven by the buyer's potential profit - a landowner agrees to a timber cutting deal without the knowledge of which trees should be cut and what the trees are worth. Cutting the best trees or species, especially when all of those are cut, often yields no suitable seed stock for future natural regeneration of the valuable native hardwood forest. Wildlife habitat is also degraded when too many seed bearing hard mast (nut) trees are removed. Prevailing forestry silviculture dictates that cutting only or all of the worst trees and worst species (less those needed for specific habitats) each time a harvest occurs yields a continuous higher quality, healthier and more profitable forest which can be sustainable over generations. Professional Consulting Foresters, practicing locally or regionally, are available statewide and work only for landowners without interests or ownership in mills, markets, log sales or industry businesses. The DNR District Foresters are also available to give unbiased science based recommendations and harvest advisement to all landowners owning 10 acres of forest. The DNR Division of Forest Resources estimates seventy-five percent (75%) of sales and harvests of timber on private lands lack professional advisement or involvement. High-grading timber stands means future harvests yield diminished returns or often are non-marketable. In some cases, many decades of repair and restoration would be required to return a high-graded forest to a full stocking of healthy, desirable hardwood tree species.



### Family Forest Ownerships with 10+ Acres in Illinois, 2011-2013

The U.S. Forest Service, Forest Inventory and Analysis program conducts the National Woodland Owner Survey in order to better understand: who owns America's forests, why they own it, what they have done with it in the past, and what they intend to do with it in the future. This document summarizes data on family forest owners with 10+ acres in Illinois. These summaries are based on responses from randomly selected landowners from across Illinois collected between 2011 and 2013 (n=177). For explanations of the numbers and figures below, underlying summary tables, additional results, definitions, and methods see supplementary information at <http://dx.doi.org/10.2737/NRS-RN-205> or visit [www.fia.fs.fed.us/nwos](http://www.fia.fs.fed.us/nwos).

#### General Forest Ownership Information<sup>1</sup>

Table 1.—Forest land in Illinois by ownership category

Ownership Category	Area Acres (millions)	Standard Error (SE)
Family	3.7	<0.1
Corporate	0.3	<0.1
Other private	<0.1	<0.1
Federal	0.4	<0.1
State	0.2	<0.1
Local	0.2	<0.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>0.1</b>




Figure 1.—Percentage of forest land in Illinois by ownership category.<sup>2</sup>



Figure 2.—Private (▨) and public (▩) forest land across Illinois. Source: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2737/RDS-2014-0002> (Hewes et al. 2014b).



#### Characteristics of Family Forest Ownerships with 10+ Acres in Illinois

- Area owned: 3,435,000 acres<sup>3</sup> (SE=108,000)
- Number of ownerships: 76,000 (SE=6,000)




Figure 3.—Size of forest holdings.



Figure 4.—Forest land is part of home or farm.




Figure 5.—Forest land tenure.






Figure 6.—Reasons for owning.<sup>4,5</sup>




Figure 9.—Activities in the past 5 years.<sup>5</sup>




Figure 7.—Landowner concerns.<sup>4</sup>




Figure 10.—Likely activities in the next 5 years.<sup>6</sup>




Figure 8.—Landowner age.



Figure 11.—Management activities.

<sup>1</sup> Values in this section are based on Forest Inventory and Analysis ([www.fia.fs.fed.us](http://www.fia.fs.fed.us)) data collected between 2008 and 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Error bars on all figures represent a 68 percent confidence interval around the value depicted.

<sup>3</sup> This value does not equal the value in Table 1 because it excludes ownerships with 1-9 acres of forest land.

<sup>4</sup> Excluding, where applicable, the "none of the above" option, respondents could select multiple options.

<sup>5</sup> NTFPs = nontimber forest products.

See the Supplemental Information document (<http://dx.doi.org/10.2737/NRS-RN-205>) for details on data sources and graphics.

**Suggested citation:** Butler, Brett J.; Butler, Sarah M. 2016. Family forest ownerships with 10+ acres in Illinois, 2011-2013. Res. Note NRS-213. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 2 p. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2737/NRS-RN-213>.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

(Figure 5).

## Current Conditions and Trends of Illinois Forests:

### Ecological Provinces of Illinois

Illinois spans three ecological provinces: The Eastern Broadleaf Forest, the Prairie Parkland, and the Lower Mississippi Riverine Forest (*Figure 6*).

The rolling hills and flat expanses of the Eastern Broadleaf Forest Province are dominated by a diverse mixture of broadleaf deciduous species. Relatively low precipitation in the area favors the drought resistance of the oak/hickory forest-type group (Bailey 1995). Major species include: white oak, red oak, black oak, shagbark hickory, and bitternut hickory. Maple, beech, and basswood increase in dominance in the northern portions of the province. In this area, sugar maple and American basswood dominate the maple/basswood forest type (Bailey 1995).

The Prairie Parkland Province is characterized by an alternating pattern of prairie and deciduous forest. Forested portions of the province consist of uplands dominated by oak and hickory, moist slopes dominated by oak and central hardwoods, and floodplains where eastern cottonwood and American elm are common species. Grasses and forbs are the predominant vegetation in prairies (Bailey 1995).

Broad floodplains and low terraces typify the land form of the Lower Mississippi Riverine Forest Province (Bailey 1995). Vegetation is classified as bottomland deciduous forest and the primary forest-type groups are oak/gum/cypress and oak/hickory. Major species include nuttall oak, water oak, cherrybark oak, cottonwood, sycamore, and bald cypress in the oak/gum/cypress group, and post oak, bur oak, and northern red oak in the oak/hickory group. Pecan, green ash, sweetgum and water tupelo are also present (Bailey 1995; McNab and Avers 1996).

The greatest percentage of Illinois' forest land is in southern Illinois, much of which is in the Shawnee National Forest (*Figure 7*). There is also significant forest area in the western portion of the State along the borders of the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers.

### Distribution of Forest Land by Forest Type and Stand Size

Occupying 65 percent of forest land, oak/hickory is the predominant forest-type group in Illinois (Figure 2). Though oak/hickory is found throughout the State, this forest-type group is highly concentrated in west-central and southern Illinois. Elm/ash/cottonwood, which makes up 23 percent of forest land, is the second largest forest-type group.

Forest land in Illinois consists largely of stands with sawtimber-size trees. Sawtimber occupies 3.3 million acres, or 72 percent of forest land. Twenty percent of forest land is made up of poletimber and 8 percent contains sapling/seedlings. Mature oak/hickory stands are the most prominent feature on Illinois forest land.

Please see Appendix XX titled *Illinois Forest Resources 2010* (linked below) for further information on the statistics and facts about Illinois forests pertaining to this and other sections of this IFAP. This plan uses primarily 2005 data from previous forest inventory and analysis reports. This appendix is the most current data for Illinois:

[http://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/rn/rn\\_nrs120.pdf](http://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/rn/rn_nrs120.pdf) (Snapshot Report)

[http://www.fs.fed.us/nrs/pubs/ru/ru\\_fs39.pdf](http://www.fs.fed.us/nrs/pubs/ru/ru_fs39.pdf) (Full Report)

DRAFT




Figure 6.—Ecological provinces of Illinois (Bailey 1995).




Figure 7.—Distribution of forest land by forest-type group, Illinois, 2005.

### Forest Area

In the early 1800s, prior to European settlement, tall grass prairie and eastern deciduous forests were the dominant features on the Illinois landscape (Illinois State Nat. Survey Div. 1960). Forests during this period spanned an estimated 13.8 million acres, approximately 40 percent of the total land area. For nearly 120 years, from 1800 to the 1920s, the Illinois forests declined and in 1924 reached the lowest point with only 3 million acres of forest land (Telford 1926). A survey of Illinois' forest resources in 1948 revealed an increase to 4 million acres. Since 1948, forest land has steadily risen and is currently an estimated 4.5 million acres (Figure 8).




Figure 8—Area of forest land by inventory year, Illinois, 2005 (error bars represent a 66-percent confidence interval).

Illinois' forest land began to increase in the 1960s and 1970s as a result of a declining farm economy. The reduced need for agricultural land fueled a reversion of pastures and marginal agricultural lands to forest land. A second increase in forest area occurred during the latter half of the 1980s. This was due in large part to the success of state and national programs designed to promote well managed forests and forest regeneration. Since the Illinois Forestry Development Act of 1983, which granted cost-share assistance and favorable tax treatment for timber-producing forested lands having forest management plan, the annual rate of increase in forest area has nearly doubled from 0.2 percent between 1948 and 1985 to 0.3 percent between 1985

and 2005. The greatest increase occurred between 1998 and 2005, when the annual rate of increase was 0.6 percent.

Nonforested land with trees accounts for 2 percent of Illinois' total land base (*Figure 9*). The greatest percentages of nonforest land with trees are within the northern and southern tiers of the State. There are several classes of nonforest land that contain trees. In Illinois, the urban and other with trees class has the largest area of nonforest land with trees. However, a substantial portion is also found in pasture and rangeland with trees, and in narrow wooded strips lacking interior forest values. Non-forest land with trees adds an additional 858,900 acres of land to the total area of land with tree cover, or the area of treed land. Thus, nonforest land with trees and forest land form a combined total 5.3 million acres of treed land, which is equivalent to 15 percent of the total land area in the State. Even with the addition of nonforest land with trees, the southern tier remains the most heavily treed portion of Illinois.




Figure 9—Distribution of total land area by land use, Illinois, 2005.

#### Biomass

Illinois biomass has been increasing since 1985 (*Figure 10*). Currently estimated at 210.6 million dry tons, an average of 48 dry tons per acre, the distribution of biomass is similar to that of forest area. The majority of biomass is found in the southern tier of the State, primarily within or near the purchase areas of the Shawnee National Forest. Biomass on private forest land is currently about five times greater than biomass on public forest land; however, public forest land contains

more biomass per acre (Figure 10). Growing-stock trees contain 84 percent of biomass; 11 percent is in other trees, and 5 percent is in saplings.

Illinois' forests sequester 343 million tons of carbon. Live trees, which sequester 44 percent of total carbon, are the State's largest source of forest carbon. Soil is another substantial carbon pool (33 percent). Additional carbon pools include live trees, below ground (8 percent); the forest floor (7 percent); down and dead wood (4 percent); standing dead trees (3 percent); and understory vegetation (1 percent).




Figure 5.—Live biomass per acre of forest land by ownership and inventory year, Illinois, 1985 - 2005 (error bars represent a 66-percent confidence interval).

#### Species Composition

Illinois' forest land contains just over 2 billion trees (greater than 1 inch in dbh) from nearly 100 different species. This number represents a 25 percent decrease in the number of trees between 1998 and 2005, consistent with a maturing forest resource, equivalent to a reduction of about a half billion trees. American elm, sugar maple, and black cherry are the most abundant species by number (Figure 11).






Figure 11.—Top 10 species on forest land by number of live trees, Illinois, 1998-2005.

Live volume on forest land is an estimated 8 billion cubic feet. Most of this volume is found in the large-diameter size classes (Figure 12). White oak remains the most dominant species (Figure 13). Between 1998 and 2005, there were significant volume increases in silver maple, green ash, and American elm and a significant decrease in black oak volume.

Illinois' forests are composed of a diverse array of tree species. White oak, black oak, northern red oak, and silver maple are the most voluminous species in the State. The most abundant species, in terms of total number, are American elm and sugar maple, along with a host of predominantly understory species. While this is a reflection of variation in ecological roles, where species such as hackberry, eastern hop-hornbeam, and flowering dogwood are typically understory species and oaks and maples are dominant overstory species, it is also a sign of changing understory dynamics. Disturbance, particularly from harvesting and fire management, promotes oak regeneration. The absence of such disturbances has allowed shade-tolerant species to out-compete understory oaks. Thus, although oaks are fewer in number, their dominance in volume is due to high numbers of mature trees in the overstory. As these oaks continue to senesce, oak mortality will create gaps in the overstory that will likely be filled by maples and elms that now represent the majority of understory species. In the absence of wide-scale intervention, non-oaks will replace oaks as the dominant species within Illinois forests.




Figure 12.—Live volume on forest land by stand-size class and inventory year, Illinois, 1998-2005.




Figure 13.—Live volume on forest land for the 10 most voluminous species, Illinois, 1998-2005 (error bars represent a 66-percent confidence interval).

### Forest Density

An average acre of Illinois forest land contains 459 trees. Live volume per acre of forest land has steadily increased since 1985 and now totals an estimated 1,751 cubic feet per acre (Figure 14). Most of Illinois forest land is fully (40 percent) or moderately stocked (44 percent). Overstocked stands, which represent 3 percent of forest land, contain too many trees to support adequate tree growth and development. Poorly stocked stands that do not contain enough trees to fully utilize a site represent 12 percent of forest land area. All stands containing ash species will experience lighter canopy stocking over a short time period, to the degree ash is present, as mortality of all ash is expected due to Emerald Ash Borer sometime over the next 15 years depending on the geographical location stands.




Figure 14—Live volume per acre of forest land by inventory year, Illinois, 1985-2005 (error bars represent a 66-percent confidence interval).

Illinois' overstory is currently dominated by oak, maple, hickory, and ash sawtimber (Table 1A). As a group, oaks make up the largest percentage of sawtimber density (28 percent), but represent only 7 percent of sapling/poletimber density. In comparison, maple species make up a smaller percentage of sawtimber density (14 percent) and a larger portion of sapling/poletimber density (12 percent). Overall, there is much higher density in the smaller sapling and poletimber trees. American elm, sugar maple, black cherry, hackberry, and green ash have the highest sapling/poletimber densities.

Species	Sawtimber density <sup>†</sup>					
	1985		1998		2005	
	estimate	SE	estimate	SE	estimate	SE
Boxelder	0.5 a	± 0.08	0.6 ab	± 0.10	0.9 b	± 0.14
Red maple	0.4 a	± 0.07	0.7 b	± 0.11	0.5 b	± 0.12
Silver maple	1.4 a	± 0.16	2.2 b	± 0.24	3.0 c	± 0.39
Sugar maple	0.9 a	± 0.09	1.2 b	± 0.11	1.2 ab	± 0.15
Pignut hickory	0.8 a	± 0.07	1.1 b	± 0.10	1.3 b	± 0.14
Shagbark hickory	1.0 a	± 0.08	1.3 b	± 0.10	1.6 c	± 0.16
Mockernut hickory	0.6 a	± 0.06	0.8 b	± 0.08	0.4 c	± 0.08
Hackberry	0.5 a	± 0.07	0.8 b	± 0.09	1.2 c	± 0.13
White ash	0.9 a	± 0.08	1.1 b	± 0.10	0.8 a	± 0.12
Green ash	0.6 a	± 0.08	1.0 b	± 0.10	1.5 c	± 0.17
E. hophornbeam	0.0 a	n/a	0.0 a	n/a	0.0 a	n/a
Black cherry	0.5 a	± 0.05	0.8 b	± 0.08	1.0 c	± 0.12
White oak	4.1 a	± 0.22	5.0 b	± 0.27	4.8 b	± 0.36
Shingle oak	0.4 a	± 0.05	0.8 b	± 0.08	0.9 b	± 0.12
Bur oak	0.6 a	± 0.08	0.7 a	± 0.10	0.8 b	± 0.14
Northern red oak	1.6 a	± 0.11	2.1 b	± 0.15	1.9 b	± 0.19
Black oak	3.0 a	± 0.19	3.5 b	± 0.22	2.9 a	± 0.25
Sassafras	0.1 a	± 0.03	0.2 ab	± 0.04	0.3 b	± 0.06
American elm	0.7 a	± 0.06	1.0 b	± 0.08	1.2 c	± 0.13
Slippery elm	0.4 a	± 0.04	0.4 a	± 0.05	0.5 a	± 0.08
All other species	9.4 a	± 0.38	12.2 b	± 0.49	13.6 c	± 0.71
<b>Total</b>	<b>29.5 a</b>	<b>± 0.53</b>	<b>37.5 b</b>	<b>± 0.63</b>	<b>40.1 c</b>	<b>± 0.87</b>

Table 1A.—Sawtimber density, expressed as number of live trees per acre on forest land, by inventory year, Illinois, 1985-2005 (Sampling errors [SE] represent a 66-percent confidence interval. Sawtimber density estimates for a given species are not significantly different from one another if followed by the same letter). †Sawtimber trees must be greater than 9 inches dbh. for softwoods and greater than 11 inches dbh. for hardwoods.

For the past 20 years, oaks have made up a large portion of the overstory. Presently, the density of American elm, silver maple, shagbark hickory, and green ash (where the borer is not present) sawtimber is increasing, while the density of oak sawtimber is decreasing (Table 1A). Individually, the density of most oak saplings and poletimber has remained fairly constant. Black oak, whose sapling/poletimber density dramatically fell between 1998 and 2005, is a major exception (Table 1B). As a group, the density of oak saplings and poletimber has slightly decreased over time.

