

**FOREST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING (FMAC OR COMMITTEE)
October 5, 2011
Meeting Minutes**

FMAC MEMBERS PRESENT

Ms. Lynne M. Boyd, Chief, Forest Management Division (FMD), Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
Ms. Lauri Elbing, the Nature Conservancy
Mr. Marvin Roberson, the Sierra Club
Ms. Kim Korbecki, FMAC Assistant, DNR-FMD
Mr. William Manson, Jr., Michigan Snowmobile Association
Ms. Amy Trotter, Michigan United Conservation Clubs (MUCC)
Ms. Karen Putnam, representing Dr. Donna LaCourt, Michigan Economic Development Corporation (MEDC)
Mr. Bill Botti, Chair, Michigan Forest Association
Dr. Dan Keathley, Michigan State University
Dr. Peg Gale, Michigan Technological University
Mr. Gary Melow, Michigan Biomass
Mr. Stephen Shine, Michigan Department of Agriculture
Mr. Warren Suchovsky, Suchovsky Logging

FMAC ADVISORS PRESENT

Mr. Barry Paulson, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Huron-Manistee

PUBLIC ATTENDEES / GUESTS

Ms. Cara Boucher, DNR
Director Rodney A. Stokes, Director, DNR
Ms. Patricia Stewart, DNR

I. Welcome

Chair Botti called the October 5, 2011 Forest Management Advisory Committee (FMAC) meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. He welcomed all members and guests.

II. Action Items

- Adoption of October 5, 2011 FMAC Meeting Agenda
Ms. Boyd reported that Director Stokes, DNR, appointed a new member to the FMAC, Mr. Scott Robbins from the Forest Products Council. The agenda was adopted as presented.
- Adoption of July 13, 2011 FMAC Meeting Minutes
Chair Botti asked if there were comments; there was none. He quoted the 7-day rule on comments in the FMAC bylaws, and the July 13 Meeting Minutes was adopted as presented.

III. Public Comments

None

IV. FMAC Direction and Role – Director Rodney A. Stokes

Chair Botti welcomed Director Stokes and Ms. Patricia Stewart, both from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to the FMAC meeting.

Director Stokes reported there will be changes made in the DNR. A Timber Advisory Council (TAC) is being created, and Ms. Cara Boucher, DNR, was asked to step down as State Forester. The decision came from having conversations with the industry, and being asked by the Governor and the Legislature to place more emphasis on timber harvesting. From the Director's discussion with the timber industry, it (the industry) does not feel it has a voice on the FMAC. It decided it was time to talk with the Director and others about what it feels timber can be in the state.

Director Stokes stated he would be spending some time working with the TAC and the FMAC to see if they can make it what it could be. The timber industry feels that they do have some voice within the DNR, so Director Stokes will be working to hopefully merge the two groups back together. His goal is to not have two separate groups out there, but the timber industry was adamant about not being heard.

Chair Botti pointed out that there has not been representation from the timber industry on the FMAC in over two years. He commented the thought of merging the two committees is a new idea. **Director Stokes** responded that he did not see it as being a new idea, that the industry should be included in FMAC now. The Director feels he can accomplish bringing the industry back into the fold by creating a separate council to begin with.

Mr. Roberson commented that he was confused how the industry could feel it was not being heard when it does not attend the meetings. He stated the FMAC has never denied the industry an agenda item when it was requested. **Director Stokes** responded that the industry's comment was that other subjects were taking up too much time.

Ms. Trotter asked if with there being two separate bodies, will it change the responsibilities of the FMAC. **Director Stokes** responded he did not see the role or the charge of the FMAC changing. He will take information from both groups so he can make a decision. He will also present conflicts at each committee. **Director Stokes** reiterated he would eventually like to merge the two groups back together.

Mr. Shine commented that he had seen a news release that mentioned the Forest Stewardship Advisory Committee and wondered if it would still exist. **Director Stokes** stated he is not familiar with that committee, but has no plans to change it.

