

Proposed WALCE/WLWCA Merger Input Survey August 2, 2011

Results

1. What is your "vision" for a merged organization? Vision meaning – what services or benefits that are currently provided by your organization will you expect to be part of the new merged organization? How might the new organization provide additional services?

#	Response
1	I'd like to basically retain all of the services WALCE currently provides to members with an added Lobbying component from WLWCA's side.
2	I would expect the merger to strengthen our two organizations. A better relationship between employees and supervisors would be welcomed.
3	I envision, hopefully, more opportunities for improved communication between LWCD staff and LCC's. Understanding issues on a state wide level helps to make better decisions locally and vice-versa. From a professional stand point this would hopefully be an opportunity to show elected officials, both local and state, why LWCD's need continued support.
4	My vision is that the merged organization will be a well-blended combination of LCC and LCD staff working together as equal partners to promote county conservation. I think the services and benefits they provide can and may be different or the way they are provided may be different. I think that should be a decision of the merged organization. If no merger takes place I believe there will be changes to the services and benefits that the counties receive from WLWCA as well.
5	One conference with excellent sessions through out. Synergy with supervisors and staff working together. Efficiency between staff and supervisors and message to agencies and legislators. Unified message-higher profiles as one merged group.
6	My vision is an organization that still represents the employees as a group in environmental and policy issues at a state level while maintaining the high level of training programs for both employees and policy makers. Additional services might include regional training possibilities as we find that issues can vary across the state, but remain constant within a region.
7	My largest concern is enough participation with such a large committee structure. I would rather see fewer committees /combined committees to ensure participation. Staff does not always have the choice to participate, especially during the tightening of budgets. My second largest concern is the dues structure. I would prefer to see the dues structured similar to WLWCA, and each member with a vote. If a merger happens, I would be interested in a report listing how many employees for Land Conservation offices paid for their own membership, due to lack of County participation.
8	Advocacy of conservation support, including funding, with the legislature, governor, and the public. Public, legislative, and gubernatorial awareness of conservation issues and the role of county conservation departments. Promote cooperative efforts with other agencies and organizations. Development of technical guidelines. Development, publication, and distribution of educational materials. Training of conservation staff.
9	One voice for conservation. I think that as county committees are restructured, keeping a connection to the "field" will be more important for supervisors.
10	Continue funding for training opportunities. Continue conservation orientated conference. Provide an equal opportunity for any member to serve the organization.
11	continued scholarship opportunities

12	I'm not wild about the merger. What advantage do we have once WLWCA is part of WALCE?
13	Improve communications with the legislative body of Wisconsin. Politicians will listen to other elected officials and staff are more knowledgeable about the impact onto the county programs.
14	Continued professional improvement training. Strong lobbying for conservation in the state
15	Professional training conferences Voting privileges Continue facilitating state youth education contests
16	The Land Conservation employees and represented elected officials need to have a strong voice in Madison with what should be a unified message with WLWCA: joining with conservation professionals, along with elected official oversight, and financial resources should provide the best opportunity to sustain conservation into the future.
17	I enjoy the services and benefits currently being offered by the individual organizations. I would expect the combined organization to offer similar services. One-stop shopping may be a convenience.
18	a single organization for legislative recognition and contacts is important. The merger would achieve that.
19	I would envision that an organization that allows each member to have a voice to continue that practice.
20	It's not clear what the merger vision is. I think this should be clearly spelled out so every one can see it. As a merged organization, we will be able to do the following: a, b, c, As a merged organization, here is what we believe should be dropped (if anything)
21	I expect the new organization to continue providing training for staff and LCC members. The benefits to a merger should be financial due to one large conference instead of two smaller ones, and strategic by allowing for greater appreciation between LCC and staff regarding what each group does and how we can address the many environmental challenges we face.
22	With everything occurring at the State level budget (NR 115, NR151, etc.) This proposed merger, if it occurs, should be the catalyst for increased efforts to retain conservation implementation at the local level. A merged organization should have a stronger voice and be better received by the State's elected officials.
23	Supervisors and county cons look at a problem/issue differently. Each brings a different perspective. The combination of the two will bring a better perspective to the table. Combining the annual meetings makes a lot of sense--bigger and better
24	By combining the two, the LCD committee's will know the same issues and concerns of the employees are working to fix. Should help resolve approval issues. Also might make employees more responsible.
25	A merged organization would still serve the needs of both on the ground technicians as well as the committee members that oversee them, much as the separate organizations do now. However, by merging, it is hoped that many services can be consolidated, trainings and conferences will be more cost effective, and a unified voice will be presented at all levels of government. I believe a merger could improve communications between committee members and county staff on many levels as well.

