



Surveillance Audit Report

2010-2014 Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard

November 25, 2011

A. Michigan Department of Natural Resources

FRS #5Y031

B. Scope: No Change Changed

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.

Note: The certified State Forest system includes all lands which are inventoried under either the Operations Inventory or IFMAP forest inventory systems, are identified in a State Forest Compartment, and go through the Michigan DNR compartment review process.

C. NSF Audit Team: Lead Auditor: Mike Ferrucci

Auditor: Robert Hrubes

D. Audit Dates: October 17-20, 2011

E. Reference Documentation:

2010-2014 SFI Standard®

Michigan DNR SFI Documentation: Miscellaneous, with Work Instructions the core documents

F. Audit Results: Based on the results at this visit, the auditor concluded

- Acceptable with no nonconformances; or
- Acceptable with minor nonconformances to be corrected before the next scheduled audit visit;
- Not acceptable with one or two major nonconformances - corrective action required;
- Several major nonconformances - certification may be canceled unless immediate action is taken

G. Changes to Operations or to the SFI Standard:

Are there any significant changes in operations, procedures, specifications, FRS, etc. from the previous visit? Yes No

Note: Changes focused on responding to CARs and OFIs; Michigan DNR returned to previous organizational status, the organization is no longer combined with the environmental regulatory agencies that had been recently added to create the (discontinued) Michigan Department of Natural Resources & Environment.

H. Other Issues Reviewed:

- Yes No Public report from previous audit(s) is posted on SFB web site.
- Yes No N.A. SFI and other relevant logos or labels are utilized correctly. If no, document on CAR forms.

Yes **No** The program is a Multi-site Organization:
Multi-Site Organization: A n organization having an identified central function (hereafter referred to as a central office — but not necessarily the headquarters of the organization) at which certain activities are planned, controlled or managed and a network of local offices or branches (sites) at which such activities are fully or partially carried out.

Source: SFI Requirements, Section 9, Appendix: Audits of Multi-Site Organizations

IAF-MD1 or The alternate approach outlined in SFI Requirements, Section 9, Appendix 1 was assessed by NSF’s Lead Auditor during the certification audit.

Yes **No** Concerns/ issues are listed in the checklist
 (if yes these are to be reviewed by NSF Forestry Program Manager)

I. Corrective Action Requests:

Corrective Action Requests issued this visit (through NSF’s on-line OASIS audit tool):

1. Indicator 17.1.5 involving regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts
2. Indicator 20.1.3 involving annual review and follow-up on internal corrective actions

A Corrective Action Plan is required within sixty days of this visit (for Minor Nonconformances). CARs will be verified during the next Surveillance Audit. Your Corrective Action Plans should be provided through your NSF On-line Interface. Any questions should be directed to Tyrek A. Morgan 734-827-6869 tmorgan@nsf-isr.org.

At the conclusion of this Surveillance Audit visit, the following CARs remain open:

MAJOR(S): 0 MINOR(S): 2 Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs) identified: 4

H. Future Audit Schedule:

Follow-up or Surveillance Audits are required by the 2010-2014 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard ®. The next Surveillance Audit is scheduled for October 15-18, 2012. The assigned lead auditor will contact you 2-3 months prior to this date to reconfirm and begin preparations. Recertification must be completed before November 8, 2013. Michigan DNR is considered to be a multi-site organization; the sampling plan requires audits of the central function and at least 3 of the 15 Forest Management Units each year.

Appendices:

Appendix I: Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule

Appendix II: Public Surveillance Audit Report

Appendix III: Audit Matrix

Appendix IV: Field Sites and Attendees

Appendix V: SFI Reporting Form

Appendix I



Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule



October 14, 2011

Re: Confirmation of SFI and FSC Surveillance Audits, Michigan DNR

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

Dear Mr. Nezich:

We are scheduled to conduct the Annual Surveillance Audits of the Michigan DNR on Monday October 17 to Thursday October 20. This is a partial review of your SFI Program to confirm that it continues to be in conformance with the SFI Standard and that continual improvement is being made. The audit also includes a similar review of the FSC Requirements. The FSC audit will be described in more detail in a separate document.

The audit team will consist of Michael Ferrucci, NSF Lead Auditor and Dr. Robert Hrubes, SCS Lead Auditor. Nadine Block of SFI, Inc. will participate one day as an observer.

We have worked to develop the following tentative schedule:

Monday October 17, 2011 – Travel Day, Partial SFI Meeting

- Ferrucci arrives Traverse City 1:11 pm Delta 2997
- 6 pm, Holiday Inn Express, 3536 Mount Hope Road. Williamsburg, MI lobby: Ferrucci, MDNR Team as available – dinner and review of Multi-site Requirements pertaining to the centralized management

Tuesday October 18, 2011 – Cadillac FMU

Dave Fisher, Cadillac FMD Unit Manager

C140, (discuss C111), C138, C 129 planting sites, and roads/bridge

| | |
|-------------|--|
| 7:10 am | Depart Hotel (1 hour drive) |
| 8:30-10:35 | Opening Meeting Carl T Johnson Center, Review FSC and SFI CARs |
| 10:35-10:45 | Break |
| 10:45 am | District Overview and Issues |
| 11:15 am | Cadillac FMU Overview and Update |
| 11:45-11:55 | Review of itinerary for this year's audit. |
| 12- 12:15 | Lunch and prepare for field |
| Noon-5 pm | Field; briefing at last stop |
| 5-6 pm | Return to Traverse City (50 minutes) |
| Evening | Dinner and daily briefing |

Wednesday October 19, 2011 – Atlanta FMU

Cody Stevens, Atlanta FMD Unit Manger

(RH) East Team: C88, C89, Snowmobile ORV/RDR repairs, 1 active sale, Wildlife Flooding

(MF) West Team: C12, C121, C125prescriptions relating to KW, planting, roads/bridges, hardwood thinning if possible

