

SFI CERTIFICATION AUDIT FINAL REPORT

**Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard
2010-2014 Edition**



for

**Michigan Department of Natural Resources &
Environment
Lansing, Michigan**

December 7, 2010

Mike Ferrucci, NSF Lead Auditor

NSF-ISR

789 North Dixboro Road

Ann Arbor, MI 48105

888-NSF-9000

www.nsf-isr.org

Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment

SFI Summary Audit Report

The SFI Program of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment of Lansing, Michigan has achieved conformance with the SFI Standard®, 2010-2014 Edition, according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit Process. The program was certified under the 2005-2009 SFI Standard in December, 2005. We report on the successful re-certification to the new standard, which now has a 3-year certificate life. Annual surveillance audits are still required.

The audit was performed by NSF-ISR on October 18 through 25, 2010 by an audit team headed by Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor and which included

- Dr. Robert J. Hrubes, FSC Lead Auditor, Forester
- Paul Pingrey, Forester
- Dr. David Capen, Wildlife Biologist
- Katie Fernholz, Social Scientist

Audit team members fulfill the qualification criteria for conducting SFIS Certification Audits of “Section 9. SFI 2010-2014 Audit Procedures and Auditor Qualifications and Accreditation” contained in Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program: Standards, Rules for Label Use, Procedures, and Guidance.

The objective of the audit was to assess conformance of the organization’s SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2010-2014.

The scope of the SFIS Audit included the forest management portions of the standard (Objectives 1-7 and 14-20). Forest practices that were the focus of field inspections included those that have been under active management over the past two year. Practices conducted earlier were also reviewed as appropriate (regeneration and BMP issues, for example). In addition, SFI obligations to promote sustainable forestry practices, to seek legal compliance, and to incorporate continual improvement systems were within the scope of the audit.

Several of the SFI Performance Measures were outside of the scope of Michigan DNRE’s SFI program and were excluded from the scope of the SFI Certification Audit as follows:

- Indicator 2.1.4 involving planting exotic species
- Indicator 2.1.7 involving planting non-forested areas
- Indicator 3.2.5 involving situations where the state lacks BMPs
- Objectives 8 through 13 for procurement

None of the indicators were modified; the SFI 2010-2014 Standard’s relevant indicators and performance measures were used as published (available on-line at <http://www.sfiprogram.org/>).

Scope

Land management on 3.9 million acres of Michigan State Forest and related sustainable forestry activities required by the SFI 2010-2014 Standard. Exclusions: Long-term military lease lands, lands leased to Luce County, and Wildlife Areas that do not go through the compartment review process are not included in the scope of the certificate. The SFI Certificate Number is NSF-SFIS-5Y031.

Overview of Michigan DNRE's Lands and Sustainable Forestry Programs

Source: Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment Request for Proposals

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment, Forest, Mineral, and Fire Management Division (MDNRE-FMD) and Wildlife Division (WD) co-manage 3.9 million of the 21 million acres of forested land in the state of Michigan. Authorizing legislation found in Part 5 of Public Act 451 of 1994, as amended, details various aspects of this management. Michigan State Forest lands have historically been managed for multiple uses including aesthetics, recreation, timber, wildlife, soil and water conservation, biodiversity preservation and restoration, and minerals. Many management operations depend on the revenues from products sold from commercial operations on these lands. Major users of some forest products will only purchase products from lands that are certified as practicing sustainable forest management under a third party standard.

On February 11, 2005 Michigan Governor Jennifer Granholm announced that these state forests would be managed under the concepts of sustainable forest certification and that dual third party certification would be sought and obtained by December 31, 2005. To comply with the Governor's announcement, maintain the market for certain forest products, and to continue the tradition of multiple-use management on a sustainable basis, the State of Michigan sought and attained certification of its State Forest System in December 2005 under the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) standards. The expiration date for FSC Certification is December 31, 2010, and for SFI Certification is December 8, 2010.

MDNRE-FMD has 15 forest management units within the State Forest system and additional administrative offices as outlined in Attachment B. Michigan currently intends to maintain dual SFI and FSC certification.

Status of Current Operations Systems

Michigan's current system of management and operational planning includes a computerized forest inventory that is updated annually for approximately one-tenth of the State Forest area. There are two inventory systems in place, an older technology called Operations inventory (OI), and a new technology termed Integrated Forest Monitoring, Assessment and Prescription (IFMAP) system. Operations inventory utilizes older technology and will be phased out and replaced by IFMAP which is an updated GIS-based inventory scheduled to be fully implemented beginning in 2012. The new inventory will provide closer tracking of a wider range of resource variables, treatment activities, and conditions than is currently kept.

Likewise, timber sale treatments are proposed and tracked in a computerized system that is also in the process of being rewritten and updated to improve functionality. Treatments and other management actions tracked in both these systems are proposed, reviewed, and approved in a formal process with formalized policies, procedures, and approvals that involve an increasing

amount of public involvement at various levels from proposal through treatment completion. These efforts are ongoing at this time.

Status of Planning

State forest lands are co-managed by the Forest, Mineral and Fire Management and Wildlife Divisions. Management for these lands is done within 15 Forest Management Units.

The MDNRE uses a 3-tiered planning structure for the management of Michigan's State Forest resources; statewide, regional and unit levels. The Michigan State Forest Management Plan (approved April 10, 2008) and the four Regional State Forest Management Plans (under development) provide landscape-level analyses and direction to assist tactical decisions for management of forest stands and compartments at the unit level. Michigan's State Forests have well-established tactical planning called Compartment Review which is conducted at the Forest Management Unit level and which generates an Annual Plan of Work.

The Annual Plan of Work is derived from the 10-year planning cycle for forest compartments. The Annual plan of work is operationally implemented by Operations Inventory and Compartment Review Procedures, as contained in Forest, Mineral and Fire management Division (FMD) Policy and Procedure 441 dated January 10, 2000. Annual compartment reviews by year of entry are conducted at the Forest Management Unit level, and the aggregate of all forest prescriptions from compartment reviews are contained in the Annual Plan of Work, which represents the tactical level of planning for State Forest operations.

The MDNRE will be developing strategic plans that will address all ownerships in a region (including all DNRE lands – forests, parks and wildlife areas, other public lands, and private lands), which will be known as Ecoregional Resource Plans (ERP). ERP's will provide strategic goals and objectives that will inform Regional State Forest Management Plans. The MDNRE has many other plans that are related to specific program areas, including the Michigan's Wildlife Action Plan, the Michigan Off-Road Vehicle Plan, the Michigan State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, Natural River plans, and others.

Policy & Procedures

Formal policies and procedures exist and are documented in policy manuals for MDNRE-FMD and Wildlife Division, as well as other Natural Resources Commission policies. These are not all maintained in an up-to-date condition, and some gaps likely exist vis-a-vis forest certification standards. The DNRE forest certification internet site has links to DNRE policy and procedure and other information related to this RFP (see "Forest Certification Audits") at: http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153-30301_33360--,00.html

Forest Certification Work Instructions

Work instructions are new or updated Department operational procedures initially developed in 2005 that helped close the forest certification gaps at that time and ensured compliance with all indicators in the forest certification standards. All proposed actions identified in the Department's Forest Certification Action Plan were implemented through 21 work instructions.

Work instruction implementation is an important focus of the MDNRE's management review system, and is an important focus of MDNRE internal audits. The work instructions make forest certification more manageable for Department staff and they are refined as needed in order to maintain conformance with forest certification standards. Current versions of the work instructions can be found on the DNRE internet at: http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153-30301_33360-144865--,00.html

SFIS Audit Process

NSF-ISR initiated the SFI audit process with a series of planning and readiness review phone calls to confirm the scope of the audit, review the SFI Indicators and evidence to be used to assess conformance, verify that Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment (MDNRE) was prepared to proceed to the SFIS Certification Audit, and to prepare a detailed audit plan including field site selections. NSF's five-person audit team then conducted the SFIS Re-Certification Audit of conformance to the SFI Standard. A report was prepared and the decision regarding certification was made by an independent NSF Certification Board Member.

The audit was governed by a detailed audit plan designed to enable the audit team to efficiently determine conformance with the applicable SFI requirements. The plan provided for the assembly and review of audit evidence consisting of documents, interviews, and on-site inspections of ongoing or completed forest practices.

During the audit NSF-ISR reviewed a sample of the written documentation assembled to provide objective evidence of SFIS Conformance. NSF-ISR also selected field sites for inspection based upon the risk of environmental impact, likelihood of occurrence, special features, and other criteria outlined in the NSF-ISR SFI-SOP. Field inspections were made within 6 of the 15 Forest Management Units as follows: Gladwin, Grayling, Gaylord, Newberry, Shingleton, and Escanaba. NSF-ISR also selected and interviewed stakeholders such as contract loggers, landowners and other interested parties, and interviewed employees within the organization to confirm that the SFI Standard was understood and actively implemented.

The possible findings of the audit included Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, Opportunities for Improvement, and Practices that exceeded the Basic Requirements of the SFIS.

Overview of Audit Findings

MDNRE's SFI Program was found to be in conformance with the SFIS Standard. NSF-ISR determined that there were three minor non-conformances:

- **Minor Non-Conformance SFI-2010-1**
Stand-level retention does not consistently meet the written guidelines.
SFI Indicator 4.1.4: "Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate best scientific information, to retain stand-level wildlife habitat elements such as snags, stumps, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees and nest trees."
- **Minor Non-Conformance SFI-2010-2**
Field foresters and biologists have not been made aware of information regarding climate change impacts, including information known to specialists.
SFI Indicator 15.3.2: "Program Participants are knowledgeable about climate change impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitats and conservation of biological diversity through international, national, regional or local programs."
- **Minor Non-Conformance SFI-2010-3**
Understanding of the Within-Stand Retention Guidelines and the accurate use of

silviculture terminology are areas where training is not consistently sufficient to roles and responsibilities of land managers.

SFI Indicator 16.1.3: “Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.”

Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment has developed plans to address these issues. Progress in implementing these corrective action plans will be reviewed in subsequent surveillance audits.

Eleven opportunities for improvement were also identified, and included:

- There is an opportunity to improve documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan in a manner appropriate to document future activities”.
SFI Indicator 1.1.2 requires “Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan in a manner appropriate to document past and future activities.”
- There is an opportunity to improve routine road maintenance.
SFI Indicator 2.3.3 requires “Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.”
- There is an opportunity to improve efforts to update the silviculture guidance documents.
SFI Indicator 2.3.5 requires “Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with scientific silvicultural standards for the area.
SFI Indicator 2.4.2 requires “Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.
- There is an opportunity to improve road planning efforts.
SFI Indicator 2.3.7 requires “Road construction and skidding layout to minimize impacts to soil productivity and water quality.
- There is an opportunity to improve tactical (compartment) landscape-scale biodiversity planning (i.e. forest cover types, age or size classes, and habitats), by including an analysis of trends and conditions at the Management Area scale to supplement analysis currently provided for each compartment, for the “ aggregated same year-of-entry compartments”, and at the Forest Management Unit scale.
SFI Indicator 4.1.5 requires “Program for assessment, conducted either individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types, age or size classes, and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and take into account findings in planning and management activities.
- There is an opportunity to improve the approach to prevention of invasive plant species.
SFI Indicator 4.1.7 requires “Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities.
- There is an opportunity to improve aesthetic considerations on lands adjacent to homes and cabins.
SFI Indicator 5.1.2 requires “Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.
- There is an opportunity to improve the program to monitor information generated from regional climate models on long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.

SFI Indicator 15.3.1 requires “Where available, monitor information generated from regional climate models on long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.

- There is an opportunity to improve support for logger training.
SFI Performance Measure 16.2 requires “Program Participants shall work individually and/or with SFI Implementation Committees, logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.
- There is an opportunity to improve the Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment to identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites.
SFI Indicator 18.2.1 requires “Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to: b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites.
- There is an opportunity to improve protection of regeneration from adverse effects of deer on natural regeneration.
SFI Indicator 2.1.3 requires “Clear criteria to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct understocked areas and achieve acceptable species composition and stocking rates for both planting and natural regeneration.”

These findings do not indicate a current deficiency, but served to alert Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment to areas that could be strengthened or which could merit future attention.

NSF-ISR also identified the following areas where forestry practices and operations on MDNRE’s lands exceed the basic requirements of the SFI Standard:

- The program to protect threatened and endangered species exceeds the requirements.
SFI Indicator 4.1.2 “Program to protect threatened and endangered species.”
- Public recreation opportunities are high-quality, diverse, and widely available.
SFI Indicator 5.4.1: “Provide recreational opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.”
- Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment has a Forest Certification Action Team, an active working group drawn from across the Michigan DNRE with assignments for all SFI Performance Measures and Indicators, and a dedicated Forest Certification Specialist.
SFI Indicator 16.1.2 “Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives.”
- Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment’s program of certification-related management review is exemplary.
SFI Indicator 20.1: “Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.”

The audit team commends the Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment for these exemplary practices, and for the fine work done throughout the organization to ensure that the lands under its stewardship are sustainably managed.

Follow-up or Surveillance Audits are required by the 2010-2014 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ®. The initial Surveillance Audit is scheduled for October, 2011.



General Description of Evidence of Conformity

NSF's audit team used a variety of evidence to determine conformance. A general description of this evidence is provided below, organized by SFI Objective.

Objective 1. Forest Management Planning - To broaden the implementation of sustainable forestry by ensuring long-term forest productivity and yield based on the use of the best scientific information available.

Summary of Evidence – The Michigan State Forest Plan, Compartment Plans for all compartments visited, the state's Wildlife Division Strategic Plan, many other plans supporting particular species, species groups, issues or sites, and the associated inventory data and growth models were sufficient to determine conformance with the requirements of Objective 1.

Objective 2. Forest Productivity - To ensure long-term forest productivity, carbon storage and conservation of forest resources through prompt reforestation, soil conservation, afforestation and other measures.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations and associated records were used to confirm practices. Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment has programs for reforestation, for protection against wildfire and against many insects and diseases including Emerald Ash Borer, Beech Bark Disease, Gypsy Moth, and for careful management of activities which could potentially impact soil and long-term productivity.

Objective 3. Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources - To protect water quality in streams, lakes and other water bodies.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations of a range of sites were the key evidence. Auditors inspected portions of many field sites that were closest to water resources.

Objective 4. Conservation of Biological Diversity including Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value To manage the quality and distribution of wildlife habitats and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by developing and implementing stand- and landscape-level measures that promote habitat diversity and the conservation of forest plants and animals, including aquatic species.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations, written plans and policies including work to recover the Kirtland's Warbler, use of college-trained field biologists, availability of specialists, and regular staff involvement in conferences and workshops that cover scientific advances were the evidence used to assess the requirements involved biodiversity conservation.

Objective 5. Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits - To manage the visual impact of forest operations and provide recreational opportunities for the public.

Summary of Evidence – Field observations of completed operations and policies/procedures for visual quality were assessed during the evaluation. Additionally, maps and brochures for recreation sites, combined with field visits, helped confirm a strong recreation program.

Objective 6. Protection of Special Sites - To manage lands that are ecologically, geologically, or culturally important in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities.

Summary of Evidence – Foresters use data from the Michigan Natural Features Inventory and consult with the Office of the State Archeologist as part of the program to protect special sites. Field observations of completed operations, records of special sites, training records, and written protection plans were all assessed during the evaluation.

Objective 7. Efficient Use of Forest Resources - To promote the efficient use of forest resources.

Summary of Evidence –Field observations of completed operations which showed good utilization of harvested trees, contract clauses, and discussions with supervising field foresters and with loggers provided the key evidence.

Objective 14. Legal and Regulatory Compliance -

Compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state and local laws and regulations.

Summary of Evidence – Field reviews of ongoing and completed operations were the most critical evidence. A review of regulatory compliance did not reveal challenges in this area.

Objective 15. Forestry Research, Science, and Technology - To support forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sustainable forest management decisions are based.

Summary of Evidence – Support for research as confirmed by review of records of research and by contacting selected recipients of research support.

Objective 16. Training and Education -To improve the implementation of sustainable forestry practices through appropriate training and education programs.

Summary of Evidence – Training records of selected personnel, records associated with harvest sites audited, and logger interviews were the key evidence for this objective.

Objective 17. Community Involvement in the Practice of Sustainable Forestry -

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging the public and forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry, and publicly report progress.

Summary of Evidence – Interviews with staff showed strong involvement with local groups and regular opportunities to work with youth groups and others in the community. Mailing lists, agendas for meetings, and selected summaries of comments were sufficient to assess the requirements.

Objective 18: Public Land Management Responsibilities -

To support and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

Summary of Evidence – Interviews with MDNRE staff and with stakeholders, as well as review of correspondence were used to confirm the requirements.

Objective 19. Communications and Public Reporting - To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by documenting progress and opportunities for improvement.

Summary of Evidence – Reports filed with SFI Inc. and the SFI Inc. website provided the key evidence.

Objective 20. Management Review and Continual Improvement - To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry, and to monitor, measure, and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

Summary of Evidence – Records of program reviews including formal internal audits, agendas and notes from management review meetings, and interviews with personnel from all involved levels in the organization were assessed to determine strong performance regarding management review.



Relevance of Forestry Certification

Third-party certification provides assurance that forests are being managed under the principles of sustainable forestry, which are described in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard as:

1. Sustainable Forestry

To practice sustainable forestry to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by practicing a land stewardship ethic that integrates reforestation and the managing, growing, nurturing and harvesting of trees for useful products and ecosystem services such as the conservation of soil, air and water quality, carbon, biological diversity, wildlife and aquatic habitats, recreation, and aesthetics.

2. Forest Productivity and Health

To provide for regeneration after harvest and maintain the productive capacity of the forest land base, and to protect and maintain long-term forest and soil productivity. In addition, to protect forests from economically or environmentally undesirable levels of wildfire, pests, diseases, invasive exotic plants and animals and other damaging agents and thus maintain and improve long-term forest health and productivity.

3. Protection of Water Resources

To protect water bodies and riparian zones, and to conform with best management practices to protect water quality.

4. Protection of Biological Diversity

To manage forests in ways that protect and promote biological diversity, including animal and plant species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types.

5. Aesthetics and Recreation

To manage the visual impacts of forest operations, and to provide recreational opportunities for the public.

6. Protection of Special Sites

To manage forests and lands of special significance (ecologically, geologically or culturally important) in a manner that protects their integrity and takes into account their unique qualities.

7. Responsible Fiber Sourcing Practices in North America (where applicable)

To use and promote among other forest landowners sustainable forestry practices that are both scientifically credible and economically, environmentally and socially responsible.

8. Avoidance of Controversial Sources including Illegal Logging in Offshore Fiber Sourcing (where applicable)

To avoid wood fiber from illegally logged forests when procuring fiber outside of North America, and to avoid sourcing fiber from countries without effective social laws.

9. Legal Compliance

To comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws, statutes, and regulations.

10. Research

To support advances in sustainable forest management through forestry research, science and technology.

11. Training and Education

To improve the practice of sustainable forestry through training and education programs.

12. Public Involvement

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry on public lands through community involvement.

13. Transparency

To broaden the understanding of forest certification to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard by documenting certification audits and making the findings publicly available.

14. Continual Improvement

To continually improve the practice of forest management, and to monitor, measure and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

Source: Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2010-2014 Edition

END OF PUBLIC REPORT

**Other Required Information**

Note: The remaining portions of this report are not part of the Summary Report required by SFI, Inc. and thus may be kept confidential at the discretion of the SFI Program Participant.

Audit Team

The audit team is fully qualified to conduct the SFI Certification Audit, with an understanding of the forest industry, certification requirements of the SFI Standard, and of sustainable forestry practices within your region. Qualifications of audit team members were described in the Audit Proposal. The audit team for the certification audit was:

- Mike Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor
- Dr. Robert J. Hrubes, FSC Lead Auditor

- Kathryn Fernholz, Lead Report Author
- Paul Pingrey, Forester
- Dr. David Capen, Biologist

Confidentiality

NSF requires all auditors to adhere to strict agreements regarding confidentiality and prohibiting consulting during audits. A copy of this agreement is available from NSF on request.

Scope of Audit

The scope statement to appear on the certificate is as follows:

Land management on 3.9 million acres of Michigan State Forests and related sustainable forestry activities under the SFI 2010-2014 Standard. Exclusions: Long-term military lease lands, lands leased to Luce County, and Wildlife Areas that do not go through the compartment review process are not included in the scope of the certificate. The SFI Certificate Number is NSF-SFIS-5Y031.

NSF-ISR SFI Audit Process and Reporting

The NSF-ISR Audit Report consists of all documents used in the audit process, including the Readiness Review, the Tentative Audit Plan, and the Re-Certification Audit documents. The findings of the Readiness Review Report including the Document Review were provided previously.