26	I like the ability to meet with other employees in the state, and being able to share ideas and network together to be a better employee for the county and the landowners I assist. I enjoy the training offered at WALCE, it is very valuable. I would hope that the new organization could allow LCC members to become better educated about the work performed by county employees, which in turn may help the LCC better understand their role in the committee.
27	I do not believe the organizations should merge. Although both work in the conservation field, missions are different and always have been.
28	I Think One Organization Is Stronger And Has More Power In The Political Arena
29	I think that the merger may bring a degree of professionalism to WALCE conference with the presents of the supervisors? Then again it might make the conference a bit stuffy.
30	professional improvement training
31	A merged organization will continue to provide the same level of opportunities for employee growth as our current WALCE org does. A merged organization will be stronger, and cross over and merge the boundaries between LWCC and staff each will learn more and benefit more from interaction. Political presence will be stronger because of expertise mixed with elected officials from county government, we need to make sure younger LWCD staff from all arenas have the opportunity learn and be accepted in different levels of the work we do, currently walce does a great job of exposing anyone to any of this levels, we need to make sure membership has value for all, the membership is the lifeline.
32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater lobbying power with a louder voice. • Increased pool of knowledge – More Minds/More Ideas/More Results. • More diversity in backgrounds of members – bringing more views to the table. • Combined financial resources would hopefully lead to wiser expenditures.
33	Mergers usually mean greater efficiencies through the combined management. I would caution that the philosophies are on the same page or will we lose some of our representation.
34	I believe there is potential saving and a closer working relationship.
35	Sharing/combining the strengths of WALCE & WLWCA to advance natural resource protection in WI. Recognize the roles of different people & positions and utilize their skills. Strengthen County level conservation.
36	A bigger/unified voice in Wisconsin concerning conservation which should make marketing/funding hopefully easier in the future.
37	Larger attendance at conference. This will provide more revenue to provide consistent training of staff and committee members.
38	shared power of departments and committees to protect natural resources and empower county level conservation programming
39	Co. Cons should make learning about the merger mandatory and strongly encourage employees to fill out this survey. I did, we will see if anyone listened to me! Some mistakes will occur and as long as the new organization is flexible enough to make changes along the way things will turn out good.

40	Ultimately, my vision is more conservation on the land. In order to accomplish this, I believe we need to increase staff which means increasing staffing monies, which means more lobbying (if pursue the additional monies through the DATCP). I would like to see Julian continue and do more lobbying, with Kurt Pawlisch. I would like to see LCC involved with conservation lobbying. I'm not sure sure a merger is required for my vision. WLWCA staff (Kirsten) help with walce conference - execute hotel contract/arrangements. Others able to assist walce Pres/vp with work load. Merger = more conservation.
41	An organization that simplifies and unifies. Doesn't pull time and resources in two different directions. Provide education and resources that help in the conservation field. Continued leadership in the political arena organizing and unifying the conservation voice.
42	-Continuing focus on high quality training as WALCE has historically done. -Improved integration of WALCE and WLWCA activities relating to legislative matters -Improved integration of WALCE and WLWCA activities relating to education of general public on conservation issues
43	An efficient organization, able to handle current and new issues with knowledgeable people serving. Cost effective dues and staff to aid the BOD. An organization that can run in times of lean funds and manpower.
44	Effective lobbying efforts at the state level to secure adequate funding for doing conservation work at the local level, and to create effective conservation programs through state legislation.
45	Continue WALCE scholarship program and maintain similar conference agenda.
46	Don't have a vision, I disagree to the merger.
47	As an employee, I want to continue to be able to attend the annual conference. This is my chance to learn and get familiar with changes and new technology. I hope that the supervisors don't take that away from us.
48	Informative annual conference, training scholarships and lobbying in support of conservation and conservation funding.
49	My vision is for a bigger more politically powerful organization that still has a good joint PIC for both factions of the organization. This past WALCE PIC attendance was disappointing. It needs an overhaul. Maybe we need to invite more agency people (DNR/DATCP)and some private sector and use it as a time to build relationships as we have done with each other.
50	A merged organization should still provide all of the strengths of the individual organizations. A merged organization should have a director and staff that are able to continue the services provided by WALCE such as Employee Improvement Training, scholarships, workshop ideas, as well as training for supervisors, statewide environmental education programs, and legislative guidance.
51	Core functions should be professional improvement for county and agency staff, and information and policy update. Politicing and legislative involvement has proven to be a negative and divisive for WALCE in the past.
52	Better communications/ updates More great trainings
53	Remember the role that elected officials bring to the table as well as the professional staff.
54	to keep all programs & be more effort
55	Merging the two organizations would create a more unified voice. I would like to see this unified voice help promote and fight for conservation and the staff and programs associated with it.