6:30 am Depart Hotel (1 3/4 hour drive)

8:30 am District Overview & Atlanta FMU Overview and Update

9:45 am Prepare for field, review field stops and divide into two teams

10 am – 4:30 pm Field, Return to Atlanta by 4:30

4:30-6:30 pm Return to Traverse City

Note: Ferrucci and Dennis Nezich will review any remaining of Multi-site Requirements pertaining to the centralized management

Evening Dinner and daily briefing

Thursday October 20, 2011 – Traverse City FMU

Dave Lemmien, TC FMD Unit Manager

Sites: C41Lone Track Hardwood; C42 Active harvest logger interviews, trail; 45 Sands Lake Quiet Area, BSA; C156 2012 YOE discuss planning process; examples of unmaintained two-track roads

7:30 am Depart Hotel (1/4 hour drive)

8 am – Noon Field Review (Note: be ready to leave office at 8 am, no District or FMU overviews are scheduled)

12:30 pm Return to TC Field Office

12:30 - 1:30 pm Audit Team discussions; possible additional information request (lunch provided at the office)

1:30-2:30 pm FSC Closing Meeting (Dr. Robert Hrubes will depart for TC airport at 2:30 pm and will not be available for the SFI closing meeting.)

2:30-3:15 pm SFI Closing Meeting

3:32 pm Hrubes flight from TC

5:14 pm Ferrucci flight from TC

This is a partial review of your SFI and FSC Programs to confirm that they continue to be in conformance with the requirements and that progress is being made in closing your CARs. The audit team will consist of Mike Ferrucci, NSF-ISR Lead Auditor and Robert Hrubes, SCS Lead auditor. During the audit we will focus on the following:

Both Programs:

- A review of the outstanding findings from the 2010 Re-certification Audit
- Review of any changes within DNR (e.g., staffing, land acquisitions, planning documents) that are pertinent to the certification.
- Evidence will include documents, interviews, and observations

FSC Program:

Provided separately.

SFI Program:

- Verify effective implementation of the Corrective Action Plans from the 2010 audit and review progress or changes associated with the 2010 Opportunities for Improvement;
- Review progress on achieving SFI objectives and performance measures and continual improvement and the results of the management review of your SFI Program;
- Review logo and/or label use;
- Confirm public availability of public reports;
- Evaluate the effectiveness of planned activities aimed at of your SFI Program.
- Evaluate the multi-site requirements; and
- Review selected components of your SFI program as provided below:

Objectives 1 to 7: Requirements for Land Management

- 2.1 Prompt Reforestation After Harvest
- 2.2 Minimize Use of Chemicals
- 2.3 Protect and Maintain Forest & Soil Productivity
- 2.4 Forest Protection
- 2.5 Scientific Use of Improved Planting Stock
- 3.1 Best Management Practices
- 3.2 Riparian Protection Measures
- 5.1 Visual Quality of Harvests
- 5.2 Clear-cut Size, Shape, Placement
- 5.3 “Green Up” or Alternative Methods
- 5.4 Support Recreational Opportunities for the Public
- 6.1 Identification & Management of Special Sites

Objectives 14 to 20 Requirements for All Program Participants

- 15.1 Support or Funding for Research
- 15.2 Develop or Use Regional Analyses
- 15.3 Broaden Awareness of Climate Change Impacts
- 16.1 Training of Contractors and Personnel
- 16.2 Improved Wood Producer Professionalism
- 18.1 Public Lands Planning Involvement
- 18.2 Public Lands Conferring with Native Peoples
- 19.1 Summary Audit Report (following audits)
- 19.2 Annual Reporting to SFI, Inc.
- 20.1 Management Review System

Multi-Site Sampling Plan

The DNR is being audited as a multi-site organization per “Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program: Standards, Rules for Label Use, Procedures, and Guidance, Section 9, Annex 1”. There are 15 Forest Management Units. This Surveillance Audit must cover the requirements of the central organization and three of the units selected: Cadillac, Atlanta, and Traverse City. These sites were selected based on proximity and due to length of time since previous audits. I’ve previously sent you a copy of the NSF checklist used during all audits to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard and pointed out that the multi-site requirements are at the end of the checklist.

Logistics

- As during the certification audit we should plan to have lunch on site to expedite the visit.
- We will travel in your vehicle(s) each day during the audit.
- We ask that you provide hardhats.

Field Site Selections

You have provided maps showing activities in these locations over the past several years. We have selected an initial subset of compartments and requested additional information on them, including their accessibility and the likelihood of being actively harvested during the visit. We then selected a smaller number of sites that we hope to visit. On the day of the audit we would ask your local forestry staff to tell us about any sales that are being worked at that time, and we would add one or two of these if possible

Documentation Requested

When we arrive each day please provide documentation for the selected sites as was done during the certification audit (maps, project descriptions, and at least one example contract per day). The team must review the Timber Sale Contract Field Inspection Report, R-4050 for any sales visited where harvesting has been done or completed. We also need copies of the compartment plans and any other information that would help us determine conformance to the certification requirements and closure of the CARs. Please email some of this material in advance.

The tentative schedule should be reviewed by all participants. This schedule can be adapted either in advance or on-site to accommodate any special circumstances. If you have any questions regarding this planned audit, please contact either of us.

Sincerely yours,



Mike Ferrucci
SFI Program Manager, NSF-ISR
26 Commerce Drive
North Branford, CT 06471
mferrucci@iforest.com
Office and Mobile: 203-887-9248

Dr. Robert Hrubes
Senior Vice-President SCS
2000 Powell Street, Suite 600
Emeryville, CA 94608
rhrubes@scscertified.com
510-452-8007 Mobile: 510-913-0696

Appendix II



Michigan DNR SFI Summary Surveillance Audit Report

The SFI Program of the Michigan DNR has achieved continuing conformance with the SFI Standard®, 2010-2014 Edition, according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit Process.