Species	Sapling/poletimber density <sup>†</sup>					
	1985		1998		2005	
	estimate	SE	estimate	SE	estimate	SE
Boxelder	13.5 a	± 1.30	18.0 b	± 2.84	12.1 a	± 2.30
Red maple	7.9 a	± 1.30	10.2 a	± 3.40	4.6 b	± 0.96
Silver maple	12.8 a	± 1.41	7.9 b	± 1.52	7.3 b	± 1.28
Sugar maple	28.0 a	± 2.13	32.0 a	± 4.20	26.6 a	± 3.00
Pignut hickory	15.1 a	± 1.05	12.0 ab	± 2.92	9.5 b	± 1.13
Shagbark hickory	8.5 a	± 0.93	15.7 b	± 1.98	12.1 c	± 1.28
Mockernut hickory	11.0 a	± 1.07	8.2 b	± 1.70	3.8 c	± 0.68
Hackberry	15.6 a	± 1.18	28.6 b	± 3.49	22.3 c	± 2.22
White ash	15.2 a	± 1.14	16.9 a	± 2.19	7.7 b	± 1.15
Green ash	11.0 a	± 1.21	12.0 a	± 1.95	18.6 b	± 2.18
E. hophornbeam	18.1 a	± 1.58	25.0 b	± 3.53	19.0 ab	± 2.60
Black cherry	16.0 a	± 1.34	29.4 b	± 3.30	22.1 c	± 2.02
White oak	12.4 a	± 0.92	9.1 b	± 1.07	7.1 b	± 0.84
Shingle oak	7.1 a	± 0.72	15.7 b	± 3.90	8.1 a	± 1.36
Bur oak	1.1 a	± 0.22	1.6 ab	± 0.86	1.8 b	± 0.46
Northern red oak	4.1 a	± 0.47	3.6 a	± 0.81	3.2 a	± 0.50
Black oak	12.4 a	± 1.01	15.1 a	± 2.19	7.7 b	± 1.07
Sassafras	22.4 a	± 1.62	26.9 a	± 3.73	17.7 b	± 1.91
American elm	50.0 a	± 2.38	78.5 b	± 6.23	51.3 a	± 3.59
Slippery elm	28.0 a	± 1.55	23.5 a	± 2.94	15.3 b	± 1.69
All other species	140.3 a	± 4.28	159.3 b	± 9.46	129.5 c	± 6.36
<b>Total</b>	<b>450.3 a</b>	<b>± 6.93</b>	<b>549.4 b</b>	<b>± 20.99</b>	<b>407.4 c</b>	<b>± 10.71</b>


Table 1B.—Sapling/poletimber density, expressed as number of live trees per acre on forest land, by inventory year, Illinois, 1985-2005 (Sampling errors [SE] represent a 66-percent confidence interval. Sapling/poletimber density estimates for a given species are not significantly different from one another if followed by the same letter). <sup>†</sup>Sapling/poletimber trees range from 1.0 to 8.9 inches dbh. for softwoods and from 1.0 to 10.9 inches dbh. for hardwoods.

The decrease in the number of trees per acre and the increase in live volume per acre are indicative of mature stands with adequate spacing and good growth. This is a result of the increased availability of growing space following a reduction in the overall number of trees. The stems that remain then face less competition for growing space and are able to grow more quickly. The existence of quality growth conditions is mirrored in the current levels of stocking, which show that the growing space available for tree development is fully utilized on the majority of forest acreage.

Evidence of possible transition to maple forest types is reflected in the changes in forest density among Illinois' saplings, poletimber, and sawtimber trees. The density of oak sawtimber appears to be leveling off and it does not appear that oak will replace itself in the overstory. A lack of increasing oak density in the sapling/poletimber size classes coupled with decreasing oak sawtimber density and high maple sapling/poletimber density is an indication that future stands may include fewer oaks and more maples.

**Ownership**

Illinois' forest land is predominantly held by private landowners. An estimated 206,000 families and individuals own a total of 3.5 million acres, or 77 percent of forest land. An additional 265,000 acres are owned by other private groups (e.g., corporations, associations, etc.). Collectively, private owners hold 82 percent of the State's forests. Family forest owners generally own less than 10 acres of forest land (*Figure 15*). However, family forest owners with landholdings greater than 10 acres own more than 55 percent of private forest land. The most common reasons for owning forest land are related to beauty and scenery, forest land as part of a farm, privacy, and as a family asset or legacy to pass on to heirs. Timber has been harvested on 11 percent of privately owned forest land in the past 5 years. Four percent of family forest owners reported having a written forest management plan and 15 percent have sought management advice. Trespassing was rated as a significant concern by 46 percent of family forest owners. Other prevalent concerns were related to vandalism, dumping, property taxes, and owners' abilities to keep their land intact for heirs. One in 10 acres of forest land is owned by someone who plans to transfer or sell it within the next 5 years. This is related, in part, to owner age; 49 percent of family forest land is owned by people 65 or older.




*Figure 15—Area of family owned forests and number of family forest owners by size of landholdings, Illinois, 2002-2004.*

Cooperating Illinois Forestry Development Act (FDA) forest landowners having a ten-year forest management plan represent about 1 in 8 eligible forest landowners, or 13 %, who own 10 acres or more of forestland. Those FDA landowners manage over 600,000 acres of the 3.1 million privately held Illinois forest acres which equates to 20% of private forestland parcels 10 acres or larger. Forest parcels 10 acres in size happen to be the general minimum operational threshold for a timber buyer seeking standing timber. Not having a written or FDA approved plan does not mean owners do not work with a professional forester. Consulting foresters help landowners manage forests of all sizes everyday regardless if they have a written plan or whether or not they are enrolled in the FDA as a cooperator. The best estimate from DFR forestry staff is about 25 percent of landowners owning 10 acres or more of timber have a plan written by a professional forester and/or work with a professional forester.

Riparian Forests

Riparian forests total an estimated 992,500 acres and account for 22 percent of Illinois’ forest land. A mapped distribution of riparian forests using U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s National Wetlands Inventory data shows that much of these forests are concentrated along rivers and streams in the southern tier of Illinois. FIA data indicates that 74 percent of riparian forest land is



in narrow floodplains and bottomlands that are less than a quarter mile wide. Illinois’ riparian forests currently contain an estimated 352.3 million live trees, an average of 355 trees per acre of riparian forest land. Nearly 70 tree species were identified; the most commonly observed species were American elm, green ash, silver maple, hackberry, and boxelder (Figure 16). These five species account for half of the total number of trees on riparian forest land.

Figure 16—Top 12 species, by number of trees, in riparian physiographic classes on forest land, Illinois, 2005 (error bars represent a 66-percent confidence interval).

Estimates show that riparian forests contain 2.1 billion cubic feet of volume, or 26 percent of the State's total live volume of forest land. Silver maple (29 percent of total riparian volume), eastern cottonwood (9 percent), green ash (7 percent), hackberry and sycamore (5 percent each) have the greatest percentage of volume in riparian forests. Thirty-eight percent of total mortality of growing stock on forest land occurred in riparian forests. Species with considerable mortality include: red maple (6.3 million cubic feet), silver maple (3.6 million cubic feet), American elm (3.3 million cubic feet), hackberry (2 million cubic feet), green ash (1.3 million cubic feet), and pin oak (474,500 cubic feet).

Average Annual Growth

Since 1962, average annual net growth of growing stock has been on the rise. Net growth averaged 327 million cubic feet per year between 1998 and 2005. Nearly all of that growth (98 percent) was in hardwoods. Silver maple had the highest growth rate, followed by eastern cottonwood, white oak, and northern red oak (Figure 17). Collectively, Illinois' major oak species (white, northern red, bur, and black oak) account for 23 percent of total growth. The bulk of growth occurred in large-diameter stands. Ninety-four percent of net growth in white, northern red, bur and black oaks was in large-diameter stands.




Figure 12.—Average annual net growth of growing stock on forest land for the top 12 species, Illinois, 1998 to 2005.



Illinois' forests are growing at their highest rates since 1962. The preponderance of this growth is occurring within large-diameter stands, which indicates that mature trees are continuing to increase in volume. While sustained growth of large-diameter oak increases its availability for commercial wood products, growth of other species in a variety of size classes suggests that in the future oak may not be as dominant as it is today.

#### Average Annual Removals

Growing-stock removal rates began a rapid climb during the 1960s, reaching a peak in the early 1980s (Figure 18). Since 1985, the rate at which growing stock was removed from forest land has decreased. Currently, growing stock is removed at an average of 60.6 million cubic feet per year. Eighty-seven percent of growing-stock removals occurred on private land. Hardwoods account for virtually all of total removals; softwood removals total 43,000 cubic feet per year and represent less than 0.1 percent of total removals. White oak and eastern cottonwood had the highest annual removals, each averaging 8.9 million cubic feet per year. Oak species account for 36 percent of annual removals.

Wood products represent an important industry in Illinois. Changing market demands and market values can influence the rate of tree removals and the species being removed. Black oak was the only species to show a significant change (decrease) in removals between inventory cycles. Perhaps the most important trend is an apparent change in which species are being removed. Illinois' forest products market often indicates declining utilization of oak and other hard hardwoods while demand for cottonwood, silver maple and other lighter hardwoods is increasing. Hickory demand is increasing. Ash demand and removals due to rapid mortality from Emerald Ash Borer are increasing. Black walnut continues to be in steady, high demand partially due to continued premium pricing.




Figure 18—Average annual removals of growing stock on forest land by inventory year, Illinois, 1962 to 2005 (error bars represent a 66-percent confidence interval).




Figure 19.—Average annual mortality of growing stock on forest land by inventory year, Illinois, 1962 to 2005.

Average Annual Mortality

Since the 1960s, the rate of growing-stock mortality has continued to grow with each inventory (Figure 19). Average annual mortality of growing stock on forest land is currently an estimated 86.7 million cubic feet per year, roughly 1.3 percent of total growing stock volume. American elm, black oak, and red maple have the highest rates of mortality; all three species experienced significant increases in mortality since 1998 (Figure 20). A closer look at elm mortality shows that 27 percent of elms were infected with disease; 72 percent of elm mortality was unknown.

Increasing mortality reflects the growing maturity of Illinois’ forests. As the bulk of the State’s forests are made up of large-diameter stands, much of the mortality may be the result of senescence. However, elm mortality is largely due to the continued spread of Dutch Elm Disease (DED). Black oak mortality is related to oak wilt and old age. As oak is a major overstory component and does not appear to be replacing itself in the overstory, oak mortality has implications for the future composition of Illinois’ forests. As American elm and maples now occupy the majority of the pole-timber density, high elm mortality makes maples likely candidates to replace oaks in the overstory. All ash species are currently affected by the Emerald Ash Borer insect from Asia and mortality of all mature ash is evident now (2016) in northeastern Illinois and imminent for the remainder of the state over the next 10 years. Most ash, now mixed in Illinois upland forests and a significant component of many riparian forests, will become standing dead or fallen snags during this period. It is uncertain what the long term prospects are for native ash though continuous, sporadic re-sprouting from existing root systems and already present seedlings. Dying trees do bear ample seed that seed is viable for one season.




Figure 20—Average annual mortality of growing stock on forest land for the top seven species by inventory year, Illinois, 1985 to 2005 (error bars represent a 66-percent confidence interval).

#### Status of Urban Forests

The current status of the urban and community forest resources statewide, the management of that resource, and the social and political opportunities and constraints follow:

#### U&CF Resources:

According to the 2010 United States Census, 88 percent of Illinois residents live in urban areas, in and around community forests. Trees in our urban areas and towns are located where people sit, stand, walk, run, bicycle and drive their cars. It includes trees along sidewalks, streets, rights of ways, parks, parking lots, backyards, natural areas, waterways and any other place trees grow in our communities. The trees in these urban and community forests provide significant economic, health, social, psychological and environmental benefits to humans and wildlife (Coder, 1996). Trees are an appreciating asset with quantifiable value. Mature, properly placed trees provide multiple, important economic benefits and services to the environment and residents. Illinois has an estimated 77million trees, which store about 14.7 million metric tons of

carbon (\$335.2 million), and annually remove about 484,000 metric tons of carbon (\$11.0 million) and 13,560 metric tons of air pollution (\$107.9 million) (Nowak, et.al, 2010).

Stormwater infrastructure and management continues to be an expensive investment for communities. Trees (absorption of rainwater) remain the least expensive approach for mitigating stormwater runoff. For every 5% of tree cover added to a community, storm water runoff is reduced by approximately 2 percent. (Coder, 1998). According to the American Planning Association, “The Federal Clean Water Act provides one of the clearest examples of an external mandate impacting local government, and urban forestry and other elements of green infrastructure can be effective tools in meeting its requirements. Stormwater engineering solutions or “best management practices” can be expensive. Green infrastructure and trees can play a major role in reducing those costs, particularly when strategically located in stream buffers and floodplains where it also helps to minimize soil erosion.”

Illinois urban and community forests are comprised of both publically and privately owned land and trees interfaced with patches of natural forest across a wide range of land uses. The urban forest has multiple owners including municipalities, park districts, forest preserve districts, water or sanitation districts, townships, corporations, organizations, private citizens and others. The complexity of owners and infrastructure constraints makes growing and sustaining trees in our urban forest one of the most challenging tasks in forestry.

Urban forests are exposed to more man-made disturbances than their rural counterparts, which can negatively affect their health, growth and ability to survive and yield benefits (American Forests, 2016). The compelling reasons trees growing throughout urban forest areas have critical importance to the health and well-being of Illinois citizens is outlined by David Nowak et.al. in a series of urban forestry research recently published. Please see <https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/people/dnowak>.

To manage an urban or community forest today takes targeted actions, based on sound sciences and knowledge of tree physiology, tree insects and diseases, tree care standards, tree planting standards, local tree care policy, demographics, social dynamics, politics and other factors. To affect urban forestry fully the ecological, climatic, urban, political, and cultural conditions that foster or inhibit the growth and survival of trees must all be considered (Schwab, 2009).

Illinois Urban and Community forests provide both environmental and economic benefits to Illinois citizens. Tree canopy cover is directly related to the tree benefits. Tree canopy cover, canopy green space, and tree cover per capita varied among communities, county subdivisions and counties. Nowak and others (2009) further found that Illinois averages 12.1 percent canopy cover with 96.7 percent total green space, 12.5 percent green space and 1,397.9 square meters of canopy cover per capita. When Illinois is compared nationally for the urban canopy per person, it ranks in the lower quadrants – especially versus the northeast and southern United States. Illinois also ranks in the lower quadrant for urban canopy per square foot per person. Please see

these and other facts found in the Nowak, 2010 report Sustaining America's Urban Trees and Forests (<https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/people/dnowak>).

Commented [RFS4]: Relates to nothing here – move to timber section?

Urban or community land in Illinois continues to increase in acreage as more land is annexed for development. The urban and community areas comprised about 8.7 percent of the state land area in 2000, an increase from 7.5 percent in 1990. It is projected that Illinois will lose from 250,001 to 500,000 acres or 10-20% of the contiguous forest cover due to urban development by 2050 (Nowak, 2010) with increasing urbanization, urban forests management will likely take on a relatively higher regional and national importance because as rural and exurban forest areas decline, the services of the remaining urban and non-urban forests will become even more critical to the regional and national population (Nowak et. al., 2010)

Commented [RFS5]: This is all said in other places

Illinois has been through two major insect and disease epidemics – the Dutch elm disease era of the 1950's through the 1970's and the Emerald Ash Borer epidemic of the 2000 to current times. Illinois communities listened to the post-Dutch elm disease message to not plant monocultures of trees. However, at that point in time only five to six easy-to-grow, intermediate/fast growing trees were available in the local nurseries. This meant that many communities ended up with a high density of the same species, albeit less than the previous era of elm monocultures. The well managed city forests improved tree species diversification since the DED era potentially saving those communities significant dollars today during severe storms and insect and disease epidemics. In some cases, those well-managed, diversified and maintained urban forest helped to pay for the entire forestry department expenditures to manage the municipal forest (Hildebrandt, Fall 2008). As the USDA Forest Service in the state of Illinois provides leadership and assistance, more communities will create local municipal forestry programs with proper tree care and tree planting protocols.

Economic impacts for the U.S. Green Industry in 2002 were estimated at \$147.8 billion in output, 1,964,339 jobs, \$95 billion value added, \$64.3 in labor income, and \$6.9 in direct business taxes. For the horticultural services sectors of landscape services and landscape architects, the impacts were \$57.8 billion in outputs and 753,557 jobs. "Illinois had 6.897 million in output impacts, 75,110 jobs with \$4.3 billion in value added impacts" (Hall, 2015). In addition, for every dollar spent locally on trees by taxpayers received \$4 back in public benefits (Hall, 2015).

#### U&CF Management:

Urban and Community Forestry is generally defined as the art, science and technology of managing trees and forest resources in and around urban community ecosystems for the physiological, sociological, economic and aesthetic benefits trees provide society.

Our urban and community forests face a myriad of current management challenges, (Nowak, 2010). These challenges include: insect and diseases; natural catastrophic events such as floods, ice storms, high winds and snow events; invasive plants; environmental impacts such as

pollution, road salts or chemicals; development pressures, climate change, and socio-economic impacts such as budget impacts.

Since 1991, the USDA Forest Service has provided funding for federal, state and local urban and community forestry programs. This funding has allowed work with state, regional and local partners to integrate trees into sound planning practices to improve the environment and provide for connectivity of fragmented landscapes. Relative to the years preceding 1990 the state's urban and community forestry programs have grown and expanded tremendously.

While only a subgroup of the municipal jurisdictions, organizations and volunteer groups that maintain urban and community forests across the state of Illinois, Tree City USA (TCU) communities spent over \$94 million on their local forestry programs (Hildebrandt, 2016a). In 2016, about \$20 million was spent on each of these management components statewide: tree planting, trimming and removals. An additional \$26 million was spent on in-house staffing. Seven million was dedicated toward emerald ash borer expenditures and \$6 million being spent on utility clearance, volunteer input and other costs (Hildebrandt, 2016b).