The NSF-ISR SFI Certification Audit was governed by a detailed Audit Plan that was prepared specifically for your SFI Audit. The Audit Plan, included here as Section A, was focused on helping the audit team determine whether there were any deficiencies and inconsistencies between your SFI Program and the SFIS requirements that apply to your organization.

As described in the Audit Plan the objective of the audit was to assess conformance of your SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2010-2014 Edition. The possible findings of the audit included Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, Opportunities for Improvement, and Practices that exceeded the Basic Requirements of the SFIS. The detailed spreadsheets addressing the above findings are contained in the SFI Certification Audit Matrix (Section B). Any non-conformances were fully documented and reported using the NSF-ISR Corrective Action Request process. Your organization can access these through the NSF On-line system.

NSF-ISR also identified a number of forest practices and operations that exceed the basic requirements of the SFI Standard. These practices are documented in the SFI Certification Audit Matrix and summarized in the Public Report section. Your organization is to be commended for performance above and beyond the basic requirements of the SFIS in the areas specified.

Completion of Certification Process

This complete Final Report is the sole property of your organization and will be treated with the utmost confidentiality and privacy. The report is intended for use by your organization in

understanding your conformance with the SFI Standard and for purposes of improving your SFI Program. NSF may provide copies of the report to audit team members.

The Public Audit Report section provides a summary of the audit results intended for public disclosure. If necessary, NSF's SFI Program Manager can work with your designee to modify the summary, consistent with SFI requirements, to meet your needs. The Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard requires the following:

A Certified Program Participant shall provide a report to the SFI Inc. not less than two weeks after the successful completion of certification, recertification, or surveillance audit to the 2010-2014 SFI Standard. The public report will be posted on the SFI Inc. website and available for public review.

The Lead Auditor may, at your direction, provide a copy of the final SFI Public Report to SFI, Inc. NSF must also provide the SFI Reporting Form (Section C) to SFI, Inc.; the data from the form are posted on various certification-tracking websites.

You are responsible for informing NSF immediately regarding any change to your program or ownership that would affect the accuracy of the certificate. NSF will work with you to accommodate these changes.

NSF-ISR will issue a formal Certificate of Conformance to the SFI Standard to your organization. The Certificate includes the NSF-ISR Logo, your organization's name, the standard certified to, the date of the certification, and signatures of responsible authorities.

Follow-up or Surveillance Audits are required by the 2010-2014 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ®. The Surveillance Audits can be conducted in the continuous or standard format. The initial Surveillance Audit is scheduled for mid-October 2011. The assigned lead auditor will contact you 2 months prior to this date to reconfirm and begin preparations.

Certification Report Sections:

Section A	Audit Plan
Section B	SFI Certification Audit Matrix
Section B-1	SFI Certification Audit Matrix
Section B-2	Participants
Section C	SFI Reporting Form



Section A Audit Plan

Note: A “Preliminary Audit Plan” was provided in the April 27, 2010 certification proposal from NSF (and SCS). The following are excerpts, with additional and/or revised items included that were provided or developed prior to the audit.



Dennis Nezich, Forest Certification Specialist
 Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Forest, Mineral, and Fire Management Division
 1990 US-41 South, Marquette, MI 49855

Dear Mr. Nezich:

We are scheduled to conduct the Re-Certification Audit for the Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment Monday Oct. 18 to Monday October 25 as listed in the agendas below:

Auditor Schedule - A one-week audit, to occur the third full week of October as follows:

October 17 (Sunday)	Auditors Travel & Audit Team Meeting
Oct. 18 (Monday)	Lansing presentations/interviews, Stakeholder Meeting
Oct. 19-22 (Tuesday-Friday)	Field Audits, possible 2 nd public Meeting
Oct. 22-23 (Fri.pm-Saturday)	Audit Team Meets for Analysis and Scoring
October 24 (Sunday)	Audit Team Leaders work on findings/closing
October 25 (Monday)	Closing Briefing and Leaders Travel Home
October 26-29	Audit Teams focus on completing draft reports

Proposed On-Site Assessment Schedule:

DAY	AM	PM/Evening	Notes
<i>Sunday</i>	Audit team travels to Lansing, MI	Audit team meeting	
<i>Monday 18th</i>	Opening meeting in Lansing Overview presentation by DNRE Interviews with managers & specialists	DNRE interviews continue. Lansing Public stakeholder meeting 2 pm to 3:30 pm Depart for field inspections	
<i>Tuesday 19th</i>	FMU Sample 1 (NLP - Gladwin): Full 5-person team interviews FMU staff and OSC/District Staff Office Meeting: 8 am – 10 am Field Sites: 10 am-4:30 pm	FMU Sample 1 (continues): Field inspection- Full team visits 3-4 timber sales and other management activities jointly. Closing meeting in field at 4:30 pm	Gladwin FMU Terms A&B work together on first FMU

Wednesday 20th	<p>FMU Sample 2 (Grayling): 2-person Team A Office meeting: 8-9 am Field sites: until 3:30 pm, return to office by 4 pm</p> <p>FMU Sample 3 (Gaylord): 2-person Team B Office meeting: 8-9:30 at Gaylord OSC. Field sites: meet Indian River staff at 10 am, field review until 3:30 pm</p> <p>Stakeholder specialist may work separately</p>	<p>Audit teams work in field until 3:30 pm; then travel to hotel in Newberry in the UP</p> <p>Evening: Team deliberations</p>	<p>Note: Roscommon Compartment Review is this day so some Gaylord Supervisors may not be available to participate in audit.</p> <p>LED Division wide training occurs this day so COs will not participate</p> <p>Grayling FMU – Team A Gaylord FMU – Team B</p>
Thursday 21st	<p>FMU Sample 4 (Newberry): 2-person Team A Office meeting: 8 – 10 am Field Sites: 10 am – 3:00 pm</p> <p>FMU Sample 5 (Shingleton): 2-person Team B Office meeting: 8 – 9 am Field Sites: 9 am – 4 pm</p> <p>Stakeholder specialist may work separately</p>	<p>Audit team A in field until 3:00 pm; back in office by 3:30 pm; then prepare for stakeholder and CAC meetings.</p> <p>Audit team B will work in field until 4 am; closing comments and last field site. Depart for Escanaba for team deliberations in evening.</p>	<p>Newberry FMU – Team A Shingleton FMU – Team B</p> <p>A separate public meeting is scheduled for 4:30 – 5:45 pm in Newberry.</p> <p>Auditors will attend the E UP CAC meeting and have 15 minutes on the CAC meeting agenda.</p>
Friday 22nd	<p>FMU Sample 6 (Escanaba): Full Team Office Meeting: 8- 8:45 am Field sites until 3 pm</p>	<p>Afternoon and Evening: Synthesis and overall deliberations begin</p>	<p>Escanaba FMU – Teams A&B work together. Auditors will stay overnight in Escanaba</p>
Saturday	<p>Synthesis/Decision making continues</p>	<p>Synthesis/Decision making continues</p> <p>Evening: Most auditors (not Ferrucci and Capen) travel home</p>	<p>Auditors will work at Escanaba (5) during day.</p> <p>Robert Hrubes will depart late Saturday as will Paul Pingrey and Kathryn Fernholz</p> <p>Mike Ferrucci and David Capen will stay overnight in Esc.</p>
Sunday	<p>AM: Off</p>	<p>Lead Auditors prepare for exit meeting and presentation of results; begin work on audit reports</p>	<p>Mike and David will stay overnight in Marquette.</p>
Monday	<p>AM: Exit meeting and presentation of results by Ferrucci and Capen</p>	<p>Ferrucci and Capen travel home</p>	<p>Closing meeting at Marquette OSC 8:15 am to 9:30 am (face-to-face plus teleconference)</p>

RECERTIFICATION AUDIT OPENING SESSION

DRAFT AGENDA for Monday, October 18 (Revised 9-30-10)

General Information:

DNRE staff presentations and general discussion will occur 8AM to 9:45 AM in the Director's Conference Room on the 6th floor. A brief review of evidence submitted to clear the FSC and SFI CARs will occur between 10 and 11 AM in the Director's Conference Room. Small breakout sessions and staff interviews will be conducted between 11 AM and 2 PM utilizing conference rooms on the 7th floor along with the Director's conference room.

A public meeting is scheduled to begin at 2 PM. DNRE staff will not attend this session. The public meeting is expected to last roughly 90 minutes. This meeting will be held in the Director's conference room if fewer than 30 people attend. If a larger group attends, the meeting will be moved to the 1921 Department of Conservation room on the 7th floor.

Auditors tentatively plan to depart for the Northern Lower Peninsula sometime between 4 and 5 PM.

Staff Presentations 8 AM to 9:45 AM, Director's Conference Rm. 6th floor, Mason Bldg:

5 min	Welcome and introductions.	Lynne Boyd
20 min 8:05-8:25	Auditor introductions and review of auditing protocols	SFI lead auditor Mike Ferrucci & FSC lead auditor Robert Hrubec
30 min 8:25-8:55	Overview of DNRE, evolution of change, merger and re-organization, brief overview of planning initiatives for new audit team members.	Lynne Boyd assisted by Mindy Koch, Frank Ruswick, Doug Reeves, Kelley Smith, Gary Hagler, Bill Creal, Ron Olson
30 min 8:55-9:25	More detailed overview of planning effort within context of the CARs (RSFMP, BSA program). Explain evolution of planning initiatives.	David Price assisted by Larry Pedersen
20 min 9:25-9:45	Explain OI / IFMAP and compartment review process and how treatment prescriptions are made and implemented.	Bill Sterrett assisted by Larry Pedersen
Break	15 Minute Break at 9:45 AM	

Staff Presentations continued 10:00 AM to 11 AM, Director's Conference Rm.

Evidence re: FSC CAR 1 (15 min) 10-10:15	DNR must develop and implement field level and planning level guidance as to what land use activities are considered acceptable within designated Biodiversity Stewardship Areas; that is, activities that are deemed compatible with the underlying biodiversity conservation objectives.	Lynne Boyd
Evidence re: SFI CAR 1 (15 min) 10:15-10:30	There is a need to make more tangible progress on developing consensus strategic management direction for each of the management areas that comprise the core of the Regional State Forest Management Plans.	David Price, assisted by Larry Pedersen
Evidence re: SFI CAR 2 & FSC CAR 2 (10 min) 10:30-10:40	SFI: BMPs or standards for ORV Routes that ensure environmental protections (while offering the desired recreational experience) have been developed for Drummond Island but are not in place for the rest of the state forests. FSC: Written assurance, endorsed by the FMFM Chief, must be provided to SCS that, in the future event DNR were to provide motorized recreational use opportunities, such as those found on Drummond Island, elsewhere within the State Forest system, that the standards established for Drummond Island (in response to CAR 2008.2) would apply.	Jim Radabaugh

Evidence re: FSC CAR 3 (5 min) 10:40-10:45	DNR must rectify the non-conformance with FSC Criterion 6.8 by either ceasing use of GMO plant materials on all lands “within scope” or take actions that will excise those lands on which GMOs are used from within the scope of their FSC certification. In selecting which option to pursue, DNR personnel should consult with personnel from the Wisconsin and Minnesota Departments of Natural Resources as this same issue as previously arisen in those states.	Penney Melchoir
Discussion FSC REC 1 (5 min) 10:45-10:50	DNR should conduct an analysis to determine if the within-stand retention policy is fully compatible with (insures compliance with) the draft Michigan Wood Biomass Retention Guidelines.	Cara Boucher, assisted by FRM Section
Discussion SFI OFI 1 (5 min) 10:50-10:55	There is an opportunity to improve the system to distribute information within the organization regarding informal silvicultural trials and other “adaptive management” approaches.	Cara Boucher will determine approach
Discussion SFI OFI 2 (5 min) 10:55-11:00	There is an opportunity to improve the application of stand level retention by more commonly considering leaving large, decadent aspen and/or large spruce.	Cara Boucher will determine approach
End	End CAR review at approximately 11 AM	

Small break out Q&A sessions 11:00 PM to 1:30 or 2 PM

Hrubes and Fernholz 11am–12:30 pm	Forestry Leadership – Stakeholder issues, budget, other	Directors Conf Room, 6 th floor	Lynne Boyd, Cara Boucher, Bill O’Neill, Tom Wellman, Jim Radabaugh, Scott Heather, Naomi Krefman
Hrubes and Fernholz 1-1:30 pm	Tribal issues	Directors Conf Room, 6 th floor	Dennis Knapp, Dennis Nezich (FMD), Capt. Dan Hopkins (LED), Pat Lederle (WLD), Nick Popoff (FD)
Capen 11am-12:30 pm	Wildlife Issues	Apple Blossom Room, 7 th floor	Doug Reeves, Penney Melchoir, plus others ID’ed by Penney and Doug
Capen 1-2 pm	Heritage database, GIS system	Apple Blossom Room, 7 th floor	Lisa Dygert, Mike Donovan, Brian Maki, Bill O’Neill, Cara Boucher
Ferrucci and Pingrey 11-Noon	Forest Health, Forest Nursery, & Tree Improvement	Petoskey Stone Room, 7 th floor	William Sterrett, Ron Murray, Richard Mergener (telephone), Robert Heyd, Roger Mech, Dave Neumann
Ferrucci and Pingrey 12:30-130 pm	Forest Markets and Utilization	Petoskey Stone Room, 7 th floor	William Sterrett, Larry Pedersen, Anthony Weatherspoon, Doug Heym
Ferrucci and Pingrey 1:30-2 pm	SFI Implementation Committee	Petoskey Stone Room, 7 th floor	Dennis Nezich, Cara Boucher

FSC and SFI Recertification Protocols

Preparatory Communications and Document Review

The audit team leaders will initiate telephone dialogue with pertinent MDNRE personnel for purposes of the following:

- Identifying and obtaining relevant documentation pertaining to forest properties and MDNRE's management of the respective programs;
- Identifying key stakeholders to contact;
- Identifying key MDNRE (and related agency) field personnel to interview;
- To begin desk review of pertinent documents, including Michigan Statutes, Administrative Code, and Operational Handbooks, among others.

As described earlier, the SCS/NSF-ISR audit team already has considerable in-depth knowledge of the suite of MDNRE documents that address the certification standards' requirements. This familiarity will help ensure that MDNRE's collection of documents will be correctly credited as evidence of conformance with the FSC and SFI standards, where such credit is appropriate.

Audit Planning Meeting

An initial teleconference meeting will be held to present the goals and methods of the audit protocols, introduce key participants, and to develop the audit plan. A major objective of audit planning is to identify the field sample, starting with the selection of Forest Management Units (FMU) to visit during the audit. These are selected by a combination of random and directed selection (random selections are modified to ensure reasonable audit travel times).

Within each selected FMU similar random and directed site selections will be made. The MDNRE will be asked to provide, for each selected FMU, lists of potential sites for review. Those lands with significant timber management, vegetation treatment sites (harvest or cultural treatments) provide a logical sampling framework. On these properties, starting from a full list of such treatment sites a sample provides the backbone of an audit "tour"; nearby sites will be added illustrating as full a range of other management activities as time allows.

Examples of management practices that will be focused on include:

- Regeneration timber harvests
- Commercial and Pre-commercial thinning operations
- Conservation Areas
- Wildlife Management Areas
- Stand establishment
- Public use management
- Landscape planning
- Watercourse Management Zone protection strategies
- Cultural resource identification and protection strategies
- Recreation facility (e.g., trails, campgrounds) development and maintenance

Collection, Synthesis, and Analysis of Information

The next phase of the recertification evaluation is to gather information that will enable the audit

team to arrive at judgments as to the extent to which the condition and management of Michigan State Forests comply with the standards of certification. This is accomplished through: interviews with MDNRE personnel, review of pertinent documents, and sample-based field inspections. (Note: Our auditors will require personal protective safety equipment while in the field, consistent with MDNRE requirements for your employees and contractors. At minimum hard hats will be worn at all active logging sites.)

SCS/NSF-ISR existing in-depth understanding of how the state forests are managed will ensure that the team triages to allow for more time on complicated and deserving issues. Furthermore, the team's familiarity will minimize the amount of time that MDNRE staff need to spend explaining basic aspects of their programs and presenting conformance evidence on requirements where SCS/NSF-ISR understand non-conformance to be of low risk (e.g., payment of fees).

Our auditors are skilled at drawing out information from field audit participants. General questions are asked, with follow-up detailed questions. Questions are directed at key staff who we believe should know how to respond; when they can't answer, the question is redirected to a higher-level person. Some people can freeze when asked a question in a large group; our auditors know how to identify this issue and will find a way to get the information in a less-stressful environment if possible. Daily orientation and exit briefing sessions are opportunities to lower the anxiety level, ensure that the audit proceeds in a professional and comfortable manner, and in the exit briefings allows issues to be readdressed if more time was needed to gather complete information or if MDNRE responders feel that they did not fully and clearly express their knowledge and experience.

Also, prior to and during the field assessments, per FSC protocols, one or more members of the team will consult with a range of pertinent stakeholders (e.g., government representatives, contractors, environmental and conservation non-governmental organizations, recreation user groups, trade association representatives) to obtain input on how these individuals/groups view DNR's management of the MDNRE State Forest. The majority of the stakeholder consultation will be conducted prior to the assessment. Katie Fernholz will lead the stakeholder consultation efforts. Stakeholder input will be gathered through mail solicitation, phone interviews, and face-to-face meetings. On the evening of the first day of the MDNRE forestlands assessment, SCS/NSF-ISR will hold a public meeting in Lansing (location to-be-determined).

To efficiently complete this work task, requirements placed upon MDNRE are to:

- Provide SCS/NSF-ISR with pertinent documentation and data that describes the forest resource and the management programs that are implemented on the land;
- Make available to the assessment team pertinent MDNRE management, planning and field personnel;
- Provide to SCS/NSF-ISR the names and contact information of pertinent stakeholders, including recreational user groups, environmental groups, trade groups, contractors and suppliers;
- Dedicate sufficient personnel and resources to independently develop any management system components that are currently lacking.

Synthesis and Conformity Findings

Under the FSC process, after document review, field inspections, and stakeholder consultations, the audit team sequesters to translate the team's judgments into conformance decisions for each of the criteria that constitute the evaluation standard. Conformance decisions are reached through a consensus process amongst all members of the evaluation team. SCS/NSF-ISR have found consensus decision making to be the most effective method of translating each team member's observations into a decision as to whether or not there is conformance with a given FSC criterion. Although corrective action requests (CARs) do not stipulate a specific approach with detailed steps, as that would constitute consultative services, they are specific enough for the landowner to take the necessary actions to comply with the deficiency. Both SCS and NSF-ISR are committed to and have a track record of working with all certificate holders to ensure that issued CARs are achievable, while credibly addressing the non-conformance. It is not in the interest of either the FSC or SFI programs to issue CARs to a certificate holder that are simply not feasible because of unrealistic timelines or requirements.

In addition to CARs, the team may offer Observations. These are suggested actions that help the forest managers to move even further toward exemplary status. Actions on the recommendations are voluntary and do not affect the award or maintenance of the certificate.

The SFI process involves review of the management systems and their implementation to determine conformance to all of the relevant SFI Performance Measures and Indicators. The auditors inform the Michigan DNR's designated representative immediately if a non-conformance is likely or being considered. This allows MDNRE to bring additional information for consideration or to clarify any misunderstanding.

Certification Decision and Reporting

Under FSC, the decision as to whether recertification can be awarded is based on the overall conformance with each Criterion. Major CARs are issued for Criterion-level non-conformances and minor CARs are issued for Indicator level non-conformances. FSC recertification will be awarded if there are no Major CARs issued during the recertification or any Major CARs that are issued are sufficiently addressed prior to the expiration dates for the certificates. SFI Recertification can be awarded immediately if there are no Major Non-conformances and if the program has developed Corrective Action Plans for any Minor Non-conformances. Major Non-conformances must be closed quickly to allow continuing certification.

The results of the recertification audit and overall certification decisions will be preliminarily communicated to MDNRE in a joint closing meeting on the final day of the on-site audit. At the closing meeting the SFI non-conformances will be provided and the status of audited program with respect to SFI Certification will be presented. FSC CARs will be discussed but are not likely to be finalized during the closing meeting. Instead, they will be conveyed along with the draft report within one week of the exit meeting. After departing from the project site, the audit team will then prepare certification evaluation reports that present the team's findings, recommendations and FSC CARs in final form. The justification for any stipulated CARs will be detailed in the assessment report.