NSF-ISR initially certified Michigan DNR to the SFIS in 2005 and recertified the organization on November 9, 2010. This report describes the first annual follow-up surveillance audit designed to focus on changes in the standard, changes in operations and practices, the management review system, and efforts to resolve past non-conformances and to respond to identified “Opportunities for Improvement”. In addition, a subset of SFI requirements were selected for detailed review this year, including all of the land management requirements (Objectives 1-7) and Objectives 15, 16, 18, 19, and 20.

The surveillance audit was performed by NSF-ISR on October 17-20, 2011 by an audit team headed by Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor supported by Dr. Robert Hrubes, who led the simultaneous FSC Annual Audit. 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 firm’s SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2010-2014 Edition.

The scope of the SFIS Audit included land management operations. Forest practices that were the focus of field inspections included those that have been conducted since the previous field audit conducted in October, 2010. Practices conducted earlier were also reviewed as appropriate (regeneration and BMP issues, for example). In addition, a subset of SFI obligations to promote sustainable forestry practices, to ensure appropriate training of people involved in the forest management program, to seek legal compliance, and to incorporate continual improvement systems were reexamined during the audit. Use of the SFI logo and the requirement to provide a public of audit reports were also reviewed.

The audit reviewed the central management and field practices at three of the fifteen Forest Management Units (FMUs): Cadillac FMU, Atlanta FMU, and Traverse City FMU.

As with the initial certification, several of the SFI Performance Measures were outside of the scope of Michigan DNR'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 DNR's Lands and Sustainable Forestry Programs

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources Forest Management Division (FMD) and Wildlife Division (WD) co-manage the 3.9 million Michigan State Forest System. The certified State Forest system includes all lands which are inventoried under either the Operations Inventory or IFMAP forest inventory systems, are identified in a State Forest Compartment, and go through the Michigan DNR compartment review process.

The FMD has organized the State Forest system into 15 forest management units which constitute the sampling units for the multi-site audit sampling program employed by NSF, the SFI Certification Body. These units are the basis of the internal audits conducted by Michigan DNR that serve to help drive continuous improvement in the programs.

Excerpts from Michigan DNR documents provide the remainder of this overview.

Source: Michigan State Forest Management Plan, April 10, 2008

“A primary management objective for the landscape of northern Michigan during the 20th century was to restore the forest resource that was devastated from over-exploitation in the late 19th century. This restoration has laid the basis for a rich array of opportunities for our forests in the 21st century.

Michigan's forests are healthy and still growing, with many options for future uses. There are multiple objectives for our forests, including continuing with use and restoration within a framework of long-term sustainability, while also enabling an expanding diversity of uses. This plan is intended to focus on future management and use of one large part of Michigan's forest

resources: the 3.9 million acre state forest system administered by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR).

Part 525, Sustainable Forestry on State Forest Lands, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, 1994 PA 451, as amended, requires the DNR to manage the state forest in a manner that is consistent with the principles of sustainable forestry, and to prepare and implement a management plan that states long-term management objectives and the means of achieving these objectives. Components of the management plan include:

1. Identification of the interests of local communities, outdoor recreation interests, the tourism industry, and the forest products industry, which are addressed in Section 3 of the plan.
2. Identification of the annual production capability of the state forest and management goals based on that level of productivity, which are addressed in Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the plan.
3. Methods to promote and encourage the use of the state forest for outdoor recreation, tourism, and the forest products industry, which are addressed in Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the plan.
4. A landscape management plan for the state forest incorporating biodiversity conservation goals, indicators, and measures, which are addressed in Sections 4 and 5 of the plan.
5. Standards for sustainable forestry consistent with section 52502 of Part 525, which are addressed in Sections 4 and 5 of the plan.
6. Identification of environmentally sensitive areas, which is addressed in Sect. 5 of the plan.
7. Identification of the need for forest treatments to maintain and sustain healthy, vigorous forest vegetation and quality habitat for wildlife and environmentally sensitive species, which are addressed in Sections 4 and 5 of the plan.

Part 525 also required the DNR to seek and maintain third party certification of the management of the state forest that satisfies sustainable forestry standards of at least one credible certification program. Subsequently, the DNR was certified under the standards of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and the Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI)...

Recent state forest average harvests have been close to 53,000 acres per year, with a 20-year average of about 700,000 cords per year. Timber harvest trends differ by species. The current conditions and trends for the state forest as a whole indicate that the annual production capacity for timber harvests will remain similar to what it has been or slightly increase. Harvests have predominantly occurred in five cover types: the aspen association, jack pine, the oak association, red pine, and northern hardwoods. Some significant trends can be noted since the mid-1990s for aspen, northern hardwoods, red pine, white pine and mixed swamp conifers. Due to intensive harvests in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the number of acres of aspen sold gradually decreased after 1997 and reached a low in 2003. Throughout this period, aspen volumes per acre remained steady at close to 20 cords per acre.

Volume of production from the northern hardwoods, red pine, and white pine cover types have increased since 1996. In contrast, production from mixed swamp conifers has dropped off sharply beginning in 2001, in part reflecting changes in cover type coding. Thus, the composition of timber sales has changed over the past decade, with the most significant change being more

acres of selectively-harvested upland hardwoods sold as the number of clear-cut aspen acres declined. This tradeoff has resulted in less volume harvested per acre.