TCU is a national technical assistance and recognition program that helps communities create local forestry programs. It is a national partnership administered by the National Arbor Day Foundation in cooperation with the USDA Forest Service, the National Association of State Foresters, and the Illinois Department of Natural Resources Urban and Community Forestry Program. According to Sass, et. al. 2010, when compared to non-Tree City USA communities, the Illinois Tree City USA communities:

- Held more positive attitudes about the benefits of their trees
- Had historic data on their trees
- Had staff with higher levels of education
- Were more likely to have cost-share programs on public lands with a few also having a cost-share program on private lands
- Included tree care and tree planting standards in their tree ordinances
- 75% had at least a basic tree inventory and were more likely to have a management plan

The combination of Tree City USA recognition and an active state grant program has helped to grow participation in urban and community forestry in Illinois. From 1992 to 2002 the Urban and Community Forestry Grant Program was funded at the level of \$100,000 to \$400,000 annually and during that period the number of Tree City USA communities doubled. Those grants have helped to develop over: 27 successful tree boards/committees, 31 different municipal tree ordinances, 60 urban forest management plans; 100 street tree inventories, 79 tree planting projects; 48 educational outreach projects and 42 forestry staff development projects.

Tree diversity is extremely important in sustainable urban and community forest management. Illinois has been successful for the most part in diversifying the urban and community forests since the Dutch elm disease days when American elms made up a much higher percent of the

local municipal forests. A current “industry standard” of professional urban foresters for insuring tree diversification is known as the “30-20-10 rule” (or the stricter 20-10-5 rule). That standard means any tree family, any tree genus or any tree species does not exceed 30%, 20% or 10% of the total urban forest, respectively.

Species selection is critical to the sustainability of our urban and community forests. Matching species to site is another key concept in reforestation efforts. Nursery growers, tree suppliers and local decision makers all need to plan for the diversity of soil conditions and site types that exist in our municipal areas. IDNR Urban and Community Forestry program has compiled and posted resources on-line including “Tree Selection and Planting Guidelines” found under Technical Assistance. The challenge is to get these tools into the hands of the practitioners and decision makers. Statewide partnerships are valued and greatly assist the IDNR U&CF program with producing and sharing resources.

#### *U&CF Socio-economic & political:*

In spite of the many complex political, social, developmental and environmental pressures of our urban and community forests, Illinois is fortunate to have a group of strongly dedicated urban and community foresters at all levels. The American Planning Association identified multiple tiers of stakeholders as: 1) Forestry and park professionals who are often degreed foresters, landscape architects or horticulturalist or International Society of Arboricultural Certified Arborists; 2) Allied professionals providing programmatic support such as state and federal forestry agencies, plant health professionals, and regional planners; 3) The public, developers and elected officials, and 4) Other advocacy groups. In a successful program, all of these people are involved at different levels, and all bring something vital and necessary to the process (Schwab, 2009). Forestry professionals and practitioners face many individual groups who prefer to create with concrete, wood and steel or prefer increased impervious surfaces in our urban areas for a perceived ease of maintenance. These facts solidify the important role for public education and outreach for green infrastructure as well as continued professional development opportunities.

Politics is a constant in our world and in urban forest management as well. When bad things happen to good programs in local government, it is most often because the public or its elected officials, or both, do not fully appreciate the program’s value and benefits. Public works managers have the daunting task of balancing the recommendations of experts, the wishes of council members and other elected officials, the needs of citizens, the pressures of local economics, the concerns for liability issues, the physical aspects of trees, the forces of nature and severe weather events, and the desire for all of these factors to be met simultaneously (American Public Works Association, 2014). Often there is no advocacy group available to assist the tree and forestry professionals with securing adequate budgets and staffing.

There are considerable socio-economic differences between and within communities in various parts of the state. Past research has focused on environmental injustice and indicated that there were fewer trees in low-income areas. Some biologists fear that global urbanization causes an “extinction of experience” in which, as the biodiversity in cities diminishes, so too does our appreciation for and connection with nature (Pyle, 1978, Turner et al., 2004). This can have far-reaching negative consequences for both biodiversity conservation and human quality of life. From a conservation perspective, people who experience less biodiversity may have lowered expectations about environmental quality and be apathetic about the natural world, which can in turn lead to even more environmental degradation (Miller, 2005). On the other hand, local biodiversity has the potential to foster conservation-mindedness in urban residents (Miller and Hobbs, 2002). From a human quality of life perspective, people often experience physical and mental benefits from natural environments (e.g., Ulrich, 1984; Kuo, 2001) and diversity of wildlife (Fuller et.al. 2007). Therefore, if certain socioeconomic groups are less exposed to biodiversity, then a self-reinforcing feedback loop might occur wherein individuals from a group become more and more detached from nature and are thus benefiting less from its services. Therefore, it is important to manage the complex socio-economic and political nature of urban and community forestry, so it can add to the sustainability of the forest and not distract from it.

## **Priority Forestry Areas of the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, Division of Forest Resources:**

Priority Forestry Areas for the Division of Forest Resources (DFR) are in part determined by the natural resources themselves as well as mandates from Illinois conservation law and cooperative program agreements with federal partners. The forestry division also aligns its priorities with the other resource conservation priorities of the allied IDNR resource conservation divisions. Implementing forest campaign goals and objectives of the Illinois Wildlife Action Plan (IWAP) cannot be understated as is the case for most northeastern area states partnering their efforts and common forest resource objectives between the wildlife and the forest action plans. The wildlife plan is an Appendix (Appendix XX) to this forest plan document. The IWAP is required reference and guidance for developing wildlife habitat sections and considerations within all forestry plans initiated by USDA Forest Service, USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service, American Tree Farm System and the Illinois Forestry Development Act.

DFR programs that are core, ongoing forest resource priorities include forest health, forest planning, forest inventory and analysis, state forests, forest products, forest management, forest fire, urban & community forests, and forest protection. In general, these ongoing core priority programs are all statewide in nature and have specific prioritization, geography or conditions. Specific programs within the DFR core programs do have high priority and are governed by specific resource types, specific geography or specific conditions. These are Forest Stewardship (management), Wild and Rx Fire, Urban & Community Forests, Forest Legacy (protection) and State Forests.



**Forest Stewardship:**

Forest Stewardship priority areas within Illinois were classified by the IFDC using the USDA Forest Service S&PF Forest Stewardship Program’s Spatial Analysis Project methodology. The GIS layering resulted in a map of the state which is shown below as Figure 19. The prioritization was based on twelve core data layers, representing important aspects and outputs of forest resource conservation, using a weighted ranking system for each data layer (Tables 2A & 2B). As a primary example, the low amount of forestland remaining after significant losses of Illinois’ forests over the past centuries resulted in all intact, original forest area as a high priority area. That High Priority Forest Stewardship color spatial-analysis map shows both water and urban/built-up areas as white. Though the subtleties of layering weighted priorities are not seen from the panned-out view; High Priority Stewardship areas are, in general; “all the existing forest in Illinois” plus “forestland that once forest cleared for agriculture and having forest soils”.

Table 2A: Layer and corresponding weight used to develop original Stewardship priority areas.

<b>Layer</b>	<b>Weight (%)</b>
Private Forest	15.32
Riparian Corridors	12.73
Forest Patches	11.31
Wetlands	9.60
Priority Watersheds	9.09
Developmental Pressure	8.59
T & E Species	6.97
Drinking Water Supply	6.87
Proximity to Public Land	6.67
Forest Health	6.46
Topographic Slope	5.45
Fire Risk	0.91
	100.0

Table 2B: The spatial analysis tool layers and weights were re-layered in 2013 and the priority areas simplified to be either High Priority Stewardship or Priority Stewardship for Illinois’s forest stewardship efforts across Illinois. The four Forest Legacy Areas were overlain as High Priority. Participation in the USDA Forest Service grants to help fund the Illinois Forest Stewardship Program recognizes only the High Priority (dark Green) Stewardship areas.

<b>Layer</b>	<b>Orig. Weight (%)</b>	<b>Revised Weight 2013</b>
Fire Risk	0.91	1.01
Topographic Slope	5.45	5.85
Forest Health	6.46	6.94
Proximity to Public Lands	6.67	7.16
Drinking Water Supply	6.87	
T&E Species	6.97	7.48
Development Pressure	8.59	9.22
Priority Watersheds	9.09	9.76

Wetlands	9.60	10.31
Forest Patches	11.31	12.14
Riparian Corridors	12.73	13.67
Private Forest	15.32	16.45
Total	100.00	100.00




Figure 19. Priority areas within Illinois as determined by the IFDC and the Illinois DFR. Dark Green is High Priority Stewardship; Light Green is Priority Stewardship.

### **Urban & Community Forestry:**

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources, Urban and Community Forestry Program (iUCF) is a part of a nearly 5 billion-dollar economic engine in Illinois that continues to grow as more rural land is converted to urban areas. The iUCF program mission is to provide leadership to create and enhance self-sustaining urban and community forestry programs that preserve, plant and manage forest ecosystems for public safety, benefits and quality of life. With 87.8% of Illinois citizens living in urban and community areas this program seeks to initiate public understanding concerning the important immeasurable amenity values of the local forest ecosystems. These ecosystems provide environmental services such as energy conservation, better air quality, economic vitality, reduced storm water runoff, carbon sequestration and the psychological benefits of stress reduction through green and aesthetically pleasing spaces.

The iUCF is funded in part through the Forest Service Federal Urban and Community Forestry Program as authorized by the amended Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978, Public Law 95-313. The federal Urban and Community Forestry program provides 1/3 to 1/2 million dollars annually to iUCF as core funding. IDNR is the designated state agency for receiving these federal funds. In order to receive these funds, the state must meet the muster of the law which includes having: 1) a full time State Urban Forestry Program Administrator; 2) an urban and community forestry council (IFDC – Urban & Community Forestry Committee); 3) a strategic plan (UCF Addendum as an Appendices in this document); and 4) volunteer capacity (typically contractual in Illinois). At the state level the iUCF Program is authorized by the Illinois Forestry Development Act (525 ILCS 15/) (from Ch. 96 1/2, par. 9101). There is only one professional full time assigned to this program serving as the mandated State Urban Forestry Program Administrator.

The iUCF program priority areas include: 1) technical assistance and training for communities and tree care professionals; 2) financial assistance to communities and non-profits; 3) public education in support of planting trees in urban environments; 4) volunteer coordination assistance to encourage participation at the local level. Central to the iUCF program services is a partnership between IDNR and the Arbor Day Foundation in administering the national Tree City USA technical assistance and recognition program. This program has four standards for sustainable local community forestry programs. 1) Designation of tree authority; 2) Development of a tree care ordinance that addresses tree authority and tree care standards; 3) Spending \$2 per capita; and 4) A public Arbor Day/tree planting event where the major signs an Arbor Day proclamation. The iUCF services include: helping Illinois municipalities to develop local municipal programs through the Tree City USA standards; creating local management programs with management plans based on tree inventories, sustaining municipal forests through reforestation and insect and

disease mitigation such as Dutch elm disease, gypsy moth and emerald ash borer; and developing volunteer capacity.

Throughout history, the iUCF program has employed several strategies for technical outreach to constituency. These strategies include the Tree City USA program annual conferences; the DNR website, the *TCU Newsbits* (Formerly Prairie Tree Companion Newsletter), regional urban forestry council assistance, plus educational outreach through training and workshops. Annual funding for educational sessions at the Illinois Arborist Association Annual Conference has been provided. Program delivery for volunteer capacity has been contractually over the years with organizations such as the Illinois Arborist Association, University of Illinois, Southern Illinois University, Southwestern Illinois Resource Conservation and Development offices, Morton Arboretum, Openlands, and Trees Forever. These contracts serve to provide regional assistance to municipalities, forestry professionals and arborist and citizen concerning the trees in their neighborhoods. Most recently there is a growing demand for natural disaster assistance in the form of UCF Strike-team assistance to identify high risk trees as a part of the response process, conduct tree inventories after the storm, assist with Tree planting efforts and assistance creating a program to help the community be prepared for future natural disasters.

The State of Illinois has legislation authorizing the Urban and Community Forestry Grant Program through (30 ILCS 735/) Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Act. The Urban and Community grant program funds project that lead to a more effective and efficient management of urban and community forests. From 1991 to 2002 the Urban and Community Forestry Grant Program was funded at the level of \$400,000 to \$100,000 annually. Also, during that same time, the number of Tree City USA communities doubled in size and iUCF helped local units of government to develop at least: 27 successful tree boards/committees, thirty-one tree ordinances, 60 Management Plans; 100 inventories, 79 tree planting projects; 48 Educational outreach projects at the municipal level; and forty-two staff development projects. Since 2000 grant cycles have been reduced to periodically every three to five years. In lieu of the grant program, during this time frame, communities were instead provided tree inventory services through a program called "Trees Count!" for several years. The combination of Tree City USA recognition and an active state grant program contributed to the grow participation in urban and community forestry in Illinois.

Urban and Community Forestry often oversees the frontier of the future forests of the state. In order to preserve at least remnants of our rural forests near population centers, we need to be actively advocating for these areas and helping to preserve our forests as a part of a sustainable living environment iUCF program supports and assists local units of government in comprehensive ecosystem planning, management, and education to create healthy urban and community forests to enhance the quality of life for Illinois citizens. The iUCF program and its partners help municipalities and local units of government design landscape forest for long term forest health and societal sustainability.

### **Wild and Prescribed Fire:**

Overall, Illinois has a relatively low wildfire risk, and this is reflected in the weighted ranking system for high priority areas analyzed for Forest Stewardship. Nevertheless, IDNR favors local wildfire protection planning. Many local governments and communities have begun to assess wildfire risk through the development of community wildfire protection plans (Figure 20).

Makanda Township in Jackson County, Illinois was the first area with a community wildfire protection plan and, currently, other areas considering plan development in southern Illinois. The Chicago Wilderness organization developed a similar plan to Makanda's for the seven collar counties of the Chicago area in 2012. Prescribed fire is used frequently in those Chicago collar counties to manage public and private lands and forests. Counties, Districts and other localities having a recognized wildfire protection plan are a priority for participation in some IDNR fire funding and grants. The development of Forest Fire Prevention Plans remains an ongoing priority for IDNR fire programs and is encouraged for any and all township and county wildfire protection districts.

The Illinois Forest Fire Prevention Districts Act affects all of Illinois by law. By proclamation of the IDNR during certain drought-fire risk conditions the seven southern counties of Jackson, Pope, Hardin, Johnson, Union, Alexander, and Pulaski can require burn permits for any and all open burning which are to be issued by a fire warden designated by the IDNR. The peak fire hazard months of February, March, April, October and November are the usual months that fire wardens and permits would be instituted. The seven counties mentioned in the state act are a priority for IDNR forest fire prevention programs.

Illinois DNR fire programs already require prescribed burn plans and Certified Burn Bosses. IDNR requires approved prescribed "burn plans" are approved and prescribed burns are conducted by a Certified Burn Boss. IDNR issues the Burn Boss certifications and, together with other agencies, restricts prescribed fire burning to "burn seasons" when natural fuels are most combustible and smoke is minimal. The prescribed fire plan and burn boss programs do not carry internal or external priorities and are offered statewide




Figure 20. Map of Makanda Township Wildfire Protection Plan. The color red represents areas with the greatest fire risk.

**Forest Legacy:**

An updated Illinois Forest Legacy Program Assessment of Needs is found in the Appendix. The Assessment of Needs outlines the basis and necessity for the Forest Legacy Program in Illinois and identifies four (4) Forest Legacy Areas (Figure XX) where permanent forestry conservation easements or critical fee simple acquisitions may be purchased and owned by the IDNR. The Forest Legacy Program exists between the State IDNR, via the Division of Forest Resources, and the USDA Forest Service, State & Private Forestry section.

Acquisitions of permanent conservation easements and critical fee simple purchases of lands may only be targeted by the DFR through the Forest Legacy Program if the land is within one of the four Forest Legacy Areas (FLAs) designated cooperatively by the Division of Forest Resources, the IDNR, conservation groups and constituents, the IFDC and the USDA Forest Service as well as the local public via public meetings.

Historically, since 1993, the Forest Legacy Program has been available in Illinois with four initial Forest Legacy Areas. National since that period the program has conserved over 1 million acres of important, strategic and threatened working forests. Included in the updated AON for Illinois is one new Forest Legacy Area in the lower Kaskaskia River. New Forest Legacy Areas can be added or the existing areas removed, shrunk or expanded by consensus of the IDNR forestry division, the State Forest Stewardship Coordinating Committee, the public and the USDA Forest Service.

The current Forest Legacy Areas are the priority the IDNR for important permanent easements or strategic fee-simple acquisitions of working forestlands. Existing committees of the Illinois Forestry Development Council (who is the Forest Stewardship Coordinating Committee) and forestry program managers favor future prioritization for two additional Forest Legacy Areas to be designated for Forest Legacy Eligibility. Though it requires the consensus of four parties; the northwestern Illinois "Driftless Area" (Carroll County) and the greater Shawnee National Forest areas (Williamson County) are being discussed.




Figure XX. Designated Forest Legacy Areas for Illinois

**State Forests:**

Illinois's seven State Forests have been designated by law (525 ILCS 40) and mandated to be operational as forest management and demonstration areas to exhibit and outreach the sciences of forestry and the application of silviculture. State Forests total 22,000 acres and represent 8 % of State owned lands and ½ of 1% of the total forestland in Illinois. Annual management affects



about 1% or less of State Forest acreage and 1/200th of 1% of total forestland in Illinois. Forest management will yield commercial forest products at an occasional frequency available for procurement by Illinois' family and small businesses in the primary wood market. In keeping with the mission of the IDNR, the Office of Resource Conservation and the Division of Forest Resources the State Forests will integrate managing timber with wildlife habitats, site ecology, soil & water resources, outdoor recreation, aesthetics and forest health.