Audit Team

The audit team for the certification audit included the following:

Dr. Robert J. Hrubes, Lead Auditor
Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor
Kathryn Fernholz, Lead Report Author
Paul Pingrey, Forester
Dr. David Capen, Biologist

This audit team has considerable experience auditing the Michigan State Forests; three of the team members conducted the original certification assessment, and the two leaders have conducted every annual audit since. Dr. Hrubes and Mr. Ferrucci possess a solid understanding of DNRE operational procedures and policies, having led all FSC and SFI scoping, full, and surveillance evaluations of the Michigan State Forests during the first five-year certification period. Short bios are provided here; full resumes are provided in the Appendix.

Michael Ferrucci

Proposed Role: SFI Lead Auditor

Mike Ferrucci has over 30 years of experience in the forestry industry with expertise ranging from sustainable forest management planning and certification to the application of easements for large-scale working forests. He also holds expertise in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests. Mr. Ferrucci co-founded The Conservation Forestry Network, which focuses on the conservation of forest biodiversity at multiple levels.

Ferrucci has conducted audits of forest management operations throughout the United States and abroad, with field experience in 4 countries and 30 U.S. states, including 7 field audits of the Michigan State Forest System. He has worked with the Northern Forest Protection Fund and is a member of the Society of American Foresters. Ferrucci currently serves as Past Chair of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) Auditor's Forum.

Ferrucci has conducted Chain of Custody audits for all segments of the forest products industry, including printers, corrugated and box producers, integrated paper companies, paper distributors, solid wood mills, engineered wood products facilities, brokers, and distributors. This includes addressing issues involving recycled content.

Ferrucci currently serves as SFI Program Manager for NSF International Strategic Registrations (NSF-ISR) where he is responsible for all aspects of the SFI Certification program. He is qualified as a Lead Auditor to conduct Chain of Custody, Procurement System or Sustainable Forest Management audits under the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard® (SFI), the Forest Stewardship Program (FSC), and the Tree Farm Group Certification programs. Ferrucci is also credentialed as a Lead Auditor under RAB-QSA (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems) and is a Greenhouse Gas Lead Auditor.

Robert J. Hrubes, Ph.D.

Proposed Role: FSC Lead Auditor

Dr. Hrubes is a California registered professional forester (#2228) and forest economist with over 30 years of professional experience in both public and public forest management issues. He is presently Senior Vice-President of Scientific Certification Systems. In addition to serving as team leader for the Michigan State Forest evaluation, Dr. Hrubes worked in collaboration with other SCS personnel to develop the programmatic protocol that guides all SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluations. Dr. Hrubes has previously led numerous SCS Forest Conservation Program evaluations of North American public forests, industrial forest ownerships and non-industrial forests, as well as operations in Scandinavia, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Australia and New Zealand. Dr. Hrubes holds graduate degrees in forest economics, economics and resource systems management from the University of California-Berkeley and the University of Michigan. His professional forestry degree (B.S.F. with double major in Outdoor Recreation) was awarded from Iowa State University. He was employed for 14 years, in a variety of positions ranging from research forester to operations research analyst to planning team leader, by the USDA Forest Service. Upon leaving federal service, he entered private consulting from 1988 to 2000. He has been Senior V.P. at SCS since February, 2000.

Kathryn Fernholz

Proposed Role: Audit Team Member, Social Science, Forestry Specialist

Kathryn is Executive Director of Dovetail Partners, Inc. and a trained forester. Kathryn has worked on development and forest management issues in a range of roles. With a consulting firm, Kathryn was a member of the environmental services department where her work included natural resource inventories, comprehensive planning, environmental impact assessments and the use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS). While working for the Community Forestry Resource Center, Kathryn developed and managed a group certification project for family forests and worked to increase local capacity to provide forest management and marketing services that are compatible with certification standards. Kathryn has been a leader within the forestry community in the Upper Midwest through her service as Chair of the Minnesota Society of American Foresters and her appointment to the Minnesota Forest Resources Council. Kathryn served as a member of the Advisory Board for the Blandin Foundation's Vital Forests/Vital Communities Initiative, and currently serves on the Minnesota DNR's Stewardship Committee and the Forests for the Future Committee. She is a member of the Board of Directors for the Minnesota Environmental Partnership, the Forest Guild, and the College of Food, Agricultural and Natural Resource Sciences Alumni Society. Kathryn has a B.S. in Forest Resources from the University of Minnesota, College of Natural Resources and also studied at the College of Saint Benedict in St. Joseph, MN and Sheldon Jackson College in Sitka, Alaska. Kathryn is an experienced forest certification lead auditor having audited public, tribal, industrial and small and large scale non-industrial forestlands throughout the eastern United States.

Paul Pingrey

Proposed Role: Audit Team Member, Forestry

Paul Pingrey is a forester with extensive experience in sustainable resource certification, public land management and family woodland management. He is currently self-employed as a

consulting forest policy analyst and works as an auditor for Scientific Certification Systems and NSF-International. Pingrey retired from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources in December 2009 after more than 35 years of service. Most recently, he served in Division of Forestry administrative positions as the DNR Forest Certification Coordinator, Private Forestry Specialist and the Wisconsin Forest Tax Law Supervisor. From 2004 to 2009, Pingrey managed Forest Stewardship Council, Sustainable Forest Initiative, and American Tree Farm System certification for 6 million acres of DNR forestry programs. He was also a certification advisor to the Chequamegon-Nicolet National Forest and a member of the Wisconsin SFI Implementation Committee. In 2008-2009, Pingrey served on national panels that developed the FSC-US Family Forest Standard and revised the American Tree Farm Standard. For 20 years he worked directly with small woodland owners in six southern Wisconsin counties, including eleven years as the Madison Area Forestry Supervisor. His duties also included operation of a state park, management of state wildlife areas, property master planning, environmental impact assessment, and management of the Juneau County Forest. He has served in numerous Wisconsin Society of American Foresters leadership positions and was chair of the National SAF Certification Working Group. Pingrey received a forest management degree from Iowa State University in 1974 and completed U.S. Forest Service Silviculturist Certification in 1988.

Dr. David Capen

**Proposed Roles: Audit Team Member, Wildlife Biology and Ecology;
FSC Report Lead Author**

Dr. David Capen is Research Professor, School of Natural Resources, University of Vermont. He is an expert in Wildlife Habitat Analysis, Avian Ecology, Landscape Ecology, Biodiversity Analysis, GIS and Remote Sensing, Multivariate Statistics, and Conservation Planning and Reserve Design.

He holds the following degrees:

- University of Tennessee, B.S.F., 1969 (Forestry)
- University of Maine, M.S., 1972 (Wildlife Management)
- Utah State University, Ph.D., 1977 (Wildlife Science)

Dr. Capen has participated in a variety of forest certification projects, including SFI and FSC projects on state lands. He was a team member on the Michigan State Forests for both the scoping audit (2004) and the original certification audit (2005). His other certification projects include the following:

- SFI/FSC Forest Certification, Audit Team, State of Maine
- FSC Forest Certification, Audit Team, State of Massachusetts
- SFI Forest Certification, Audit Team, Harden Furniture, for NSF-ISR
- FSC/SFI Forest Certification, Audit Team, Seven Islands Land Co., Maine
- SFI/FSC Forest Certification, Audit Team, Yale-Meyers Forest, Conn
- FSC Forest Re-certification Audit, Team Leader, Baskahegan Company, Maine
- FSC/SFI Forest Certification, Audit Team, Indiana Division of Forestry



Section B
SFI Certification Audit Matrix

NSF-ISR SFI 2010-2014 MATRIX INCLUDING GUIDANCE FOR TRANSITION REQUIREMENTS

Findings and Instructions:

C	Conformance
Exr	Exceeds the Requirements
Maj	Major Non-conformance
Min	Minor Non-conformance
OFI	Opportunity for Improvement (can also be in Conformance)
NA	Not Applicable
Likely Gap *	Likely GAP Against 2010-2014 SFIS; not used in this report
Likely Conf. *	Likely Conformance With 2010-2014 SFIS; not used in this report
Auditor	Used for audit planning.
10	Date Codes, for example: 10= October 2010
Other	Words in <i>italics</i> are defined in the standard.
	Portions underlined are modified within the 2010-2014 SFI Standard from similar elements of the older version.

Objective 1. Forest Management Planning

To broaden the implementation of *sustainable forestry* by ensuring *long-term forest productivity and yield* based on the use of the *best scientific information* available.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1	Program Participants shall ensure that forest management plans include long-term harvest levels that are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth-and-yield models.	MF	10						
Notes	The State Forest Plan Harvest levels are based on area control; thinning or selection intervals are conservative; rotation lengths are appropriate. Plan Components, Statewide Level are listed on the following 2 pages.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1.1	Forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a. <u>a long-term resources analysis;</u> b. <u>a periodic or ongoing forest inventory;</u> c. <u>a land classification system;</u> d. <u>soils inventory and maps, where available;</u> e. <u>access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities;</u> f. <u>up-to-date maps or a geographic information system;</u> g. <u>recommended sustainable harvest levels for areas available for harvest; and</u> h. <u>a review of non-timber issues.</u>	MF, PP	10						
Notes	<p><u>Closed 2009 Minor Non-conformance:</u> “There is a need to make more tangible progress on developing consensus strategic management direction for each of the management areas that comprise the core of the Regional State Forest Management Plans.”</p> <p><u>2010 Status:</u> Most of the Management Area portions of the Regional State Forest Management Plans have been drafted, discussed by local staff from all three divisions, and are ready for inclusion in the plans.</p> <p>Concern: Management Area Guides, in draft form, are intended to provide landscape context and help connect treatments in each year with the longer-term DFCs. MAs are not being used directly by field staff, but district specialists are occasionally using the management areas to help guide input. Management areas are important because they were designed as an interdisciplinary, landscape-scale component of the Ecoregional State Forest Plan, tied to DFCs etc.</p> <p>The next two pages provide a partial list of documents that comprise the overall management plan, and which comprise the long-term resources analysis required sub-indicator a. Notes for sub-indicators b. through g. are provided after that.</p>								

Summary of Statewide DNR Management Plans for Natural Resource Management in Michigan

Statewide plans are applicable to management in all ecoregions and management units.

* Primary Division - FMD: Forest Management Division WLD: Wildlife Division RD: Recreation Division FD: Fisheries Division

Plan Title	*	Purpose of Plan	Periodicity of Revision	Orig. or Rev.	URL or Location
Michigan State Forest Management Plan	FMD	To provide guidance to Ecoregional Mgt. Plans	Operational components: 5 yrs. Strategic components: every 10 yrs.	2008	http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153--144977--00.html
FMD Annual Plan of Work	FMD	To provide plan of annual forest prescriptions	Annually	2007	http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153-30301_30505_31025-69106--00.html
Wildlife Action Plan	WLD	Provides a strategic framework and set of mgt. tools for the conservation of aquatic and terrestrial species	Initially within 3 yr. then every 10 yrs.	2005	http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153-10370_30909-120235--00.html
Natural Areas Program Strategic Plan	WLD	To provide strategic direction for the management of natural areas	None planned	2000	http://www.michigandnr.com/publications/pdfs/huntingwildlifehabitat/NA_strategy.pdf
Wildlife Division Annual Plan of Work	WLD	Provides direction for individual staff in meeting division programmatic goals	Annually	2005	Electronic DB system for planning, budget, and accomplishment reporting.
Michigan Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) Plan 2008	All DNR	Provides a plan for the ORV recreation upon DNR lands.	None Specified	2008	http://www.michigan.gov/documents/dnr/ORVPlanApproved_234099_7.pdf
2008-2012 Michigan State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan	All DNR	Provides goals to meet needs and opportunities for outdoor recreation.	Every 5 years	2008	http://michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153-10366_37984-176508--00.html
State Park Management Planning	PRD	To provide management objectives and strategic guidance for management of parks and recreation areas.	General Management Plans and Long and Short-Range Action Plans are updated every five years.	See list of local plans	http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153-10365_31399--00.html

Joint Strategic Plan for Management of Great Lakes Fisheries	FD	To provide for Great Lakes consensus based management between 8 states, 1 province, 2 federal governments and 13 Native American Tribes	As needed.	1997	http://www.glfco.org/pubs_out/communi.php
Michigan State Waterways Commission - Strategic Plan	PRD	To provide strategic direction for 2001-2005	The Waterways Strategic Plan revision will be discussed with the Waterways Commission	2001	http://www.michigan.gov/documents/dnr/MSWCStrategicPlanfinal_188610_7.pdf
Strategic Plan for Accessibility	All DNR	To comply with the provisions of the ADA	As required by law.	2004	http://www.michigan.gov/documents/strategic-plan_161405_7.pdf
Wildlife Field Surveys	WLD	Provide an index, estimate or total count of species population numbers	Annually	Follow link	See "Wildlife Division Plans" folder under Certification Audit 2010\Auditor Master CD File\Management Plans and Guidelines
Species Management Plans	WLD	Plans for species recovery, disease management, and nuisance wildlife	Upon change in species status.	Follow link	See "Wildlife Division Plans" folder under Certification Audit 2010\Auditor Master CD File\Management Plans and Guidelines
Lake Sturgeon Rehabilitation Strategy	FD	To conserve and rehabilitate self-sustaining populations of lake sturgeon	Undergoing Revision.	1997	http://www.michigandnr.com/PUBLICATIONS/PDFS/ifr/ifrlibrary/special/reports/18sr.pdf
Management Guidelines	Various	To provide means for achieving statewide, regional and local goals and objectives	As required	Follow link	See "Compendium-GuidanceDocs_163960_7.pdf" under Certification Audit 2010\Auditor Master CD File\Management Plans and Guidelines

Notes:

- 2008: The DNR completed the Michigan State Forest Management Plan. This plan provided a framework upon which the Regional State Forest Management Plans will be based, and superseded and replaced the 1983 Statewide Forest Resources Plan. The DNR began implementation of the Biodiversity Conservation Planning Process with stakeholders. Timelines for the Regional State Forest Management Plans were modified to allow for the completion of the Biodiversity Conservation Planning Process and the integration of Biodiversity Stewardship Areas into the plans.
- 2010: The DNRE completed a Michigan Forest Resource Assessment and Strategy, which is a strategic plan for cooperative forestry programs (Forest Health, Forest Stewardship, Forest Legacy, Urban and Community Forestry, and Wildfire Management).

Source: Evolution Of Michigan DNRE Land Management Planning, David Price, October 18, 2010

<i>1.1.1b</i>	A periodic or ongoing forest inventory: Periodic inventory through compartment process; 10% of forest each year. See indicators below for details.
<i>1.1.1c</i>	A land classification system: Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment has classified the state forest system by origin, legal status or acquisition intent, special management areas or zones of various types, and sensitive areas (visual, wetlands, etc).
<i>1.1.1d</i>	Up-to-date maps or a geographic information system: an excellent GIS is in place and is widely used.
<i>1.1.1e</i>	Soils inventory and maps are found within the GIS
<i>1.1.1f</i>	Access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities: Covered by the planning office in Lansing. Use of area control has caused efforts in growth modeling to be de-emphasized.
<i>1.1.1g</i>	Recommended sustainable harvest levels for areas available for harvest: The State Forest Plan Harvest levels and annual harvest levels are based on area control. Thinning or selection intervals are conservative; rotation lengths are appropriate. The current goal is to treat 53,000 acre per year.

<p>1.1.1h</p>	<p>A review of non-timber issues (e.g. recreation, tourism, pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, bioenergy feedstock production, or biological diversity conservation, or to address climate-induced ecosystem change).</p> <p>Fish and Aquatic: Summary of DNR Natural River (NR) Management Plans. http://www.midnr.com/publications/pdfs/ForestsLandWater/ForestCert2008/CompendiumNaturalRiversV4.28.pdf Summary of DNR River Assessments and Management Plans. http://www.midnr.com/publications/pdfs/ForestsLandWater/ForestCert2008/CompendiumRiverV4.28.pdf</p> <p>Terrestrial: “ DRAFT for Public Comment 10.04.10 - Guiding Principles and Strategies, MDNRE: Wildlife Division Strategic Plan 2010-2015” The ongoing BSA Planning Process comprises a significant portion of “planning (for) ... e.g. non-timber issues... biological diversity conservation” from item h. <i>“A BSA identifies a geographic area on the landscape where there is an emphasis on biodiversity conservation achieved through restoring and/or maintaining native natural communities. Within a specific BSA boundary, the emphasis is on natural communities that have been identified for their contribution to a network of representative natural communities or groups of natural communities.</i> <i>The portions of BSAs that occur on MDNRE-administered land will emphasize biodiversity conservation within a high-quality natural community framework. Uses that promote or do not impact or detract from biodiversity conservation are acceptable. Uses include but are not limited to recreation, mineral extraction, and timber harvests.”</i> Source: Guidance for Land Use Activities within DNRE-Administered Portions of Biodiversity Stewardship Areas (BSAs) Progress in BSA planning has been substantial, with the most progress on management guidance and approaches to be employed once the BSA designations have been made. <i>“To accomplish Ecoteam and Management Team reviews of Core Design Team recommended Biodiversity Stewardship Areas (BSAs) the DNRE developed several documents that provide information and direction regarding the management of BSAs. These documents include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Guidance for Land Use Activities within DNRE-Administered Portions of Biodiversity Stewardship Areas was developed by the Statewide Biodiversity Team, and was approved by the DNRE Statewide Council on May 10, 2010.</i> • <i>DNRE General Principles of Management for Biodiversity Stewardship Areas were developed by the Statewide Biodiversity Team, and were approved by the DNRE Statewide Council on May 10, 2010.</i> • <i>Generic Desired Future Conditions for major Forested Natural Communities within Biodiversity Stewardship Areas on DNRE-Administered Lands were developed by the DNRE Silviculture and Regeneration Team, FMD Planners, and WLD Ecologists over the course of the year. DFCs for northern communities were approved by the DNRE Statewide Council on August 9, 2010. Approval of a revision to incorporate southern communities is in progress.</i> • <i>Draft Silvicultural Guidance for Biodiversity Stewardship Area Natural Communities on State Forest Lands (2/17/2010) are being developed by the DNRE Silviculture and Regeneration Team.</i> <p><i>Development of these documents was instrumental to the review of potential BSAs in the context of social, economic, and ecological values, but had the effect of extending the internal DNRE review process, especially at the Ecoteam and Management Team levels.”</i></p>
---------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *																																																																	
1.1.2	Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan <u>in a manner appropriate to document past and future activities.</u>	MF	10				10																																																																			
Notes	<p>There is an opportunity to improve documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan in a manner appropriate to document future activities”.</p> <p>The 2005 Timber harvest trends report which provided “trend analysis” has not been updated recently.</p> <p>The growth on state forests substantially exceeds removals (source: State Forest Management Plan Table 3.8.–Volume of growth, mortality, and removals by forest type on state forestland [cubic feet; U. S. Forest Service 2004]).</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">Contrast of Estimated Growth versus Removals</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Fiscal Year</th> <th>FIA-based Est. Net Growth</th> <th>Harvested Volume</th> <th>Difference</th> <th>Growth / Removals Ratio</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2000</td><td>1,485,565</td><td>777,065</td><td>708,500</td><td>1.9</td></tr> <tr><td>2001</td><td>1,485,565</td><td>731,951</td><td>753,614</td><td>2.0</td></tr> <tr><td>2002</td><td>1,485,565</td><td>724,931</td><td>760,634</td><td>2.0</td></tr> <tr><td>2003</td><td>1,485,565</td><td>643,942</td><td>841,623</td><td>2.3</td></tr> <tr><td>2004</td><td>1,485,565</td><td>623,736</td><td>861,829</td><td>2.4</td></tr> <tr><td>2005</td><td>1,485,565</td><td>744,326</td><td>741,240</td><td>2.0</td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td>1,485,565</td><td>587,211</td><td>898,354</td><td>2.5</td></tr> <tr><td>2007</td><td>1,485,565</td><td>629,367</td><td>856,198</td><td>2.4</td></tr> <tr><td>2008</td><td>1,485,565</td><td>746,732</td><td>738,834</td><td>2.0</td></tr> <tr><td>2009</td><td>1,485,565</td><td>736,272</td><td>749,293</td><td>2.0</td></tr> <tr><td>average:</td><td>1,485,565</td><td>694,553</td><td>791,012</td><td>2.2</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>FIA data provides a check; currently the growth exceeds removals according to FIA. However there are significant differences in the acreage figures between MDNRE and FIA data for some cover types, notably Northern Hardwoods.</p>									Contrast of Estimated Growth versus Removals					Fiscal Year	FIA-based Est. Net Growth	Harvested Volume	Difference	Growth / Removals Ratio	2000	1,485,565	777,065	708,500	1.9	2001	1,485,565	731,951	753,614	2.0	2002	1,485,565	724,931	760,634	2.0	2003	1,485,565	643,942	841,623	2.3	2004	1,485,565	623,736	861,829	2.4	2005	1,485,565	744,326	741,240	2.0	2006	1,485,565	587,211	898,354	2.5	2007	1,485,565	629,367	856,198	2.4	2008	1,485,565	746,732	738,834	2.0	2009	1,485,565	736,272	749,293	2.0	average:	1,485,565	694,553	791,012	2.2
Contrast of Estimated Growth versus Removals																																																																										
Fiscal Year	FIA-based Est. Net Growth	Harvested Volume	Difference	Growth / Removals Ratio																																																																						
2000	1,485,565	777,065	708,500	1.9																																																																						
2001	1,485,565	731,951	753,614	2.0																																																																						
2002	1,485,565	724,931	760,634	2.0																																																																						
2003	1,485,565	643,942	841,623	2.3																																																																						
2004	1,485,565	623,736	861,829	2.4																																																																						
2005	1,485,565	744,326	741,240	2.0																																																																						
2006	1,485,565	587,211	898,354	2.5																																																																						
2007	1,485,565	629,367	856,198	2.4																																																																						
2008	1,485,565	746,732	738,834	2.0																																																																						
2009	1,485,565	736,272	749,293	2.0																																																																						
average:	1,485,565	694,553	791,012	2.2																																																																						