Mr. Roberson stated that the FMAC is supposed to deal with forest issues, so having another group dealing with all timber issues seems repetitive. **Director Stokes** responded that he was sorry that this disturbed Mr. Roberson, but it was his decision to create the new committee.

Members of both committees will be appointed by the Director. **Chair Botti** asked what the procedure for merging the two committees would be. **Director Stokes** stated he has not selected members for the TAC yet. Those he wishes to appoint will be sent through the Governor's office for vetting.

Chair Botti asked if the FMAC had more questions for Director Stokes, and apologized to him that his first visit to an FMAC meeting had been rough. He asked if the new State Forester appointment will be reporting to Director Stokes. **Director Stokes** responded that the State Forester has never reported to him before, but since the Governor's Office has asked him to work with the timber industry he feels it is best for the position to report to him now.

Chair Botti commented that he thinks one positive about this is it will raise the timber industry to a higher level. **Director Stokes** stated he is hoping it will turn out to be a positive experience. He would not have done this if he did not think it had a strong possibility of having a positive outcome. He continued that there has been a long battle between the timber industry and the DNR, and it is time to bring them together. If a two-step process is needed, then the DNR will do a two-step process.

Director Stokes stated he thinks the FMAC and the timber industry all have the same purpose, just different views on how to get there. You do not start the process of getting there by not

talking. If the two committees are in different rooms at first, that is fine. Then they can come together and talk with each other. The DNR has a lot of committees and boards. It is not his goal to set up another board. The goal is to deal with the issue at hand. **Director Stokes** continued that eventually the FMAC and TAC has to get together because our forests are not just timber. There is also snowmobiling, hunting, etc. It is a multiuse forest and it must be managed that way. He will not say that timber is king and everything must take a back seat to that. But this is an issue that must be dealt with and he is doing it in the best way he knows how.

Chair Botti asked if part of the charge of the TAC will be to make the merger. **Director Stokes** responded that he can make that part of the charge. He may not do so right away, but perhaps down the road it will be added to the charge. If he feels the timing is not right, he will not approach it right away. He wants to develop trust first.

Dr. Gale asked how the FMAC reports out now. **Ms. Boyd** responded that the TAC will be working with Director Stokes, as well as the new State Forester (when appointed) to get things done. **Dr. Gale** then asked how the FMAC is going to know what the TAC is working on. **Director Stokes** responded that the two committees will share minutes and the minutes will also be available online. **Dr. Gale** asked if a one page summary can be developed for what is talked about at the meetings.

Ms. Trotter asked if the TAC will be looking mainly at state forests, or at private forests as well. **Director Stokes** responded he thinks it would be narrowly focused if it only looked at state land. He would like to work toward getting the state and federal forests to eventually come together. **Ms. Trotter** commented it is the goal of MUCC to see all partners work together also.

Mr. Suchovsky asked about the pool of candidates for the State Forester position. **Director Stokes** stated he has received names from seven or eight different groups, with a total of around fifteen. The DNR has not started the process yet. It is still researching what qualifications are needed. **Mr. Suchovsky** asked how the position ties in with the Deputy Director. **Director Stokes** answered that candidates have already been interviewed for the Deputy Director position, and he still needs to check a few references. The State Forester will report to the Director for at least a year, and perhaps report to the Deputy Director after that.

Mr. Roberson stated that although he 'buted heads' a lot with Ms. Boucher, he has a lot of respect for her and it will be unfortunate to lose her. **Director Stokes** responded that he felt that was the way to go. **Mr. Suchovsky** stated he seconded Mr. Roberson's statement.

Chair Botti asked if the FMAC had any other comments. There were none. He wanted to point out that the FMAC serves at Director Stokes' direction. At some point it would be helpful for one of the FMAC members to attend a TAC meeting. **Director Stokes** replied that he understands the FMAC's concern about him not placing a priority on what it does, but he does. Given his charge, he feels this must be done to meet his goal which is that the DNR ends up with one committee. Right now, from what he has ascertained, it is not possible.