All seven State Forests share oak and central hardwood forest types with similar ranges of forest conditions, including some aging, planted pine stands. Forest management and silvicultural options for managing and regenerating healthy, sustainable native forests will be employed over time to achieve sustainable, high quality oak-hickory forests of both old growth and new young growth. The physical forest resources themselves dictate annual and near term forest planning options as well as considerations out 50 years. Each forest will use best management and adaptive management approaches and will include resource inventories, applied research, and monitoring. Forest management outputs will include longer lived high-quality oak stands, young oak-hickory regeneration, favorable forest tree composition, increases in native forest plants and groundcover habitats, important vertical roosting, nesting, and feeding habitats, protected water quality, improved hunting and recreation, and income from sale of forest products. The State Forests outlined below remain a high priority for the IDNR and the Division of Forest Resources.

Big River State Forest (2900 acres) - Henderson Co.

Big River forest sites are largely sandy soils growing hardwood stands containing mostly blackjack oak with associate central hardwoods including ash, bur oak, black oak, black cherry, walnut, and others. Small acreages of Mississippi River bottomland forest contain mostly silver maple and cottonwood. Older stands of planted pines exist in areas subject to past and present wind erosion. Hunting and equestrian recreation use is moderate to high and a designated Natural Area exists.

Hidden Springs State Forest (1200 acres) - Shelby Co.

Hidden Springs forest sites contain a range of soils growing upland hardwood stands containing many species of native oak, hickories, and black walnut with other central hardwoods. Hundreds of acres of established pine forest and are now being thinned. Bottomland forests are also extensive throughout the forest. Fishing, camping and hiking recreation use is low to moderate.

Lowden-Miller State Forest (2400 acres) - Ogle Co.

Lowden-Miller forest sites contain a variety of quality forest soils and extensive oak-hickory and central hardwood forest containing white, red, and black oak with shagbark hickory growing as well as elm, ash, cherry, walnut, and many others. Hundreds of acres of pine plantations, a recently abandoned Christmas tree field, and some bottomland forest also exist. Hunting, fishing, hiking/skiing and equestrian use is moderate to high. A Boy Scout camp and Castle Rock S.P. are adjacent to the forest.

Sand Ridge State Forest (7200 acres) - Mason Co.

Sand Ridge forest sites are all sand-based soils growing thousands of acres of black oak dominated, oak-hickory forest needing regenerated and an equal acreage of planted pine forests needing thinned and managed. Most oak stands are over-mature and of low-quality timber. Hunting, hiking, fishing, horseback riding, camping and recreation use is moderate. Designated Natural Areas exist.

Spoon River State Forest (1680 acres) - Knox Co.

Spoon River forest sites are rich, heavy forest soils growing oak-hickory forests and mesic central hardwood species. Fourteen hundred acres of hardwood forest with a history of forest management harvests exist. No pine stands exist. Spoon River has no camping or picnic areas. Hiking, hunting, fishing and boating use is low to moderate.

Trail of Tears State Forest (5200 acres) - Union Co.

Tail of Tears forest sites are of rich forest soils growing high quality oak-hickory forests dominated with white and black oak and associate central hardwood species. Small acreages of maturing planted southern pines exist. Hunting, camping and equestrian recreation use is low to moderate. The 220 acre something-something Nature Preserve exists. Union State Nursery occupies 120 acres of the Forest.

Wildcat Hollow State Forest (700 acres) - Effingham Co.

Wildcat Hollow forest sites are rich forest soils growing high quality oak-hickory forests dominated with white oak and associated central hardwood forest species. The oak dominated, hardwood forests lack the necessary oak regeneration and recruitment to assure future forests of oak. Hunting and recreation use is moderate to high and a designated Natural Area exists.

**Forest Health:**

Forest Health is a priority program itself that affects and is intertwined with all core forestry programs and priority programs in Illinois. Forest Health is also funded cooperative program with the USDA Forest Service. Illinois currently contracts most state obligations tied to the grant funding to University based entomologists and pathologists via contracts with the IDNR. The priority for this program is to hire the IDNR permanent position of forest health specialist; a program manager within the ORC Forestry Division. That degreed professional is required to be a Division employee according to the federal grant for Forest Health to Illinois. That specialist will be more effective than contracted minimum surveys since they can interact directly with the IDNR foresters, biologists and staffs who are each seeing thousands of acres of private forest annually.

## **Priorities Areas (and Partnering) in the Midwest**

Illinois is a part of several other regional forestry priority areas and priority issues in the Midwest region. The importance of the regional implications of can result in many important projects positively affecting Illinois forests and forestry when state interests partner together to accomplish mutual goals or compete for funding. Border areas of most states do have similar issues and usually share biological and geographical similarities.

Common and overlapping state-level forestry priorities identified by state planners during a series of webinars held in, and continuing since, spring of 2010 have been summarized below (Table 3). For example, within the Upper Mississippi Watershed of the Midwest region, several sub-watersheds have been classified as high priority by the Upper Mississippi River Partnership and the USFS Northeastern Area S&PF. These watersheds were selected because they showcase needed forest stewardship practices that improve water quality and wildlife habitat important to neighboring states and river conservation. In Illinois, the Cache and Lower Illinois-Lake Chautauqua watersheds were ranked at the highest priority level, while the Apple Plum and Cahokia-Joachim were ranked at the second highest priority level (Figure 20).

DRAFT

Figure 21. Priority areas within the Upper Mississippi Watershed as determined by the Upper Mississippi River Partnership and the USFS Northeastern Area S&PF.




Table XX. Regional priority areas and priority issues associated with Illinois identified by forest planners during a series of webinars held in spring of 2010

Name	States	Issue/Description
Climate change	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, MO, WI	How will potential changes in climate affect forests resources in the future?
Driftless area	IL, IA, MN, WI	Unique ecology & forest resource - heavy development pressure.
Ecosystem services	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, MO, WI	Ecosystem services often lack a formal market and these natural assets are traditionally absent from society's balance sheet; their critical contributions are often overlooked in public, corporate, and individual decision-making.
Wildfire risk	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, MO, WI	Where wildfire risk is identified as a critical issue, planning and management are needed to reduce a relatively high risk of wildfire.
Forestation-Reforestation	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, MO, WI	Many forest-types are becoming increasingly harder to maintain and/or regenerate due to a variety of factors including climate, disease, insect activity, deer herbivory, and invasive plants to name a few.
Invasive species	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, MO, WI	Non-native invasive species have the potential to reduce forest diversity and cause huge economic and ecological damage to forests.
Great Lakes Regional Collaborative	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, MO, NY, OH, PA, WI	GLRC was assembled as a collective group of stakeholders to develop a strategic plan for the restoration, protection and sustainable use of the Great Lakes.
Karst Topography	IL, IA, IN, MO, KY	Porous landscape can lead to poor water quality.
Upper Mississippi	IL, IN, IA, MN, MO, WI	Water pollution, loss of migratory bird habitat, forest loss and fragmentation.
Major watersheds that cross state boundaries	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, MO, WI	All units of governments-federal to local-ultimately implement programs at a state or local level, so addressing resource concerns that cross state boundaries are challenging.
Promoting sustainable active private forest management	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, MO, WI	The vast majority of private forestlands are unmanaged, undermanaged, or mismanaged representing an untapped resource of timber, fiber and associated forest-related employment opportunities.
Sustaining forest industry and markets	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, MO, WI	The loss of forest products industries and markets constrains opportunities to manage forests and diminishes options for the production and enhancement of an array of ecosystem services.

The 2008 Farm Bill (PL 110-246) required State Forest Actions Plans to include “any multistate areas that are a regional priority.” As requested by State Foresters, the USDA Forest Service, Northeastern Area, State and Private Forestry (NA S&PF) facilitated a process to help States identify and share all northeastern multistate priority areas and issues. There were just over 70 unique multistate priorities identified by the 20 States and the District of Columbia. Over half of these priorities are existing efforts though the detail about multistate priorities varied widely. For example, some states included a simple list of “potential” multistate priorities while others provided detailed information about each multistate priority they intend to pursue.

One-third of the multi-state priorities identified are *issues* that could benefit from collaboration among multiple States. Two-thirds of the multi-state priorities are specific landscape *areas* such as the Mississippi River Watershed or the Chesapeake Bay watershed. The multi-state priorities listed here can be considered for focused projects and collaboration, such as to further the regional, landscape-scale conservation approach ([www.na.fs.fed.us/stewardship](http://www.na.fs.fed.us/stewardship)). It is important to recognize that there are landscape-scale areas that are located fully with one state and there It is also important to recognize there may be issues impacting landscape scale conservation that are best addressed by states individually. In addition, these tables do not necessarily include every area, issue, or effort that states might address or coordinate on individually or together.

All Multi-state Priority Issues identified by Illinois and regional neighbor states;  
in order of most-to-least states included:

Multistate Issue	States Naming	Description
Insects, diseases, and invasive plants that threaten forest health	CT, IL, IN, IA, MD, MI, MN, MO, NJ, OH, VT, WI, WV (KY, KS, MS, NC, ND, SD, TN, VA)	<p>Invasive non-native and native insects, diseases, and plant species have the potential to reduce forest diversity and cause huge economic and ecological damage to forests.</p> <p><b>Insect species specifically referenced for multi-state efforts include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Asian long-horned beetle (IA, IN, MI, MN, MO, WI)</li> <li>• Emerald Ash borer (IA, IN, KY, KS, MD, MI, MN, MO, MS, ND, NJ, TN, VA, WI)</li> <li>• Gypsy Moth Slow the Spread effort (IA, KY, MO, MN, OH, TN, WI, WV)</li> <li>• Hemlock Woolly Adelgid (GA, KY, MD, NC, NJ, TN)</li> <li>• Sirex Wood Wasp (MD)</li> <li>• Southern Pine Beetle (NJ, MD, MS, TN, TX, VA)</li> </ul> <p><b>Diseases specifically referenced for potential multi-state efforts include:</b> Beech Bark Disease (IA, MN, MO, WI), Butternut Canker (IA), Dutch Elm Disease (IA, MN, MO, WI), Hickory Mortality (IA), Sudden Oak Death (IA, MN, MO, WI), and White Pine Blister Rust (IA, MN, MO, WI)</p> <p><b>Examples of invasive plants</b> of concern include European buckthorn, garlic mustard, Japanese stilt grass and reed canary grass. Objectives for combating invasive plants include prevention and eradication strategies and involved efforts within multiple Cooperative Weed Management Areas. There is a Midwestern Invasive Plant Network that is a regional organization of land managers, resource professionals, landowners, and private citizens who are dedicated to reducing the impact of invasive plant species in the Midwest.</p>

Sustain forest industry and diversify markets	IL, IA, MI, MN, MO, PA, RI, VT, WV, WI (AL, FL, KY, NC, SC, TX)	The ability to effectively maintain and manage the region's forests and sustain rural forest-based communities is based in part on sustaining and diversifying forest product markets. Without this, it will be extremely difficult to manage forests in a sound, scientific manner. This issue also includes consideration of markets for utilizing urban wood waste.
Reduce wildfire risk	IL, IN, MD, MI, MN, MO, OH, PA, WI, WV (AL, AR, FL, GA, LA, NC, SC)	Threats to forests and public safety from wildfire are addressed by individual compacts listed in the priority areas section, including: Big Rivers Forest Fire Management Compact, Great Lakes Forest Fire Compact, and the Mid-Atlantic Fire Compact. There is also a Fire Activity and Emissions Tracking System effort under way by several Mid-Atlantic and Southern states.
Promote sustainable, active private forest management and "Call Before You Cut" programs	IL, IA, IN, MI, MN, MO, OH, VT, WI, WV	A significant amount of private forestlands across the region may be unmanaged or undermanaged. Promoting sustainable active management of private forest lands can help to off-set the rising costs of forest ownership while contributing to the health, resiliency, and productivity of the region's forests. "Call Before You Cut" (listed by IN, MN, MO, OH, WI, and WV) programs provide information to landowners about proper timber sale contracts, encourage private landowners to contact professional foresters for advice/assistance with timber harvesting and forest management activities, and advise landowners to seek reputable loggers for timber sales.
Forestation, reforestation and diminished species restoration	IL, IA, MD, MN, MO, NJ, WI (AK, AR, NC, OK, TN, VA)	Healthy forests are essential for providing a broad range of ecosystem goods and services. Forestation and reforestation involves maintaining a balance of the many forest types within the landscape and is increasingly difficult due to the many interests of various forest land owners and managers. Also, many forest types are becoming increasingly difficult to maintain or regenerate due to factors such as climate change, disease, insect outbreaks, lack of fire disturbance, deer browsing, and invasive plants. Diminished species restoration was cited for certain tree species, including those below, which includes nursery efforts for restoration of tree species under threat, such as Ash seed banking.
Ecosystem services	IL, IA, MI, MN, MO, WI	Ecosystem services, as a conservation framework, recognize forest ecosystems as natural assets with economic and social value that can be used to promote more responsible decision-making. The ability to communicate and capture the financial value of ecosystem services may help landowners—who currently do not benefit from the true value of their land and all of the public goods and services forests provide—keep their forests forested. One example effort is the Working Forest Carbon Offset project by the states of MI and IL and the Delta Institute.

Climate change	IL, MN, MO, NJ, WI (AL, FL, MS, NC, TX)	Important questions exist about the impact that potential changes in climate will have on forest resources. Many natural resource agencies within the region are interested in collaborating and sharing information in order to produce assessments that will provide managers and policy makers with the information needed to decide how to respond to climate change impacts. The Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts (WICCI) is an example that could be expanded further. The Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) was also referenced.
Water quality and forested watersheds	CT, IL, MI, MN, VT (NC)	Protecting and managing forested watersheds is essential to providing clean water. This issue is complex since units of government, from local to federal, and public and private forest land owners along the urban and rural continuum are all critical for addressing water quality issues in forested watersheds that cross state boundaries. Examples referenced include watersheds along the I-95 corridor, Lake Superior Basin, St. Lawrence Basin Water Resources Compact, Western Lake Erie Partnership and several additional watersheds listed in the multi-state priority areas section.

All Multistate Priority Areas identified by Illinois and regional neighbor states; in order of east to west Midwest. Illinois overlaps many areas but does not identify all areas as priority:

Multistate Area	States Covered	States Naming	Description
Ohio River Basin and Wabash River Valley	IL, IN, OH, PA, WV, KY, TN	IN, OH, PA, WV	The Ohio River is 981 miles long, starting at the confluence of the Allegheny and the Monongahela Rivers in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and ending in Cairo, Illinois, where it flows into the Mississippi River and eventually the Gulf of Mexico. It is a direct source of drinking water for more than three million people. There is a growing recognition that conservation efforts to address water quality and urbanization issues in the states bordering the Ohio River would highly benefit the environment along this major national waterway. Forestry would be a major part of any such wide-scale effort. There are several efforts underway including an Ohio River Basin Study by the US Army Corps of Engineers; efforts around the Wabash river, which flows over 475 miles from Indiana, draining two-thirds of 92 counties (over 33,000 square miles) its confluence with the Ohio below Mount Vernon; and the efforts described below.
Great Lakes Basin	IL, IN, MI, MN, NY, OH, PA, WI; Ontario Province	IL, IN, MI, MN, NY, OH, PA, WI	The Superior, Michigan, Huron, Erie, and Ontario Lakes contain 18% of the world's fresh surface water. The Great Lakes provide approximately 4.2% of all US drinking water. They are essential to commerce, trade, wildlife, and transportation of goods. The Nature Conservancy had identified the Great Lakes region as "critical" to the hundreds of millions of birds that migrate through North America each year. The collaborative and initiatives listed below are currently active in the Great Lakes Region.
Great Lakes Forest Fire Compact	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, WI; Ontario	MI, MN, WI	The Great Lakes Forest Fire Compact is an association that promotes effective prevention, suppression and control of forest fires in the Great Lakes Region of the United States and adjacent areas of Canada.



	& Manitob a Province s		
Great Lakes Regional Collaboration and Strategy	IL, IN, MI, MN, NY, OH, PA, WI	IL, IN, MN, NY, WI	Formed with input from the federal Great Lakes Interagency Task Force, the Council of Great Lakes Governors, the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Cities Initiative, Great Lakes tribes (represented by the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission) and the Great Lakes Congressional Task Force moved to convene a group now known as the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration (GLRC). This is a wide-ranging, cooperative effort to design and implement a strategy for the restoration, protection and sustainable use of the Great Lakes. Several plans have been created to respond to the GLRC Strategy including the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, Lake Erie Protection and Restoration Plan, MI Great Lakes Plan, and WI Great Lakes Strategy.
Great Lakes Restoration Initiative	IL, IN, MI, MN, NY, OH, PA, WI	MI, MN, NY, WI	This initiative, led by the Environmental Protection Agency, targets the most significant problems in the region, including invasive aquatic species, nonpoint source pollution, and contaminated sediment. EPA and its federal partners are coordinating with State, tribal, local, and forestry industry entities to protect, maintain, and restore the chemical, biological, and physical integrity of the Great Lakes.
Upper Midwest and Great Lakes Landscape Conservation Cooperative	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, NY, OH, PA, VT, WI	IN, MN, WI	Landscape Conservation Cooperatives are Department of the Interior-led management-science partnerships that inform integrated resource management actions addressing climate change and other stressors within and across landscapes. This area includes unparalleled deep-water habitats, beaches, coastal wetlands, more than 35,000 islands, major river systems, boreal forests, and prairie hardwood transition zones.
Upper Mississippi Watershed	IL, IN, IA, MN, MO, WI	IL, IA, MN, MO, WI	Some issues in this watershed are water pollution, loss of migratory bird habitat, and forest loss and fragmentation. There are many overlapping initiatives and opportunities for partnership.
Moraine Forest	IL, IN, MI, WI,	IN	The Valparaiso Moraine is a terminal moraine around the Lake Michigan basin. It is a band of high, hilly terrain made up of glacial till and sand that reaches an elevation of near 300 feet above the level of Lake Michigan at its maximum height in Indiana and 17 miles wide at its maximum width in Indiana.
Central Hardwoods Bird Conservation Region and Joint Venture	AL, AR, IL, IN, KY, MO, OK, TN	IN, MO	Members of the Central Hardwoods Joint Venture formed a partnership, beginning in 2000, to elevate emphasis on bird conservation within the Central Hardwoods Bird Conservation Region. The partnership works to maintain native bird populations and implement the conservation objectives of the various national and international bird conservation plans under the North American Bird Conservation Initiative.
Chicago Wilderness	IL, IN	IN	Chicago Wilderness is a regional alliance active in Chicago, IL and Gary, IN that connects people and nature. The partnership includes more than 250 organizations that work together to restore natural resources, protect the region's lands and waters, and to improve the quality of life for people.