Major trends in forest health include increasing numbers of both native and nonnative insects and diseases, cervid herbivory effects on understory composition and regeneration, and the emerging environmental issue of global climate change. Some epidemic nonnative pathogens such as Dutch elm disease, the emerald ash borer and beech bark disease pose threats across the entire landscape of the state. Others are more localized in the range of their effect. The current management strategy is to contain and eradicate newly identified pathogens; however, some agents are now securely entrenched into ecosystems of the state. The effects of cervid herbivory (deer, moose, and elk) upon the composition and structure (particularly regeneration) of herbaceous and shrub strata of forest ecosystems are becoming an increasing concern. A DNR Cervid Herbivory Team is charged with developing methods and protocols for use in establishing thresholds for unacceptable levels of browse, developing monitoring processes and protocols for measuring the effect of cervid browsing on plant life, and determining where unacceptable levels of cervid browsing is occurring. Global climate change due to global warming has the potential to disrupt the natural composition, function, and health of native ecosystems. It could affect the range of native plant and animal species, and could potentially interact with other forest health threats by causing environmental stressors (such as the incidence and severity of drought) that can in turn trigger outbreaks of insect and disease infestations. All of these pose increasing threats to the health of the state's forest ecosystems, which may be expressed by potential major ecological changes in the composition of native forest communities and substantial economic effects.

Forest recreation is now trending toward year-round use, as the popularity increases for spring activities such as fishing for migratory steelhead, wild Turkey and mushroom hunting, and off-road vehicle (ORV) riding and for many winter sports such as snowmobiling, skiing, and ice fishing. This diversified activity provides year-round benefits to many local economies that were previously more seasonal in nature. General trends from various data sources indicate that hunting, fishing, and power boating recreation are relatively static or declining. Specifically, the trend of dispersed hunting recreation can be seen in the number of hunting license holders, which has been steadily decreasing over the past decade. Conversely, wildlife viewing, ORV, and snowmobile riding have grown in the past decade. The use of state forest campgrounds has been relatively stable over the past four years, with most use occurring in the Northern Lower Peninsula Ecoregion.

Unbalanced age-class distributions in early successional forest types are continuing relative “booms and busts” of wildlife populations that are dependent upon these habitats. This will continue for some time until the age class distributions are much more balanced...”

Excerpts from Michigan Department of Natural Resources Request for Proposals

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

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 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 MDNR will be developing strategic plans that will address all ownerships in a region (including all DNR lands – forests, parks and wildlife areas, other public plans, 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 MDNR 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 MDNR-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 DNR forest certification internet site has links to DNR 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 MDNR's management review system, and is an important focus of MDNR 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 DNR internet at: http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153-30301_33360-144865--_00.html

SFIS Surveillance Audit Process

The review was governed by a detailed audit protocol designed to enable the audit team determine conformance with the applicable SFI requirements. The process included the assembly and review of audit evidence consisting of documents, interviews, and on-site inspections of ongoing or completed forest practices. Documents describing these activities were provided to the auditor in advance, and a sample of the available audit evidence was designated by the auditor for review.

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. 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 for specific SFI requirements included Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, Opportunities for Improvement, and Practices that exceeded the Basic Requirements of the SFIS. Surveillance Audits generally focus on conformance issues and do not generally address exceptional practices.

Overview of Audit Findings

The SFI Program of the Michigan DNR has achieved continuing conformance with the SFI Standard®, 2010-2014 Edition, according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit Process.

There were two new Minor Non-conformances:

SFI Indicator 17.1.5 requires that “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 take into account the results of these efforts in planning.” Minor Non-conformance: Absent completion of the Regional State Forest Management Plans, and considering that the BSA process has been reset, conformance with this indicator was not completely demonstrated.

SFI Indicator 20.1.3 requires an “Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve conformance to the SFI 2010-2014 Standard.” Minor Non-conformance: Annual review has not led to effective follow-up for one repeated internal audit Minor Non-conformance.

Michigan DNR has developed plans to address these new issues. Progress in implementing the remaining open corrective action plans will be reviewed in subsequent surveillance audits.

Several opportunities for improvement were also identified. These findings do not indicate a current deficiency, but served to alert the Michigan DNR to areas that could be strengthened or which could merit future attention. These are reported as either new or continuing from 2010:

New Opportunities for Improvement:

There is an opportunity to improve completeness of employee training records.
SFI Indicator 16.1.3 “Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.”

There is an opportunity to improve staff knowledge of climate change models and impacts to wildlife and biodiversity.

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.”

Opportunities for Improvement Issued in 2010 and Continued for 2011:

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.”

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.”

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

Exceptional Practices:

NSF-ISR also identified the following areas where forestry practices and operations on MDNR’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 has a Forest Certification 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.

SFI Indicator 16.1.2 “Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives.”

Michigan Department of Natural Resources exceeds the standard in its support for research.

SFI Indicator 15.1.1 requires “Financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations.”

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

Review of 2010 Audit Findings and Disposition in 2011 Surveillance Audit

In 2010 NSF-ISR determined that there were three minor non-conformances, all of which were closed based on evidence reviewed in the 2011 Surveillance Audit:

- **CLOSED - 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.”
- **CLOSED - 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.”

(Note new OFI for this indicator: There is an opportunity to improve staff knowledge of climate change models and impacts to wildlife and biodiversity.)

- **CLOSED - 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.”

In 2010 eleven opportunities for improvement were also identified, and included:

- **CLOSED - 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.”
- **Kept Open - 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.”
- **CLOSED - 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.”
- **CLOSED - 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.

- Kept Open - 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.
- CLOSED- 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.
- CLOSED - 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.
- CLOSED - 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.
- CLOSED - 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.
- CLOSED - 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.
- CLOSED - There is an opportunity to improve the Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Michigan Department of Natural Resources 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.

The next Surveillance Audit is scheduled for October 15-18, 2012.

* * * * *



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 2008 Michigan State Forest Plan, Compartment Plans for all compartments visited, the state's Wildlife Division Guiding Principles and Strategies, 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 has programs for reforestation, for protection against wildfire and against many insects and diseases including Emerald Ash Borer, Beech Bark Disease, Oak Wilt, 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 Within-Stand Retention Guidance, 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 – Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit.

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 – While most requirement of Objective 17 were not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit the areas reviewed were supported by interviews with staff and stakeholders in the community.

