

**Forest Management Advisory Committee  
Meeting Summary  
February 8, 2006  
Michigan United Conservation Clubs Conference Room  
2101 Wood St., Lansing**

**Attendees:**

***FMAC Members:***, Joel Blohm, William (Bill) Bobier, Lynne Boyd, William (Bill) Cook, , Thomas Dunn, Margaret (Peg) Gale, Susan Holben, Mark Janke, Warren Suchovsky, Sam Washington, Gordon Wenk, Anne Woiwode, Kerry Gray (staff support).

Steven Arwood, Leland Crawford, John Fowler, Desmond Jones, Daniel Keathley William (Bill) Manson Frank Ruswick and Leanne Marten (committee advisor were absent.

***Other Attendees:*** George Berghorn (Michigan Forest Products Council), Dennis Fox (MDNR), Erin McDonough (MUCC-Delegate), Todd Scott (Michigan Mountain Biking Association), Stephen Shine (MDA)

**Welcome**

Lynne Boyd welcomed FMAC members and guests.

Additions to the agenda:

Update on forestry legislation

**Meeting Summary**

Warren Suchovsky motioned to approve January 4 FMAC meeting summary. Joel Blohm seconded.

**MUCC Private Landowner Forestry Initiative**

Erin McDonough described the private landowner forestry initiative that MUCC has received a grant to complete. The project aims to coordinate the efforts of stakeholders that work with non-industrial private forest (NIPF) landowners to get them to properly manage their forest lands. A second goal is to address issues of fragmentation/ parcelization of land.

The project will start with a background paper that will describe the current project/initiatives that are directed at NIPF landowners and the stakeholders involved in these projects/initiatives. The second component will be a stakeholder meeting to flush out a three year strategic plan that is aimed at NIPF landowners. The third component is to create a committee that will oversee the implementation of the strategic plan.

Erin encouraged FMAC members if they were interested or knew of someone that was interested in participating in this initiative to contact her at MUCC. Several FMAC members encouraged Erin to include stakeholders that are doing work on carbon sequestration (including the USDA Forest Service), since it is becoming a hot topic.

## **Right to Forest Legislation- Working Group Updates**

### *Visual Management Working Group*

George Berghorn, Working Group Chair, provided a handout and update. The working group used Wisconsin and Minnesota as models when addressing this issue. A Minnesota publication put visual management into three sensitivity classifications: Level 1: most sensitive - areas where significant public use occurs; Level 2: moderately sensitive - areas not included in level 1 - with less significant public use; Level 3: less sensitive - areas of low volume use where public use does not occur on a regular basis. The working group chose to use these three levels when developing the visual management GAFMPs. He reviewed the working group's handout. The final working group document will have a list detailing what activities should be taken under each sensitivity level. Committee members suggested including examples in the GAFMPs that may help clarify some of the visual management issues.

A discussion occurred following the visual management report about including ecological conditions into the GAFMPs. Some members were concerned that visual quality is not a good measure of ecological health/conditions. It was decided by FMAC members that a statement should be included in the beginning of the GAFMPs about ecological conditions.

Boyd will ask Attorney General's office to provide a legal definition of nuisance- FMAC members wanted clarification on the term to help them craft the GAFMPs.

Working group received support from the FMAC members to continue with their activities.

### *Noise and Dust Working Group*

Suchovsky provided handout and working group update. The noise and dust working group followed the same concept as visual management in using the sensitivity classification levels. They also tried to keep in mind how local zoning ordinances will fit into the creation of the GAFMPs. Working group separated noise and dust into separate categories and applied the sensitivity classifications to each. A topic that came up as an important addition to noise and dust is smoke. FMAC members agreed and asked the working group to add smoke to their GAFMPs. Working group received support from FMAC members to continue with their activities.

### *Removal of Vegetation*

No update was provided by working group.

### *Chemicals*

Anne Woiwode provided an update for the chemicals working group. She worked with Polly Kapala from Michigan Department of Agriculture (MDA) and Jim Ferris from the DNR. Polly was involved in the creation of the Right to Farm agriculture GAMPs. Polly's understanding was that if a forest landowner was using chemicals on their property that they fall under the Right to Farm GAMPs. The working group wanted clarification to identify if there really needed to be separate GAFMPs with the Right to Forest Act or could they just be added to the Right to Farm GAMPs. If MDA has authority over forest lands that use chemicals, and FMAC creates GAFMPs – they may

be in conflict with MDA's GAMPs.