Ms. Trotter asked if the Natural Resources Commission (NRC) will be involved with the TAC. **Director Stokes** responded that his goal is to have the NRC tied to it in some way, whether as a member or an ex-officio. It is important for him to make sure he is addressing the timber industry, and the NRC has some issues as well. He is not sure what role it will play, but it will play some sort of role.

Mr. Roberson commented that the FMAC began with many people from the timber industry, and it is not fair for them to not attend the meetings and then say they have not been heard.

Chair Botti asked if there were any other comments. There were none. He thanked Director Stokes for coming to the meeting and presenting his position. **Director Stokes** responded that, again, it is unfortunate that the first FMAC meeting he attended was under these circumstances, but at the same time he is here to listen, and to take back what the FMAC has said and to try to address it. If you do not listen you do not learn, and if you do not learn you do not change. He commented that he hoped the FMAC does not take what he is doing as disrespect or lack of caring. He does appreciate what the FMAC does, and for them taking the time to listen and comment, whether in agreement or disagreement.

Director Stokes left the FMAC meeting at 1:36 p.m.

Mr. Shine asked what members from the timber industry left the FMAC. The only Forest Product Representative, Mr. George Burgoyne, left the FMAC two years ago and was not replaced. **Ms. Boyd** stated she has talked to land conservancy groups, and they generally felt that FMAC was not a good fit for them.

Chair Botti commented that it is unfortunate that the FMAC was not invited to make comments when it mattered. It is clear that the industry had ample opportunity to participate. An example is Ms. Maggie Cox, the Forest Products Council (at the time), who should have only commented during the public comment period but was always invited to sit at the table with the FMAC.

Mr. Suchovsky commented that he never felt that he was not heard by the FMAC.

Ms. Boyd stated the original membership had five or six people from the timber industry, and they just stopped attending the meetings. **Ms. Trotter** stated that the Forest Stewardship Advisory Council is mandated to have certain representation. **Ms. Boucher** commented that it is mandated in the Farm Bill and the Right to Forest Act.

Dr. Gale stated she would like to see a table showing what committees the DNR has and who they report to. **Mr. Shine** said the challenge for some is hours and hours of different committee assignments. It would be better if they were all combined.

Ms. Boyd stated that currently the State Forester was involved in three committees and reported to her. With the changes Director Stokes is making, the State Forester will now be reporting to him. Legislation dictated that the State Forester have three committees, so now those committees will also be reporting to Director Stokes.

MOTION: **Mr. Roberson** moved to thank Ms. Boucher and Ms. Boyd for their many years of hard work as the State Forester and their work for the FMAC; supported by **Mr. Suchovsky**.

Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Botti asked if the FMAC assists with forest certification. **Ms. Boyd** responded that the FMAC does help with forest certification, even if not directly. **Dr. Keathley** commented that he finds it mildly disappointing when someone comes in and says that he is here to listen, when the FMAC was not notified before the decision was made. The discussion of the timber management committee reports out to another line; what is the purpose of the FMAC? A question was posed that the State Forester reports to the Director, yet all of the land management staff flow to Ms. Boyd. Is the FMAC still beneficial to Ms. Boyd? Is the FMAC the balance? **Ms. Boyd** responded that she absolutely believes the FMAC is the balance. There

will have to be some crossover between the two committees. **Ms. Boyd** commented she believed she would have some involvement with the TAC. She will be able to come back and say "this is what is being considered," and get recommendations from the FMAC regarding what else the DNR needs to do to implement what is being considered.

Ms. Trotter commented that the FMAC still has more time to react, and at least the TAC will know what is going on and will attend meetings. **Dr. Gale** stated that she looks at this as a top-down process. The timber industry has legislators they are feeding ideas to already. She thinks they may go straight to the legislature, so although the FMAC see things coming down it will miss the opportunity for comment. The FMAC may be able to discuss issues, but the lobbying will already be going on.