56	Getting conservation on the ground rather than managing programs. Wisconsin used to be the national leader in local resource management efforts, but no more. More effective resource management does not necessarily mean more money. An effective organization, like the one you are reaching for, could also advance conservation.
57	The continued face-to-face meeting with conservationists and technicians and the exchange of ideas, questions & hopefully answers to issues.
58	I AM NOT FOR THIS MERGER. There is no accountability of the executive director or the secretary. Executive director does not attend Southern area meetings.
59	This should reduce the amount of communication from outside organizations, such as the one I work with.
60	Organizational efficiency Cohesive voice for lobbying on conservation issues
61	it is a mistake. bureaucrats are not supposed to lobby for funds to the state or feds now they can't. with no money it is hard to provide services.
62	To be more of a force in the political arena. Increased visibility and recognition.
63	training offered at conference and equal partnership between all members after the merger

2. Do you have any recommendations for the Adhoc Committee as they explore the merger options?	
#	Response
1	It's important to me that all members, CC's and Tech's alike have an equal opportunity to serve on the Board of Directors of the merged organization, similar to how WALCE holds general elections for officer positions now. Without this, I can't support a merger.
2	How will both groups be integrated as far as conferences, communication etc. Will a non supervisory employee be allowed to serve along side CC's and WLWCA members?
3	I think the ground rules for equal say by employees in decisions is extremely important in moving forward. If everyone goes into this with open minds about improving conservation in WI as the focus then I am optimistic that whatever shakes out at the end will be positive for both sides.
4	I think it is very important for the Adhoc Committee to look for comments from the individuals that might be opposed to the merger, so the AdHoc committee can discuss and possibly resolved the opposition before the annual meeting. The annual meeting is no place to bring up reasons for opposition.
5	It still seems like there will be alot of committees to populate. May have to consider merging a few of them if they you encounter problems with getting enough people involved. Overall though, this is excellent....
6	Dig down! There is a lot of talent to be found outside of the Committee Chair and County Con level. Explore ways to exploit and promote some of the Jr talent base opportunities.
7	There doesn't appear to be many current WLWCA Board members completely opposed to the proposed merger, but there may be some that may be opposed to the whole organization in the future. Keep this in mind while drafting bylaws, giving committee empowerment authority, or look for the seams where damage could be done if this individual, or group of individuals looked for personal agendas. Exhibit A: Look at our current State Government leadership and appointments. Exhibit B: Some people may consider the "Karst Report", a "regional" or "personal agenda" to pull funding or attention away from other counties or areas. Exhibit C: Look at the effort made to dismantle the LWCB, and reduce their role.
8	Look beyond the narrow viewpoint of the organization you represent and consider greater long-term conservation goals.
9	Don't feel as though you need to follow anyone else's model. Be bold and creative.
10	Make sure the by-laws have no hidden agenda's or loop holes.
11	Be very careful with the money that has been saved by WALCE. Remember WLWCA has NO money. That is why they want to merge.
12	Keep everyone informed, list out the pros and cons of the subject matter.
13	All individuals need to have an equal voice.
14	No, I think they are doing a fine job.
15	The outreach from WLWCA must represent all of conservation, not just farms/nutrient management. This message needs to cover the entire state for farmland, sustainable forestry, and water quality issues, etc. This combined voice should convey all of the counties' priorities identified in their individual Land and Water Resource Management plans.