Objective 18: Public Land Management Responsibilities -

To support and implement sustainable forest management on public lands.

Summary of Evidence – Interviews with MDNR staff and with stakeholders, as well as review of documents 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. Records of internal audits and management review of these audits were key to developing the audit findings for this objective.



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

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

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

For Additional Information Contact:

Mike Ferrucci
SFI Program Manager
NSF-ISR
26 Commerce Drive
North Branford, CT 06471
203-887-9248
mferrucci@iforest.com

Dennis Nezich
Forest Certification Coordinator
Michigan DNR, Forest Management Division
1990 US-41 South
Marquette, MI 49855
906-228-6561
nezichd@michigan.gov



Appendix III



Audit Matrix

Michigan DNR 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* |
| Likely Conf. * | Likely Conformance With 2010-2014 SFIS* |
| | * formerly used for transition issues; Gap columns retained for use during Baseline Audits. |
| Auditor | Optional; may be used for audit planning. |
| 10, 11 | Date Codes, for example: 11= July 2011; 12=Aug. 2012 |
| Other | Words in <i>italics</i> are defined in the standard. |

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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Auditor reviewed “2010 Recertification Audit - Overview of Michigan DNRE Planning Efforts in 2010, October 18, 2010” and “Completion of regional State Forest Management Decisions (RSFMPs) as of October 12, 2011; David Price”. Auditor also reviewed a draft update of the “2011 Michigan State Forest Timber Harvest Trends Report”. Plans do include sustainable harvest levels which appear to be slightly conservative but which are consistent with growth models and with the ecosystem-management approach being implemented. | | | | | | | | |

| | 2010-2014 Requirement (Performance Measures bold) | 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. a long-term resources analysis; b. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; c. a land classification system; d. soils inventory and maps, where available; e. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; f. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system; g. recommended sustainable harvest levels for areas available for harvest; and h. 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). | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | The State Forest Plan Harvest levels are based on area control; thinning or selection intervals are conservative; rotation lengths are appropriate. Wildlife Division has completed a strategic plan (GPS) and updated the Elk Management Plan. | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1.2 | Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan in a manner appropriate to document past and future activities. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Notes | <p>Michigan State Forest Plan 53,000 acres treated per year; this will be revised (slightly) with a more refined analysis being done in conjunction with the development of RSFMPs. The expectation is for a modest increase in acres treated per year, with a concurrent shift towards more harvesting in Aspen and in Red Pine stands, which yield higher volumes per acre.</p> <p>Monitoring reports on the Michigan DNR’s web site (Performance and Monitoring Reports) provide evidence of harvest and volume trends.</p> <p>2003- 45,833 acres 2007- 50,422 acres</p> <p>2004- 48,582 acres 2008- 59,338 acres</p> <p>2005- 55,117 acres 2009- 49,126 acres</p> <p>2006- 41,764 acres 2010- 62,280 acres Source: “2011 Michigan State Forest Timber Harvest Trends Report”</p> <p>There is also language in statute to report acres and cords harvested from state forest land: <i>“Part 525, P.A. 451, 1994, as amended. Sec. 52506. By January 1 of each year, the department shall prepare and submit to the commission of natural resources, the standing committees of the senate and the house of representatives with primary jurisdiction over forestry issues, and the senate and house appropriations committees a report that details the following from the previous state fiscal year: ... The number of acres of the state forest that were harvested and the number of cords of wood that were harvested from the state forest.”</i> Source: Michigan DNR Timber Harvest Determination Process provided to audit team in 2010.</p> <p>The above evidence shows that the department has responded to and resolved the 2010 OFI: “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> | | | | | | | | |
| | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | The 2005 Timber Harvest Trend Report (tab 10) and the draft update of the “2011 Michigan State Forest Timber Harvest Trends Report” provide evidence. | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| | 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 forest inventory and recalculation of planned harvests 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.). | MF | 11 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Notes | <p>Harvests are planned using area control to determine acres treated. These are recalculated prior to developing harvest prescriptions.</p> <p>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. The audit team confirmed the continued, robust use of these inventory and harvest planning approaches across the system by means of interviews and review of documents for selected compartments.</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> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>1.1.5</i> | Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | See indicators. MDNR has a comprehensive program to ensure regeneration after final harvests | | | | | | | | |

| | 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> |
|-------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2.1.1 | Designation of all harvest areas for either natural regeneration or by planting. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | 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. Reviewed some planting sites and the processes for planning overseeing planting. Confirmed designation of regeneration method for sites visited, and for other sites where paperwork was requested but time did not allow field visits of planting 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> |
|-------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Review of selected sites across a range of soils, including nutrient poor, sandy soils, showed that the department continues to allocate considerable resources to achieve regeneration. Regeneration delays are uncommon; most sites visited had good stocking levels. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 11 | | | | 11 | | |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>2011, 2010 OFI: “There is an opportunity to improve protection of regeneration from adverse effects of deer on natural regeneration.”</p> <p>Standards exist for all regeneration treatments. 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. The audit team will consider this issue in the 2012 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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2.1.4 | Minimized plantings of exotic tree species, and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Field observations confirmed good results in this indicator. 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. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Consideration of composition goals for regeneration is a routine part of sale planning, with site analysis tools available and widely used.</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 habitat 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 | Afforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of the selection and planting of tree species in non-forested landscapes. | | NA | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>No afforestation is being conducted. 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, including wildlife and aquatic habitats. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2.2.1 | Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Chemical treatment in the Lower Peninsula clearly shows a trend of reduced chemical use. Units visited during this audit reported very little use of forest chemicals. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <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. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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. | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 11 | | | | | | | |
| <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> | |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 2.3.1 | Use of soils maps where available. | MF | 11 | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Foresters reported that 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | <p>Soils maps, Kotar habitat 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.</p> <p>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.</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> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2.3.3 | Use of erosion control measures to <i>minimize</i> the loss of soil and site <i>productivity</i> . | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | <p>Each FMU was provided \$5,000 for road and trail maintenance in FY 2011 (ended September, 2011). Several impressive RDR-related road repairs or upgrades were inspected during the audits.</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. One site visited which had recent logging on steep slopes was being protected by having the harvesting contractor place brush on the skid trails which ran directly up and down the slopes.</p> <p>Closed 2010 OFI: "There is an opportunity to improve routine road maintenance."</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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| 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 scientific silvicultural standards for the area. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| <i>Notes</i> | Confirmed by field observations that thinnings remove overtopped or intermediate crown class trees first, as well as crooked, forked, or damaged trees. The Compleat Marker is in use for tolerant hardwood stands (dominated by sugar maple). Draft of silvicultural guidance being prepared for other species or timber types was provided to the audit team: “DRAFT Silvics and Management Guidance Manual”. CLOSED - 2010 OFI: “There is an opportunity to improve efforts to update the silviculture guidance documents.” |
|--------------|---|

| | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 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”. 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.” | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | Road construction and skidding layout to minimize impacts to soil productivity and water quality. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <u>2011, 2010 OFI: “There is an opportunity to improve road planning efforts.”</u> Systematic planning for roads is limited; only the Pigeon River County Forest Management Unit has a comprehensive roads plan. Compartment plans 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) issues. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2.4.1 | Program to protect forests from damaging agents. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Forest Management Division Policy 591: Forest Pest Management specifies a program consistent with Performance Measure 2.4 and the Indicators. Foresters are aware of the normal forest pest issues, and have ready access to forest health staff . | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | 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. Draft of silvicultural guidance provided to the audit team. Closed the 2010 OFI, which had stated “There is an opportunity to improve efforts to update the silviculture guidance documents.” | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Fire: Continued impressive conformance. Each FMU has several fire officers and an impressive collection of fire control vehicles. 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. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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, including varietal seedlings, shall use sound scientific methods. | | | | | | | | |
| Notes | Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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, including varietal seedlings. | | | | | | | | |

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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Foresters plan and oversee harvests and cultural treatments, and work with engineers on larger road/bridge projects. BMPs are designed into these projects.</p> <p>ORV use continues to be a major part of the recreation program, with potential impacts from erosion and sedimentation. The document “2011 Accomplishments Related To Implementation Of The Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan; October 6, 2011” provided evidence of significant, sustained efforts to educate users and user’s groups, improve compliance with rules, protect sensitive areas, and maintain the trail system properly. A database printout “Funded ORV Restoration Grants On State Forest Lands” provided evidence focusing on projects funded to restore ORV trails.</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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 3.1.2 | Contract provisions that specify conformance to best management practices. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Confirmed by review of documents for harvests selected for field review. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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. forest inventory systems, wet-weather tracts, definitions of acceptable operating conditions). | MF | 11 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <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. | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>For roads and trails, for monitoring MDNR 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. Confirmed the use of the R4050 by field foresters via review of documents for harvests selected for field review. One forester in Atlanta had very few notes on a sale reviewed by the west audit team.</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 | 11 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <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 rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies and riparian zones. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <i>Notes</i> | Professional 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 commences with the forest inventory work 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. | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | 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 rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies as specified in state or provincial best management practices and, where appropriate, identification on the ground. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| 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 rivers, streams, lakes, and other water bodies. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Field observations confirmed that streams, lakes, and other waterbodies are protected during all operations, in most cases by leaving significant uncut buffer 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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 3.2.4 | Identification and protection of non-forested wetlands, including bogs, fens and marshes, and vernal pools of ecological significance. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| 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. | NA | | | | | | | |
| Notes | NA, BMPs do exist. | | | | | | | | |

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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.1.1 | Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats and ecological community types. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Compartment exams—conducted by each Management Unit—involve participation by Michigan Department of Natural Resources' 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 the Wildlife Division Strategic Plan (Guiding Principles and Strategies). 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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.1.2 | Program to protect threatened and endangered species. | MF | | 11 | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p><u>The program to protect threatened and endangered species exceeds the requirements.</u></p> <p>The Wildlife Division of MDNR 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 also known as Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value. 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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Revised Work Instruction 1.4 describes many aspects of the High Conservation Value Forest, which is a broader filter than Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value. Several such sites were visited during the audit; each had a site-specific analysis and recommendations. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 best scientific information, to retain stand-level wildlife habitat elements such as snags, stumps, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees and nest trees. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | <p>Revised Work Instruction 1.4 Biodiversity Management of State Forest Areas, which includes “Training/Skills” will be incorporated in the FY12 Training Plan. This document is approved and in use, and contains some content that addresses this finding (Legacy Trees). The three FMUs audited in 2011 (of total of 15) had preliminary training.</p> <p>Michigan DNR established a working committee to revise “Within-Stand Retention Guidance” (previous version 10/05/06) and is developing a field reference guide. There is a near final draft, to be finalized in November, and likely approved in December.</p> <p>The Pre-Timber Sale Checklist includes an item for stand level habitat elements and a selection of three pre-written sale specifications that can be checked and then inserted into the “Sale Specific Conditions and Requirements” for the timber sale contract. For example Sale Number 61-049-07 (Traverse City) has this provision “5.2.2.2 – Snag tree creation... Tree marked with G must be girdled by making two saw cuts, 2 inches deep completely around the tree. The tree must be left standing”.</p> <p>Closed Minor Non-Conformance SFI-2010-1, which had stated that “Stand-level retention does not consistently meet the written guidelines.”</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, 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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Notes | <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> <p>A discussion of the 2010 OFI revealed that the program is planning to do this, but not until the Management Area direction is completed.</p> <p>Closed 2010 OFI: <i>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.</i></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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Auditors asked field foresters about Type 1 and Type 2 Old Growth areas in their units and how these are protected. The consensus view is that these areas are already protected as SCAs or ERAs. A new effort is underway to continue to look for these smaller old growth 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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.1.7 | 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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | <p>As evidenced by the summary listing provided to the auditors “Forest Management Division (FMD) Invasive Species Project 2011” the program is in conformance.</p> <p>“Forest Management Division (FMD) Invasive Species Project 2011 (Ron Murray, 10-12-11)” summarized: FMD Invasive Species Projects (ARRA Funding, Pest & Disease Loan Funding, and Great Lakes Restoration Initiative Funding described separately); Training; and Application Development (“Forest Health Program Leader Roger Mech worked with Lisa Dygert, RAU, to develop a Forest Health Reporting application for Nomads and other handheld units that run Windows Mobile 5.0 or better. The application allows quick easy reporting of forest health symptoms and problems in a format that is easily imported into IFMAP. Lisa and others have also developed a similar application that easily allows reporting of Invasive Plants to MISIN in a format that is also compatible with IFMAP. Solo Forest software is required to run this application. A similar application is under development that will not require Solo Forest, but will give the same reporting functionality.”)</p> <p>Closed 2010 OFI: <i>“There is an opportunity to improve the approach to prevention of invasive plant species.”</i></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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Fire is commonly prescribed when appropriate, especially in the management of Jack Pine communities, but also to maintain openings and grassland plant species (Site in Atlanta FMU). Prescribed fire 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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | MDNR, 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 Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value 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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | DNR supports the state Natural Features Inventory, in cooperation with Michigan State University, thus natural heritage information is readily available to staff in FMD. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4.2.2 | A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Use of professionally-trained biologists who cover both terrestrial and aquatic species. | | | | | | | | |