Big Rivers Forest Fire Management Compact	IL, IN, IA, MO	IL, IN, MO	This compact encompasses the major rivers found in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and Missouri. Members of the compact share information about wildfire prevention and the <i>Firewise</i> programs, as well as operations, training, and mutual aid information.
Karst Topography Areas	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, MO, SD, NE	IL, IN, IA, MN, MO	The Karst areas have a geology of limestone or other soluble rock that is characterized by caves, sinkholes, and sinking streams. These areas are important for native bat populations.
Driftless Area Initiative	IL, IA, MI, MN, WI	IL, IA, MN, WI	The Driftless Area Initiative is a partnership of six RC&D Areas in four states. The area is characterized by karst topography with shallow limestone bedrock, caves and sinkholes. Several watersheds in the area have been designated as priority watersheds for the Upper Mississippi Forest Partnership. Maintaining a high quality forest resource is a priority for the Initiative.
Midwest Glacial Lakes Partnership	IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, WI, ND, SD	MN	The Midwest Glacial Lakes Partnership works to protect, rehabilitate, and enhance sustainable fish habitats in glacial lakes greater than 10 acres in size. The goals are to protect and maintain intact and healthy lake systems; prevent further degradation of fish habitats that have been adversely affected; reverse declines in the quality and quantity of aquatic habitats in lakes to improve the overall health of fish and other aquatic organisms; and increase the quality and quantity of fish habitats in lakes that support a broad natural diversity of aquatic species.
Lower Mississippi Bottomland Areas	IL, MO, KY, TN	MO (KY)	Loss of bottomland forests and forest fragmentation with restoration potential. One example is the River Bends Conservation Opportunity Area that spans across Missouri and Kentucky.
Missouri and Mississippi Rivers Confluence	IL, MO	MO	Habitat restoration and recreational opportunities are important in this area.
St. Louis Metro Urban Area	IL, MO	MO	Emphasis on urban areas that transcend state lines.

## National Priorities and Priority Areas (USFS)

### Illinois Forest Action Plan success stories aligned with USFS National Priorities:

The 2008 Farm Bill amended the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 to require each state and territory develop a long-term, state-wide assessment and strategies of their forest resources. These assessments and strategies are referred to as Forest Action Plans and remain focused on three national priorities established by the USDA Forest Service, State & Private Forestry section:

- Conserve and Manage Working Forest Landscapes for Multiple Values and Uses
- Protect Forests from Threats
- Enhance Public Benefits from Trees and Forests

Highlights and success stories that align with these national priorities which are tied to Illinois having a Forest Action Plan follow:

Projects in Illinois awarded competitive funding grants from NA S&PF since the IFAP

*The Illinois Forest Action Plan (IFAP) and its assessments have been noticed and remain a partial focus of most significant forestry partner organizations in Illinois. Each year Illinois has been awarded one or more competitive NA S&PF grant project(s) based on their forestry merit and their alignment with the assessments and/or strategies of the IFAP. Grants have included a good mix of urban and community projects, fire, forest health, and stewardship-based private forest management. All grants have been aligned with the assessments and Illinois's 5 priority concerns outlined in the IFAP. A list of these projects and those from other states and organizations can be found on the USDA Forest Service Northeastern Area S&PF website.*

Universal Illinois Forest Management Plan cements commitment to wildlife habitat

*The Illinois Forest Management Plan (IFMP) was greatly influenced by the IFAP assessments and the historical commitment to expanding forestry and wildlife habitat by the Division of Forest Resources. In 2010 the IDNR Forestry Stewardship Forester, the Illinois Extension Forester, the Illinois Tree Farm Director and USDA NRCS State Forester tasked themselves with developing, outlining and approving universal forest management plan standards that all Illinois forest management plans will follow so that each meets all the standards of the Tree Farm System, USDA NRCS EQIP 106, Forest Stewardship, and the Illinois Forestry Development Act (tax-law) programs. Making the management plan universal allows consultants to write more and better plans and allows DNR to be efficient in their review and implementation of Forest Stewardship and other plans. Illinois plans, since the winter of 2011/2012, now require wildlife habitat considerations and alignment with the principles found within the Illinois Wildlife Action Plan.*

IFDA – IFA Partnership: Forestry Communication Initiative

Each year the Illinois Forestry Development Council (Council) manages a budget authorized under the Illinois Forestry Development Act (IFDA) to forward and promote forestry across Illinois. In Illinois fiscal year 2015 the Council awarded a project grant to the Illinois Forestry Association as a forestry communication initiative. This project collects and builds an email database “group” for real-time forestry communication in Illinois that will be used by both the association, to email information, news, or issues; or by the forestry division, to email business and communications. In the past important communication on a forestry issue or opportunity was done by inefficient, time-consuming word of mouth, phone calls and US mail and was so burdensome the effort was rarely undertaken. The initial target is the 11,000 landowners already participating in Illinois’s IFDA private land forestry management program. A planned continuation of this partnership is expected in the Council’s 2016 and 2017 budget years. Thousands more forestry minded landowners - especially those participating in other IDNR land management programs – will hopefully be added. There are approximately 200,000 non-industrial private forest landowners in Illinois. The forestry communications email group will not be limited to forest landowners and can include anyone with an interest in forestry or forestry issues. Ultimately this type of forestry communication in Illinois results in communicating the IFAP itself and all related current issues to landowners, stakeholders at citizens at large.

#### Wood Utilization & Marketing HQ Forester

The IFAP noted the decline of forest industry and lack of professional foresters in Illinois as huge concerns. Our State Forester was, appropriately, one of the first persons to take action on the IFAP to address these two concerns and in 2011 began the efforts which resulted in hiring in 2013 a Wood Utilization and Marketing forester position at DNR headquarters that had been vacant since year 2000. A number of positive effects have resulted in the 2-year period since hiring that forester with many essential and important projects ahead. In that Illinois DNR has less than 20 professional foresters within the division, each head-count added or replaced is significant to our operations and our responsibilities.

#### Fire Program western/Illinois and Fire Management Cooperatives

The IFAP documented the changing dynamics and loss of the Illinois oak-hickory forests due to lack of disturbances. Fire and harvesting are the primary stand and landscape disturbances that promote oak-hickory forest types in Illinois. The Illinois DNR fire-program, which is two-faceted, has grown in response. DNR and other related disciplines outside and inside DNR are now required to have minimum annual classwork, physically pass annual refresher, and carry a Prescribed Burn Managers card. The IDNR Forestry program manager has expanded the Illinois fire program to train hundreds of rural fire district personnel and more division foresters as well as maintaining an entire Illinois crew of re-carded firefighters available for NWCG fire duty and has been, for the last decade, active every season. The prescribed burn and wild land fire training programs and grants have expanded the capacity for the DNR and its partners and allied agencies to be better geared and more efficient on their expanded use of fire on the landscape. Noteworthy is a prescribed fire project partially funded by a competitive NA S&PF grant. A multiple county

*burn association was formed which functions like a cooperative to deliver prescribe fire to mostly private forestland in Illinois's most important forest region in southern Illinois.*

#### River to River Cooperative Weed Management Area (CWMA)

*This southern Illinois weed management cooperative was inspired by the IFAP assessment and the NA S&PF competitive grant which it received to survey and map bush-honeysuckle, Illinois's worst forest understory invader, between the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in the heavily-forested southern counties of Illinois. The mapping project was successful and now the CWMA lives on and remains active in battling the invasion of the unwanted forest shrub. As an example, the email blast below circulated in November 2015:*

*The River to River CWMA, in cooperation with our partners at the IDNR, Shawnee NF, and Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry would like to invite you to participate in a Honeysuckle Roundup and Pot-luck to be held at Trail of Tears State Forest, December 18 from 9am-4pm. <http://www.rtrcwma.org> <http://www.facebook.com/rtrcwma>*

#### IL CREP 1400 CEs and Required Timber Harvest Plans

*The State of Illinois Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) program has developed approximately 1,400 permanent conservation easements with private landowners owning forest and non-forestland in river bottoms and directly adjacent lands across Illinois two biggest watersheds. Owners in the Illinois and Kaskaskia River basins are eligible if they have active federal CRP or CREP contracts in or adjacent to a floodplain and after detailed property inspection and an internal technical review. The IFAP illustrated how important the need for professional foresters is across Illinois and so CREP program managers are now working with the forestry division to approve timber harvest plans for any CREP easement landowners who wish to cut timber on their easement. Approval of a harvest involves either a qualified forestry consultant and/or a state service forester to review, further develop, and/or approve timber harvest plans assuring each addresses silvicultural management and forest regeneration principles.*

#### U&CF Committee Expansion and Urban Assessments and Strategies

*In an effort to integrate Urban and Community Forestry closer into the mainstream of forestry, the Urban & Community Forestry Committee compiled existing assessments and strategic documents into one comprehensive plan. Partners and organizations that support urban forestry within the state created a document to update the mission of urban forestry and provide the goals and objectives that will allow for more competitiveness of projects and initiatives for NA grants. As a collective effort the Forestry Development Urban and Community Forestry Committee worked together to utilize the work from the past to create the current Addendum 1.0 to the IFAP (2014). The U&CF committee continues to meet regularly to monitor, assess and strategize on that work and on current issues which will be meshed and included in the updated 2016 IFAP.*

#### Be a Hero Transport Zero message/campaign

*Illinois Division of Fisheries has been working with the Illinois-Indiana sea-grant on the aquatic message of the “Be a Hero” campaign since 2014. The grant team asked DNR wide for volunteers for developing a companion land message to address, primarily, invasive and exotic plants and insects . Due to the IFAP, and it confirming the threat of changing forest dynamics and forest health issues, the Stewardship Forester of the Illinois Division of Forest Resources volunteered. The IDNR Invasive Species Coordinator (also a forester) volunteered as a second. Together both worked with sea-grant specialists on a message and main points to create a parallel icon for terrestrial land threats and invaders affecting forests.*



*For more information visit [TransportZero.org](http://TransportZero.org) and [ReleaseZero.org](http://ReleaseZero.org). To learn more about becoming a Be a Hero partner, contact Charlebois at [charlebo@illinois.edu](mailto:charlebo@illinois.edu).*

Illinois's Forest Action Plan threats and strategies align with USFS National Priorities:

The 2017 Illinois Forest Action Plan identifies seven main threats and strategies concerning forest resources. State & Private Forestry objectives, listed and numbered under each federal forestry concern (in bold), are all addressed in Illinois:

**Conserve and Manage Working Forest Landscapes for Multiple Values and Uses**

Identify and conserve high priority forest ecosystems and landscapes (objective 1.1)

Actively and sustainably manage forests (objective 1.2)

**Protect Forests from Threats**

Restore fire-adapted lands and reduce risk of wildfire impacts (objective 2.1)

Identify, manage, and reduce threats to forest and ecosystem health (objective 2.2)

**Enhance Public Benefits from Trees and Forests**

Protect and enhance water quality and quantity (objective 3.1)

Improve air quality and conserve energy (objective 3.2)

Assist communities in planning for and reducing forest health risks (objective 3.3)

Maintain and enhance the economic benefits and values of trees and forests (objective: 3.4)

Protect, conserve, and enhance wildlife and fish habitat (objective: 3.5)

Connect people to trees & forests; engage them in environmental stewardship activities (obj. 3.6)

Manage trees and forests to mitigate and adapt to global climate change (objective 3.7)

These seven Illinois forest resource threats, and the strategies to address them, align with each State & Private Forestry concern (in bold) and the State & Private Forestry objectives listed:

- 1 Oak-Hickory Forests...
  - Conserve and Manage Working Forest Landscapes for Multiple Values and Uses**
  - Protect Forests from Threats**
  - Enhance Public Benefits from Trees and Forests**SPF Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7
  
- 2 Large Forest Blocks ...
  - Conserve and Manage Working Forest Landscapes for Multiple Values and Uses**
  - Protect Forests from Threats**
  - Enhance Public Benefits from Trees and Forests**SPF Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7
  
- 3 Forest Health Threats ...
  - Conserve and Manage Working Forest Landscapes for Multiple Values and Uses**
  - Protect Forests from Threats**
  - Enhance Public Benefits from Trees and Forests**SPF Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7
  
- 4 Forestry Professionals ...
  - Conserve and Manage Working Forest Landscapes for Multiple Values and Uses**
  - Protect Forests from Threats**
  - Enhance Public Benefits from Trees and Forests**SPF Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7
  
- 5 Illinois Forest Industry ...
  - Conserve and Manage Working Forest Landscapes for Multiple Values and Uses**
  - Protect Forests from Threats**
  - Enhance Public Benefits from Trees and Forests**SPF Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7
  
- 6 Urban and Community Forests ...
  - Conserve and Manage Working Forest Landscapes for Multiple Values and Uses**
  - Protect Forests from Threats**
  - Enhance Public Benefits from Trees and Forests**SPF Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7
  
- 7 Other Threats ...
  - Conserve and Manage Working Forest Landscapes for Multiple Values and Uses**
  - Protect Forests from Threats**
  - Enhance Public Benefits from Trees and Forests**SPF Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, and 3.7



# Illinois Forest Resource Strategies & Actions

In that Illinois forests and future forests are truly threatened statewide; Illinois forestry leaders, forestry practitioners, forestry council members, key stakeholders and partners and a diverse range of conservation specialists conclude these strategies listed below are the most important, current priorities for Illinois forests and forest resources. Many of the strategic forest resource actions, and the threats that necessitate these strategies and actions, were derived from the original research and assembly of the 2010 Illinois Forest Action Plan. In addition, many goals and action items from the 1999 Council publication *Realizing the Forests' Full Potential: Assessment and Long-Range Action Plan for Forest Resources in Illinois* are included in these current strategies that follow. The 1999 planning document continues to be relevant and is found as Appendix XX. It is available on the Illinois Forestry Development Council website.

These statewide forest resource strategies must ultimately be addressed if Illinois is to achieve and sustain long term health and productivity of forests. Nearly all Illinois forests are both environmentally and socially important. Addressing the threats by employing these core strategies will yield healthy, richly-productive future forests which are of critical importance.

These seven strategies are not in priority order and the number of each strategy is irrelevant to its priority. Collectively each of the seven strategies and the lettered action items that comprise each strategy are all considered high priority. Any particular effort, investment or cost to realize a strategy or action, or a particular strategy or action over another, should consider other factors and priorities as necessary. Implementing these equally important strategies is much more important than prioritizing them in advance. Prioritization of forestry actions is discussed in the section following this strategies and actions section.

These are numbered and lettered for reference only:

## **Strategy 1. Save and Expand Oak-Hickory Forests**

- A Intensify canopy disturbances, mid-story control and re-introduce fire into the forest system.
- B Additional forest disturbances toward addressing declining tree species diversity must put implementation of canopy, sub-canopy and understory disturbances front and center.
- C Timber stand improvement (TSI) practices are necessary to favor bottomland and upland oak forests.
- D Favor impacted oak species of black oak, scarlet oak, southern red oak and shortleaf pine, sassafras, dogwood, persimmon, cottonwood, and aspen with forest disturbance.
- E Full funding of forestry incentive programs is needed to encourage private landowners to undertake TSI, Rx burning, and other beneficial stewardship activities.

- F Funds collected from the state timber sales tax must be made fully available to interested forest landowners.
- G Pioneering cooperative efforts between non-industrial private forest landowners and state agencies that is showing promise in reversing plant biodiversity declines such as the Southeastern Illinois Prescribed Burn Association
- H Management to enhance tree biodiversity and oak dominance is good wildlife habitat management
- I Strengthened markets for small, poorly formed, or decadent trees that interfere with regeneration are key to getting more light to forest understories and more necessary disturbance of forest soils.
- J IDNR, should serve as a statewide leader by demonstrating stewardship practices that enhance biodiversity on state forest lands and appropriate areas of rural parks.
- K Educational programs on the essential role of disturbance, including fire, in Illinois forest ecosystems targeted for private forest landowners need to be developed emphasizing the importance of disturbance in the maintenance and restoration of desired forest traits
- L Incorporating a full appreciation for the legacy of human activities on forest ecosystem function and composition should be incorporated into education curricula at all levels
- M Partner and co-develop wildlife and forestry efforts to keep oak as critical wildlife habitat.
- N Convert marginal farmland to forests having mix of oak, native forest and timber species
- O Practice active oak forest management on State Forests.
- P Fund and implement invasive species control on all forestland – especially bush-honeysuckle. Early control prior to epidemic levels is best and most effective.
- Q Oaks should be planted more in city, state, county parks and open spaces.