Mr. Suchovsky asked what the relationship is of Forest Legacy Committee to Forest Stewardship Committee. **Ms. Boyd** responded that the Forest Legacy Committee makes recommendations to the Forest Stewardship Committee who then makes recommendations to the State Forester. It is more advisory than stand-alone. She continued that the last time the FMAC met it had a presentation on regeneration that relates to certification. It also took a couple of field trips to the Grayling and Roscommon areas, which also tied to certification and other things related to impact of certain recreational uses on the resource. So there are ways the FMAC looks at and discusses issues, and sometimes make recommendations.

Ms. Boyd stated that Director Humphries wanted a multidisciplinary team. She had individual groups coming in individually. She thought at the time that the DNR would be better advised by getting a bigger view of what was happening. The FMAC was heavily weighted with timber industry people at the beginning. There was never a limitation on the FMAC looking at private lands. The GAFMPS played a part in getting all the players to the table to see that there was common ground. For an example, the impact of timber harvesting on snowmobile trails was a great format for the FMAC to discuss.

Mr. Shine commented that he is still stuck on why the timber representatives backed away from attending FMAC meetings, and will they do the same with the TAC? **Mr. Shine** stated he did not think there were that many timber representatives on the FMAC. **Ms. Boyd** answered there were several from the Forest Products Council, and the DNR also looked at loggers, mills etc., and filled out the FMAC with others as required by the Right to Forestry Act.

Mr. Roberson commented that during the last certification, they asked about the FMAC and were told that it is beneficial to certification. He offered a motion, because the FMAC is a multidisciplinary team, that the TAC should be brought into the FMAC. **Chair Botti** commented he was thinking a similar thought, but thought perhaps a letter from the FMAC to Director Stokes stating confirmation of its discussion and outlining its feelings on what has been done, would be more appropriate. The FMAC needs to communicate that it is disingenuous that the timber industry states it does not get to say what it wants to say at the FMAC meetings when it does not bother to attend the meetings. **Mr. Manson** stated he felt this was already covered in the meeting minutes.

Ms. Trotter stated that from her perspective, if the TAC is going forward it should be the goal of the FMAC to embrace it into the fold when it is appropriate. **Chair Botti** commented he wants to reiterate the fact that the FMAC wants the minutes from the TAC meetings. **Ms. Boucher** stated in going forward the FMAC should ask for a member to have a seat on the TAC and vice-versa.

Dr. Gale commented the visibility of forestry is with FMAC, but thinks there will be more visibility for forestry with the TAC. She feels the FMAC has been sort of an advisory group but thinks the FMAC needs to be more visible to the people of the state. Perhaps the TAC will assist the FMAC in gaining visibility. **Mr. Roberson** commented that the TAC would be giving more visibility to timber, rather than forestry resources. **Dr. Gale** responded she is not sure that is the case.

Mr. Suchovsky commented he would like the letter from FMAC to the Director Stokes to request that the FMAC and the TAC meet together two times per year. He stated that he is fairly close to the Forest Products Council (Council), but so often things have developed that he is not sure that persons involved with the Council really relate to why the DNR has developed some of the guidelines that it has developed. He also does not think these people realize that the guidelines have a lot to do with forest certification. **Mr. Suchovsky** continued that he told the Council that it needs to pay attention to biodiversity, but it did not do so. He does not feel these issues register with it. He also thinks part of the issue is that the Council members that sit at the table are not necessarily the person(s) that can make decisions for the organization. **Mr. Suchovsky** finished by saying that the Council needs to be an important player, but also needs to understand how all pieces of the puzzle fit together.

Mr. Melow stated he agrees with what Ms. Trotter suggested, but to get back to relevance he thinks the road and path has been laid out and the FMAC knows what is going to happen. It is now time to look at how the FMAC can be more relevant, which is a continuation of what he brought up during the last two months; why does the FMAC exist, what is its agenda, etc. He feels it is to continue doing what the FMAC is doing, but to make it more relevant and to proactively get the TAC engaged with the FMAC.