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1.3	A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth and yield.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Inventory:</p> <p>The older Operations Inventory approach has largely been replaced by a GIS-based IFMAP inventory system. Transition to IFMAP for gathering new field inventory information is more than 90% complete; by FY 2011 (YOE 2013) 97% of the compartments will be cruised in IFMAP, with only Pigeon River FMU still using the older Operations Inventory (OI). With a 10-year rotating inventory the OI inventory data will remain in the system for up to 10 years from the time of changeover. The team was told “forest inventory is essentially a census”, as opposed to a statistical modeling-approach.</p> <p>The inventory system (old and new) is focused on acres, stand ages, and basal area, not the total volumes or growth rates. OI had a module for more detailed inventory, often used for management of northern hardwoods. A quantitative component for the new system is under development. Standing volume estimates are based on age-class and basal area data, and empirical yield tables based on many years of experience.</p> <p>All cover types and all stands are assessed; commercial stands have plots measured sufficient to develop a prescription for action or a detailed reason for deferring treatment. The initial inventory (IFMAP) is used within one year to decide whether to set up timber sales or other treatments based on silvicultural criteria. Silvicultural criteria are either age-based or basal-area based. A timber cruise is done as part of sale preparation only if a harvest prescription has been approved during compartment review. This timber cruise can either be a 100% marking tally or a sample-plot design for clearcuts.</p> <p>The inventory information generated by IFMAP is qualitative, not quantitative. It is not designed to provide a reliable estimate of volumes at the compartment level or Forest Management Unit level. Instead it provides sufficient information to prescribe treatments. FIA data provides an estimate of total forest volumes; the MDNRE maintains the ability to use older OI data and long-term harvest data to provide a check against the FIA data, but the audit team did not assess this. In the team’s view, use of “area control” for regulation of harvest levels removes the need for a precise volume estimate. However, major industrial users of wood in Michigan have expressed concerns about the methods described above regarding its usefulness of the volume estimates for their purposes.</p> <p>Harvest volumes are based on detailed and more traditional volume cruises, or in some cases 100% marking tallies. These are compiled into Quarterly Legislative Reports which list harvest acres and harvest volumes. An example of another report is the “DNR Annual Total Report of acres examined, prescribed, and sold’. These methods certainly provide a sufficiently precise estimate of timber volumes harvested.</p> <p>Growth:</p> <p>The growth calculation, using FIA data, is updated regularly using the most current growth data (see chart in notes for Indicator 1.1.2 above).</p> <p>The Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment is no longer contracting for enhanced-intensity FIA data plots. Michigan State forest timber revenues supported a 3X intensity of FIA data over a 8-year period ending in 2007. FIA data collection for the state forests has returned to standard inventory intensity (about 700 plots on the 3.9 million acre state forest).</p> <p>Calculation of growth presented in the State Forest Management plan is based on 2004 FIA data (reference is to a 2004 US Forest Service Report).</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1.4	Periodic updates of <u>forest</u> inventory and recalculation of planned harvests <u>to account for changes in growth due to productivity increases or decreases (e.g. improved data, long-term drought, fertilization, climate change, forest land ownership changes, etc.)</u> .	MF	10						
Notes	Harvests are planned using area control to determine acres treated. These are recalculated prior to developing harvest prescriptions. The inventory system is based on compartments of 1-3,000 acres. 10% of the compartments are considered for treatment each year. Harvest levels are based on up-to-date qualitative compartment inventory (IFMAP) conducted 1-2 years prior to development of compartment plans and stand prescriptions. Changes in growth, or unexpected growth increases or decreases are factored in immediately during development of compartment plans and stand prescriptions. Also see indicators above, which cover inventory methods.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
1.1.5	Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.	MF	10						
Notes	Area control is used; there is no “allowable cut effect”. The harvest plans do not assume accelerated growth based on fertilization or other intensive stand silvicultural practices. The key assumptions that might affect harvest levels are that stands will be regenerated promptly and planted stands will be released as needed; forest practices associated with these assumptions are well documented, both in the compartment planning process and in the associated forest treatment process. This includes Forest Treatment Proposals (FTP) and Forest Treatment Completion Reports that provide acres treated, treatment method, objectives, cover types, basal area removed if appropriate, equipment and materials used, and costs.								

Objective 2. Forest Productivity.

To ensure *long-term forest productivity*, carbon storage, and *conservation* of forest resources through prompt *reforestation*, *soil conservation*, *afforestation* and other measures.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1	Program Participants shall promptly reforest after final harvest.	MF, PP	10						

Notes	<p>See indicators. MDNRE has a comprehensive program to ensure regeneration after final harvests including: Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment Policy 241: Reforestation:</p> <p><i>“It shall be the policy to establish new vegetative cover in accordance with the management objective established at Compartment Review within five years after stand removal. This applies to all stands, whether they are to be regenerated naturally or artificially. Timber Management Specialists shall be responsible to see that this is accomplished or to document reasons for failure.</i></p> <p><i>Natural regeneration is preferred where a good-quality crop of the desired species can be anticipated. Where a good quality crop or desired species is not likely to occur naturally, artificial means should be used to achieve the desired objective.</i></p> <p><i>Trees planted and direct seeded will be from seed sources approved by the Nursery and Tree Improvement Specialist.</i></p> <p><i>Reforestation plans must be approved at Compartment Review. However, projects of an emergency nature may be done without Compartment Review with the approval of the Unit, Forest Supervisor, Field Coordinator, Division Office and Wildlife Division, using the Forest Treatment Proposal form.</i></p> <p><i>Layout of plantations will follow contours or natural land features to create as visually pleasing an area as possible.</i></p> <p><i>In special management areas such as the "Kirtland Warbler Management Unit" the pattern of planting and the spacing of trees will be modified so as to best serve the special interest.”</i></p>
--------------	---

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
2.1.1	Designation of all harvest areas for either natural regeneration or by planting.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	<p>Confirmed designation of regeneration method for sites visited, and for sites where paperwork was requested but time did not allow field visits.</p> <p>Forest Treatment Proposals (FTP) were confirmed for regeneration harvests for which planting and/or site preparation was expected to be needed, based on the Forest Harvest Plan. Occasionally plan are changed, such as when natural regeneration fails or when it appears in sufficient numbers to remove the planting need; in these cases the change of plan is documented.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
2.1.2	Reforestation, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations or legal requirements, through planting within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	<p>Review of selected sites across a range of soils, including nutrient poor, sandy soils, showed that the department continues to allocate sufficient resources to achieve regeneration.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.3	Clear criteria to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct understocked areas and achieve acceptable species composition and stocking rates for both planting and natural regeneration.	MF, PP	10				10		
Notes	<p><u>There is an opportunity to improve protection of regeneration from adverse effects of deer on natural regeneration.</u></p> <p>Standards exist for all regeneration treatments.</p> <p>Multiple site preparation and planting treatments are employed in those (limited) cases where drought or other factors caused initial efforts to fail.</p> <p>The effects of high densities of deer in some regions and the associated impact on the natural species diversity in the forest, as well as the ability to adequately regenerate a productive forest, continues to be a concern expressed by stakeholders and some FMD foresters. A Cervid Herbivory Team was appointed to address this issue, but little progress has been made.</p>								
	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.4	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species, and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	Exotic tree species are not planted.								
	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.5	Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	<p>Field observations confirmed good results in this indicator.</p> <p>An effective system is in place to ensure that this indicator is met. The pre-timber sale checklist, a key part of the timber sale planning process, has question 20: "Is desirable (advanced) natural regeneration present?" If yes, then the "Related Sale Spec" #3.4.1 is checked and the specification is inserted into the timber sale contract. The specification provides for financial penalty if too much regeneration is disturbed during harvest.</p>								
	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.6	Planting programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.	DC, MF	10						

Notes	<p>Consideration of composition goals for regeneration is a routine part of sale planning.</p> <p>Biologists are involved in planning of harvests, most of which do not change species composition. When changes in species composition are intended they are often accomplished by natural regeneration, but also can be done by planting. Either way the decision is based on soil types, the Kotar soil classification, ecological considerations (habitat needs, stand development pathways), and a robust review process that includes silviculture and wildlife specialists.</p>
--------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.1.7	<u>Afforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of the selection and planting of tree species in non-forested landscapes.</u>	DC, MF	10						
Notes	<p>Non-forested landscapes are not afforested. Instead, some forested areas are converted to open or brush landscapes, but only after multi-disciplinary review and only if there is a demonstrated habitat need, often to support populations of rare, threatened, or declining species.</p> <p>In some areas adjacent or nearby small patches of forest and non-forested cover types are “swapped” to consolidate small patches into large patches while also attempting to more closely match vegetation to soil and site potential. These efforts are based on careful analysis and are primarily driven by ecological goals, but have ancillary economic benefits including more efficient management and harvesting.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2	Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the environment, <u>including wildlife and aquatic habitats.</u>	MF, PP	10						
Notes	<p>MDNRE’s management of the 3.9 million acres of certified lands is accomplished with modest to minimal levels of chemical use. Trends of chemical use over the past 5 years have been stable or slightly decreased. See indicators.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.1	Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.	MF, PP	10						

Notes	<p>Chemical treatment in the Western District of the Lower Peninsula clearly shows a trend of reduced chemical use.</p> <p>In the eastern UP Forest Management Units (FMUs) Glyphosate is applied at the end of the growing season to release Red pine seedlings from hardwood competition at rates slightly below maximum label rates.</p> <p>Non-chemical site preparation is extensively employed, particularly mechanical scarification and/or disc-trenching.</p> <p>Cost-benefit modeling is used to help guide pest management decisions.</p>
--------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.2	Use of least-toxic and narrowest-spectrum pesticides necessary to achieve management objectives.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	<p>Glyphosate is the main chemical used; this chemical has low toxicity and is not a broad-spectrum pesticide when used according to the label.</p> <p>Dimilin has been derogated (allowed under FSC exceptions procedure); Bt used on occasion.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.3	Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with label requirements.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	Interviews and review of records show use according to the label.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.4	Use of integrated pest management where feasible.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	<p>Forest health staff helps ensure that insect pests are detected and treated early and only when and where necessary.</p> <p>Forest silviculture specialists review FTP requests and prepare detailed plans for herbicide use, and supervise their implementation. They have developed expertise that allows them to ensure that herbicide treatments are used only when necessary and cost-effective.</p> <p>Non-chemical site preparation is extensively employed, particularly mechanical scarification and/or disc-trenching.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

2.2.5	Supervision of forest chemical applications by state- or provincial-trained or certified applicators.	MF, PP	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Applicators and forest silviculture specialists are Michigan certified. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview applicator Sparky Stimart, Skyline Helicopters 715-493-7294								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.2.6	Use of management practices appropriate to the situation, for example: a. notification of adjoining landowners or nearby residents concerning applications and chemicals used; b. appropriate multilingual signs or oral warnings; c. control of public road access during and immediately after applications; d. designation of streamside and other needed buffer strips; e. use of positive shutoff and minimal-drift spray valves; f. aerial application of forest chemicals parallel to buffer zones to minimize drift; g. monitoring of water quality or safeguards to ensure proper equipment use and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies; h. appropriate storage of chemicals; i. filing of required state or provincial reports; and/or j. use of methods to ensure protection of threatened and endangered species.	MF, PP	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Interviews and review of records								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3	Program Participants shall implement forest management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.	MF, PP	10						

Notes	See indicators. Sustainable Soil and Water Quality Practices on Forest Land (formerly Best Management Practices (BMP) on Forest Land) “This Manual describes a set of voluntary Forestry Best Management Practices (BMPs) that protect our soil and water resources while allowing appropriate use of our forest resources. This is the first substantial revision of the 1994 publication, Water Quality Practices on Forest Land, also known as Michigan’s Forestry Best Management Practices (BMP) Manual. This 2009 version supersedes previous versions.”
--------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	Soils maps are used during planning.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction, and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	Soils maps, Kotar site classifications, topographic maps, and air photos are used during planning. Combined with field evaluations of the sites these tools help foresters to plan harvest units to avoid wetlands and vulnerable soils within upland units or to specify that harvesting can only occur during frozen conditions. The pre-timber sale checklist, a key part of the timber sale planning process, has provisions for recording risk of soil compaction and/or rutting. If these risks are identified then seasonal restrictions and/or related sale specifications (5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, 5.4.5, or, 5.4.6) can be inserted into the timber sale contract and enforced during harvest administration.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to <i>minimize</i> the loss of soil and site productivity.	MF, PP	10				10		

Notes	<p><u>There is an opportunity to improve routine road maintenance.</u></p> <p>Until recently the improved gravel roads were maintained by department fire personnel using state-owned equipment. There were no funds available during FY 2009-2010 for routine road maintenance, and some roads traveled during the audit were not properly graded. Grading is also accomplished by logging companies on many of the forest roads lacking an improved gravel road surface (also called “sand roads”) but many years between such grading by loggers on some of these roads.</p> <p>Conformance with respect to harvest areas was demonstrated. See previous indicator. Seasonal restrictions, rutting specifications, and the ready availability of cut-to-length systems are some of the erosion control measures. Most sites have nearly flat or gently-sloping terrain and well-drained soils; compaction is a greater risk than erosion.</p>
--------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.4	Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g. limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).	MF, PP	10						
Notes	Field observations confirmed limited rutting, retained down woody debris, and minimized or well-planned skid trails.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with <u>scientific silvicultural standards</u> for the area.	MF, PP	10				10		
Notes	<p><u>There is an opportunity to improve efforts to update the silviculture guidance documents. (This OFI was also listed for Indicator 2.4.2.)</u></p> <p>Thinnings remove overtopped or intermediate crown class trees first, as well as crooked, forked, or damaged trees.</p> <p>One lowland hardwood harvest specified removal of the largest trees (diameter-limit) but the smaller trees were younger and were good quality and vigorous; most were red maples, but some oaks with competitive crown positions were present as well. Diameter-limit harvests will degrade stands if not carefully assessed to ensure that these simplified prescriptions avoid dysgenic practices and release vigorous trees.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.	MF, PP	10						

Notes	<p>All contracts have “General Conditions & Requirements...Clause 5.4 Soil Protection: The Purchaser shall avoid operating equipment when soil conditions are such that excessive damage will result as determined by the Unit Manager or their representative”.</p> <p>Rutting criteria are available in the form of additional “Sale Specific Conditions & Requirements”. These specify (5.4.1) “Operations are to cease immediately if equipment and weather conditions result in rutting of roads and skid trails which is 12 inches or greater in depth and 50 feet in length. The Unit Manager or his/her representative may restrict hauling and/or skidding if ruts exceed the specified depth. With the Unit Manager or his/her representative’s approval, the Purchaser may return to the area when risk of rutting has decreased.”</p>
--------------	---

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.3.7	<u>Road construction and skidding layout to minimize impacts to soil productivity and water quality.</u>	MF, PP	10				10		
Notes	<p><u>There is an opportunity to improve road planning efforts.</u></p> <p>Systematic planning for roads is limited; only the Pigeon River County Forest Management Unit has a comprehensive roads plan.</p> <p>Compartment plans (including PRC) have a short section “Vehicle Access” that is focused on short-term access needs related to proposed treatments, with no written consideration of strategic (long term) or comprehensive (across larger areas including other landowners).</p> <p>County ORV ordinances allowing ORV use on any county road have led to more, and more dispersed ORV use on the state lands. Significant progress has been made using the RDR tool, to resolve legacy ORV damage and user patterns, but more work remains.</p> <p>RDR tool continues to enjoy widespread support and use. While there is a backlog of sites that have identified as needing work this backlog has stabilized, and in most Forest Management Units, has been reduced slightly, over the past two years.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.4	<u>Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents, such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases and invasive exotic plants and animals, to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.</u>	MF, PP	10						
Notes	Forest Management Division Policy591: Forest Pest Management specifies a program consistent with Performance Measure 2.4 and the Indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.4.1	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.	MF, PP	10						

Notes	<p>Forest Management Division Policy 591: Forest Pest Management specifies a program consistent with Performance Measure 2.4 and the Indicators. Forest health issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerald Ash Borer (EAB): using parasites for control • Beech Bark Disease (BBD), • Oak Wilt: Mostly isolated spots, seems to be increasing; Cooperative project with USFS and MSU in Menominee and Dickenson Counties to keep an Oak wilt epicenter from spreading elsewhere in the UP • Hemlock woolly adelgid (HWA) • Maple decline in the UP (related perhaps to drought episodes over the past two decades) <p>Forest health monitoring: annual forest health survey, fly annually to cover several million acres covering all ownerships to detect larger disturbances; then determine the ground efforts including drive-and-look and long-term monitoring plots. No forest pathologist on staff, rely on university scientists, cooperate w. USDA Forest Service; currently university has a mycologist only. Much work with cooperators throughout the state including the major Michigan universities (UM, MSU, Michigan Tech).</p> <p>Also conduct directed surveys based on risk monitoring; examples: HWA, ALB in state parks, grant for exotic bark beetle trapping.</p> <p>Working with USFS FHTET Team to field test new techniques and technology; one product is risk mapping. For each insect and disease they field test the models by developing maps and then field checking the predictions. One tool is high resolution satellite imagery to detect outbreaks, particularly defoliation, which is termed “disturbance tracking”.</p> <p>Also asking foresters to help with forest health reporting. A field reporting form for reporting forest health symptoms is available; conducted a series of trainings this summer covering EAB and BBD.</p> <p>Great Lakes Resource Protection Initiative: Focus on the western UP to provide landowners with advice on how to deal with EAB; created the publication “Prepare Your Woodlot for Emerald Ash Borer”.</p> <p>Release of parasites for EAB in the eastern UP: work led by the USFS, following national peer review by APHIS, MDA, Universities, others.</p> <p>Also have released insects for spotted knapweed.</p>
--------------	---

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.	MF, PP	10				10		

Notes

There is an opportunity to improve efforts to update the silviculture guidance documents (also listed for Indicator 2.3.5).

Drafts revisions of the silviculture guidance have not yet been finalized. Many of the silviculture guidelines on the intranet, including published USFS guides and Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment documents are somewhat dated. The list on the intranet currently:

- Black Spruce Management on State Forest Lands. Typewritten 2 page manuscript.
- Upland Spruce-Fir Management on State Forest Lands. Typewritten 3 page manuscript.
- Black Spruce Management on State Forest Lands. Typewritten 2 page manuscript.
- Jack Pine Management on State Forest Lands. Typewritten 5 page manuscript with hand-drawn chart.
- Forest Cover Types. Typewritten 5 page manuscript.
- Even-aged Silviculture for Upland Central Hardwoods – A manager’s guide. USDA Ag. Hbk. 355. 1968.
- Reproduction of Upland Hardwood Forests in the Central States. Ag. Handbook 405. 1971

- Manager’s Handbook for Black Spruce in the North Central States. GTR NC-36. 1977.
- Manager’s Handbook for Northern White Cedar in the North Central States. GTR NC-35. 1977.
- Manager’s Handbook for Jack Pine in the North Central States. GTR NC-32. 1977.
- Manager’s Handbook for Black Walnut in the North Central States. GTR NC-33. 1977.
- Manager’s Handbook for Northern Hardwoods in the North Central States. GTR NC-37. 1977.
- Manager’s Handbook for Oaks in the North Central States. GTR NC-39. 1977.
- Manager’s Handbook for Red Pine in the North Central States. GTR NC-33. 1977.