**Strategy 2. Save Existing, and Create More, Large Forest Blocks of 500 acres**

- A Programs geared toward encouraging voluntary coordinated management across ownerships could increase the positive impacts of forest management.
- B Property tax and zoning policies that encourage good forest stewardship need to be developed and propagated to encourage sound utilization and stewardship practices and in critical areas to keep more forest in 'forest.'

- C In urbanizing areas, amenity values of forests can be preserved and enhanced through regional land-use planning that encourages conservation of greenways, riparian areas and, where appropriate, wildlife travel corridors.
- D A viable forest products industry to maintaining forestry as a preferred land use and reducing fragment size cannot be overstressed
- E Outreach program that respond to the evolving interests and priorities of the land ownership base must be expanded.
- F Conserve, Expand, and Connect Working Forest Landscapes to retain all existing Illinois forests, improve their management, and convert 300,000 acres of marginal cropland to forest cover.
- G Connect forests via reforestation to create 500 acre and larger contiguous forestlands.
- H State Tree Nurseries remain open to produce genetically sound planting stock.

**Strategy 3. Mitigate Forest Health Threats**

- A Invasive species management is a concern among Natural Heritage, Wildlife and Forestry interests. Cooperative weed management programs, such as is being enacted through the River to River Cooperative Weed Management Area should be replicated through the state.
- B Invasive plant species management will go hand in hand with other forest management practices.
- C Preventing further invasions will require continued early detection and intervention efforts including information dissemination to public employees, private enterprises and the public.
- D Research, educational materials, and volunteer coordination by Illinois Natural History Survey scientists play critical roles in this effort and adequate funding and staffing must continue for the interdisciplinary IDNR Invasive Species Working Group.
- E An integrated approach to exotic species control tailored to local conditions is warranted.
- F Landowners who harvest timber should be able to recoup severance tax payments to support invasive species management practices in situations where both exotic and native invasive species threaten the long-term sustainability of timber production.
- G Eradicate, control, and prevent the introduction of invasive exotic species to new areas.
- H Manage trees and forests to mitigate and adapt to global climate change.

**Strategy 4. Hire More Forestry Professionals**

- A As awareness of forest stewardship and incentive programs grow; the demand for a professional state support system will be greater than ever.
- B The need for informational, educational and outreach programs that explain forest importance and forestry outputs such as oak regeneration, prescribed burning, habitat fragmentation, water quality relationships, ecosystem services or enrollment in private forestry management programs cannot be met without the personnel to deliver them.
- C Increasing the number of state forestry professionals and technical personnel must be the first step in reestablishing a win-win relationship that ensures the vitality and productivity of Illinois forests. Without adequate levels of staffing, forest resource conservation in our state will suffer serious setbacks.
- D Illinois Forestry Association have advocated for full staffing of IDNR district forestry personnel, increased support for forestry extension, and improved collaboration between state, local, and federal natural resources management agencies and organizations.
- E Initiatives to encourage partnerships among agencies and organizations within the forestry community will be necessary to address this need and prevent duplication of effort.
- F State support for university-based outreach and extension efforts, such as the Illinois Virtual Forest, must be maintained because educated citizens become land stewards. By educating Illinois citizens about forest health and sound management practices, we protect both market and non-market values of Illinois forests for citizens, communities, and the state today and in the future.
- G Illinois forest landowners would benefit from an expanded pool of knowledgeable individuals to provide forest management services needed to effectively undertake active stewardship and its attendant economic benefits.
- H Illinois' increasing number of private forest landowners has also created a situation in which many landowners are unaware of the value of their timber and how, with a professionally prepared management plan, it can be harvested in an environmentally responsible manner.
- I Cooperation with other land management agencies and interests and promotion of education programs such as the American Forest Foundation's Project Learning Tree should be pursued to broaden public understanding of forest management.
- J Expanded use of state and other public lands and public-private cooperation to demonstrate good land stewardship practices would be a key resource for private landowners seeking to undertake similar measures on their own land.

**Strategy 5. Statewide Focus on Illinois Forest Industry**

- A Illinois is forfeiting most of its forest generated wealth to adjacent states by discouraging the development of a vibrant wood products sector. Legal and institutional supports are needed in order to develop an industry that matches the quality of the resource.
- B The number of primary wood-using firms in Illinois has sharply declined due to comparatively high workers' compensation and unemployment insurance rates, as well as energy and transportation costs all equaling an unfavorable business climate for wood products.
- C Institutional technological and marketing support for the forest products industry is at an all-time low with the failure to replace retired wood products faculty in the forestry programs at University of Illinois and Southern Illinois University.
- D Many Illinois secondary wood-using firms remain unaware that quality Illinois hardwoods are available and no central market exists to bring buyer and seller together.
- E State and county economic development programs should increase support for forest-based industries. Assistance to increase marketing capacity, improve access to financing and capital, and revise taxation formulas will be necessary to stimulate entrepreneurial business development in the Illinois forest products industry.
- F To add value to material once regarded as waste, Illinois will need to investigate new technologies and new markets for waste wood including urban wood waste as a commercial/institutional heating fuel.
- G Initiate partnering public agencies, private enterprises, and university researchers is demonstrating the potential of portable band sawmills and dehumidification dry kilns to produce high grade lumber from trees removed from urban forests.
- H Public-private partnerships and state or regional integrated waste management programs will be needed to increase the rate of waste wood recovery and bring it to market in Illinois and including urban trees as versatile assets.
- I Improve and expand the capacity and marketing potential of Illinois wood-products industries so that the available forest resources can be used most effectively and the increased demand for forest products can be met.

**Strategy 6. Expand Urban and Community Forests and Forestry**

- A Improve and Expand Forest Composition and Health

There is a need to understand the composition of the urban forest and the operations capacity of those who own and manage the forest. With appropriate data and analysis landowners and managers across the state will be able to make informed decisions for urban forest management. See Appendix A for additional information.

**B Achieve Widespread Illinois Urban Forestry Sustainability and Management**

A sustainable Illinois urban forest promotes trees as part of urban infrastructure and play critical roles as green infrastructure delivering many benefits. Work to integrate adaptation strategies into maintenance practices, improved species lists based on environmental impacts and infrastructure features which will help to support the urban forest in a time of change. See Appendix A for additional information.

**C Education and Training for Professionals and Non-professionals**

Increase the number of credentialed individuals performing work in Illinois along with supporting and adding incentives for additional tangential training (BMP's, ANSI, regulatory and building program capacity) Additionally, engage elected officials to builds awareness and advocacy potential of state forestry goals and educate and engage developers, contractors and utilities professionals who construct or manage facilities in the urban forest. Providing and expanding opportunities for youth education and engagement prepares this demographic to become forestry professionals and advocates. See Appendix A for additional information.

**D Urban Forest Plants, Insect and Disease Invasive Species Awareness and Management**

Invasive pests, plants and diseases threaten the health of Illinois' urban trees. Ongoing education and outreach to professionals and residents must be provided to ensure the highest level of awareness and engagement statewide. See Appendix A for additional information.

**E Nurture Urban Forestry Partnerships**

Public and private sectors partnerships throughout Illinois are needed to develop statewide urban and community forestry needs. Partnerships are needed to research, develop and disseminate urban and community forestry information to those practitioners to promote best management practices. See Appendix A for additional information.

**F Expand and Support Advocacy**

Key to the success of urban and community forestry in Illinois is recognition of the importance and benefits of urban trees to the State and its citizens. Urban and community Forestry needs to receive support and assistance from State legislators and policy makers. See Appendix A for additional information.

**G Increase Funding for Urban & Community Forestry**

The Urban and Community Forestry Committee and the Illinois Forestry Development Council should work with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources to identify dedicated funding for the State Urban and Community Forestry Program and to support continued funding from the U.S. Forest Service. See Appendix A for additional information.

**H Increase State Urban Forestry Staffing**

It is critical for the continued success of the state urban and community forestry program that additional dedicated Urban and Community Forestry field staff be hired. See Appendix A for additional information.

Commented [bc6]: Inset Appendix

**Strategy 7. Realize other Unmet Critical Forest Resource Needs**

- A Initiate Legislation for permanent forestry and forest conservation funding (like State of Missouri and others have). This is one of the most critical strategies for Illinois.
- B Insure solid funding for the Illinois Forestry Development Council (IFDC).
- C Maintain six (6) regular meetings and full attendance to IFDC meetings annually.
- D Strengthen and expand conservation education programs that instill a stewardship and forest management ethic that results in economic, productive, attractive, and healthful forests throughout the state.
- E Update and amend Ginseng Conservation laws and improve reporting systems.
- F Outreach proven and demonstrated information about increased water quality and water conservation benefits from actively managed forestland.
- G Contact all new Illinois forest landowners 10 acres or more via assessors and/or real estate lawyers.
- H Actively engage with all stakeholders to reduce the incidence of timber harvests that remove all or only the best trees or best species in a forest. This practice, known as “high-grading”,

## Prioritizing Forest Resource Strategies & Actions

While the magnitude of Illinois forestry professionals, forestry funding and forestry activity support pale in comparison to the more heavily forested states and territories; the quality, experience, expertise and longevity of forest resource professionals here in both the private and public sector is outstanding. Forestry funding is often scarce or unstable in Illinois. Funds generated by the Division of Forest Resources to support IDNR professional foresters and forestry programs are about 10% of the division's annual expenditures (at the current staffing level and assuming annual forestry cost-share spending). Though forestry support and partnering is slowly expanding statewide, critical mass for widespread support, for stable, ample funding and for initiating forest resource strategies is absent in Illinois.

To date, leveraging on grants and partnering forest dollars on mutual or urgent concerns has had some success in addressing Illinois priority forest resource concerns. Priority projects and actions usually occur infrequently at a slow pace. Partnering multiple organizations and dollars on priority environmental concerns has become a common federal, state and local practice. Partnering dollars on forestry and environmental concerns has become common of federal, state, local governments or organizations. The DFR has, due to fiscal necessity, trended toward prioritizing only projects that have funding mechanisms or leveraged dollars. The division currently barely meets its vital State of Illinois missions and mandates.

The primary year in - year out priorities for the Division of Forest Resources are often only those activities that meet the focus or requirements for federally supported "programs", such as Forest Stewardship or Urban and Community Forestry, without the luxury of additional or expanded initiatives. Statewide forestry division priority areas within Illinois mean, for example, that township and community plans are needed most in the southern 7 counties, that urban & community forest plans are needed in the populated, established, village, cities, and towns, that forest management incentives and programs should occur in the forested and historically forested areas (dark green High Priority areas) and that Forest Legacy Program easements are only forwarded if they occur in a designated Forest Legacy Area.

Secondary priorities (for the Division of Forest Resources or IDNR) are the measure of material or financial support of active, significant partners. A simple measure of how many significant partners materially, physically or financially participate should gauge decisions between projects and efforts that would otherwise have similar priorities. Since so many important strategies exist beyond the federally supported "programs" and state mandates, the forestry division and the resource itself needs significant funding and partners to initiate additional strategies.

Tertiary priorities exist from a broad range of interests and exist at different scales. When a project or an effort is also of significance to important conservation and forestry partners, such as the IDNR Division of Wildlife, the USDA, a neighboring state government or significant forestry organization; then the tertiary priority is higher.



**EXAMPLE:** State Agency Initiated Rural Forest Management Project...

*Primary* \*If this project is in the “white” area on the Stewardship priority map; then the rank is low and the project would not be initiated. If this is in a “light green” priority Stewardship area it is a normal priority and rank is moderate. If this is in a “dark green”, high priority Stewardship area it is determined to be a high priority project and the rank high.

*Secondary* \*The project has two additional financially participating partners. The higher the number of participating significant partners; the higher a priority it is to initiate the project.

*Tertiary* \*This example has one shared important state issue with the Illinois Wildlife Action Plan, two shared priorities with neighboring state forestry agencies, and meets three USDA Forest Service S&PF objectives. The higher the number of shared issues or areas; the higher priority the project should be.




Table 4. Strategic matrix of Illinois Forest Resources

<b>Threat to forest resources</b>	<b>Strategies to mitigate threats</b>	<b>Resources required</b>	<b>National objective</b>
Oak Forests Threatened	TSI and Disturbance	Federal funding, IDNR forestry funding	Objective 1.1 Objective 1.2 Objective 2.1 Objective 3.5
Large Forest Blocks now Critical	Tax relief for forest landowners, Reforestation	Federal funding, IDNR forestry funding	Objective 1.1 Objective 3.1 Objective 3.5
Forest Health Threats High	Cooperative weed management programs, Forest monitoring	Federal funding, IDNR forestry funding	Objective 2.2
Forestry Professionals Disappearing	Increase IDNR Forestry hiring Incentivize professional consultants	Federal funding, IDNR forestry funding	Objective 3.6
Illinois Forest Industry Decline	Lower tax rates & workman compensation, Research and applied technology	New Legislation	Objective 3.4
Urban and Community Forest Very Important	Increase IDNR forestry funding Incentives for U&CF	Federal funding, IDNR forestry funding	Objectives 3.1-3.7
Historic, Critical Forest Resource Needs still Exist	Re-evaluate past long range plans	Council and IDNR Forestry critique	Objective 1.2 Objective 3.1 Objective 3.2

Table 5. Challenges of the IDNR according to the 2017 draft Forest & Woodlands Campaign of the Illinois Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plan & Strategy:

-----  
The actions included within the forest/woodlands campaign section are provided to help guide the next 10 years of implementation. While other actions may be needed and larger goals could be set, the campaign prioritizes the actions below as realistic, achievable and most needed to best aid in reaching the overarching goals of for Illinois Forest & Woodland wildlife resources:

1. Establish desired number and distribution of viable populations for each Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN).
  2. Manage habitats through promoting natural processes, desired structure, and disturbance regimes for the benefit of native species.
  3. Develop resiliency and connectedness into habitats so species can adjust to landscape and environmental changes.
- 

Table 6. Goals for improving forest habitat according to the 2017 draft Forest & Woodlands Campaign of the Illinois Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plan & Strategy:

- 
1. Implement sustainable forestry practices, including forest stand improvement, prescribed fire, timber harvesting and invasive species control to enhance oak-dominance and maintain understory and herbaceous layer diversity on 1 million acres of forest and savanna/barren/open woodland habitat. Restore and manage small woodlots as open woodlands/savannas as appropriate.
  2. Increase statewide forest and woodland acreage by 350,000 acres, emphasizing restoration of floodplains and riparian corridors, increasing ecological connectivity among forests and other habitat patches, and reducing fragmentation of forests 500 acres and larger.
  3. Develop high-quality examples of all forest communities, including all Grade A & B Illinois Natural Areas Inventory sites, restored and managed within all natural divisions within which they occur.
  4. Manage healthy and well-maintained urban forests and woodlands.
-

Table 8 State and Private Forestry National Priorities and Objectives, USDA Forest Service and NASF, Sept. 2008, Sept. 2012.

---

**1. Conserve Working Forest Landscapes**

- 1.1. Identify and conserve high priority forest ecosystems and landscapes
- 1.2. Actively and sustainably manage forests

**2. Protect Forests from Harm**

- 2.1. Restore fire-adapted lands and reduce risk of wildfire impacts
- 2.2. Identify, manage, and reduce threats to forest and ecosystem health

**3. Enhance Public Benefits from Trees and Forests**

- 3.1. Protect and enhance water quality and quantity
  - 3.2. Improve air quality and conserve energy
  - 3.3. Assist communities in planning for and reducing wildfire risks
  - 3.4. Maintain and enhance the economic benefits and values of trees and forests
  - 3.5. Protect, conserve, and enhance wildlife and fish habitat
  - 3.6. Connect people to trees and forests, and engage them in environmental stewardship activities
  - 3.7. Manage and restore trees and forests to mitigate and adapt to global climate change
-

## Appendices

This appendix has material content substantial to this Illinois Forest Action Plan. The following appendices and the References section that follows are considered part of the plan and not to be separated from the plan.

### Appendix A.

*Urban & Community Forestry State Committee, 2014 U&CF Strategies and Action Items.*  
(attached in print)

### Appendix B.

*Illinois Forest Legacy Program. Assessment of Need 1994, 2017.*

The Illinois Forest Legacy Program had until now been implemented according to the current Assessment of Need approved on November 29, 1994. A copy of the IDNR designation letter, the previous Assessment of Need, and the current approval letter are housed at the IDNR headquarters in Springfield, Illinois.