The GAFMPs that the chemicals working group developed used the same template as the Right to Farm agricultural GAMPs that MDA created, they just replaced forestry for many of the activities. They also added a provision about not dumping chemicals in forests. Suchovsky also suggested the chemicals working group reference the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality's pollution prevention program that covers forestry. Working group received support from FMAC members to continue with their activities.

#### *General Discussion about Right to Forest*

Members discussed the lack of oversight there is to the provisions in the Right to Forest Act. The only person that makes a determination if someone falls under the Right to Forest Act is a judge. In the Right to Farm Act, MDA inspectors ensure that there is compliance with the act and are required to respond to any complaint within 5 days. MDA does what it can to avoid litigation between landowners.

Suchovsky asked if FMAC could provide faults with legislation in the report to the NRC. Boyd said committee could put what they thought was necessary in the report.

It was suggested that working groups may want to draft something that had less detail to present to the Natural Resource Commission and then continue to work on a document with more detail.

Woiwode asked about the formatting of the GAFMPs since each working group is formatting them differently. Once all of the GAFMPs are completed DNR staff will format and bring back to the FMAC for approval before sending on to NRC.

\*Next meeting all working groups will have their final GAFMPs and at the April FMAC meeting the formatted version will be presented.

**Public Comment**- None

#### **Trends in Michigan's Forest Industry**

George Berghorn, Michigan Forest Products Council, presented on trends in Michigan's forest industry. He will provide a pdf version for FMAC committee members. Members discussed points in Berghorn's presentation and also jobs and forestry in Michigan. Boyd asked what can this committee do to improve climate for the forest industry? She will bring the DNR document "Working Forests for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century" to the March FMAC meeting.

What other topics do members want presented on to help address the top issues facing Michigan's forest resource?

DNR's limiting factors

Dr. Burton Barnes- retired professor- to discuss forest ecology issues

Mike Rodenburg- DTE and Alex Friend- USFS- to discuss carbon and carbon sequestration.

## **Update on Michigan Forest Legislation**

There have been some changes to the forestry bills that were introduced but the DNR still opposes them. Four bills passed out of the House on Tuesday, February 7 and 5 bills were being discussed on the floor on Wednesday, February 8 and were sure to be passed out of the House the same day.

There is a new bill that has been introduced by Representative Casperson- HB 5628. The bill states that money received from the first 90,000 cords of wood harvested, “(i) THE FIRST \$2,200,000.00 OF THE MONEY SHALL BE DISTRIBUTED TO EACH CITY, TOWNSHIP, VILLAGE, AND COUNTY IN EACH COUNTY THAT HAS LAND CLASSIFIED AS COMMERCIAL FOREST UNDER PART 511 IN PROPORTION TO THE AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL FORESTLAND IN THAT LOCAL TAX COLLECTING UNIT, TO BE DISTRIBUTED IN THE SAME MANNER AND IN THE SAME PROPORTION AS AD VALOREM TAXES COLLECTED UNDER THE GENERAL PROPERTY TAX ACT, 1893 PA 206, MCL 211.1 TO 211.157.

(ii) THE NEXT \$2,200,000.00 OF THE MONEY SHALL BE DEPOSITED INTO THE SCHOOL AID FUND ESTABLISHED UNDER SECTION 11 OF ARTICLE IX OF THE STATE CONSTITUTION OF 1963.

(iii) THE BALANCE OF THE MONEY SHALL BE DEPOSITED IN THE GENERAL FUND.]” - From HB 5628 passed by the House.

The DNR is strongly opposed to this bill.

## **New Business**

None

## **Next Meeting**

March 8 meeting will be from **9 a.m. to 12 p.m.** at the Michigan United Conservation Clubs (MUCC) offices in Lansing.

- Agenda Items for March 8 meeting
  - Right to Forest Working Group- GAFMPs final versions presented
  - DNR Limiting Factors
  - Dr. Burt Barnes- overview of forest ecology and major issues

Upcoming meetings

- April 5 from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. – US Forest Service office- St. Ignace
- May 3 from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. – location TBD

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.