- Converting Partially-harvested Aspen Stands to Fully-Stocked Stands in the Lake States – An Economic Analysis. 1978
- Michigan State Forest Red Pine Management Guidelines – old guidance. 5.1.91
- Lowland Hardwood Management Guides. 1993.
- The Complete Marker: A guide to managing northern hardwoods on Michigan State Forests. 1994.
- Controlling Oak Wilt. MNDNR FMFM 2003
- Guidelines for Red Pine Management based on Ecosystem Management Principles for State Forestland in Michigan. Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Northern Lower Michigan Ecoteam. Edited by John Pilon, Forest Planner. 2006.
- Within-Stand Retention Guidance. Principal Authors: Jim Bielecki, Jim Ferris, Keith Kintigh, Mike Koss, Don Kuhr, Sherry MacKinnon, Scott Throop, Larry Visser, Mike Walters (MSU). MDNR. Forest, Mineral & Fire Management IC. 4110 (10/05/2006)
- Within Stand Retention Guide Memo. October 17, 2006.
- American Beech Management: Beech Bark Disease. DRAFT – Not for Distribution. June 14, 2007.
- Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) Ash Management on State Forest Lands. DRAFT – Not for Distribution June 14, 2007
- Complete Marker Addendum 01/09/2008 (rev.)
- Ash Management in Michigan: The Emerald Ash Borer – APPENDICES. May 2009.

20 families of resistant beech trees have been developed from genetic cross-breeding to determine whether they have really developed resistant beech; have a database of resistant trees on GPS for trees that foresters are supposed to be locating and marking with a big white “R”.

Field observations confirmed that management promotes healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents. Most stand types (exceptions are for some lowland types) are rigorously maintained within desired stocking and rotation-length parameters, with allowance for ecosystem management goals and for access issues.

Use of diameter limit harvests in bottomland hardwoods is not a generally accepted practice.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	<p>Fire: Continued impressive conformance.</p> <p>Pests: There have been some funding challenges. Most funding comes through federal grants; the pest program often can't provide the match, so miss out on some funds; do often work with universities to get the needed match.</p> <p>There has been a shift in the federal funding approach; no longer getting core funding without competing.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.5	Program Participants that deploy improved planting stock, <u>including varietal seedlings</u>, shall use sound scientific methods.	MF	10						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of improved planting stock, <u>including varietal seedlings</u> .	MF	10						
Notes	<p>Policy 243 Tree Improvement and interview with Rich Mergener, Nursery Manager contributed to a finding of conformance.</p> <p>Operate one forest nursery and tree improvement center in Manistique, MI in the UP; produce 5-7 million tree seedlings per year mostly jack pine (5 million), red (2million red pine) and white pine (500,000 per year); some hardwood. Trees are grown at the state nurseries only for regeneration on state forest land. Much seed is wild-collected; use tracked seed lots to ensure that the trees are planted back in the same general area. No exotics are grown or planted.</p> <p>Work with MSU for Jack Pine tree improvement; traditional approach; review provenance tests to determine which seed source grows best in which areas, building on work started in the 50s and 60s; full-sib seedlings grown in seed orchards from crossing selections of the best trees; seedlings from these crosses were planted at three test plantations. Starting to do some grafting but this orchard is quite small due to challenges with grafting. Use the chemical GOAL (oxyfluorfen) at the nursery: this is allowed by FSC at the nursery as an exception.</p>								

Objective 3. Protection and Maintenance of Water Resources

To protect water quality in rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1	Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws, and meet or exceed best management practices developed under Canadian or U.S. Environmental Protection Agency–approved water quality programs.	MF, PP	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.1	Program to implement state or provincial best management practices during all phases of management activities.	MF, PP	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Foresters plan and oversee all harvests, cultural treatments, and work with engineers on larger road/bridge projects. BMPs are designed into these projects.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.2	Contract provisions that specify <u>conformance</u> to best management practices.	MF, PP	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Confirmed that contracts contains a clause (5.3 Stream Protection) specifying the use of all BMPs.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.3	Plans that address wet-weather events (e.g. <u>forest</u> inventory systems, wet-weather tracts, definitions of acceptable operating conditions).	MF, PP, DC	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Contracts contain provisions limiting the amount of rutting allowed or otherwise allow “Unit Manager or their representative” to halt operations that are causing excessive damage. Escanaba FMU Fire Supervisor described his approach to inspecting road-related infrastructure following major storms.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.1.4	Monitoring of overall best management practices implementation.	MF, PP, DC	10						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>For roads and trails, for monitoring MDNRE continues to utilize the Resource Damage Reporting (RDR) System, which is in the same format as other DNR programs, has automatic notifications via automatic emails, is tied to GIS; and flags other nearby RDRs already reported.</p> <p>For timber harvests the form R4050E “Timber Sale Contract – Field Inspection Report” is used to record monitoring of all aspects of the harvest, including road issues, BMPs, cleanup, soil protection, aesthetic consideration, stump heights, and other aspects of utilization.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2	Program Participants shall have or develop, implement and document riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation, ecological function, harvesting system and other applicable factors.	MF, PP, DC	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.1	Program addressing management and protection of <u>rivers</u> , streams, lakes, and other water bodies and riparian zones.	MF, PP, DC	10						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Trained foresters, wildlife biologists, and fisheries biologists work collaboratively to set up (foresters), review, and approve (all three disciplines) all proposed treatments and infrastructure development projects. Site-level planning generally commences with the forest inventory work done in each compartment on the “year of entry” cycle. Resource conditions are discussed during compartment “pre-review”; proposed treatments are developed and then shared with the public; and treatments are finalized during compartment review. All three divisions (Forest Management, Wildlife, and Fisheries) are involved in these three planning stages. A focus is on protection of streams, lakes, other water bodies and riparian zones.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.2	Mapping of <u>rivers</u> , streams, lakes, and other water bodies as specified in state or provincial best management practices and, where appropriate, identification on the ground.	MF, PP, DC	10						

Notes	Streams, lakes, etc. are shown on maps and sale offering and administrative documents (contract specifications). They are generally identified on the ground by paint marks on trees.								
--------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.3	Implementation of plans to manage or protect <u>rivers</u> , streams, lakes, and other water bodies.	MF, PP, DC	10						
Notes	Field observations confirmed that streams, lakes, and other waterbodies are protected during all operations. Robust program for protection and some restoration of trout streams.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.4	Identification and protection of non-forested wetlands, including bogs, fens and marshes, and vernal pools <u>of ecological significance</u> .	MF, PP, DC	10						
Notes	Non-forested wetlands are identified on aerial photos and on harvest area maps and are excluded from harvest areas; when they are enclosed within a harvest area they are “painted out”.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
3.2.5	Where regulations or best management practices do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.	MF	10						
Notes	<p>Closed 2009 Minor Non-conformance based on 3.15.10 letter from Lynne Boyd, Chief of Forest Management System stating that “off-road vehicle routes on Drummond Island are a unique situation... which has existed for many years... There are no plans to offer a similar experience, namely an ORV route with sanctioned water hole and mud hole features in other parts of the state forest system. However, if the type of ORV route that exists on Drummond Island is offered somewhere else in the state at some point in the future, the same route standards will apply.”</p> <p>Note: 2009 Minor Non-conformance - BMPs or standards for ORV Routes that ensure environmental protections (while offering the desired recreational experience) have been developed for Drummond Island but are not in place for the rest of the state forests.</p>								

Objective 4. Conservation of Biological Diversity including Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value.

To manage the quality and distribution of wildlife habitats and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by developing and implementing stand- and landscape-level measures that promote a diversity of types of habitat and successional stages, and conservation of forest plants and animals, including aquatic species.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1	Program Participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape-levels.	DC	10						
Notes	Compartment exams—conducted by each Management Unit—involve participation by Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment's wildlife habitat biologists. A combination of species plans, special habitat initiatives, and a new program of using featured species to identify a diverse set of habitat indicators guide habitat biologists, as well as a recently completed draft of a Wildlife Division Strategic Plan. Guidance documents addressing retention stands for timber harvest and biomass harvesting address within-stand features for wildlife.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.1	Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats and <u>ecological</u> community types.	DC	10						
Notes	Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment has progressed through a series of initiatives directed toward the goal of biodiversity conservation: Ecological Reference Areas, High Conservation Value Areas, Special Conservation Areas, and Biodiversity Stewardship Areas.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.	DC		10					
Notes	<p><u>The program to protect threatened and endangered species exceeds the requirements.</u></p> <p>The Wildlife Division of MDNRE and Michigan Natural Features Inventory, house biologists that have assignments for protection of threatened and endangered species of wildlife and plants, respectively. Noteworthy accomplishments of endangered species recovery are illustrated by Kirtland Warblers and Gray Wolves, two species where populations now exceed recovery goals.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>

4.1.3	Program to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities <u>also known as Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value</u> . Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively, and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies.	DC	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Work Instruction 1.4 describes many aspects of the High Conservation Value Forest, which is a broader filter than Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value. One type of HCVF, however, is defined by viable occurrences of imperiled species and communities, when multiple occurrences of such elements occur in the same area. Individual occurrences of imperiled features are protected in numerous ways, as determined by the nature of any threats or disturbances. Recovery plans, developed with numerous cooperators, are the primary means of guiding programs for protection of imperiled species and their habitats.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.4	Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate <u>best scientific information</u> , to retain stand-level wildlife habitat elements such as snags, <u>stumps</u> , mast trees, down woody debris, den trees and nest trees.	DC, MF	10			10			
<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>Minor Non-Conformance SFI-2010-1:</u> Stand-level retention does not consistently meet the written guidelines, which are complex and not understood by significant numbers of foresters.</p> <p>Training and project reviews and internal audits do not assure consistent understanding and implementation of current guidelines for within-stand retention. The guidelines may not include the best scientific information such as concepts of legacy trees and emulating natural disturbance regimes. The response to the 2009 OFI indicated that the goal of including flexible and diverse approaches to retention may have obscured the possibility of leaving large decadent aspen and/or other large trees with potential commercial value.</p> <p>Sale contracts contain provisions for stand retention, including protection/retention of den trees (5.2.2.1), retention of dead trees (5.2.4.3), retention of reserve trees (2.1.12), reserve areas (2.4.3)</p> <p>(SFI OFI-2009-02: There is an opportunity to improve the application of stand level retention by more commonly considering leaving large, decadent aspen and/or large spruce.)</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.5	Program for assessment, conducted either individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types, <u>age or size classes</u> , and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, <u>and take into account findings in planning and management activities</u> .	DC, MF	10				10		

Notes	<p><u>There is an opportunity to improve tactical (compartment) landscape-scale biodiversity planning (i.e. forest cover types, age or size classes, and habitats), by including an analysis of trends and conditions at the Management Area scale to supplement analysis currently provided for each compartment, for the “ aggregated same year-of-entry compartments”, and at the Forest Management Unit scale.</u></p> <p>Absent goals for landscape management that will be provided for each Management Area within the Regional State Forest Plans, the landscape goals for the Gladwin Unit do not address biodiversity goals beyond balancing the age class distribution of the major cover types; instead they “manage to maintain” with respect to species composition.</p> <p>An improved “assessment ... of forest cover types, age or size classes, and habitats at the individual ownership level” is underway, based on biophysical land units, but findings from the assessment are only partially and informally “taken into account” in management activities. Continued delays in the development of regional plans, due to the complexity of BSA designation and Management Area planning, mean that district and unit staff must provide landscape analysis and goals for each proposed treatment and compartment review.</p>
--------------	---

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.6	Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.	DC	10						
Notes	Old growth stands are preserved; may be coded as SCAs or ERA or Natural Areas. A summary of FSC Types 1 and 2 old-growth stands protected by statute indicates 71,543 acres of old-growth forest. Many of these acres are on lands administered by DNRE other than State Forests.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.1.7	Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities.	DC, MF	10				10		
Notes	<p><u>There is an opportunity to improve the approach to prevention of invasive plant species.</u></p> <p>Efforts on prevention invasive insects or diseases are quite strong.</p> <p>2009 Report “Meeting the Challenge for Invasive Plants – A Framework for Action” prepared for the Wildlife Division is a good start, but actions to implement the recommendations do not appear to have been taken as yet.</p> <p>Programs are in place in some units to treat invasive plant species. Invasive plant issues are common and widespread in nearby states, but efforts to prevent are not yet widespread on consistent.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

4.1.8	Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.	DC	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Fire is commonly prescribed when appropriate, especially in the management of Jack Pine communities, and is an essential activity in the management of Kirtland's Warbler, an endangered species. Managers would like to use fire on more sites, but personnel and financial resources limit further use.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.2	Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.	DC	10						
<i>Notes</i>	MDNRE, in the Wildlife Division, has a small team of research biologists. More significantly, though, the Department funds the PERM program at Michigan State University, supporting two research faculty positions and graduate students. Faculty and graduate students from other universities also conduct research on State Forests. Managers interviewed during field visits frequently demonstrated application of research results to the management of wildlife.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
4.2.1	Collection of information on <u>Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value</u> and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing non-proprietary scientific information, time and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.	DC	10						
<i>Notes</i>	DNRE supports the state Natural Features Inventory, in cooperation with Michigan State University, thus natural heritage information is readily available to staff in FMD.								

Objective 5. Management of Visual Quality and Recreational Benefits.

To manage the visual impact of forest operations and provide recreational opportunities for the public.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.1	Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.	MF, PP	10						

<i>Notes</i>	MDNRE effectively manages the impact of harvesting on visual quality within the constraints of law and biodiversity protection goals. Work to provide habitat for the federally-listed (endangered) Kirtland's Warbler provides some challenges, but overall the program is meeting the SFI requirements.								
--------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.	MF, PP	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Trained foresters plan all harvests; guidelines exist to address visual management; senior managers review all proposed treatments. Visual management programs are in place and generally very effective – forests visited were being managed with visual considerations.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.1.2	Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.	MF, PP	10				10		
<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>There is an opportunity to improve aesthetic considerations on lands adjacent to homes and cabins.</u></p> <p>Confirmed that aesthetic management is employed by field observations of selected sales and observations of large sections of the certified forests observed while traveling between selected audit sites. Practices observed include requirements for scattering slash or moving it out of landings or away from roads, retained visual buffers, including visual considerations in the decisions regarding retention primarily designed for biodiversity enhancement, landings cleaned, and adjustments to the size, shape, and placement of clearcuts.</p> <p>Managers do not contact owners of abutting lands except in unusual situations. Owners of vacation homes or cabins adjacent to heavy harvests are often surprised by harvest preparations or actual harvests; some clearcuts occur directly adjacent to property lines.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.2	Program Participants shall manage the size, shape and placement of clearcut harvests.	MF, PP	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
--	------------------------------	--------------	----------	------------	------------	------------	------------	-------------------------	---------------------------

5.2.1	Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres (50 hectares), except when necessary <u>to meet regulatory requirements</u> or to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	Clearcuts observed at selected sites as well as those observed while traveling between sites were generally less than 50 acres, with a small number of larger clearcuts. One exception involved large clearcuts created to develop and maintain habitat for the federally-listed (endangered) Kirtland's Warbler								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	38 (average size of stand that was clearcut = 24 acres; average size of clearcut acres per contract = 52)								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.3	Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.3.1	Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	Trained foresters review of all proposed projects by a multi-disciplinary team.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.3.2	Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate <u>conformance</u> with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF, PP	10						

Notes	Confirmed the harvest area tracking system to demonstrate conformance with the green-up requirement by review of timber harvest records. Maps are developed that show the cut unit boundaries and retention areas. These maps are available when adjacent compartments are treated. Foresters are instructed to look at stands in adjacent compartments.
--------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.3.3	Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet (1.5 meters) high at the desired level of stocking before adjacent areas are clearcut, or as appropriate to address operational and economic considerations, alternative methods to reach the performance measure are utilized by the Program Participant.	MF, PP	10						
Notes	Conformance was confirmed by field observations. Some clearcuts are separated by very narrow buffers. In the Kirtland's Warbler Management Area harvest areas must be larger to accommodate the habitat needs of this federally endangered bird; foresters attempt to utilize the retention patches to provide visual buffering where possible.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.4	<u>Program Participants shall support and promote recreational opportunities for the public.</u>	MF		10					
<i>Notes</i>	MDNRE provides and promotes (through advertising, brochures, maps, etc) extensive, high-quality recreation opportunities.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
5.4.1	<u>Provide recreational opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.</u>	MF		10					
<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>Exceeds the Requirement: Public recreation opportunities are high-quality, diverse, and widely available.</u></p> <p>Confirmed recreational facilities at all six Forest Management Units visited, including extensive trails networks, campgrounds, boat launch areas, and day use areas. The program supports dispersed recreation; these activities are widespread and diverse.</p> <p>For example Escanaba Forest Management Unit offers 2 pathways for mountain biking/walking and a nature trail.</p> <p>Verified that the following Internal Audit Corrective Action Plan was fully implemented: “ Internal Audit Finding from the Escanaba Management Unit; Site location: Cedar River Campground; Non Conformance Report Number (Unit Code - yyyy - #) 33-2010-06; Work Instruction or Standard and Clause Number: 6.2 Integrating Public Recreational Opportunities with Management on State Forest Land. Requirement of Audited Standard/ Work Instruction: 5(a) Impacts on Campgrounds are reported, monitored and addressed. Observed Nonconformity: Although campground impacts and needs were monitored and reported, actions to address needs were not completed. Numerous functional and safety issues were observed. See Cedar River Campground inspection report dated 6-10-10. Observed Nonconformity: Although campground impacts and needs were monitored and reported, actions to address needs were not completed. Numerous functional and safety issues were observed. See Cedar River Campground inspection report dated 6-10-10. Corrective Action – (To be completed by the Unit and relevant Divisions): Prepared by and date: Eric W. Thompson August 10, 2010 Unit staff has been directed to correct every item on the Inspection Report dated June 10, 2010 as well as the items identified on the most recent Health Dept. inspection. Proposed Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy): September 1, 2010 Responsible Manager (RM): Eric W. Thompson”</p>								

Objective 6. Protection of Special Sites.

To manage lands that are ecologically, geologically or culturally important in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
6.1	Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.	DC	10						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
6.1.1	Use of information such as existing natural heritage data, expert advice or <u>stakeholder consultation</u> in identifying or selecting special sites for protection.	DC, MF	10						
Notes	Work Instructions specify that the requirements of this indicator are met, with foresters the first part of the process. Foresters seek special sites during inventory and check existing databases for known sites.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging and management of identified special sites.	DC, MF	10						
Notes	Designated sites within the SCA/ERA/HCVa hierarchy are mapped (GIS, printed maps) and cataloged. Foresters report new special sites to the appropriate entity, including the department's archeologist or the MNFI. Work instructions cover this.								

Objective 7. Efficient Use of Forest Resources. To promote the efficient use of forest resources.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
7.1	Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and in-woods manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives.	MF, PP	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicator.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
7.1.1	Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure: a. <u>management of harvest residue (e.g. slash, limbs, tops) considers economic, social and environmental factors (e.g. organic and nutrient value to future forests) and other utilization needs;</u> b. training or incentives to encourage loggers to enhance utilization; c. cooperation with mill managers for better utilization of species and low-grade material; d. <u>exploration</u> of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood <u>and alternative markets (e.g. bioenergy markets);</u> or e. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation.	MF, PP	10						

Notes	<p>Utilization is covered in logging contracts which are enforced by the local forest inspector (essentially the timber sale administrator).</p> <p>Item a: confirm by field observations that management of harvest residue is considered in planning and enforced during sale administration.</p> <p>Item b: SFI training includes utilization; the key incentive is that all sales are lump-sum.</p> <p>Item c and d: Michigan has excellent markets for all species and products, at least down to an 8-foot stick of 4-inch diameter.</p> <p>Anthony Weatherspoon, Forest Utilization and Marketing Specialist works closely with the mills and buyers on utilization issues. He is working on a new project to better utilize urban wood waste. He also manages the on-line Michigan Forest Products Directory.</p> <p>Michigan is providing support for development of ethanol production and has worked on biomass studies to support the use of wood for energy. There were goals developed statewide for increased overall wood energy use. There are 9 commercial wood pellet plants in Michigan; larger ones use green wood and mill residues, while the smaller plants use just sawdust which is challenging due to competition from use as animal bedding.</p> <p>Item e: Confirmed that foresters make field inspections and review utilization; covered by sale administration notes using the form R4050E “Timber Sale Contract – Field Inspection Report” for all aspects of the harvest, including stump heights and utilization.</p> <p>Department has a no-bid list. Buyers don’t have to have training to purchase the timber; Lead worker on the harvest must have the Michigan SFI Training or Wisconsin FISTA Training.</p> <p>There is a system that allows for varied utilization clauses to be included in timber sale contracts to accommodate customized approaches to tradeoffs between utilization and resource protection.</p>
--------------	---

This landowner does not procure fiber for mills it owns or controls.