(attached in print)

### Appendix C.

*Illinois Forest Resources 2010*

[http://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/rn/rn\\_nrs120.pdf](http://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/pubs/rn/rn_nrs120.pdf)

[http://www.fs.fed.us/nrs/pubs/ru/ru\\_fs39.pdf](http://www.fs.fed.us/nrs/pubs/ru/ru_fs39.pdf)

### Appendix D.

*Illinois Wildlife Action Plan \_ Implementation Guide & Woodland Campaign*

[http://www.dnr.illinois.gov/conservation/IWAP/Documents/FinalDraft2015\\_FINAL\\_Revisi  
on%204-18-16.pdf](http://www.dnr.illinois.gov/conservation/IWAP/Documents/FinalDraft2015_FINAL_Revisi%20on%204-18-16.pdf)

### Appendix E.

*Illinois Silvics Manual*

[http://mypage.siu.edu/eholzmue/index\\_files/ilbmp.htm](http://mypage.siu.edu/eholzmue/index_files/ilbmp.htm)

### Appendix F.

*Realizing the Forests' Full Potential: Assessment and Long-Range Action Plan for Forest Resources in Illinois, 1999.*

[http://ifdc.nres.illinois.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/ifdc\\_assessment-and-long-  
range-action-plan\\_1999.pdf](http://ifdc.nres.illinois.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/ifdc_assessment-and-long-range-action-plan_1999.pdf)

### Appendix G.

*Illinois Consulting Foresters Directory*

<http://www.ilforestry.org/resources/Documents/Publications/tfb-nres-202-16.pdf>

## References

- Bailey, R.G. 1995. Description of the ecoregions of the United States. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. [Available at: [www.fs.fed.us/land/ecosysgmt/ecoreg1\\_home.html](http://www.fs.fed.us/land/ecosysgmt/ecoreg1_home.html)].
- Collinge, S.K. 1996. Ecological consequences of habitat fragmentation: implications for landscape architecture and planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 36: 59-77.
- Forman, R.T. 1995. Land mosaics: the ecology of landscapes and regions. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 632 p.
- Haynes, R.H., tech. cord. 2003. An analysis of the timber situation in the United States: 1952 to 2050. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-560. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 254 p.
- Heske, E.J.; Robinson, S.K.; Brawn, J.D. 1999. Predator activity and predation on songbird nests on forest-field edges in east-central Illinois. *Landscape Ecology*. 14: 345-354.
- McNab, W.H.; Avers, P.E. 1996. Ecological subregions of the United States. WO-WSA-5. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. [Available at: [www.fs.fed.us/land/pubs/ecoregions/](http://www.fs.fed.us/land/pubs/ecoregions/)].
- O'Brien, J.G.; Mielke, M.E.; Oak, S.; Moltzan, B. 2002. Sudden oak death: pest alert. NA-PR-02-02. Newtown Square, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Area, State and Private Forestry. 2 p.
- Telford, C.J. 1926. Third report on a forest survey of Illinois. *Illinois Natural History Survey Bulletin*. 1 (1): 1-102.
- Crocker, S.J, Brand, GJ, Butler, BJ, Haugen, DE, Little, DC, Meneguzzo, DM, Perry, CH, Piva, RJ, Wilson, BT, Woodall, CW. 2009. Illinois' Forests 2005. Resource Bulletin NRS-29. Newtown Square, PA: USDA Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 114 p. (Appendix X)
- Authors here, xxxxxxx, xxxxxx Illinois' Forests 2010. Resource Bulletin NRS-29. Newtown Square, PA: USDA Forest Service, Northern Research Station. (Appendix)
- Guyon LJ and Edgington J. Illinois Report on Sustainable Forest Mangement: Criteria and Indicators. Illinois Forestry Development Council. 59 p.
- Illinois Division of Wildlife Resources. 2005. The Illinois Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plan and Strategy. Illinois Division of Wildlife Resources. 353 p.
- Illinois Forestry Association. 2007. Urgent need for additional professional and technical staff within the Division of Forestry in the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. Illinois Forestry Association. 4 p.

Illinois Forestry Development Council. 1999. Realizing the Forests' Full Potential: Assessment and Long-Range Action Plan for Forest Resources in Illinois. Illinois Forestry Development Council. 60 p. (Appendix)

Illinois Forestry Development Council. Critical Issues Facing Illinois Forests and Forestry. 2005. Illinois Forestry Development Council. 16 p.

Illinois Forestry Development Council. Forestry Impact on Illinois Economy. Illinois Forestry Development Council. 6 p.

Illinois Forest Legacy Program. 1994. Assessment of Need. 65 p.

Nowak, DJ and Greenfield EJ. 2010. Urban and Community Forests of the North Central East Region. General Technical Report . NRS-54USDA Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 54 p. (Appendix)

Ruffner CM. 2009. Makanda Township Wildfire Protection Plan. Southern Illinois University. (Appendix)

Authors here, xxxxxx, it is CW CW xxxx. Lake McHenry Counties (Townships) Wildfire Protection Plan. DFR?Lake CO?. (Appendix)

USDA Forest Service. 2008. Northeastern Area State And Private Forestry Strategic Plan Update for Fiscal Years 2008-2012. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Area, State and Private Forestry. 55 p.

Hayek, J. A., 2015(6). Illinois Directory of Consultants Foresters. University of Illinois Forestry Extension. XX p. (Appendix )

Allen, D., Beckmann, C., Boutelle Fidler, T., Brewer, P., Deizman, P., Delahunt, K., Enrietto, N., Lindsay, B., Shimp, J., Shults, S., Snyder, B., 2014. Trail of Tears State Forest Demonstration Project, Illinois Department of Natural Resources, Springfield, Illinois. 21 p. (Appendix )

American Forests. 2016 [Forests & Cities: Urban Forests Website](#)

American Public Works Association. Abt. 2014. Urban Forestry Best management Practices for Public Works Managers – Urban Forest Management Plan. American Public Works Association Press. P. 28

Based on photo-interpretation of Google Earth TM imagery (Image dates circa 2008 and 2010) of 1,00 random pointes in each county and the City of Chicago.

Census Bureau. 2010. Illinois: Sept. 2012 Population and Housing Units Counts 2010 Census of Population and Housing. United States Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S> Census Bureau CPH-2-15

Coder, Dr. Kim D., “Identified Benefits of Community Trees and Forests”, University of Georgia, October, 1996.

Charles R. Hall, Alan W. Hodges, and John J. Haydu. 2005. Economic Impacts of the Green Industry in the United States - Final Report to the National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Committee

City of Urbana 2015(Council on Forestry Development, Urban and Community Forestry Committee, 2007) Under the Canopy: Creating Personal Greenspaces Poster.

Davey Resources, Inc. . 2016 I-Tree Analysis

Davis, Ameile Y., J. Amy Belaire, Monica A. Farfan, Dan Milz, Eric R. Sweeney, Scott R. Loss, Emily S. Minor. Nov. 2012. [Green Infrastructure and bird diversity across an urban socioeconomic gradient.](#) EcoSphere Volume 3, Issue 11 P. 18

Hildebrandt, Reinee. 2016a. Tree City USA Report on Annual Expenditures in a speech and Powerpoint presentation at the March 2016 Illinois Arborist Association Northeastern Illinois Municipal Foresters Meeting.

Hildebrandt, Reinee. 2016b. State of Illinois Urban and Community Forestry: Tree City USA Building Sustainable Communities. Speech and Powerpoint presentation at the July, 2016 Association of Illinois Soil and Water Districts.

Hildebrandt, Reinee. Fall 2008. Part I Macroeconomic Impact of Local Urban and Community Forestry Programs During Major Insect Infestations. Illinois Trees A Quarterly Publication of the Illinois Arborist Association Volume XXIV Number 1.

Hildebrandt, Reinee. Fall 2008. Part II Macroeconomic Impact of Local Urban and Community Forestry Programs During Major Insect Infestations. Illinois Trees A Quarterly Publication of the Illinois Arborist Association Volume XXIV Number 2.

Malen, Townsend, St. Leger, Henderson-Wilson, Pryor, Prosser and Moore. 2009. Healthy Parks, Healthy People: The Health Benefits of Contact with Nature in the Park Context.

National Urban and Community Forestry Advisory Council. 2016. Ten-Year Urban Forestry Action Plan: 2016-2026. University of Virginia Institute for Environmental Negotiation P.88



Nowak, David J., Eric J. Greenfield. September, 2009. [Urban and Community Forests of the North Central East Region – Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin](#). USDA Forest Service Northern Resources Station, State and Private Forestry, General Technical Report, NRS-54. 54 p.

Nowak, David J., Robert E. Hoehn III, Allison R. Bodine, Daniel E. Crane, John F. Dwyer, Veta Bonnewell, Gary Watson. August 2013. [Urban Trees and Forests of the Chicago Region](#). USDA Forest Service Northern Resources Station, State and Private Forestry, General Technical Report, NRS-84. P. 107

Nowak, David J., Susan M. Stein, Paula B. Randler, Eric J. Greenfield, Sara J. Comas, Mary A. Carr, and Ralph J. Alig. July 2010, [Sustaining America's Urban Tree and Forests](#). USDA Forest Service Northern Resources Station, State and Private Forestry, General Technical Report, NRS-62. 27 p.

Schwab, John C.. 2009. Planning the Urban Forests: Ecology, Economy, and Community Development. American Planning Association. Planning Advisory Service Report Number 555. P. 156

State of Illinois Department of Agriculture. 2016 website.

State of Illinois Illinois Department of Natural Resources. 2015. Illinois Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) 2015-2019. P. 52

Sass, Laura, Reinee Hildebrandt, and Sue Key. 2010. Illinois' Urban and Community Tree Programs: an update of the protection, care, and management of our urban forests. Technical Report 2010 (52) Illinois Natural History Survey.

Susan J. Crocker, Gary J. Brand, Brett J. Butler, David E. Haugen, Dick C. Little, Dacia M. Meneguzzo, Charles H. Perry, Ronald J. Piva, Barry T. Wilson, and Christoohar W. Woodall. 2009. [Illinois' Forests 2005 Resource Bulletin NRS-29](#)

UIC News Center. December 2012. Hispanic neighborhoods less green. [UIC News Center Webpage](#)

Urbana, IL Tree Inventory

USDA, Environmental Protection Agency, Secretary of Interior and Council on Environmental Quality. February 2011. American's Great Outdoors: A Promise to Future Generations. P. 105

US Forest Service. October 2001. Utilizing Municipal Trees: Ideas From Across the Country, NA-TP-06-01, p. 1

Hauer, R. J. and Peterson W. D. 2016. [Municipal Tree Care and Management in the United States: A 2014 Urban and Community Forestry Census of Tree Activities](#) Special Publication 16-1 College of Natural Resources, University of Wisconsin – Stevens Point. 71pp.

Hildebrandt, Reinee. 2016a. Tree City USA Report on Annual Expenditures in a speech and PowerPoint presentation at the March 2016 Illinois Arborist Association Northeastern Illinois Municipal Foresters Meeting.

National Association of State Foresters. July 20, 2016. Forest and People: Key Threats and Opportunities. [National Association of State Foresters Northeast website](#)

DRAFT

**Appendix A.**  
**Urban & Community Forestry State Committee**  
**2014 U&CF Strategies and Action Items:**

**1.0 Improve and Expand Forest Composition and Health**

1.1 Conduct an Assessment of the Illinois Urban Forest---State and Local

1.1.A. Conduct and make accessible a State urban forest assessment including the use of LIDAR or other imagery which will allow for a complete understanding of the species matrix, age classifications, locations and planting opportunities and their changes over time. Make this information accessible to State, regional and local forestry managers for the development of a strategy for the management, planting and protection of the urban forest at all scales, utilizing cloud based technology for information sharing wherever possible.

1.1.B. Identify key areas in the state where canopy enhancement is needed.

1.1.C. Identify gaps in local and regional inventory data. Work with the local homeowners and landowners to complete the tree inventory.

1.1.D. Work with communities who have a public property tree inventory to conduct a stratified sample of private property trees to determine the community-wide forest composition and health. Utilize this information to:

- i. educate property owners on maintenance, diversity, risks, etc.
- ii. educate the public about tree trails, tree history, the benefits of trees,
- iii. develop or improve tree protection ordinances.
- iv. bring awareness of and protection to important trees in the community such as witness trees, trees of significant size, trees of historical significance, memorials, etc.

1.1.E. Collect data from all public and quasi-public agencies such as park districts, forest preserve districts, arboreta, golf courses, educational properties, corporate campuses, hunt clubs.

1.1.F. To monitor the long term health and integrity of Illinois urban and community forests, establish a mandate of a statewide urban forest assessment every 10 years correlating the data with water quality, flood potential, air quality, wildlife, and other ecosystem services that provide habitat and improved quality of life.

1.2 Enhance the Urban Forest Canopy

1.2.A. Identify opportunities to integrate trees as part of green infrastructure in replacement or augmentation of gray infrastructure. Consider urban trees as opportunities to reduce fragmentation and improve environmental conditions and habitat.

1.2.B. Utilize the inventory to improve forest species diversity, understand management issues related to age diversity, identify public tree risks and the value and importance of establishing regular maintenance, management and planting strategies.

1.2.C. Promote a goal to achieve over-time a statewide standard for improved species diversity. Good example = no more than 30% of any one family; 20% of any one genus; 10% of any one species; or 5% of any one cultivar.

1.2.D. Support community tree planting programs where diversity is encouraged. Provide opportunities and collaborative examples for public and private lands. Include in these planting opportunities, species, and age diversity. Encourage annual tree planting programs, that will sustain our forests by creating a range of tree age classifications.

1.2.E. Prioritize key canopy areas and develop a long-term strategy to plant trees in key areas.

1.2.F. Work with and support State agencies that impact the urban forest canopy to improve canopy cover, species and age diversity in their management strategies. Disseminate specifications, based on industry standards, to these agencies to properly select, grow, plant, maintain and protect trees.

1.2.G. Work with State partners to assist in communication between nurseries and tree purchasers to ensure availability and quality of diverse species for public and private urban landowners. Look for collaborative opportunities to assist the nursery industry in forecasting future diversity needs.

1.2.H. Identify and recommend incentives for landowners who actively work to improve their tree canopy (including diversity, age, and species). These could include tax credits, funding assistance, etc. This might also include looking at how other states, counties, regions or local governments provide credits for stormwater fees, green infrastructure improvements, etc. Local resources should be identified as well as regional and State.

1.2.I. Create a State statute for integration into regional and local government for assessing urban tree damage and penalties. Provide information and resource materials for county and local entities on how to prevent malicious damage to trees and/or penalties.

### 1.3 Identify and Quantify the Benefits of Trees

1.3.A. Provide up to date data on the benefits of trees to public and private landowners, land managers, foresters, developers, contractors, designers, planners, elected officials and decision makers. This could include:

- i. enhanced property values
- ii. improved economic development
- iii. reduced crime
- iv. improved public health
- v. improved wildlife habitat
- vi. water quality improvements
- vii. air quality improvements
- viii. carbon sequestration and storage

- ix. reduced gray infrastructure costs
- x. reduced erosion
- xi. provide oxygen
- xii. beautification of public spaces creating a sense of place

1.3.B. Recommend incentives and resources for those who integrate the benefits of trees as a means to improve the environment and quality of life, i.e. stormwater reduction, energy reduction, etc. at the local and regional scale.

1.3.C. Utilize the statewide urban forest assessment, regional and local tree inventory data to quantify the economic, social, health and environmental benefits of urban trees. Share this information with State officials, elected officials and decision makers. Teach the regions and communities how to calculate this information and assist them in messaging this information to their constituents.

1.3.D. Develop a statewide marketing campaign directed to multiple audiences on the benefits of trees. Include in this campaign outreach materials which can be easily downloadable. This would include brochures, articles, promotional materials, and educational materials which can be in hard copies or for websites.

## **2.0 Achieve Widespread Illinois Urban Forestry Sustainability and Management**

### **2.1 Support and increase state and local staffing for urban forestry.**

A well-funded and represented program is needed to support goals statewide. A well-funded and represented program is needed to support goals statewide.

2.1.A. Establish a funding formula to support the utilization of urban forestry field staff. Field staff should be available to communities within two-hours of their location or based on a population formula. It is recommended that not less than 6 urban forestry field staff be hired.

2.1.B. Encourage communities and public and private land managers to utilize professionally trained or educated forestry staff to oversee administration and management of the urban forest.

### **2.2 Best Management Practices**

Best management practices are those current forestry practices which are the best means, method, process or activity for the care, management, planting or selection of trees. Many of these practices are detailed in International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) manuals and are a refinement to the latest versions of American National Standards Institute resources on forestry, American Nurseryman Association standards, NRCS Urban Manual, and ILCA standards.

2.2.A. Enhancing the production and performance of nursery stock for community selection and planting based on the latest version of American Standard for Nursery Stock, ANSI Z60.1.

2.2.B. Provide guidelines and best management practices for selection, planting, preventative and routine tree care on the State website and in other approved forestry sponsored resources to assist urban forestry professionals, non-professionals and tree owners.

2.2.C Review of industry “Best Management Practices” with the intent to continually update those practices as new information becomes available.

### 2.3 Trees Are Critical Infrastructure.

Trees as green infrastructure provide important ecological services and are the only component of a community's infrastructure that appreciates in value over time. The benefits provided by trees are not always recognized until it is too late. Due to the current infestation, mortality, and removals of ash trees, it will become evident to citizens of Illinois that trees provide critical infrastructure. These infrastructure benefits include reducing heating and cooling costs, increasing property values, improving air quality, and reducing stormwater runoff and flooding. Trees are part of urban infrastructure and play critical roles in stormwater management. In urban areas, trees reduce the amount of runoff and protect surface waters from sediment and nutrient loading. This green infrastructure reduces the amount of stormwater entering the combined sewers and controls stormwater at the source. Leverage partnerships to support green infrastructure.

2.3.A. Work to build interdisciplinary partnerships and collaboration for the integration, care and planting of trees as part of the design process of the urban environment (ecosystem). Recognize the partnerships that connect green and gray infrastructure enabling a combined benefit.

2.3.B. Encourage and support volunteer programs to build volunteer support for trees and an understanding of their green infrastructure services, i.e. Forest Watch, Tree-Keepers, Tree Stewards, youth training programs, etc.

2.3.C. Provide support for tree planting which is planned and integrated to improve the environment and provide for connectivity to fragmented landscapes.

2.3.D. Support efforts to provide credits for trees in stormwater and carbon offset programs.

2.3.E. Support efforts to integrate tree BMPs into the stormwater regulatory framework. This would include credits for BMP implementation, clear design standards for engineers and designers, addressing trees in municipal Stormwater Manuals and all levels and programs MS4, TMDLs, watersheds, city ordinances, IL/DOT.