16	Be careful as you weigh the cost-benefits of a merger. I hope we are not going through this process to simply gain more representation on the WLWCA Board. As you formulate a new combined association keep in mind the professional improvement mission of WALCE and make sure that that mission is not lost. Our County cannot tolerate another dues increase, there is no way I can sell it to my LCD.
17	On voting matters, it is important to keep the vote from each organization. I would support 1 supervisor and 1 employee vote from each county or from each Area (with a preference toward County). Those county/Area votes should be decided with full employee & supervisor input; then sending on a consensus vote. The payment of dues will be a difficult issue. Employees here each pay their own. That will be difficult to do equitably with supervisors.
18	Quit acting as if the merger is a done deal. I suggest someone explore an option that allows all WALCE members to vote on their leadership instead of appointees voting on each other. Also, "open nominations" are garbage I doubt very many area reps will vote for someone not on the board to be a state rep. Furthermore, why not just get rid of area BOD's? I would say that is an unnecessary cost.
19	Get rid of all politics, and do what is correct for the org.
20	None at this time.
21	Please retain distinct identities between LCCs (elected- government) and LCDs (employed bureaucrats). Both share the same end goal, but the means of implementation can vary.
22	KISS-keep it simple on all issues. Finance the organization as WLWCA is now financed. Don't make money a big issue with the exception of the annual meeting. All should pay their fair share.
23	Not Really. I just think it is a good idea to merge
24	Keep on trying to come up with a fair and equitable leadership roles including officers, as well as equal representation when voting on matters of importance to the organization as a whole.
25	Keep up with sending the e-mails, so that everyone may be informed. I do not have the time to attend meetings or teleconferences, but at least if I receive updated e-mail I have the ability to learn about the merger process and feel I am still somewhat informed about the ongoing decision making process.
26	I recommend the Adhoc Committee discontinue to pursue a merger.
27	My Only Concern Is That When & If IT Happens Elected Officials Have The Controlling Vote
28	no
29	not so much...it appears the AC is doing fine.
30	I would either incorporate some area association definitions and role and responsibilities that are tied directly to new statewide org, or just use area's as a way to define representation as a place on earth. I think the area board rep to state board could easily be elected from the general population of both employees and committee members from that geographic region, I think it is worth discussing more, because currently it WALCE that seems to be a challenge and would go a long way to address that issue