Mr. Roberson stated he thinks the director rewarded bad behavior and he does not want to be a part of it. He does not think the FMAC should send anything to embrace what has been done.

Mr. Melow commented that it is done; the FMAC should accept it and move forward.

Ms. Elbing commented that she is new to the FMAC and she would like it to reinforce what the FMAC does. It seems that the FMAC needs to take a good look at what the needs are across the different ownerships, and it needs to be a little more proactive. She feels that the agendas have felt "fluffy" since she has been attending the FMAC meetings, which is not necessarily positioning the FMAC to be taken seriously with some of the issues going on across the state.

Chair Botti stated he thinks he should communicate with Director Stokes more. **Mr. Shine** commented it does not seem like the FMAC is focusing on, or solving problems. **Mr. Melow** stated that Ms. Elbing spoke to the agenda, and how it all fits in with the management of resources. He suggested creating an agenda for the next year so the FMAC has specific issues to work on and can then make strong recommendations to the DNR.

Dr. Gale stated that when the FMAC first started it had a great list of issues to address, ranked according to appointments. She suggested going back to the list and working that way again. She also commented that the FMAC could take Mr. Melow's approach, and go around the table and ask what each FMAC member thinks it should be dealing with. **Mr. Melow** contributed that he has seen issues that the FMAC was working on, and then it just seems to wane. The FMAC needs to put an agenda together, see what the issues are, and work so that everyone gets some satisfaction.

Ms. Elbing reported she would be attending a meeting on Senate Bill 248. The DNR is under some fire as people want to know how the DNR justifies what it is doing. She wondered if there

is a way for the FMAC to help support answering some of the legitimate questions that are being put out there. The FMAC needs to figure out how to support the DNR.

Chair Botti asked if the FMAC would support a draft letter to Director Stokes that it could review before it is sent out. The FMAC agreed. **Mr. Melow** stated that it should be done expeditiously.

V. What Facts, Figures, Data and Information Should be Reviewed

Chair Botti commented that he thought Dr. Gale's comments earlier covered some of this subject; should we recycle the old issue list? He thought the umbrella was going to be issues that the DNR would ask the FMAC for assistance with. **Mr. Melow** stated that resurrecting a prior agenda is a good idea. The FMAC should look at what it did achieve and what needs to be revisited.

Ms. Boyd commented that internally the DNR has been working on numbers it wants to bring here; allowable cuts, sustainable harvest levels, etc. She had planned on bringing it to the FMAC right away, but the State Forester was going to look at it first. She would also like the FMAC to critically review it. The Forest Management Division (FMD) has done detailed work on what is actually out there. **Dr. Gale** stated that Dr. Robert Froese and others have looked at this. **Ms. Boyd** stated that if someone is only looking at FIA, the DNR inventory is more complete for the state forestry. It has tactical details on its data. She commented she would like to bring this information back to the November FMAC meeting to look at the document, and for FMD staff to explain how it arrived at the data, explain the background, etc. **Dr. Keathley** asked where it will all come together. Does it come down to how to define what is allowable? If the new State Forester is defining extreme, and the FMD is defining it differently, how will it all come together? **Ms. Boyd** responded that she has faith that the State Forester and the division will find a way to come together.

Dr. Gale stated she thinks at the end of each session, the FMAC should issue a one-pager with any decisions it made. **Mr. Melow** volunteered to put together an action matrix to present to the FMAC at the next meeting. **Ms. Trotter** commented that the FMAC is at the point of needing something like a matrix to let others know what the FMAC has been working on, including recommendations made. It is all about communication, and it would show that the FMAC is a diverse group.