### 2.4 Climate Adaptation

Recognize the increased frequency and severity of storm events, drought and flooding. Work to integrate adaptation strategies into maintenance practices, improved species lists based on environmental impacts and infrastructure features which will help to support the urban forest in a time of change. Trees in the urban setting, during times of drought, increased flooding, increased wind and ice or other climate related issues will require the best possible growing conditions and care.

2.4.A. Improve specifications to provide optimal soil content and volume for trees. Include design features which will include adequate space in planting pits, suspended pavement, root paths and connected infrastructure to improve growing conditions.

2.4.B. Review and recommend tree species which will perform well in a changing climate. This

would include review of species recommendations at the southern end of their range which might be removed and/or northern end of the range that could be added. Review and recommend how some possible invasive trees could be utilized or should be avoided in the urban ecosystem.

2.4.C. Provide recommendations for stormwater management strategies which will include trees placed in designs that improve access to water and soil conditions for extended periods of inundation and drought. Promote the establishment of increased canopy to offset the installation of impermeable surfaces.

2.4.D. Provide recommendations for risk assessments and management practices to reduce risk. Coalesce the different resources which might be considered to provide assistance for these issues in the urban setting.

### **3.0 Education and Training for Professionals and Non-professionals**

#### **3.1 Increase the Number certified or credentialed individuals in the area of urban and community forestry.**

Increase the number of individuals taught proper forestry skills and management practices to more effectively manage the urban forest. Individuals who care for trees in communities (government, land managers, landscape contractors, etc.) may not have sufficient training or background for the forestry work they are performing. Provide education and training for these individuals with the goal that they will become certified and credentialed urban forest managers and caretakers.

3.1.A. Increase program content, locations, and number of opportunities for arborist training leading to certification, credentials and for continuing education units to maintain certification.

3.1.B. Provide funding opportunities for individuals interested in becoming certified arborists who may not have the means to pay for the training.

3.1.C. Provide incentives and/or assistance to encourage every community or land management organization to have at least one certified or credentialed professional on staff or on retainer in urban and community forestry.

3.1.D. Increase opportunities for partnerships between agencies, organizations, not-for-profits and governmental entities to facilitate cross-profession training which will expand the use of best management practices will address state, regional and local goals and encourage Arborist or professional certification. Within a community provide training for land managers, volunteers, public works, park district and other individuals on forestry with the goal to encourage further urban forestry training.

3.1.E Encourage hiring forestry interns to assist with program implementation.

3.1.F Volunteer coordinator training to help build the resources provide education on developing volunteer coordination into volunteer organizations.

#### **3.2 Education and Training for Landscapers and the Nursery Industry Field Staff**

There is a diverse audience of landscape and nursery workers who could benefit from increased training in arboriculture. The challenge is reaching this diverse audience.

3.2.A. Expand Spanish arboriculture training and opportunities for certification. Provide materials or information in a physical, visual and audio format to provide opportunities for those who may not read.

3.2.B. Provide communities with training information for contractors.

3.2.C. Develop incentives to encourage best management practices.

3.2.D. Collaborate with the Illinois Landscape Contractors Association, the Illinois Green Industry Association and other organizations to offer basic arboriculture training and workshops. Offer grants or scholarships to allow training. Encourage training sessions and outreach to non-certified participants in these fields to encourage early participation and eventual certification.

3.2.E Provide educational opportunities to urban forestry personnel on the basic best management practices of Nursery production and landscape installation. These materials should be directed to different audiences, i.e., the general public, schools, governmental entities, elected officials and land managers, developers, contractors, etc.

### 3.3 Education and Engagement of Stewards and Volunteers

One of Illinois's greatest assets is its people. Individuals wanting to learn about trees and help support their community by volunteering their time and talents have a significant impact on the health and management of the urban forest.

3.3.A. Provide training to communities, landowners and managers on how to develop strong urban forest stewards. This would include training municipal foresters how to utilize volunteers effectively so that they can expand their resources.

3.3.B. Provide training and access to urban forestry volunteer opportunities. Partner with existing tree advocacy programs to expand exposure and participation. Provide incentives for communities who have strong volunteer forestry programs.

3.3.C. Provide training and resources for tree boards and commissions.

### 3.5 Educate and Engage Youth

Youth are a tremendous resource for future forestry advocacy. Many youths do not have opportunities to participate in nature based programs or activities. It is important to engage this youth in programs and activities which may inspire them to become forestry professionals or be advocates for the urban forest in the future.

3.5.A. Work with local schools and youth organizations to teach youth about career opportunities and job skills in forestry. These programs may be part of traditional curriculum, after school programs, or content for youth organizations.



3.5.B. Provide volunteer and training opportunities for youth in arboriculture. These opportunities should be available to youth within their communities and in support of their local urban forest. These opportunities may include community service.

3.5.C. Work with colleges and universities to incorporate forestry into their appropriate programs. Look for opportunities to partner with organizations, agencies or communities for internships and other learning opportunities.

### 3.6 Educate and Engage the General Public

Community forestry staff, land managers, landscape contractors and landowners, as basic service to their constituents, need to teach their constituents about the importance of the urban forest, the need to manage the forest professionally and to engage these residents in volunteering and advocacy for trees including Right Tree---Right Place.

3.6.A. Provide education and outreach on the benefits of trees

3.6.B. Provide education and outreach on all levels of tree care. Customize existing resources such as the Forest Service Tree Owners Guide for Illinois. Update “Under The Canopy” poster.

- i. how to select the appropriate plant for the appropriate space,
- ii. what to look for in the nursery,
- iii. how to plant correctly,
- iv. how to water,
- v. how to care for the tree through maturity.

3.6.C. Strengthen the connection between community forestry staff and trained volunteers to build community volunteer tree programs and advocacy for urban trees.

### 3.7 Educate and Engage Elected Officials

Elected officials are those who act in behalf of their constituents to represent their values and priorities by developing and enforcing State and local laws. They prioritize State and local programming and allocate funding to support those programs. It is critical that these officials be supported for their public service and provided the necessary tools to act appropriately on behalf of the individuals to whom they serve.

3.7.A. Provide information to elected officials and decision makers on the value and benefits of trees to protect our environment, natural resources, wildlife and our quality of life.

3.7.B. Provide elected officials with information on how trees protect property values, improve business activity and are a vital part of urban economies.

3.7.C. Provide education on the significance of proactive tree management and the financial benefits of maintaining healthy trees including - the value of tree inventories in budget projections, tree management plans, and routine regular maintenance and planting for a diverse age and species forest.

3.7.D. Educate on the importance of a forestry professional managing the urban forest - a valuable and substantial asset.

3.7.E. Provide examples and templates for communities on forestry management plans, tree inventories, and budgets.

3.7.F. Advocate to the State and local governments on the importance of trees and the need to fund urban tree care and planting as is used in other states.

3.7.G. Promote enacting tree protection ordinances to protect trees on public property and encourage protection of trees on private property.

### 3.8 Educate and Engage Developers, Contractors and Utilities

Outreach and education to professionals who construct or manage facilities in the urban forest can reduce negative impacts and even protect the forest and focus on Right Tree--Right Place principles.

3.8.A. Provide, as part of the permitting process at State, regional and local levels, education and outreach materials packet that will teach the developer, contractor and/or utility how to reduce negative impacts to trees. Provide examples of municipal specifications that carry intense inspection and penalties for violations. Show the benefits of preventative care and standards and examples of cost savings from implementing tree friendly practices.

3.8.B. Work with professional associations to build partnerships and incentives for proper tree care and develop an incentive program which will encourage forest preservation and tree protection.

3.8.C. Develop a sub-committee within the urban forestry committee to monitor actions taken by utility companies and departments of transportation concerning ROW and utility line clearance.

3.8.D. Strengthen local cooperative agreements between municipalities and utilities or DOTs with respect to arboricultural specifications (i.e. Tree trimming).

## 4.0 Urban Forest Plants, Insect and Disease Invasive Species Awareness and Management

### 4.1 Emerald Ash Borer

Emerald ash borer infestation is a significant problem for the urban forest resulting in the loss of millions of ash trees and is a prime example of exotic pests compromising native ecosystems due to poor cultural practices. It is extremely important that Illinois communities maintain a diverse tree population. The role of the State Urban Forestry program needs to be a recognized resource to local community forestry program development and outreach to address this type of issue.

4.1.A. Work with property owners and managers to understand there are options for EAB. Provide information on options for addressing EAB and assist in educating constituents about management options.

4.1.B. A diverse urban forest is the best approach to reducing the impact of future invasive pests. Support the development and distribution of a diverse urban species list to landowners and managers to create a more sustainable forest.

4.1.C. Biomass created by EAB, should be repurposed where possible and information on wood processing and utilization for higher purposing of ash wood utilization should be encouraged. Connections between sawyers and potential ash resources need to be further developed.

4.1.D. Encourage land/homeowners and managers to develop EAB management plans. Develop templates to provide guidance.

4.1.E. Assist land/homeowners in identifying qualifications for forestry personnel, including land managers, so that these landowners are aware of "professional forestry" credentials which will help to ensure they receive the appropriate forestry services. Assist these landowners in identifying things to be watchful of so that they are not scammed or provided fraudulent service.

4.1.F. Encourage collaboration, group rates, or including small landowners in larger contracts for tree care related to EAB to provide for economies of scale.

4.1.G. Identify and designate state and/or federal funds to assist communities in reforestation after EAB losses.

#### 4.2 New Invaders

It is important to be aware of new invaders which might impact the urban forest in Illinois. This requires a collaborative effort with the U.S.D.A. and surrounding states. Emphasis should be placed on transportation facilities and corridors and distribution centers for import of new invaders.

4.2.A. Provide education and outreach to landowners and managers on potential new invaders. Include in this education early detection rapid response training.

4.2.B. Partner with organizations which can be an extension of State, regional and local personnel in early detection and rapid response, such as local birding, hiking, restoration, biking, picnicking, boating and other groups that may be able to assist in quick identification of potential new invaders.

4.2.C. Distribute new invaders information to professionals and non-professionals---including homeowners.

#### 4.3 Woody and Other Invasive Plant Species

The presence of woody invasive plant species in our urban areas costs millions of dollars every year to control. These species inhibit the ability of more desirable species to grow and thrive.

4.3.A. Work with landowners and managers to identify, remove, control, and replace invasive woody species with species which will not adversely impact other plants and wildlife.

4.3.B. Develop species lists to assist landowners and managers in replacing invasive woody species with species which will provide similar screening and other aesthetics.

4.3.C. Evaluate woodlands where woody invasive species are present for regeneration of other tree species. Manage sites for opportunities for natural regeneration and/or planting to encourage replacement species.

4.3.D. Collaborate with invasive species organizations to develop and distribute a state-wide awareness initiative on woody and other invasive species that impact the urban forest. Work collaboratively with landscape architects, nurseries, researchers, landowners and land managers to track characteristics and plants which should be monitored and identified as possible threats for colonization to natural areas.

4.3.E. Provide support to protect unique and natural areas. Reduce possible impacts from governmentally identified invasive species which might impair the ecological function and resiliency of these important areas. Recognize and support the need for buffers between diverse urban areas where some woody species may pose a threat to unique and natural areas.

#### 4.4 Diseases

It is important to be aware of diseases which might impact the urban forest in Illinois. This requires a collaborative effort with resources, inside and outside the state, which can help to identify potential threats and treatment options.

4.2.A. Provide education and outreach to landowners and managers on typical diseases and potential new diseases. Include in this education early detection rapid response training.

4.2.B. Partner with organizations which can be an extension of State, regional and local personnel in early detection and rapid response, including local birding, hiking, restoration, biking, picnicking, boating and other groups.

### 5.0 Nurture Urban Forestry Partnerships

5.1 Develop Partnerships throughout the State to meet and encourage a statewide urban and community forestry needs.

The State Urban Forestry Committee will continue to make a concerted effort to bring together all perspectives and sectors of the state in a unified effort to support urban forestry.

5.1.A. Provide opportunities for information sharing and networking to enhance unification of the State urban forestry program. Coordinate state-wide campaigns to distribute information and development of a collaborative alliance that will strengthen the overall urban forest resource.

5.1.B. Encourage mentoring programs that share resources with underserved and under resourced communities.

5.1.C. Support partnerships for state-wide problems such as emerald ash borer, wood utilization, storm mitigation and response etc.

5.1.D. Seek opportunities for partnerships between urban and community forestry professionals and education to build awareness of careers opportunities.

5.1.E. Encourage the funding of collaborative partnerships on regional landscape initiatives that promote urban and community.

5.1.F. Partner with and provide information to State and regional organizations and programs which integrate trees and ecosystems within urban and community settings, i.e., the State Wildlife Action Plan.

#### 5.4 Researchers and Scientists

Coordinate with scientists to determine urban forest research needs of urban and community forestry practitioners. Facilitate the distribution and collaboration of urban forestry research to the practitioner to promote best management practices and understanding of the urban forest ecosystem.

5.4.A. Develop partnerships with researchers and urban foresters to share the latest research results and forecast urban forestry issues.

5.4.B. Assist in the education, distribution and integration of the latest urban forestry research into best management practices.

5.4.C. Solicit and support State, Federal and other funding opportunities for research.

### 6.0 Expand and Support Advocacy

#### 6.1 Legislation

Key to the success of a State urban forestry program is recognition of the importance and benefits of urban trees to the State and to received support and assistance from State legislators and policy makers.

6.1.A. Tracking of legislation and policy at the State and Federal levels to identify urban forestry issues that should receive support and should receive support and those which might require legislative education to correct potential negative urban forestry policy.

6.1.B. Advocate and protect utility tree trimming law (Public Act 92-0214) from changes that harm urban trees and or property rights.

6.1.C. Host an annual legislative meeting with elected officials to present the urban forest strategy and discuss issues related to the protection of the urban forest.

6.1.D. Encourage partnerships and collaboration with major urban forestry organizations for info sharing and strengthening urban forestry opportunities in a cost effective manner.

6.1.E. Promote Illinois efforts and successes at National conferences and events to increase funding and recognition.

6.1.F. Coordinate official support from tree and stewardship groups across the state to promote urban forestry awareness to key agencies, legislature and executive governments in Springfield.

6.1.G. The Forestry Development Council should work with the Urban Forestry Committee to develop the state annual Council report to Legislators.

## 6.2 Local Advocacy

The majority of land within the state is owned by citizens. Decision-makers, public and private, need to be in a position to make the best possible decisions for the urban forest within their communities. Education and outreach to these officials, landowners and decision-makers, on the value and proper care of the urban forest should be readily available and relevant for their needs.

6.2.A. Resources should be developed and available for use by decision-makers which will enable them to more effectively protect and care for their urban and community forest.

6.2.B. Decision-makers should be educated and guided to the benefits and use of green infrastructure, specifically trees, as replacement for, or augmentation of, more traditional infrastructure.

6.2.C. Communities and landowners should be encouraged to work together to protect the interconnectedness of the urban forest ecosystems.

6.2.D. Communities should provide education and resources to assist private landowners in maintaining, planting and protecting trees for the benefit of the urban forest.

6.2.E. Municipalities should increase the proportion of employees with forestry backgrounds in order to foster awareness and knowledge of urban forestry practices. Educational programs should be offered to employees with minimal forestry backgrounds.

6.2.F. One of the most effective management tools available to local communities is the municipal ordinance, every community should be encouraged to implement the ordinances necessary to preserve, protect, and enhance their urban forestry resources.

## 7.0 Increase Funding for Urban & Community Forestry

### 7.1 State Capacity

The Council should work with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources to identify dedicated funding for the State Urban Forestry Program. This funding should include funding resources for State, regional and local governmental units to protect and maintain the health of the urban forest and to provide outreach and education on the important benefits of the urban forest.

7.1.A. Encourage increased sustainable funding for the State Urban Forestry program and the Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Act.

7.1.B. Continue to utilize State and federal urban forestry funding to provide technical assistance and funding for the purchase and establishment of trees to counties and communities throughout the State.

7.1.D. Significant funds are needed to provide statewide assistance for urban forestry management related to insects and diseases, i.e., emerald ash borer, etc.

## 7.2 U.S. Forest Service Funding

The U.S. Forest Service has been a strong traditional resource for urban forestry funding. Efforts need to continue to support this funding and to increase the capacity of the state through local urban forestry programs and within organizations which make this funding possible.

7.2.A. Work with all municipalities in the State which are not currently Tree City USA communities to educate them about the program and engage them to become Tree City USA communities.

7.2.B. Coordinate USFS funding opportunities with IDNR to get needed funds into the hands of practitioners.

7.2.C. Facilitate the request for proposal's process to enable NGO's and partners of all resource levels to be able to apply for funding competitive opportunities.

7.2.D. Provide grant writing education and assistance to enable communities at all resource levels to apply for needed funding.

7.2.E. Requests for proposals should ensure that program funding meets State Urban Forestry goals as established by the Council.

7.2.F. Urban and Community Forestry Committee assist in the review and administration of funding opportunities.

## 8.0 Increase State Urban Forestry Staffing

8.1 Provide dedicated staff to the Urban and Community Forestry program throughout the State since Illinois has more local units of government than most other states in the U.S. Municipalities need access to State Urban Forestry representatives throughout Illinois to help develop local urban and community forestry programs.

8.1.A. State U&CF staff should work with partners to increase the presence and understanding of urban forestry issues within the State, regional and local levels.

8.1.B. A multi-agency request should be made for six urban and community forestry district or regional administrators to be added to support statewide urban forestry efforts.

8.1.C Provide access to trained community foresters on inventories, ordinances, tree management plans, storm mitigation, tree utility conflict resolution and other important urban and community forestry issues.

**Appendix B.**  
*Illinois Forest Legacy Program. Assessment of Need 1994, 2017.*

DRAFT