NA Objective 8. Landowner Outreach.

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by forest landowners through fiber sourcing programs.

NA Objective 9. Use of Qualified Resource and Qualified Logging Professionals.

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging forest landowners to utilize the services of forest management and harvesting professionals.

NA Objective 10. Adherence to Best Management Practices.

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry through the use of best management practices to protect water quality.

NA Objective 11. Promote Conservation of Biological Diversity, Biodiversity Hotspots and High-Biodiversity Wilderness Areas.

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by conserving biological diversity, biodiversity hotspots and high-biodiversity wilderness areas.

NA Objective 12. Avoidance of Controversial Sources including Illegal Logging.

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by avoidance of illegal logging.

NA Objective 13. Avoidance of Controversial Sources including Fiber Sourced from Areas without Effective Social Laws.

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by avoiding controversial sources.

Objective 14. Legal and Regulatory Compliance.

Compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state and local laws and regulations.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.1	Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state and local forestry and related social and environmental laws and regulations.	All	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.1.1	Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.	MF, PP	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Internet and intranet sites provide ready access to laws and regulations. Federal, provincial, state and local forestry and related social and environmental laws and regulations are incorporated into policies, plans, and work instructions.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.1.2	System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state or local laws and regulations.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	The process for written prescriptions and/or project descriptions, including detailed review by specialists, across divisions, and up through the DNRE administrative hierarchy ensures compliance.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.1.3	Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.	KF, MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	No regulatory issues or problems were found.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.2	Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates.	KF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Appropriate measures are taken, including policies, laws, training, and a culture of a safe work environment for employees. Enforcement of safety provisions in harvest contracts.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.2.1	Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, anti-discrimination and anti-harassment measures, workers' compensation, indigenous peoples' rights, workers' and communities' right to know, prevailing wages, workers' right to organize, and occupational health and safety.	KF, MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>The audit team was provided flash drive with all of the policies for Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment that relate to personnel and forest and wildlife management; there are a very large number (nearly one thousand). A review of these files confirmed that Michigan has a range of social laws and policies that cover all of the examples provided in the indicator. Some examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 121 Safety Policy - Forest Mineral and Fire Management 122 Hazard Communication Program (Right-to-Know Legislation) 123 Use of Respirators 124 Explosives Handling 133 Personal Protective Equipment for Fire Management 								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
14.2.2	<u>Forestry enterprises will respect the rights of workers and labor representatives in a manner that encompasses the intent of the International Labor Organization (ILO) core conventions.</u>	MF, KF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	If there are any ILO-related complaints Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment must notify NSF, and NSF must pass these along to SFI Inc. Most of MDNRE's employees are members of unions; supervisors are not.								

Objective 15. Forestry Research, Science, and Technology.

To support forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sustainable forest management decisions are based.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.1	Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving <u>SFI Implementation Committees</u>, associations or other partners provide in-kind support or funding for forest research to improve forest health, productivity, and <u>sustainable management of forest resources, and the environmental benefits and performance of forest products.</u>	MF	10						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.1.1	Financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research shall include some of the following issues: a. forest health, productivity, and ecosystem functions; b. chemical efficiency, use rate and integrated pest management; c. water quality and/or effectiveness of best management practices <u>including effectiveness of water quality and best management practices for protecting the quality, diversity and distributions of fish and wildlife habitats;</u> d. wildlife management at stand- and landscape-levels; e. conservation of biological diversity; f. <u>ecological impacts of bioenergy feedstock removals on productivity, wildlife habitat, water quality and other ecosystem functions;</u> g. <u>climate change research for both adaptation and mitigation;</u> h. <u>social issues;</u> i. forest operations efficiencies and economics; j. energy efficiency; k. life cycle assessment; l. avoidance of illegal logging; and m. avoidance of controversial sources.	MF	10						

Notes	<p>Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment Policy 271: Forest Research and Experimentation</p> <p>Strategic forest plan mentions support for research projects. Forest health program is also involved in research.</p> <p>Research projects over past several years with Dr. Michael B. Walters, Michigan State to assess deer browse impacts on vegetation and other deer population, ecology, and management. Dr. Walters shares the status and preliminary results of his research with DNRE annually. This includes annual meetings with the FMD Silviculture and Regeneration Team, with includes the District Timber Management Specialists. Only a portion of his research has actually been published thus far.</p> <p>From the Michigan State Forest Management Plan: <i>“The Michigan Department of Natural Resources budgeted approximately \$6.6 million in FY 2006 to support a wide variety of ongoing forestry, wildlife and fisheries monitoring, assessment, and research projects that are designed to increase knowledge and to improve methods of sustainable management of Michigan’s public lands. Many of these research projects are accomplished in cooperation with state Universities through formal agreements and on an as needed call for proposals for subjects of interest. The DNR produces an annual report to document the commitment to sustainable forestry research and to inform discussion on research needs and collaboration opportunities among the DNR divisions.”</i></p> <p>Report “Summary of Sustainable Forestry Research, FY 2009, For meeting SFI Annual Reporting Requirements relating to Section V, Conservation Partnerships” showed the following:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Category</td> <td>Internal (\$US)</td> <td>External (\$US)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>A. Forest Health & Productivity</td> <td>\$3,073,222</td> <td>\$285,217</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Wildlife and Fish</td> <td>\$220,000</td> <td>\$15,300</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D. Landscape/Ecosystem Management and Biodiversity</td> <td>\$290,835</td> <td>\$576,835</td> </tr> </table>	Category	Internal (\$US)	External (\$US)	A. Forest Health & Productivity	\$3,073,222	\$285,217	C. Wildlife and Fish	\$220,000	\$15,300	D. Landscape/Ecosystem Management and Biodiversity	\$290,835	\$576,835
Category	Internal (\$US)	External (\$US)											
A. Forest Health & Productivity	\$3,073,222	\$285,217											
C. Wildlife and Fish	\$220,000	\$15,300											
D. Landscape/Ecosystem Management and Biodiversity	\$290,835	\$576,835											

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
15.1.2	Research on genetically engineered trees via forest tree biotechnology shall adhere to all applicable federal, state, and provincial regulations and international protocols.	NA							
Notes	No forest tree biotechnology or genetically engineered trees are produced.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
15.2	Program Participants shall individually <u>and/or</u> through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners develop or use state, provincial or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.	MF	10						

<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.
--------------	-----------------

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.2.1	Participation, individually <u>and/or</u> through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees <u>and/or</u> associations at the <u>national</u> , state, provincial or regional level, in the development or use of <u>some of</u> the following: a. regeneration assessments; b. growth and drain assessments; c. best management practices implementation and conformance; d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners; and e. <u>social, cultural or economic benefit assessments.</u>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Involvement in Michigan SFI Implementation Committee was confirmed, but most actions to conform are individual. A: FIA data 5 analysis includes an analysis of trends in regeneration; A and B: Michigan State forest timber revenues supported a 3X intensity of FIA data over an 8-year period ending in 2007. B: Timber products output surveys and reports to determine drain are paid for by DNR D: Michigan Natural Features Inventory “Rare Species Explorer” web tool http://web4.msue.msu.edu/mnfi/explorer/index.cfm links to useful web pages for rare features and species; D: Biodiversity conservation planning process addressed special features across all ownerships. E. Michigan Forest Resource Assessment and Strategy								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3	<u>Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners broaden the awareness of climate change impacts on forests, wildlife and biological diversity.</u>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Cara Boucher and others are involved in various cooperative efforts.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3.1	Where available, monitor information generated from regional climate models on long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.	MF	10				10		
Notes	<p><u>There is an opportunity to improve the program to “monitor information generated from regional climate models on long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability”.</u></p> <p>There is no department-wide initiative or program for monitoring information on long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability, but several people in MDNRE have duties that do cover these issues. Chris Hoving, Wildlife Division has overall lead responsibility for Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment. Amy Clark-Eagle, within the Forest Planning and Operations Unit, has some climate change duties within her written job description. Forest Health Specialists also follow trends and consider how forest insects and diseases factor in.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
15.3.2	<u>Program Participants are knowledgeable about climate change impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitats and conservation of biological diversity through international, national, regional or local programs.</u>	MF				10			
Notes	<p><u>Minor Non-Conformance SFI-2010-2:</u> <u>Field foresters and biologists have not been made aware of information regarding climate change impacts, including information known to specialists.</u></p> <p>Chris Hoving, Wildlife Division is the overall lead for Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment.</p> <p>Many field foresters and biologists interviewed have limited or no knowledge of information generated from regional climate models. Most do have a general sense of likely climate changes, but some could only specify “warmer” as the trend, without any awareness of predicted trends in precipitation or of changes in patterns or variability.</p>								

Objective 16. Training and Education.

To improve the implementation of sustainable forestry practices through appropriate training and education programs.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.1	Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	10						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.1.1	Written statement of commitment to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to <u>facility</u> and woodland managers, fiber sourcing staff and field foresters.	MF	10						
Notes	<p>The commitment to forest certification of is a part of Michigan state law.</p> <p>Michigan DNR's leadership restated the organization's commitment to certification.</p> <p>The lands out of scope and in scope were clarified (a written list was developed).</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.1.2	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives.	MF		10					
Notes	<p><u>Exceeds the Requirement: Michigan DNR has a Forest Certification Action Team an active working group drawn from across the Michigan DNR with assignments for all SFI Performance Measures and Indicators and a dedicated Forest Certification Specialist.</u></p> <p>All of the SFI Performance Measures and Indicators are contained in a series of Forest Certification Work Instructions, which are regularly reviewed and updated. These work instructions provide clear assignment of responsibilities by position.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.1.3	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	All				10			

<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>Minor Non-Conformance SFI-2010-3:</u> <u>Understanding of the Within-Stand Retention Guidelines and the accurate use of silviculture terminology are areas where training is not consistently sufficient to roles and responsibilities of land managers.</u></p> <p>Staff interviewed by the auditors was uniformly highly credentialed and very knowledgeable. Managers conduct annual performance reviews for all employees who report directly to them. Training plans are then developed for each employee.</p> <p>Both the Wildlife and Forestry Divisions develop and implement annual training plans which deal with broad training needs and which also list mandatory training identified to meet laws and priorities that are intended for selected employees.</p> <p>Formal training records are maintained in Lansing; personnel often maintain their own training records. Confirmed training records for one mid-career forester, which included Lansing’s records (Incident Qualification Record) and a more comprehensive spreadsheet of locally tracked training.</p> <p>Forester’s ability to explain wildlife retention guidelines varied widely, as did implementation of the guidelines.</p> <p>Forester’s ability to use silviculture terminology correctly may reflect an underlying lack of adequate understanding of principles and options, and certainly can lead to challenges in communicating across disciplines and organizations.</p>
--------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF, PP	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Foresters providing contract forestry services must have a professional forestry degree, pass a written test, and take an orientation test.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.1.5	<u>Forestry enterprises shall have a program for the use of certified logging professionals (where available) and qualified logging professionals.</u>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>Buyers don’t have to have training to purchase timber from the State of Michigan but a trained person must be part of the logging crew. Confirmed by field interviews with loggers on active harvests and by review of documents including the pre-sale meeting notes listing the “Trained Individual(s)” on the form R4050E “Timber Sale Contract – Field Inspection Report” that the system requiring use of trained loggers is effective. One worker on the harvest must have the Michigan SFI Training or Wisconsin FISTA Training before the cutting begins; this is covered in the TS prospectus, in the contract, and on the field inspection report.</p> <p>See the opportunity to improve under Performance Measure 16.2 (support for logger training / only one trained individual per harvest crew).</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.2	Program Participants shall work <u>individually and/or</u> with SFI Implementation Committees, logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.	MF	10				10		
Notes	<p>There is an opportunity to improve support for logger training.</p> <p>No support for logger training is provided directly by MDNRE; instead the requirement is met by participation with the SFI Implementation Committee. Having only one trained individual per harvest crew is the current minimum; more training opportunities might increase the participation, at least for critical issue such as BMP provisions or safety training.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.2.1	<p>Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses that address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI program; b. best management practices, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance and retirement; c. reforestation, <u>invasive exotic plants and animals</u>, forest resource conservation, aesthetics, and <u>special sites</u>; d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat (e.g. <u>Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value</u>); e. logging safety; f. <u>U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (COHS)</u> regulations, wage and hour rules, and other provincial, state and local employment laws; g. transportation issues; h. business management; i. public policy and outreach; and j. <u>awareness of emerging technologies</u>. 	MF	10						
Notes	<p>Sustainable Forestry Education (SFE) program is the program for the qualified logger designation.</p> <p>Not all of the new requirements have yet been incorporated into the SFE program, but plans are underway to do so.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
16.2.2	<p><u>Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria for recognition of logger certification programs, where they exist, that include:</u></p> <p><u>a. completion of SFI Implementation Committee recognized logger training programs and meeting continuing education requirements of the training program;</u></p> <p><u>b. independent in-the-forest verification of conformance with the logger certification program standards;</u></p> <p><u>c. compliance with all applicable laws and regulations including responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act and other measures to protect wildlife habitat;</u></p> <p><u>d. use of best management practices to protect water quality; e. logging safety; f. compliance with acceptable silviculture and utilization standards;</u></p> <p><u>g. aesthetic management techniques employed where applicable; and h. adherence to a management or harvest plan that is site specific and agreed to by the forest landowner.</u></p>	MF	10						
Notes	<p>Dennis Nezich recently joined the certifying board of the Michigan Master Logger Program.</p> <p>Michigan SFI Implementation Committee has not yet formally recognized the Michigan Master Logger Program, but will consider formal recognition during the upcoming fall SIC meeting.</p> <p>From: Turino, Jessica [mailto:Jessica.Turino@weyerhaeuser.com] Sent: Thursday, October 21, 2010 10:15 PM To: Michael Ferrucci Subject: RE: Michigan DNRE</p> <p>Attached you will find the notes from our spring SIC meeting and the agenda for our fall meeting. The spring SIC meeting notes confirm Michigan DNRE involvement (Dennis Nezich) and also document a discussion for the MI SIC to review the Michigan Master Logger Certification Program at our fall meeting. The fall SIC meeting agenda has a review of the MI Master Logger Certification program scheduled. Don Peterson from the American Loggers Council will be presenting and if all of the criteria of 16.2.2 and our additional proposed guidelines are met we will motion to approve/recognize the program.</p>								

Objective 17. Community Involvement in the Practice of Sustainable Forestry.

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging the public and forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry, and publicly report progress.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
<i>17.1</i>	Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state, provincial and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, <u>conservation organizations, indigenous peoples and governments, community groups, sporting organizations, labor, universities, extension agencies, the American Tree Farm System® and/or other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.</u>	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>See indicators.</p> <p>Support for American Tree Farm System® by the CFM foresters; working through the forest stewardship advisory committee to ensure that Tree Farm and Michigan Stewardship plans are compatible and can serve cross purposes.</p> <p>Grayling FMU: ELF Program in local schools and Forest Fest annually at Hartwick Pine State Forest.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	C	EXR	Maj	Min	OFI	Likely Gap *	Likely Conf. *
<i>17.1.1</i>	Support, <u>including financial</u> , for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>SFI Implementation Committee meets twice per year; DN attends these meetings. He is also on the sub-committee on Sustainable Forestry Education has also met twice annually; new Chair is Jay Eckloff</p> <p>Confirmation from Jessica Turino, Chair of the Michigan SFI Implementation Committee:</p> <p>“From: Turino, Jessica [mailto:Jessica.Turino@weyerhaeuser.com] Sent: Thursday, October 21, 2010 10:15 PM To: Michael Ferrucci Subject: RE: Michigan DNRE Mike, Attached you will find the notes from our spring SIC meeting and the agenda for our fall meeting. The spring SIC meeting notes confirm Michigan DNRE involvement (Dennis Nezich) ...”</p> <p>MDNRE pays \$1,000 per year to the SFI Implementation Committee.</p> <p>Michigan Cooperative Education Service provides logger training services.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1.2	Support for the development of educational materials for use with forest landowners (e.g. <u>information packets, websites, newsletters, workshops, tours, etc.</u>).	MF	10						
Notes	Michigan's Cooperative Forest Management program and extension program conduct these activities.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1.3	Support for the development of regional, state or provincial information materials that provide forest landowners with practical approaches for addressing <u>special sites</u> and biological diversity issues, such as <u>invasive exotic plants and animals</u> , specific wildlife habitat, <u>Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value</u> , and threatened and endangered species.	MF	10						
Notes	Conformance is achieved through extension, through wildlife division's landowner program including a landowner guide, and through MNFI Training for Invasives and Exotics opened up to attendance by private foresters and service providers. Support for the Michigan Forest Landowners Association (MFA) including a staff person on the board.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1.4	Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of managed forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs such as current-use taxation programs, Forest Legacy Program or conservation easements.	MF	10						
Notes	The State of Michigan is a supporter of all of the types of programs listed in the indicator.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.1.5	Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders and have a program to <u>take into account the results of these efforts in planning.</u>	DC, MF	10						

Notes	<p>Unlike many other states, Michigan’s Wildlife Action Plan does not provide information useful for this indicator. Long term the Ecoregional Plans will provide “credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders”. In the meantime the BSA Project and the associated Management Areas within the Regional State Forest Plans (RSFPs) help show conformance. The regional planning/priority setting (BSAs) process has largely been completed. The program to “take into account the results of these efforts in planning” involves finalizing the BSA boundaries and incorporating the BSAs and other conservation and management issues into Management Areas and RSFPs. This should be largely completed over the next six to eight months, although completion of the other planning and public involvement steps required to finalize the Regional State Forest Plans may take until late 2011 or early 2012. Because the BSA conservation planning and priority-setting process is nearly complete and because the program to take into account the results in Regional State Forest Plans is underway the team can currently find conformance with this indicator. However if the results of the analysis are not carried over into actual plans in a reasonable time frame (the current proposals appear reasonable) then conformance will be in doubt. The audit team will make this issue the highest priority for the 2011 Surveillance Audit.</p>
--------------	--

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.2	Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education and involvement related to sustainable forest management.	KF, MF	10						
Notes	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.2.1	Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. field tours, seminars, <u>websites</u>, <u>webinars</u> or workshops; b. educational trips; c. self-guided forest management trails; d. publication of articles, educational pamphlets or newsletters; or e. support for state, provincial, and local forestry organizations and soil and water conservation districts. 	MF, KF	10						
Notes	A sample of employees was interviewed regarding personal involvement in educational activities. Involvement levels vary widely, from none to significant involvement with the public covering all five examples from the indicator. The typical response was that most foresters and biologists have found an effective way to include public education, primarily involving school children, as part of their professional or personal lives. Support for the Michigan Forest Landowners Association (MFA) including a staff person on the board and support for annual “Forestry Days”.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.3	Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, <u>unions</u>, the public or other Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.3.1	Support for SFI Implementation Committees (e.g. toll free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	An inconsistent practices program has been established by the Michigan SFI Implementation Committee. Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment has a representative on the SFI Implementation Committee, but his focus is on logger training. The MDNRE website provides the hotline phone number.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
17.3.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries. <u>SFI Implementation Committees shall submit data annually to SFI Inc. regarding concerns received and responses.</u>	MF, KF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See Indicator 17.3.1 above. Other long-standing forestry, wildlife, fisheries, or MDNRE policies and systems are in place to deal with concerns about practices or plans.								

Objective 18. Public Land Management Responsibilities.

To promote and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
18.1	Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.	KF, RH	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
18.1.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.	KF, RH	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Within the Michigan State Forest Management plan are goals and strategies for consultation with government and non-government entities and individuals. The team saw multiple instances of confirmation that these approaches are being implemented.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
18.1.2	Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal or independent collaboration.	KF, RH	10						
<i>Notes</i>	<p>The document “Managing Michigan's State Forest: Your Guide to Participation” describes the compartment planning process, from pre-inventory meetings through inventory, draft prescriptions, revised prescriptions, open house formal “Compartment Review” of the final plan. There are public input opportunities at every stage of the process.</p> <p>On occasion citizens will ask for changes after Compartment Review, perhaps when the foresters are working in the forest laying out the harvest unit or marking trees. Minor changes can be made on the spot; more substantial changes must go through the Section 7 process.</p> <p>Stakeholder interviews confirmed appropriate contact.</p>								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
18.2	Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.	RH, KF	10						

<i>Notes</i>	See indicator.
--------------	----------------

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
<i>18.2.1</i>	Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. understand and respect traditional forest-related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and c. address the use of non-timber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands. 	RH, KF	10				10		
<i>Notes</i>	<p><u>There is an opportunity to improve the Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment to identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites.</u></p> <p>a: OK; may be not applicable.</p> <p>b: Methods for outreach to native American tribes are not resulting in the desired level of response and collaboration.</p> <p>c: Strong; when requests are received for gathering rights they are generally approved.</p> <p>Tribal Interactions are being emphasized at the FMU Level, but most units report very little day to day tribal involvement.</p> <p>Tribal representatives are invited to attend open houses and compartment review, but tribal representatives rarely attend.</p>								

Objective 19. Communications and Public Reporting.