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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Field observations helped confirm that Michigan DNR continues to manage 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. A variety of methods are employed to manage the impact of harvesting. 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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 5.1.1 | Program to address visual quality management. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 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. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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 to meet regulatory requirements or to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 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. Efforts are made to manage clearcut size; the modern GIS is helpful in this regard. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 39 (average size of stand that was clearcut = 24 acres; average size of clearcut acres per contract = 55). Use GIS and timber sale 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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 5.3 | Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 5.3.1 | Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Trained foresters set up and 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 conformance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 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. The “Pre-Timber Sale Checklist” has a section on Aesthetics, including provisions for clearcut size and adjacency. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Conformance was confirmed by field observations. 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 | Program Participants shall support and promote recreational opportunities for the public. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | MDNR 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 | Provide recreational opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives. | MF | | 11 | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <u>Exceeds the Requirement: Public recreation opportunities are high-quality, diverse, and widely available.</u> Confirmed recreational facilities at all three 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. The Michigan DNR has been creative and flexible in finding methods to finance the development and maintenance of recreation infrastructure. | | | | | | | | |

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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 6.1.1 | Use of information such as existing natural heritage data, expert advice or stakeholder consultation in identifying or selecting special sites for protection. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | 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. Visited some special sites during the audit. | | | | | | | | |

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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>7.1</i> | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>7.1.1</i> | Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 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; 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. exploration of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood and alternative markets (e.g. bioenergy markets); or e. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Confirmed by field observations generally very good utilization. Contracts require appropriate utilization.</p> <p>Each harvest is regularly inspected by the sale administration forester, who fills out the Timber Sale Contract –Field Inspection Report. This process includes inspection of utilization. For example Sale Number 61-049-07 (Traverse City) has extensive notes including concerns about wood cut but left on the forest. The sale administration forester ensured that the buyer and their logging contractor returned to the site to fully utilize the wood; this work was taking place on the day that the audit team visited this site. Michigan DNR has guidelines for biomass retention.</p> | | | | | | | | |

Objectives 8-13 are Not Applicable

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. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