Dr. Gale commented that she would like to know what Wildlife Division and the Department of Environmental Quality is working on. **Ms. Trotter** reported that Wildlife went through a comprehensive strategic planning process and now has an annual report. The MUCC has been looking at the report, and would like to have FMD's aspect also so that Wildlife can include information that might be beneficial to FMD. She would like to see a different set of eyes, not related to hunting and wildlife issues, to review it. **Ms. Boyd** reported there is the Michigan Snowmobile and Trails Advisory Committee, with ORV, snowmobile, equine, and non-motorized trails subcommittees. Their goal is to create a statewide trail plan. She feels that the trails portion is very well covered at the present time. **Dr. Gale** responded that she just wants information, or an update, not necessarily comments from others.

VI. Bylaw Review; Article IV Revision

This was not discussed at this meeting.

VII. DNR Issue; Revision of Forest Assessment Strategy (Assessment)

Ms. Boyd stated that this is a great example of issues that the FMAC should follow-up on. This document was shared with FMAC a year and a half ago but it was not at a point that it needed to

be revised until now. She commented that there is a real need for this assessment. Without it, the DNR will not get a lot of federal dollars, and it will help bring money and jobs to the state.

There was some confusion as to why the DNR did this document in the first place. Basically, there have been a lot of different interpretations. If you look at the document, you have to look at it as a whole. The DNR created this because it was required to under the Farm Bill. When it was creating this assessment, there were many other plans being developed. The FMD had a very short timeframe in which to complete it. It worked with other groups, both urban and community, the FMAC, and other groups. The FMD knew it would need to be revised within the next two or three years. It was a good, solid project but the FMD knew it would have to add additional information right away. Different groups identified issues and concerns. One of the maps talked about priority areas for reducing the impact of recreational activities on state forest land in Michigan, which was taken as the FMD wants to reduce the amount of recreational activities. It actually was referring to overuse and illegal recreation. The FMD's idea was to limit over and illegal recreation, or in the case of overuse expand the area. The staff looked at Maryland, where the same situation is called uncontrolled recreation. Although this document was completed awhile ago, there is still some concern that the DNR is using it to reduce recreation, whereas it is being used as a strategy to move forward. The entire document is available on the DNR website; Ms. Korbecki will send the FMAC members the link.

Ms. Boyd commented that it was important that this strategy was done in 2010. It covered fire, private forestry, forestry legacy, and the forest health programs. In the first year, \$10 million was brought into the state, and in 2011 \$12 million was brought into the state. This is more than any other state. The DNR has been very successful bringing money into the state because of this assessment.

Ms Boyd reported that last year the DNR geared all competitive grants to priority areas in the assessment plan. Funds are going out to all kinds of groups which was pulled together by the State Forester. A list of proposals was listed under one on the forest service allocations sheet. Funds were given to Michigan Tech, Davey Tree, community wildfire protection plans, different communities, the Department of Agriculture, etc. **Mr. Roberson** asked if Ms. Boucher will still be working on updating the assessment and doing the grants. **Ms. Boucher** responded that she does not know.

Dr. Gale asked if others are doing this as well. **Ms. Boyd** responded that other committees are listed, as well as the Wildlife Division and the Department of Agriculture. **Ms. Boucher** commented that FMD just provided an example, not the entire document. And funds coming in must have an assessment done. **Mr. Suchovsky** asked if through some of these programs could the Michigan Department of Transportation tie into forest health on highways. **Ms. Boucher** responded that MDOT received funds to work on some of its corridors. Now it is gearing a number of its proposals to the forest action plans.

In the NE Area there were gaps in information in the baseline forest data and future scenarios, climate change, etc. so the northern research station started working on collecting this data. The FMD needs to think of how to bring that information into the assessment. The 2012 Farm Bill will most likely require this within a certain timeframe. The FMD would like to do this in a more deliberative way. In order to keep funds coming in, jobs being developed and maintained, it needs to keep the assessment relevant and up-to-date. The FMD needs to think about what role the FMAC should take, how to engage stakeholders, and what content changes are needed.