To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by documenting progress and opportunities for improvement.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.1	<u>A Certified Program Participant shall provide a summary audit report, prepared by the certification body, to SFI Inc. after the successful completion of a certification, recertification or surveillance audit to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.</u>	MF	10						
Notes	See indicator below.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.1.1	The summary audit report submitted by the <i>Program Participant</i> (one copy must be in English), shall include, at a minimum, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a description of the audit process, <i>objectives</i> and scope; b. a description of substitute <i>indicators</i>, if any, used in the audit and a rationale for each; c. the name of <i>Program Participant</i> that was audited, including its SFI representative; d. a general description of the <i>Program Participant's</i> forestland and manufacturing operations included in the audit; e. the name of the <i>certification body</i> and <i>lead auditor</i> (names of the <i>audit team</i> members, including <i>technical experts</i> may be included at the discretion of the <i>audit team</i> and <i>Program Participant</i>); f. the dates the certification was conducted and completed; g. a summary of the findings, <u>including general descriptions of evidence of conformity</u> and any nonconformities and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities for improvement, and exceptional practices; and h. the certification decision. 	MF	10						
Notes	This is a new requirement and no past summary audit reports were subject to it. However it is understood by NSF and Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment that the NSF report will be compliant with this requirement.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.2	Program Participants shall report annually to SFI Inc. on their conformance with the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.2.1	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	From: Doty, Amy Sent: Tuesday, August 17, 2010 9:50 AM To: Michael Ferrucci Subject: RE: Required SFI Annual Survey Reports "Mike. Electronic forms were submitted for Wisconsin DNR, Michigan DNR and Minnesota DNR."								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.2.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Categories of information for the report are covered by computerized record keeping systems (databases) which appear to be kept up to date and accurate. Timber sale related records were checked for many field sites.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
19.2.3	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF	10						
<i>Notes</i>	Past copies of reports are maintained by the Forest Certification Coordinator.								

Objective 20. Management Review and Continual Improvement.

To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry, and to monitor, measure and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
20.1	Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.	MF		10					
<i>Notes</i>	Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment's program of certification-related management review is exemplary. See indicators.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
20.1.1	System to review commitments, programs and procedures to evaluate effectiveness. <u>Note: For multi-site programs the auditing requirements of Section 9 or the ISO requirements must be followed; at a minimum internal audits or monitoring that spans all sites and addresses the relevant part of the SFI Standard is expected.</u>	MF		10					
<i>Notes</i>	The system is described in the Michigan Work Instructions (Section 1.2) and includes employment of a Forest Certification Coordinator, involvement of managers from all levels of the department, many programs for monitoring and recording plans and results of activities, mandatory annual reports to the Michigan Legislature, Internal audits (see 20.1.2) and Management Review (20.1.3). Note: The NSF third-party audit and the MDNRE internal audit and management review system are compliant with the Section 9 requirements.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
20.1.2	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives and performance measures.	MF		10					
<i>Notes</i>	Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment has a robust and very well documented process of conducting internal audits and Internal NCRs. The Forest Certification Coordinator tracks NCRs using "Status" spreadsheets. The auditor reviewed the Internal Audit Reports for: Gwinn, PRC, Cadillac FMUs (2009); and for Gaylord, Shingleton, and Escanaba (Summer 2010). The reports provide a description of the internal audit and management review processes, and list findings with associated root cause analysis and corrective actions, proposed completion dates, review/acceptance of proposed corrective action, and provisions for recording completed actions.								

	2010-2014 Requirement	Audit -or	<u>C</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	<u>OFI</u>	<u>Likely Gap *</u>	<u>Likely Conf. *</u>
20.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.	MF		10					
Notes	<p>Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment - Management Review Report - February 3, 2010:</p> <p>Topics (from Agenda; all covered in the report):</p> <p> “I. Background</p> <p> Management review process – how, why, expectations, time line, etc. 3</p> <p> Fourth Annual Surveillance Audit..... 5</p> <p> External Audit Results..... 6</p> <p> Statewide non-conformances from 2009 internal audits 10</p> <p> II. Decision Items -Audit response for each functional program area.</p> <p> 1..... Clarify the scope of certification (page 11)</p> <p> 2..... Management Review (page 11)</p> <p> 3..... ORV Program (page 12)</p> <p> 4..... Planning (page 12)</p> <p> 5..... Biodiversity Guidance (page 13)</p> <p> 6..... DNRE Approval Process for Intrusive Activity (page 14)</p> <p> 7..... BMPs and RDRs (page 15)</p> <p> 8..... Research (page 15)</p> <p> 9..... Timber Sale Program (page 15)</p> <p> 10..... Staff Training (page 16)</p> <p> 11..... Forest Regeneration (page 16)</p> <p> 12..... Roads and Road Closures (page 16)</p> <p> 13..... Invasive Exotics ((page 16)</p> <p> 14..... Tribal (page 17)</p> <p> 15..... Chemical Use (page 17)</p> <p> 16..... Work Instruction Revisions (page 17)</p> <p> 17..... Appendix A – Statewide Non-conformance Reports (page 19)</p> <p> 18..... Appendix B – DNRE Internal Audit Process and Procedures (22)</p> <p> 19..... Appendix C – Status of Internal Audit NCRs (page 30)</p>								

Section B-1 Audit Field Sites

Tuesday, 19 October 2010

Gladwin Management Unit (*Robert Hrubes, Mike Ferrucci, Paul Pingrey, Kathryn Fernholz, David Capen, Auditors*)

Compartment 72, Wet/Dry Harvest. An active harvest site, Shawn Muma, the contractor; interviewed by some auditors. Muma is a large contractor and wins bids on many state forest harvest jobs. He maintains good equipment, practices safety, and complies with prescriptions and contract specifications. Checks were made for RTE species and historical sites before harvest specifications. No wetlands or water to buffer on this site, but there is a concern about the high water table; skid roads were laid out on small ridges; no rutting was observed; harvesting equipment seems to have moved about the stand freely, prompting questions about soil compaction from auditors; weather has been dry during the harvest, however. Discussion of woody biomass guidelines, and a note that despite chipping of limbs and tops during this harvest, plenty of slash was distributed about the site, much of it being dragged back from the landing.

Compartment 82. A lowland hardwood harvest, about 40 acres. The prescription was a diameter-limit harvest of oak, ash, and maple >8 inches DBH, resulting in a residual stand of <15 BA; aspen > 2 inches also were removed. There were some questions from auditors about a diameter-limit prescription in lowland hardwoods, but most discussion at this site focused on the fact that the initial prescription was different, but there were no bids. The process for changing the prescription was well documented in the compartment files. A small, local contractor acquired the bid on this sale.

Field Trial Area. Although the site was not visited because of time and distance, the management plan for a unique 5,000-acre area of intensive aspen management was discussed with the wildlife biologist for this Unit. The field trial site has been managed for this purpose since 1916 and actually is designated by the state legislature for such management. Hunting of grouse and woodcock, the featured species for field trials, is not permitted on the area, although hunting for deer is allowed after the field trial season is over.

Bently Marsh, Proposed BSA. This site served as a basis for discussing the process of screening ecologically important sites for BSA designation. Desired Future Conditions have been drafted for this marsh and a sizeable acreage of the surrounding Mesic Hardwood Forest community.

Compartment 66. Inspection of a recent gate installation to create a hiking trail and access for hunters instead of illegal access by ORV's. More repair of the trail is planned. This project was funded with wildlife habitat funds, and the intent is to control damaging illegal ORV access before investing farther in habitat improvement.

Compartment 65. Inspection of another project funded by wildlife—a parking area (being used by a grouse hunter) and berms to prevent ORV access to a recent red pine clearcut. Auditors focused mostly on the silvicultural objectives for the red pine and on distribution of residual trees and patches of residuals. Initial plans were to replant with red pine, but seemingly sufficient amounts of regeneration on site have changed those plans in favor of natural regeneration of a mixed-species stand.

AA Red Pine Sale, Stands 25 and 29. 116 acre completed harvest with significant retention of pine trees in a pine clearcut with reserves in a pine plantation. Reserved trees were generally dispersed and representative of the previous stand; some clumped retention also. Excellent aesthetics and good wildlife retention. (*Mike Ferrucci, Auditor*)

Wednesday, 20 October 2010

Gaylord Management Unit (*Robert Hrubes and Paul Pingrey, Auditors*)

North Central Rail Trail – Wolverine. The 62-mile trail, resurfaced with crushed limestone in the fall of 2007, is a popular cycling trail that runs from Gaylord to Mackinaw City. Indian River DNRE staff discussed the multi-use trail, maintenance issues and community partnerships.

Wilmot Township Transfer Station (waste collection site). The parking area and dumpsters on the site are provided in partnership with the township. The objective is to encourage town residents to drop off/recycle waste rather than dump it on state forest land. People still leave large items, tires and other junk in the woods, but problems are reduced. State forest personnel clean up most trash from the forest.

Wolverine Aspen Compartment 156. The 86 acre sale was split into three blocks and will be cut during summer to avoid snowmobile use conflicts on the adjacent trail. This block is 50 acres, and all the aspens will be harvested (none retained). Small white pine saplings and some poles (about 7.5 square feet of basal area per acre) will be retained. The foresters explained that the retention specifications are based “on site objectives, not wildlife habitat considerations.”

Compartment 148 Hardwood. Active timber harvest in one-aged northern hardwood pole/small sawtimber sized stand. The harvest is creating gaps and reducing basal area to stimulate development of regeneration. The long-term management goal is all-aged mesic hardwoods. The thinning was marked by a contracted forester.

The auditors interviewed the logging company owner and a feller-buncher operator. The harvester operator explained that he'd been in the business 23 years, three for this firm. He works 9.5 hours a day, takes a half hour lunch, and is paid an hourly wage. His only other job benefit is five days of paid leave per year (he is not paid for holidays unless he uses one of the leave days). The operator had a spill kit in the harvester. He also explained use of hose plugs in the event of a hydraulic fluid leak. The company owner attends one day of logger training per year (no one else is trained). He complained that few courses are offered and that he would need to travel long distances to pick up sessions offering new topics.

Weber Lake – ORV damage repair. Project was coordinated by DNRE Fisheries and Forestry staff. ORV users had been driving down a steep bank to clean their machines in the lake water. Boulders were positioned to block access, and a deeply eroded gully was filled and seeded. The approved seed mix included grass and white clover. Repairs here were made for about \$5,000. Of 60 Repair Damage Report (RDR) cases in the last year, 28 were fixed, 28 are on hold for lack of funds, and 14 were dropped as not needed or not feasible.

Compartment 145 Hardwood. Another active harvest similar to Stop 4 (thinning of a mesic hardwood stand to create gaps). This sale was also marked by a contracted forester, who is required to attend DNRE training and pass a periodic marking test. The sale is being cut by a hand chain saw operator, but he was not on site or available for an interview.

“Red Pine Project” site. This large old-field tract was planted to red pines in the 1930’s. Soil quality is high and so natural oaks and mesic hardwoods became established with the pines. The site has taken on a semi-natural forest appearance, and many pines have grown to large sawtimber size. Except for very few marked reserves (generally poor-formed conifers), all the pines are designated for cutting in order to allow the hardwoods to take over the site. It’s an example of the “Red Pine Project” plan to remove pines from sites better suited to hardwoods. DNRE intends to plant replacement red pines on dryer, sandy sites elsewhere. Surprisingly, no stakeholder groups have expressed public opposition to harvest of the large pines. Based on habitat type, pre-settlement stands on similar soils may have had more pines than are being reserved. Curiously, the few trees painted as reserves have no stump marks (meaning sale administrators would have a difficult time telling if marked reserves were taken).

West Branch of the Sturgeon River ORV repair. Where a town road crosses the beautiful trout stream, ORV riders had been entering the river and “playing” along the banks, presumably to wash mud from their machines. Boulders were positioned to prevent easy ORV access. The repairs made over five years ago (and viewed during the 2005 audit) are holding well.

Grayling Management Unit (*David Capen, Mike Ferrucci, Auditors*)

Compartment 7, Fire Tower RDR Site. Resource Damage form was completed in 2005; rehabilitation work began in 2007.

Compartment 7, Model T Mix. An open sale, but not active; jack pine, being managed to move toward white and red pine, consistent with site conditions. A major discussion of practices for retention in clearcuts. Biologists and foresters in this Unit have incorporated considerations of natural disturbance regimes in designing retention islands (nearby red pine clearcuts had islands of residuals that mimic fire vortices); legacy trees also are identified and retained.

White Pine-Hemlock Grove. Viewed from vehicles; a Special Conservation Area (SCA) of late successional pine and hemlock. The stand is adjacent to a curved dip on a paved county road, where accidents have occurred because of ice. County commissioners have asked that the trees be cut for some distance from the road, but MDRE has resisted because there is no evidence that trees are at fault (allegedly creating a microclimate effect).

Historic Logging Flume. Short walk along a pleasant trail to an old (late 1800's) wooden flume on a small stream. It is a significant historic site; once scheduled to be removed by another state agency.

Big V Aspen Sale. An active harvest; 125-acre clearcut, leaving all oaks <4 inches; three islands of retention, of different sizes and shapes. G&G Forest Products is the contractor, a 3-person crew owned by two brothers (both on site); interviewed Gary Spies, one of the owners. Very professional operator and compliant with safety requirements; spill kit on site; no evidence of spills or leaking equipment.

Compartment 9, Townline KW Sale. Discussion of management for the endangered Kirtland's Warbler, a species that breeds almost entirely in Michigan, and mostly on state and federal lands. Populations have exceeded recovery goal, but a second viable population—growing numbers in the UP—is desired before delisting. Young jack pine forests with dense, grassy understory are preferred habitat, but a more diverse mix of other species with jack pine is now being promoted. Discussion of planting crews, mostly migrant workers, their legality and working conditions.

Muskrat Lake Campground and ORV Trailhead. Campground is closed due to budget cuts. ORV trail is well maintained, a 50-inch trail width. Numbers of ORV registrations are still increasing.

Compartment 29, Frost Pocket Special Management Area. Inspection of a gas well pad on the edge of the frost pocket community proposed as a BSA. Appears to be an excellent example of the natural community. Invasive plants are an issue, but appropriate management practices are in place, including controlled burning.

Compartment 14, Bailey Sale. An oak stand with shelterwood harvest completed in Fall 2009; 40-50 BA residual oak, with some large white pines for diversity. Most visible regeneration is maple and aspen, but some oak is sprouting from seeds, especially in pockets that were scarified during harvest. Excellent distribution of slash on site, cut to 24-inches or less in height (a common specification); landing was small and located away from public road.

Thursday, 21 October 2010

Shingleton Management Unit *Mike Ferrucci and Paul Pingrey, Auditors*

Fletchers Hill Mix-Unit 4. Completed portion of sale is composed of two stands, one predominantly aspen and the other oak. All aspen trees were cut from the former, with red pines and oaks left as reserves. The wildlife biologist described the red pines as favorable for red crossbill bird habitat. "Aspen TSI" was also done by a prison crew to remove any non-merchantable hardwoods (except oak and June-berry) perceived as a threat to aspen sprout vigor. The treatment was described as "aspen regeneration insurance." Going forward, the prison crews will not be available since all prison work camps were closed by the state.

In the oak stand, aspen and other species were removed and the oaks were retained. For the past several years Shingleton FMU has specified no cutting of oak unless it was intentionally part of the sale volume, even if it doesn't appear during the cruise (as sometimes can occur). The harvest was classified as a "selection cut", although "intermediate thinning" would have been a more appropriate term.

South Fletchers Hill Mix – "Oak Complaint." The sale area includes three pin oak stands. The harvest created canopy gaps to release oak seedlings and stimulate stump sprouting. The gaps were not well positioned relative to oak saplings out of mistaken concern over residual damage. The stand prescription called the treatment "selection" cutting, however, "shelterwood" would have been more appropriate terminology. Pure oak stands are not common in the management unit, and so the foresters sought outside advice on treatment options. The objective was to create a two-aged stand. The foresters believe it is unlikely that hunters would support final removal of the overstory oaks, and so they will likely be retained as permanent reserves.

Aspen TSI W41-1356 Comp 36 Stand 32. Similar removal of non-aspen hardwoods as seen in stop 1, intended to release aspen sprouts. Prison crews were also used here.

Stutts Road Softwood Sale 007-2008. Jack pine pole harvest cut in 2008 and scarified to stimulate natural jack pine seedling establishment in 2010. Large red pines were retained to encourage natural seeding of mixed pine species. The scarification was done by dragging an anchor chain with a skidder.

Stutts 21 Jack Pine – Sale 012-2004. The jack pine stand (which is separated from the Stop 4 site with only a narrow buffer strip, but state green-up policies do not specify minimum buffer widths between contiguous harvests) was cut in 2005. It received a similar scarification treatment as the previous site and has excellent jack pine reproduction.

Compartment 42 – Stand 3 Site Preparation. Follow-up treatment for a 2004 red pine final clearcut after a previous jack pine intermediate removal done in 1994. The initial plan for the site was to use prescribed fire to stimulate natural jack pine regeneration. The burn window was missed, however, and so brush and herbaceous vegetation became well established. The area was trenched in 2008, sprayed with Accord® herbicide, and planted to red pine seedlings in 2008. The Accord application was done by helicopter at the rate of 1.5 quarts per acre (the product label maximum rate is 2 quarts per acre). The herbicide application appears to have been effective.

Camp 9 Pine – Units 1 and 12. First and second red pine plantation thinning operations. Trees to be cut were marked at DBH and at the stump. Removals were from below. Scattered aspens were retained in Unit 12, although it appeared that more of the hardwoods could have been left for stand diversity. The Unit 12 harvest was active, and so the auditors interviewed the logger. The logger had attended annual SFI training and wore appropriate Personal Protective Equipment. His employees were paid an hourly rate and received 40 hours of paid leave per year (and no other benefits).

Trashy Pine Sale C41-1338. The harvest removed aspen and decadent jack pines. The foresters considered whether to accept weak aspen regeneration or to use herbicides to try for better jack pines. After considering the habitat type, they chose the jack pine alternative. Discussion revolved around need for a landscape plan to help guide such decisions. OI notes show regeneration efforts (trenching, planting) and regeneration checks. Natural regeneration was not sufficient, stand was planted spring 2009 and regeneration check done December 2009. Sprayed with Accord 1.5 quarts by helicopter one month before the audit; too soon to see results.

Adopt a Forest Project. Project funding was used to clean up batteries and junk that had been dumped on state land. Fourteen volunteers picked up the trash. The money was used to pay tipping fees at a landfill and to dig a berm to block a road into the site. The Natural Resources Commission and the DNRE Commissioner approved the road closure order.

Dufour Creek Culvert Replacement. Fixed an undersized culvert on a snowmobile trail. The small culvert caused a mud hole, which was being enlarged by illegal ORV use. The repairs, including a new rock base on the trail, have eliminated the problem. Necessary permits and engineering specifications were handled by a contractor. The RDR was dated 6.28.06 and the project completion date is September, 2008.

Thompson Plains Prescribed Burn. 244 acre open lands complex burned in 2010. The work was done for sharp-tail grouse habitat. A Wild Turkey Chapter also planted 500 native crab apple saplings and high bush cranberry shrubs. The project packet included the burn plan and post-fire monitoring report.

Compartment 86 – Michaud Lake Intermittent Wetland ERA. Dry lake near a proposed aspen harvest was examined. A buffer composed of a narrow red pine stand separates the Ecological Reference Area wetland from the timber sale area. The foresters explained that at least a one-tree height buffer would have otherwise been maintained, but nothing more. The dry lakebed is being damaged by illegal ORV use, and so the Conservation Officer was alerted to watch for enforcement opportunities. A Resource Damage Report form had been filed on 10/11/2010.