31	One of the most important "Merger Challenges" mentioned in the presentation I attended was in regard to a broader participation on committees. I feel that this is vital to the representation and the power of the combined organizations. I'm not that knowledgeable about how the WLWCA operates, but I do know that WALCE members are a very diverse group of county employees that include so much more than the County Conservationists. Conservation Technicians, Agronomists, Administrative Assistants, Project Managers, GIS Specialists, etc. should be, no "must be" encouraged to participate on committees in the new WLWCA.
32	First list the goals and objectives of each organization. If they are compatible, then list the pros and cons. It should show good support for the merger before proceeding with the merger.
33	Get on with it, Just do it and see if it works. If it doesn't work change back.
34	Let the technicians continue their lead role in technical topics. Make sure County Conservationists and LCC members are equal in authority and position within the leadership of merged organization.
35	Keep in mind the field staff and LCC's and how they function at the county level and how this will relate in the more political areas of this merger.
36	Equal participation of staff and committee members on the board. Staff has valuable knowledge and could be very beneficial to the organization.
37	understand that not all county employees have the same responsibilities and thus can not have the same role within the merged organization. managers have a different role than technicians who have a different role than secretaries
38	If it is presented to the masses as well as it was presented in the listening sessions there won't be a problem. I was wary of being connected to the supervisors, but now I think it will be ok.
39	Focus on whether merger proposal adequately addresses main issue. Main issue is decreasing #'s/involvement (whether due to #of people decreasing, lack of time/interest etc.) Decreasing #'s is directly tied to decreasing funding (monies). [WALCE goes on 'cause volunteer time or performed on county time] A financial analysis of a merged organization should be conducted. A 5yr business plan of a merger organization shall be prepared/evaluated. Consider: a "prenuptial" agreement between 2 orgs. Consider proxy vote at walce annual conference. Have a backup plan continue merger discussion/evaluation if staff says no to this proposal. If truly a nonprofit org, all members of merged org should be able to vote for their respective state representative. Leave bylaws open to accommodate other orgs, like WCA. Consider changing wlwca bylaws to allow county cons on board. consider/evaluate remaining separate orgs but work closer. Eliminate area associations.
40	So far I agree with everything they have done.
41	Continue to educate the rank and file members of each organization about the thinking behind the merger proposal.
42	keep on going, good job
43	just put it together as equals, there is more knowledge to be gained working with the "CC" along with committee members. Don't get too hung up on the names of the organizations
44	Continue the good efforts to provide information to the membership, and to provide opportunities for members to give back input.
45	Consider that WALCE would be entering the merger in a "comfortable" financial situation. What is WLWCA's situation?
46	NONE

47	How are the funds to operate going to work? WLWCA seems to always be short and WALCE seems to work within their budget.
48	none
49	Find a way to make the new organization as meaningful as possible. In this political climate I feel it is important to build as powerful of a lobby as possible.
50	If the two organizations merge, would the new organization have the legal capability to request funding to support staff in the same manner that WLWCA currently obtains funding? Would WALCE Membership fund staff and office operation? If it would then the WALCE revenue would not go back to staff for scholarships, employee improvement, etc as it currently does.
51	no. Kudos to those who are investing the many many hours required to go through the process that may bring a merged group together.
52	Keep the resources in mind when making decisions
53	If it doesn't save money, don't do it.
54	Yes - drop it!
55	keep the people in mind be as helpful as posable
56	LCC training may be an issue because of the high turnover of many LCC members. I feel it would be difficult to maintain an ongoing adequate level of training for LCC members. Levels of knowledge and expertise vary with LCC and LWCD menebers, so I think many of the trainings (incl. conferences) should be separate if the merger were to happen. There needs to be equal representation from everyone (technicians, county cons, etc.) I think each and every individual (LWCD/LCC)should have their votes count.
57	Forget about the goals of the two organizations and remember the larger goal of why both are there. Think of the natural resources of the state and act accordingly.
58	Maintain the regional and state-wide meetings/conventions. Bolster the legislative efforts, both for capabilities of LCDs and state funding levels.
59	Does the Adhoc Committee know what their carbon footprint is for these meetings?
60	Perhaps a joint web page.
61	Equality Mutual respect Big picture for future
62	what is the fee for being a member for each org indivual or group how will it be paid by the county or indivual?
63	Do not forget the intended purpose of WALCE. The professional development of staff is key to maintaining membership levels and conference attendance.