Chair Botti asked if operations inventory figures in. **Ms. Boucher** answered that it is across all lands. In the 2010 version of the assessment, it only discussed a little about federal and state lands, and their value in the state. That portion needs to be updated. **Chair Botti** commented that it appears that FMD has a good picture of state land (20%.) **Ms. Boucher** stated a lot of different data sources were used. During creation of the first assessment there were so many other planning efforts going on, and FMD had such a short timeframe to complete it, it was difficult to add in everything it would have liked to. **Ms. Boyd** stated that she is asking that the FMAC take a bigger look at the assessment and give the FMD ideas on content, what is missing, and what is important to add to it.

Mr. Roberson asked what the FMD needs the FMAC to do. **Ms. Boyd** responded that it would like the FMAC to form a couple of subcommittees right away to tackle some of these issues. After reading the document, it may be that the entire FMAC is not required. **Ms. Boucher** stated there are a lot of different representatives in the FMAC. She would like to have everyone look at the assessment and suggest people we can bring into a meeting to discuss this, and to invite relevant people to come to speak to the FMAC. **Mr. Roberson** commented that he thinks getting involved with the assessment is a great way for the FMAC to continue.

Mr. Melow asked what plans are used for other than land grants. **Ms. Boucher** responded: current conditions and strategy for dealing with issues identified; keeping forest growing benefits; protecting forests from threats; identifying priority areas in the state; and strategy for doing this and identifying partners. **Mr. Melow** asked what the audience is for the assessment. Is it bureaucrats in Washington, or in-house landowners? **Ms. Boucher** responded that the Forest Service is using the assessment for focusing on federal investments; where to invest, what areas of the state, and what types of projects. As an example, if we did not have high fire danger in the state, we would not get funded. This is a way for the feds to focus its investments and for the state to identify its needs. It is a functional plan.

Mr. Melow asked if there is a timeline. **Ms. Boucher** responded that it is dependent on the 2012 Farm Bill. She expects that the assessment should be updated within 18 months, so by early 2013. **Dr. Keathley** commented that given the assessment will be used to identify where funding would be appropriate, it would be beneficial to him to have potential funding sources for the Forest Service. **Ms. Boucher** stated that she suggested 18 months because it will take awhile to know what happens with the 2012 Farm Bill, and to have a reasonable, robust discussion will take time as well. This is across all lands and there are gaps to fill. Having discussions with the people is what is important to the state.

Ms. Boyd asked if the FMAC is willing to delve into this. It will take work, but then the FMAC can look at framing some of the issues. A suggestion was made that perhaps the FMAC should refresh its memories on what is in the assessment. **Ms. Boyd** stated that Ms. Boucher could come back at a future meeting to discuss how it was drafted and funding opportunities. **Dr. Gale** asked if the FMAC would like her to send out the list of issues that the FMAC developed before for it to review again. **Mr. Suchovsky** commented that an example of a development exercise that the FMAC could work on is the current land cap bill. **Ms. Boucher** stated it took six or seven months for the State Foresters to talk to the Forest Service. It also took time to say that urban areas have different priority areas than private lands. The FMD did many different maps with layers, and weighted them differently. One of the questions that was asked is if FMD did that correctly. **Mr. Melow** suggested that the DNR comes back with a work plan on how to break this up and talk about how the FMAC can keep to-task.

Chair Botti asked if the FMAC agreed with Mr. Melow's suggestion. **Ms. Boyd** stated she will write up an action plan to present to the FMAC. **Mr. Suchovsky** asked if the FMAC could do a day-long workgroup as it did in the past. **Ms. Boyd** responded it could, after the next FMAC meeting. She stated she would have a work plan prepared and sent to the FMAC, and asked them to read the plan prior to the November 9 meeting. **Chair Botti** thanked Ms. Boucher for her update.