Stand 15, Harvest Unit 1 (not yet cut, not observed by auditors). Operations Inventory notes (FMD Comment): “Survey work will be needed to determine property line. The ability to harvest this stand depends on a survey work getting completed.” The Timber Sale Map prepared later shows a blue paint line along the boundary line with the private land, indicating that the survey work was completed. (The Unit Manager notified the auditors that a corner post was subsequently found by a forester, allowing the boundary to be marked.) After setting up the harvest the forester measured the basal area of retention and noted it in OI FMD Comment (Red Pine 3.6 sq ft, white pine 1.8 sq ft) showing that the residual basal area was 6% of the original basal area, within guidelines.

Newberry Management Unit (*Robert Hrubes, Kathryn Fernholz, David Capen, Auditors*)

Mac's Market. Small kiosk at local supermarket with brochures about ORV regulations, part of ECORD education effort.

Silver Creek ORV trail. An RDR site; form submitted in 2007, but work has not begun. Several solutions are being discussed, including moving the ORV trail away from the site of damage, a natural scramble site. Desire is to reclaim the site as red pine forest. Another possibility is to develop a permitted scramble site. Current damage does not threaten any water or wetlands.

Battle Wound Pine Sale. Aspen has been cut, but the pine remains. A narrow stand of red pine, but very plantation-like. A discussion of approaches for growing red pine in more diverse stands.

Compartment 110, Controlled burn. A large, but diverse, forest opening that had been burned several years ago; objective was to discourage the dense lichen ground cover and encourage grasses, as cover and food for wildlife.

Sleeper Lake Fire. A proposed BSA and the site of the second largest fire in the Upper Peninsula, in summer 2009. The burned area visited was mostly wetland communities, which were surrounded by fire lines. The lines have been rehabilitated—a cooperative project with The Nature Conservancy—and the progress of restoration is impressive. ORV issues here and efforts to block access. A huge bloom of morel mushrooms the year after fire attracted crowds of mushroom collector to the wetlands. Researchers predict that the mushroom boom will be only for one year. No permits are required for such a harvest, but MDNRE policy is that the collection of such non-timber products is not to be for commercial purposes. (*Robert Hrubes, David Capen, Auditors*)

Compartment 81 Skyline Ridge Jack Pine. A 71-acre closed timber sale; jack pine, black spruce, and white birch were removed, leaving other species. Jack pine and possible white pine will be planted, resulting in a stand of mixed species. Residual trees were abundant; woody debris was plentiful. Inspected crossing of a small wetland; some disturbance of wetland soils remains, but not a BMP violation. Road into sale closed. Brief inspection of an issue of access across private land to access a harvest site that has been sold. Survey work has been done to establish boundary of state land, allowing access from a different direction. (*Robert Hrubes, David Capen, Auditors*)

South 426 Red Pine 42-051-09-01. Active red pine harvest site with ORV trail. Interview with contractors. Discussion of road closure requirements, BMP, guidelines for clearing ORV trail and signage to notify trail users of active logging. (*Kathryn Fernholz, Auditor*)

Buckies Trout Pond. Pond was drawn down because of parasite issue; opportunity to restore the stream. Use of native seed mix and erosion prevention on side slopes. Conduct cost effectiveness evaluation to determine appropriateness of projects. Work with partners to restore streams and of a policy of not wanting damn on streams. (*Kathryn Fernholz, Auditor*)

Wolverine Lake. Discussion of cabin trespass issue and enforcement response (cabin removed). Trail use conflicts between dog sledding and snowmobiles. Review of designated trout pond and dispersed camping issues offered in the area. Review of aspen cut area and interview with contractor. Retention of young white pine and large white pine on a spacing advised by wildlife staff. *(Kathryn Fernholz, Auditor)*

Bass Lake Campground. Review of campground reconstruction with use of applicable guidelines. Review of beech bark disease treatment and removal in the campground area. *(Kathryn Fernholz, Auditor)*

Public Meeting, Newberry, 4:30—6:00. *(Robert Hrubes, Kathryn Fernholz, David Capen, Auditors)*

Citizens Advisory Committee, Eastern Upper Peninsula, 6:30—9:00, Newberry *(Robert Hrubes, Kathryn Fernholz, David Capen, Auditors)*

Friday, 22 October 2010

Escanaba Management Unit *(Mike Ferrucci, Paul Pingrey, Robert Hrubes, Kathryn Fernholz, David Capen, Auditors)*

Compartment 49. Discussion of inventory (2009 using OI) and compartment review. Discussion of removal of Special Conservation Area (SCA) status for several stands approved during compartment review because the stands no longer meet the criteria ('wet, poor quality cedar that do not demonstrate the mature forest conditions desired for an SCA'). Discussed silviculture for stand 85, a mixed stand of low quality hardwoods, using the upland SF guideline to prescribe even-aged management, cedar and hemlock will be retained, but not maple or yellow birch or beech; drainages will be retained untreated.

Worth Tract BSA. A proposed BSA representing the Mesic Northern Forest natural community. Discussed the field assessment of proposed BSAs and inspected the assessment report for this area; also the process of modifying the boundary proposed initially. Nested in the proposed BSA is an excellent Type 1 Old Growth stand of Hemlock and Northern Hardwoods; it is currently protected as an SCA. *(Paul Pingrey, Robert Hrubes, Kathryn Fernholz, David Capen, Auditors)*

Foxy Pine Timber Sale. 81 acres of mixed harvest types. Active harvest, interviewed Dave Zwergel (18-20 years of logging experience, hand-felling, independent and sole proprietor). Three units of clearcut with reserves are completed or nearly complete, and retention of pine and other species was adequate. One lowland conifer unit is complete; this was harvested during a dry summer with some rutting that was within the limits specified in the contract. Also reviewed a proposed FTP for red pine scarification. *(Mike Ferrucci, Auditor)*

Cedar River Campground: Campground is well maintained; issues from the MDNRE's Internal Audit Report have been resolved. Observed evidence that hazard trees around the campground had been taken down. (*Entire audit team*)

ORV Trail. A brief stop to inspect a 50-inch wide ORV trail. Some trails are 24 inches, for two-wheeled motorized and un-motorized vehicles; others, called Routes, are 72 inches in width. (*Paul Pingrey, Robert Hrubes, Kathryn Fernholz, David Capen, Auditors*)

Compartment 42, Stands 48 & 49. A northern hardwood stand on a productive site in a region where forest and cropland mix and deer densities are high. This stand was selectively harvested in the 1990's, but the only abundant regeneration is ironwood, a species avoided by deer; other species were clearly over-browsed. Auditors were told that 90,000 acres of the Western Upper Peninsula state forests have deer densities that correlate to poor regeneration in hardwoods. The WUP wildlife biologist added that more antlerless permits are being issued for the region than are used by hunters, making it difficult to remedy problems of over-browsing. (*Paul Pingrey, Robert Hrubes, Kathryn Fernholz, David Capen, Auditors*)

Compartment 42, Sale 366. A small, 16 acre, harvest area where all aspens and hardwoods except cherry and ash were cut, and where all balsam fir and spruce with more than 2 sticks of pulp were cut. All cedar, hemlock, and pine was retained. The residual stand, while not dense, is diverse, and very thick woody debris is left on the site. (*Paul Pingrey, Robert Hrubes, Kathryn Fernholz, David Capen, Auditors*)

Compartment 53: Green Birch Timber Sale (33-003-09-01): 39 acres in 7 units comprised of 9 stands; logger John Gagne (not present during site visit) has worked in 4 units; Units 5 and 6 are complete, while Unit 2 is partially complete. All three are clearcuts with retention, and the observed retention is customized by stand and generally consistent with guidelines. (*Mike Ferrucci, Auditor*)

Westman Dam: Bridge/dam stop logs maintained by Wildlife Division staff in accordance with the "Hayward Lake Wetland Complex Strategic Plan" 9.16.2003. The plan describes the dam and associated river and lakes, provides the history that includes two significant episodes of public concern, and a concise description of the compromise solution reached and still in effect. Also reviewed Closed RDR 33054552006002 which involved illegal ORV fording of a significant river (Walton River) 50 feet from the bridge. Boulders placed to block ORV access appear to have been effective in doing so. (*Mike Ferrucci, Auditor*)

Section B-2 Participants

Michigan DNR Re-Certification Audit Public Meeting 18 October 2010 Lansing, MI

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>
Robert Hrubes	SCS, FSC Lead Auditor
Katie Fernholz	Auditor
David Capen	Auditor
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor
Marvin Roberson	Sierra Club
Lauri Kay Elbing	The Nature Conservancy
Jim Maturer	Michigan Wild Turkey Hunters Assoc
Robert Jacobson	Michigan Conservation Foundation
Paul Pingrey	Auditor
Scott Everett	Lake States Lumber Association
Will Borden	Lake States Lumber Association
Tom Barnes	Michigan Association of Timbermen

Michigan DNRE Re-Certification Audit Opening Meeting 18 October 2010 Lansing, MI

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position/Title</u>
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor
Robert Hrubes	SCS, FSC Lead Auditor
Paul Pingrey	Auditor
Katie Fernholz	Auditor
David Capen	Auditor
Creig Grey	Law Enforcement- Roscommon
Frank Ruswick	Deputy Director, Stewardship
Doug Reeves	Asst. Chief, Wildlife Division
Penney Melchoir	Field Coordinator- Wildlife Division
Amy Clark Eagle	FMD Biodiversity & Conservation Program
Bill O'Neill	FMD Field Coordinator
Cara Boucher	Ass't Chief/ State Forester, FMD
Naomi Krefmen	FMD
Larry Pedersen	FMD, Forest Resource Mgmt.
David Price	FMD, Certification Planner
Kelley Smith	Chief, Fisheries Division

Lynne Boyd	Chief, Forest Management Division
Dennis Nezych	FMD, Forest Certification Specialist
Mindy Koch	Deputy Director, Resource Management
Bill Sterrett	FMD Forest Resource Mgt. Section Mgr.
Tom Wellman	FMD MLMS Mgr.
Jim Radabaugh	FMD Recreation & Trails Mgr.
	FMD Resource Protection & Cooperative
Scott Heather	Programs
Doug Heym	Timber Sale Program Leader

**Michigan DNR Re-Certification Audit
Afternoon Break-out Sessions
18 October 2010 Lansing, MI**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position/Title</u>
Nick Popoff	Tribal Coordination Unit Manager/ Fisheries Division
Creig Grey	Law Enforcement
Dennis Nezych	FMD- Tribal Coordinator
Dennis Knapp	Native American Affairs Coordinator
Dan Hopkins (Telephone)	LED Field Coordinator
Pat Lederle	DNRE Wildlife
Lynne Boyd	DNRE- FMD
Cara Boucher	FMD
Noami Krefman	FMD
Doug Reeves	WLD
Penny Melchoir	WLD
Lisa Dygert	FMD--GIS
Mike Donovan	WLD
Brian Maki	FMD--GIS
Bill Sterrett	FMD
Doug Heym	FMD
Larry Pedersen	FMD

**Michigan DNR Re-Certification Audit
Gladwin Management Unit
19 October 2010**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title/Position</u>
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor
Robert Hrubes	SCS, FSC Lead Auditor
Dennis Nezych	Forest Certification Specialist, DNRE
Paul Pingrey	SCS/NSF Auditor

Jeanette Haridaj	NSF-Business Development Manager
Roger Hoeksema	DNRE- Cadillac
Penney Melchoir	Wildlife Field Coordinator-Rose Lake
Tim Gallagher	DNRE- FMD- Gladwin Unit
Jake Figley	DNRE-FMD- Gladwin Unit
Nate Stearns	DNRE-FMD- Gladwin Unit
Joel Lundberg	DNRE- Law Division
Scott Throop	DNRE-FMD Cadillac District
	DNRE- Fish
Kathrin Schrouder	Bay City- S. Lake Huron Mgmt. Unit
Bill Sterrett	DNRE- FMD- Lansing
Creig Grey	DNRE- Law Enforcement
Mark Reichel	DNRE-FMD- Gladwin Unit
Todd Neiss	DNRE-FMD Cadillac District
Amanda Matelski	DNRE-FMD Cadillac District
Barry Sova	DNR- WLD- Bay City
Katie Keen	DNR- WLD- Bay City
Rex Ainslie	DNR- WLD- Bay City
Tom Haxby	DNRE-FMD Cadillac District
Bruce Barlow	DNRE-FMD- Gladwin Unit
Rick Myrick	DNRE-FMD- Gladwin Unit
Courtney Borgondy	DNRE-FMD- Gladwin Unit
Rosanne Hatfield	DNRE-FMD- Gladwin Unit
Dick Shellenbarger	DNRE--WLD

**Michigan DNR Re-Certification Audit
Gaylord Management Unit
20 October 2010**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title/Position</u>
Robert Hrubes	SCS, FSC Lead Auditor
Katie Fernholz	Auditor
Paul Pingrey	Auditor
John Pilon	Forest Planner
Keith Kintigh	Wildlife Ecologist
Jerry Grieve	FMD, Land Use Forester
Greg Gatesy	FMD, Land Use Forester
Bill O'Neill	FMD Field Coordinator
Brian Mastenbrook	Wildlife Habitat Biologist
Penney Melchoir	Wildlife Field Coordinator
Mark Monroe	Wildlife Technician
Joyce Angel-Ling	Gaylord Unit Mgr-FMD
Neal Godby	Fisheries Biologist
Amanda Matelski	Trails Analyst- Cadillac FMD

**Michigan DNR Re-Certification Audit
Grayling Management Unit**

20 October 2010

<u><i>Name</i></u>	<u><i>Title/Position</i></u>
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor
Dennis Nezych	Forest Certification Specialist, DNRE
David Capen	Auditor
Craig Farrer	Forest Tech
Joan Charlebois	Forester
Jim Bielecki	Timber Management Specialist
Elaine Carlson	Wildlife Biologist
Steve Sendeck	Fisheries Biologist- Grayling
Larry Allwardt	Forest Fire Officer Supervisor
Brian Burford	Forest Fire Officer-Mio
Paige Perry	Trails Program Analyst
Joel Money	Forest Fire Officer- Grayling
Lisa Weingartz	Equipment Operator- Grayling
Jack Money	Forest Fire Officer- Grayling
Tim Reis	WLD Supervisor, NEMU
Patrick Mohney	Forester- Grayling
Bill Sterrett	FRM Section Lansing
Lucas Merrick	Forester- Grayling

**Michigan DNR Re-Certification Audit
Shingleton Management Unit**

22 October 2010

<u><i>Name</i></u>	<u><i>Title/Position</i></u>
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor
Paul Pingrey	Auditor
Penney Melchoir	Wildlife Division Field Coordinator
Bill O'Neill	Forest Mgmt. Field Coordinator
Steve Tuovila	Forest Mgmt. Fire Officer
Jeff Stampfly	FMD Unit Manager
Darren Kramer	Fish Division- Fisheries Biologist
Robert Crisp	DNRE-Law
Jesse Bramer	Forest Mgmt- Forester
Scott Lakosky	FMD- Fire Supervisor
Kevin Swanson	WLD- Habitat Biologist
Don Brown	WLD- Wildlife Technician
Adam Petrelius	FM- Forester
Mario Molin	FM Forester
Bob Burnham	FM Forester

Rick-James Hill	FM Forester
Jay Osterberg	FM Fire Officer
Don Kuhr	FMD Timber Management Specialist
Peter Costa	FMD Fire Officer

**Michigan DNR Re-Certification Audit
Newberry Management Unit
21 October 2010 Newberry, MI**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title/Position</u>
Robert Hrubes	SCS, FSC Lead Auditor
Katie Fernholz	Auditor
Dave Capen	Auditor
Richard Stevenson	Unit Manager
Rob Katona	Trail Analyst Mgt. OSC
Paul E. Gaberdiel	Fire Supervisor
Dennis Nezich	Forest Certification Specialist, FMD
Kristen Matson	EUP Inventory Planning Spec, FMD
Jim Waybrant	Fish Biologist, NBY
Steve Scott	Lake Superior Basin Coordinator
Kristie Sitar	Wildlife Habitat Biologist
Chris Morris	Acting Lt. Chris Morris
Ben Travis	Forester-Newberry FMU
Bill Sterrett	FRM Section Mgr. Lansing
Jon Spieles	Mgr. Marketing, Education, Technology
Dan Moore	EUP Recreation Specialist, FMD
Terry Minzey	EUP Wildlife Supervisor
Keith Magnusson	Forester- Newberry FMU
Tori Irving	Forester- Newberry FMU
Sharolynne Robinson	Secretary, District EUP Ecoteam

**Michigan DNR Re-Certification Audit
Public Meeting, Newberry
21 October 2010**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title/Position</u>
Robert Hrubes	SCS, FSC Lead Auditor
Katie Fernholz	Auditor
Dave Capen	Auditor
Tina Hall	The Nature Conservancy Tahquamew Area School Board/
Gerald Grossman	Consulting Forester
Stephen Rodocic	Ruffed Grouse Society
Chad Radka	LP Corperation- Resource Mgr.
Bob DeVillez	Retired DNR Forester

Ginny Giddings
Warren Suchovsky

Interested citizen
Michigan Assoc. of Timbermen

Michigan DNR Re-Certification Audit
Escanaba Management Unit
22 October 2010

<u><i>Name</i></u>	<u><i>Title/Position</i></u>
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor
Robert Hrubes	SCS, FSC Lead Auditor
Dennis Nezych	Forest Certification Specialist, DNRE
David Capen	Auditor
Paul Pingrey	Auditor
Katie Fernholz	Auditor
Jason Niemi	Conservation Officer
Rob Katona	Trail Analyst Marquette OSC
Ron Yesney	Recreation Specialist U.P.
Bill O'Neill	FMD Field Coordinator
Bill Sterrett	FRM Section Mgr. -Lansing Field
Jim Ferris	FMD, Gwinn Unit Mgr.
Timothy Robson	Distict Law Supervisor- WUP
Dan Racine	FMD Forester- Escanaba
Keith Murphy	FMD Fire Supervisor- Escanaba
Deb Begalle	FMD WUP District Super Mgt.
John Hamel	FMD Inventory & Planning Specialist
Joe Durbin	FMD Forester
Bill Rollo	Wildlife Technician
Darren Kramer	Fisheries Biologist
Penney Melchoir	Field Coordinator, WLD
Eric Thompson	Escanaba Unit Mgr.
Dan McNamee	FMD Forester



Section C

SFI Reporting Form

CONTACT INFORMATION

Certified Organization		State of Michigan, Department of Natural Resources and Environment		
Organization Main Contact		Dennis Nezich		
Address	Street, No.	1990 US 41 Hwy South	Zip/Postal Code	49855
	City, State/Province	Marquette, MI	Country	USA
Telephone		906-228-6561	Fax	906-228-5245
E-mail		nezichd@michigan.gov	Web	

CERTIFIED FOREST INFORMATION

Forest Certification achieved (mark one)	SFI 2010-2014	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	SFI 2010-2014 Section 2 only	<input type="checkbox"/>
	CSA Z809	<input type="checkbox"/>
Forest area (to which certification applies)¹	State/Province Michigan	3,900,000 acres²
Is this same area certified to another forest management standard?	Yes/No (circle) If Yes, to which standard: <input type="checkbox"/> CSA <input type="checkbox"/> SFI <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC	Land Ownership 100 % public land
Canada Only: What percentage of certified land is located in the Boreal?	% ___ Boreal	AAC in m3³ (AAC to which certification applies. For private lands use annual average harvest)

DATA VERIFICATION

Certified Organization Representative <i>I agree that the information listed above is accurate. Any changes will be communicated to SFI Inc.</i>	Signature: <i>Dennis Nezich</i> Name (Printed): Dennis Nezich	Date: 11.12.10
Certification Body Representative <i>I agree that the information listed above is accurate. Any changes will be communicated to SFI Inc.</i>	Signature: <i>Michael Ferrucci</i> Name (Printed): Michael Ferrucci	Date: 11.12.10

CERTIFICATE INFORMATION (Certification Body Office Use Only)

Certificate Number	5Y031-SF1	CB Name	NSF-ISR
Certificate Issue Date	09-NOV-2010 (mm/dd/yy)	Certificate Expiry Date	08-NOV-2013 (mm/dd/yy)
Text in Scope Line of Certificate	Land management on 3.9 million acres of Michigan State Forests (excluding long-term military lease lands) and related sustainable forestry activities under the SFI 2010-2014 Standard. Exclusions: Lands leased to Luce County and Wildlife Areas that do not go through the compartment review process are not included in the scope of the certificate.		
# of Sites and Locations Certified	One		
CSA Only: Notification Fee collected and paid to PEFC Canada	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	

¹ Please refer to Principles on pages 2-3 on Reporting Guidelines

² Please list by State/Province if certificate covers forestland located in more than one state or province for accounting purposes. Add as required.

³ Please refer to Principle 6 for AAC reporting guidelines