3. Please share any general comments about the process, your organization, etc.

#	Response
1	Generally, the overall concept is good, we just need to maintain an equal opportunity for all to serve if they are so motivated to do so.
2	I think the meshing of the two groups will work fine until an issue comes up that is viewed stronger by one side or the other. Ex. Staff funding. The WLWCA members could very well be against funding amounts because they are also dealing with budget issues in their own counties. What prevents this from becoming an us vs. them issue?
3	I think in general most people are in favor for the merger. I think the process has been well planned out and discussed in great detail. I am hopeful that everyone make a point of understanding the merger prior to the annual meeting.
4	Keep up the good outreach to staff and supervisors as this progresses. I keep committee fully informed of process and thoughts.
5	While mergers tend to be painful, this one has been well managed and relatively pain-free thus far. Keep up the good work!!
6	The process has been done very well. Overall, keep up the good work. Maybe some of my comments are a little off the wall, but look at the lack of membership that occurred when part of the organization was unhappy with some of the leadership. If this were to happen again, lack of membership will hurt the organization.
7	WALCE has done all that has been asked to do for the past 30 years.
8	I think keeping open communications and do not be threaten by power or lack of power. We need to work as a team.
9	I feel everyone partaking in the merger process has been doing a great job keeping everyone informed and I hope they continue to do so.
10	Dues are a concern, they are already high for WLWCA... will they be even more, or will the combination make them lower?
11	Sustaining successful Land Conservation programming should be the goal. Counties need to be able to hold on to qualified staff that have a proven track record which shows enormous conservation gains on a statewide level. These departments appear to be working with less and less financial commitment from the state or promised funding has being redirected altogether. Having an approved LWRM plan should be the guideline for each county along with the oversight provided by elected officials that provides the focus for state funding. I believe that legislators can see that the job is getting done and they should make every effort to fulfill their statutory commitment of funding the Land Conservation positions as Chapter 92 suggests. This partnership between WALCE and WLWCA should only strengthen that voice.
12	I personally have mixed feelings about this merger. I see something lost and something gained, if we merge I hope we come out ahead.
13	You have done an excellent job with a very difficult issue. Your work & education on the issue has swayed my original vote.
14	I came to my county from the private sector and to find an organization that works to forward the professional careers of all the LC employees was a welcome change. While I recognize that WALCE needs the LCC members to be recognized in legislative activities, I think these organizations should remain separate but continue to work together where our interests overlap.
15	See no. 1 above
16	The process appears to be very thorough. Thanks for the many opportunities for member input.

17	With everything occurring at the state level, is now the right time to be solely focusing on the merger, instead of retaining conservation?
18	A number of supervisors and county cons have made 180 turns from just a few years ago. Issues that couldn't get resolve are now being addressed in a non-hostile fashion. Continue forward while this air of co-opertaion is fresh.
19	I hope that leadership roles are realistically rotated amongst the membership, so that a few do not end up doing all the work or having all the power.
20	I am proud to be a meber of WALCE. I like the fact that each person has thier own individual right to cast a vote, and also be involved in the business meeting. I fear that through the merger, I may loose my individual right to vote, the ability to be involved in the business meeting, the ability to be an individual and have a voice. I do not wish to loose these rights. These rights are what makes a member of WALCE proud. State, county and other individuals have lost many rights due to the state budget, and I am not interested in sacrificyng anymore. If you can blend WALCE and WLWCA and keep our individual rights, the new orginization will be strong.
21	I commend the WALCE committee members for their time and effort to explore a merger with the WLWCA. I do not believe that a merger will do anything for WALCE. It is a ploy to save the WLWCA. Their mission has become very diluted over the past several years. I won't be a member of an organization who will end up just catering to County Board Supervisors and sponsoring Envirothons. WALCE has been a great organization and I'm proud to be a member. But the record shows that the Adhoc Committee is mostly concerned with County Conservationists views on the merger. Good luck to you all.
22	I think that it is time to merger for the stability and strength of both organizations.
23	i support the merger
24	I think the process has been very good to this point, I think the final push should be strong. I do think if it has not yet been talked about, we could explore the option of having a sort of pre nup agreement in which say a 2 year trial program goes in place and is revisted or something at that point, financial interest could be protected/discussed, this may help some folks feel comfortable with process, then see it really work and then 100% buy in, if we made arrangements for something like this I dont think the area association, rep, county con domination thing would be an issue.
25	The merger presentations throughout the state along with these surveys are an excellent avenue for feedback. However – the committee must listen to the member’s comments and suggestions so that they don’t fall on deaf ears. It is so easy to get wrapped up in just a few people’s personal agendas.
26	I think the merger is a good idea and should move ahead.