Mr. Paulson suggested the FMAC may want to consider putting it out in segments to work on. The national forest system is faced with the same thing, and it is becoming more and more competitive with priorities. **Mr. Suchovsky** suggested inviting the Association of Townships, the Association of Counties, and State Legislators. **Chair Botti** stated that parceling it out will be part of the work plan. **Ms. Boucher** informed the FMAC that the National Association of State Foresters has a web page where you can access all other states' plans.

VIII. Update on Mining Activities

There are currently three projects: Kennecott in Marquette has started the decline into the mine body. It is expected to bring \$100 million in revenues and commodity prices. This is for state royalty, and state and local taxes. Aquila, also known as the Back Forty, in Menominee, is primarily gold, but also includes zinc, copper, and cobalt. The application was expected this year, but Aquila has fallen behind. It will apply for the mining permit early next year. In the Baraga County area, copper mining is expected. This is all on private land and an application will be submitted to the Department of Environmental Quality. This is more likely to come online than Aquila.

IX. FMAC Resolution in Priorities

Chair Botti reported that he and Dr. Gale exchanged e-mails regarding this. They may have a resolution at the next FMAC meeting. **Mr. Melow** stated that he looked at it and his thought is that it is a wonderful piece. He would like to see the FMAC deploy it beyond a simple resolution to the Director. He suggested modifying it, pulling some information out for a letter, and using a resolution as additional information. He also suggested presenting it to a broader audience. **Ms. Boyd** responded that it can be sent to different organizations on behalf of the FMAC, posted on the DNR website, as well as being sent to the Director. **Chair Botti** stated that part of the issue is that the FMAC has not sending the Director recommendations, and asked for suggestions as to how to do it. **Mr. Melow** asked how other groups transmit recommendations. **Ms. Boyd** responded that often it is transmitted in a report. **Ms. Trotter** commented that with the Wildlife and Fisheries Divisions it is done at the Natural Resources Commission meetings. **Dr. Gale** suggested using a simple document. **Ms. Boyd** stated that the DNR put together a booklet when the new legislative session began and there is no reason that the FMAC cannot say to them, "here is what we have been looking at and this is what you should be aware of." **Dr. Gale** stated she would resend the document to the FMAC and request comments.

X. Standing Discussion Items

- **Ms. Boyd** reported that the Natural Resources Budget reports are no longer being done.
- The Governor wants to assess the employee benefits. This would affect the FMD by over \$2 million. This year the FMD has this money set aside, but it will not next year. The Game and Fish Fund is continuing to decline. The DNR is putting together reduction plans for 2012. The fund balance for the Forest Development Fund will be \$6 million going into 2013. Almost all of DNR's funds, with the exception of the Park Endowment Fund, will have problems either this year or next year (revenues vs. deductions.) There will be a lot of changes in the budget priorities.

- The Legislative updates are included in the FMAC meeting packets. **Ms. Trotter** commented that the new forest bills were not included in the Legislative Updates.
- **Ms. Boyd** reported that the DNR is supportive of what is going into the CF and QF bills. The MUCC is pretty supportive of these bills as well, but would tweak them a bit.
- Improving public involvement process is always on the forefront of the DNR's mind.
- Living Legacy Program. **Ms. Boyd** reported that the Director has officially approved the communication plan. She is not sure what is next, but it is on its way.
- Discussion on Deer Yards. It is the responsibility of the FMAC to give recommendations in relation to having a sustainable forest. The forestry voice is not being heard.

XI. Next Meeting Date / Agenda Items

November 9, 2011

XII. Agenda Items

Allowable Cut

WLD / DEQ Updates - what they are working on (next or future meeting)

Strategy of Land Problems in Gwinn Area

Deer Yard Issue – Ms. Trotter

Bylaw Review; Article IV Revision

What Facts, Figures, Data and Information Should be Reviewed (future meeting)

Statewide Assessment

Re-circulate Strategy List

Standing Items

XIII. Adjournment

Chair Botti adjourned the October 5, 2011 FMAC meeting at 3:57 p.m.