27	The end result should be greater efficiency and greater representation. My concern is divergence of agendas my lead to no repr4sentation. Proceed with great caution.
28	Too much process here and lack of action. Talk to Jane Severt, Wisconsin County Forest Association - they have already done it.
29	Thanks to the merger committee members for their work. Easy to find information about the proposal.
30	I feel it would be more efficient to have one large organization working toward the same goals.
31	finish the merger soon before it is too late
32	I like the idea of a membership category for private citizens and retired lcc employees. You are doing an EXCELLENT job with this.
33	Thank you for your work, and for the opportunity to comment.
34	Looking forward to having the merger complete, so we can look forward to a unified organization. Wishing it was already here.
35	A special thanks to Perry Lindquist and Bill Schuster for their efforts in this process.
36	looks like the WALCE group did most of the work
37	The process appears to be good, open for all to participate and be heard.
38	Thanks for the time and effort put in by the ad hoc committee!
39	We need to merge WLWCA with WCA. Maintain an autonomous employee ogantization.
40	I think this is a good idea to work together and possible merge. Not sure if all the details are worked out yet.
41	none
42	I believe you have done a thorough job with the process so far.
43	The organization should be more focused on how to use the tools already available to county's to bring positive change to enviromental issues. More rules, regional rules, and exceptions should be avoided.
44	I'm wondering why it's taking so long--either it's a good idea, or it isn't.
45	Drop it!
46	LCC and LWCD's have separate budgets. What if one or the other does not pay dues? How would the BOD vote work for any given county with one not paying dues? If WLWCA is having financial issues, that should be addressed separately and not by a merger to remedy the problem.
47	Use adaptive management. Put a 3 year sunset clause in the new organizational structure with a commitment to be open to revisions and adjustments after learning the first three years. Best wishes!
48	Communication should be their first goal.
49	At this point I have very little contact with your organizations
50	The merger makes perfect sense at this unique time in our state's history. New ideas and ways of functioning are necessary. Make it work.
51	with so few farmers elected to co brds maybe the staff should take over the whole org...
52	I am not convinced that WLWCA membership, except a handful of committed individuals, has the political clout or fortitude to lead a new association. They have been lacking in that category for many years. They need to move away from the warm and fuzzies and become a stronger player at the political level where the future needs of conservation is greatest. Collectively the WLWCA membership is weak and lacks credibility with legislatures.
53	I feel that the merger is a good solution. Efficiency is key to keeping the organization alive.

4. If you would like a direct response to your questions or concerns, please provide your contact information.	
#	Response
1	Name
	Matthew Bremer
	E-mail
	matt.bremer@co.adams.wi.us
	Address
	W10443 Hwy O, Portage, WI 53901
2	Name
	Norm Tadt
	E-mail
	ntadt@co.rock.wi.us
	Address
	440 N. US HWY 14 Janesville, WI 53546
3	Name
	Lou
	E-mail
	lolson4@co.walworth.wi.us.
	Address
	PO box 1001, Elkhorn, WI 53121
4	Name
	Peter Murray
	E-mail
	petermurray@co.sauk.wi.us
	Address
	E8581 Hogsback Rd, Baraboo, WI 53913
5	Name
	Hugh Mulliken
	E-mail
	hmulliken@gmail.com
	Address
	PO Box 275
6	Name
	John M Meyers
	E-mail
	meyersjohn@live.com
	Address
	3110 County Road K, Barneveld WI 53507

7	Name
	Ed Wenger
	E-mail
	wenger@borderlandnet.net
	Address
	Florence
8	Name
	Virginia Wiedenfeld
	E-mail
	ginw@mwt.net
	Address
	24620 Smurf Lane Richland Center WI 53581
9	Name
	keith marquardt
10	E-mail
	melvinrp@centurytel.net
	Address
	no response needed !!!!!!!!
11	Name
	Thomas Sweeney
	E-mail
	sweeney@co.rock.wi.us
12	Name
	Robin Leary
	E-mail
	learyrj@uwec.edu
	Address
	2104 Providence Court, Eau Claire, WI 54703
13	Name
	Tim Parsons
	E-mail
	timothy.parsons@wi.gov
	Address
	GEF II, Madison WI
14	Name
	David Hammer
	E-mail
	davidhammer@centurytel.net
	Address
	6738 Hilldale Road Cuba City,WI