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> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>15.1</i> | Program Participants shall individually and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees, associations or other partners provide in-kind support or funding for forest research to improve forest health, productivity, and sustainable management of forest resources, and the environmental benefits and performance of forest products. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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> |
|---------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>15.1.1</i> | 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 including effectiveness of water quality and best management practices for protecting the quality, diversity and distributions of fish and wildlife habitats; d. wildlife management at stand- and landscape-levels; e. conservation of biological diversity; f. ecological impacts of bioenergy feedstock removals on productivity, wildlife habitat, water quality and other ecosystem functions; g. climate change research for both adaptation and mitigation; h. social issues; 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 | | 11 | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p><u>Michigan DNR exceeds the standard in its support for research.</u></p> <p>Summary of Sustainable Forestry Research FY2010 4.14.11(available to staff on Internet under Work Instruction 5.1) summarizes the more formal research and shows a far-reaching and well-funded range of research including issues in forest management, wildlife and biodiversity, fisheries, and recreation. At least half of the issues listed in this indicator are being funded at significant levels (multiples of hundred thousand dollars) and several of the other issues are funded to some degree. Items a, b, c, d, e, g, and h are being funded.</p> <p>A new web page has been set up for recording Silvicultural Field Trials.</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> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 15.1.2 | Research on genetically engineered trees via forest tree biotechnology shall adhere to all applicable federal, state, and provincial regulations and international protocols. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | NA | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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 and/or through cooperative efforts involving SFI Implementation Committees and/or associations at the national, state, provincial or regional level, in the development or use of some of 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. social, cultural or economic benefit assessments. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Michigan's SFI Implementation Committee sponsored, and Dennis Nezich is working on a statewide BMP audit program which would incorporate several landowner types. 30 sites were selected (10 in WUP, EUP, and NLP); Dennis Nezich co-led the audit crew for the East Upper Peninsula, which spent 3 days in the field. Audit reports were developed for each site visited; still working on overall audit results and lessons learned. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 15.3.1 | Where available, monitor information generated from regional climate models on long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>The program to monitor information generated from regional climate models on long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability appears to have been significantly improved. A intranet web site has been created that contains substantial information; an email was sent to all FMD staff informing them of the web site, and staff are beginning to use this site to increase their awareness.</p> <p>Resolved the 2010 OFI: “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.”</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 | Program Participants are knowledgeable about climate change impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitats and conservation of biological diversity through international, national, regional or local programs. | MF | 11 | | | | 11 | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve staff knowledge of climate change models and impacts to wildlife and biodiversity.</u></p> <p>Closed on the basis of the web site and email to staff: “Sent: June 16, 2011; To: DNR-FMD-All; Subject: Updated – New Silviculture and Climate Change Information Intranet Pages on FMD Intranet Site”. As such, the corrective action plan has been completed. However foresters interviewed had not yet used the site for enough time to have an understanding of climate change predictions in Michigan or the impacts.</p> <p>Closed 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.</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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| 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 facility and woodland managers, fiber sourcing staff and field foresters. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Commitment clearly communicated; link found at the top of the DNR Forest Certification web page at: http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/ titled “Michigan State Forest and Forest Certification: A Message from Rodney A Stokes, Director-designate of the Department of Natural 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> |
|--------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 16.1.2 | Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI 2010-2014 Standard objectives. | MF | | 11 | | | | | |
| 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. | MF | 11 | | | | 11 | | |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| <i>Notes</i> | <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve completeness of employee training records.</u></p> <p>Reviewed Annual “Training Plan 2012” for the FMD. It lists all training offered in 2012 and lists the course name, date(s), locations, sponsor (division), coordinator, and types of staff that the training is intended for. It includes planned training for many subjects, including “DNR Silvicultural Guidelines” (Jan 2012); “Within-Stand Retention Guidelines” revised version (Jan 2012); Work Instructions, update for the Living Legacy (BSA) process, certification-related, “natural Models for Ecological Forestry” and many others.</p> <p>5-pages of attendee names/dates on “FY11 Silvicultural Training Registrations” list for Woody Biomass Harvesting Guidance & Silviculture. There were three sessions: 6/27/11, 6/29/11, and 7/02/11.</p> <p>PowerPoint “Within-Stand Retention Guidelines Training” 45 slides will be provided to all foresters, wildlife biologists who work on the ground preparing or reviewing prescriptions.</p> <p>Forestry has a system for centralized records of training. This system was assessed by requesting the training record for two foresters on each of the three units audited; these records were detailed and apparently quite accurate for fire-related training, but less accurate for other professional forestry training. A form is in use to assess individual training needs each year at the time of evaluation (Individual Training Needs Assessment Worksheet). Foresters hired over the past 1-3 years have obtained significant professional training that links closely to certification-related issues.</p> <p>Wildlife Division has a Training and Safety Coordinator at the Lansing office who maintains a training record for each employee. This system was assessed by requesting the training record for the wildlife biologist on one of the three units audited; these records were detailed and showed considerable professional training over the past 8 years. There have been some findings from past internal audits regarding lack of training plans in this division. The Lead Auditor reviewed the “Annual Training Plan for Wildlife Division”.</p> <p>Invasives Training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “A joint two-day invasive species training was conducted with Wildlife Division (WLD) & FMD staff in August in Escanaba and Newberry. Training focused on invasive plant identification, biology, and control. The session involved hands-on field training on identification and control, including a sprayer calibration exercise for plants. The second day of training focused on invasive insects and diseases and included biology, identification, and control training as well as a field trip to visit sites exhibiting problems. • The Michigan Society of American Foresters fall (October) meeting was on invasives. Expenses and/or time was supported for staff attendance.” <p>Closed the 2010 Minor Non-Conformance SFI-2010-3, which had been: “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.”</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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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 | Forestry enterprises shall have a program for the use of certified logging professionals (where available) and qualified logging professionals. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | <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>The audit team visited 4 active harvest jobs and confirmed that trained individuals were involved in all.</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 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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | <p>The Michigan SFI Implementation Committee is working on a spill brochure for loggers, and Dennis Nezich is taking a lead. The brochure will likely be used for logger education.</p> <p>2010 "No support for logger training is provided directly by MDNR; 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> <p>Closed the 2010 OFI: "There is an opportunity to improve support for logger 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, invasive exotic plants and animals, forest resource conservation, aesthetics, and special sites; 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. Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value); e. logging safety; f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and Canadian Centre for Occupational Health and Safety (COHS) 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. awareness of emerging technologies. | MF | 11 | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Dennis Nezich, Forest Certification Coordinator is the Michigan DNR's representative on the Michigan SFI Implementation Committee.</p> <p>The Michigan SFI Implementation Committee is working on a spill brochure for loggers, and Dennis Nezich is taking a lead.</p> <p>Michigan's SFI Implementation Committee sponsored, and Dennis Nezich is working on a statewide BMP audit program which would incorporate several landowner types. 30 sites were selected (10 in WUP, EUP, and NLP); Dennis Nezich co-led the audit crew for the East Upper Peninsula, which spent 3 days in the field. Audit reports were developed for each site visited; still working on overall audit results and lessons learned.</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>Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria for recognition of logger certification programs, where they exist, that include (remainder deleted)...</p> | NR | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. Michigan does have such a 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 | <u>C</u> | <u>EXR</u> | <u>Maj</u> | <u>Min</u> | <u>OFI</u> | <u>Likely Gap *</u> | <u>Likely Conf. *</u> |
|--------------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <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, 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. | | | | | | | | |
| <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> |
|---------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>17.1.1</i> | Support, including financial, for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>SFI Implementation Committee meets twice per year; with additional teleconferences to allow more frequent contacts. Dennis Nezich is actively involved in the Michigan SFI Implementation Committee. Public agencies pay \$1,000 to SFI, Inc. annually.</p> <p>Dennis Nezich, Forest Certification Coordinator is the Michigan DNR’s representative on the Michigan SFI Implementation Committee. <i>“The Michigan DNR actively supports the Michigan SFI Implementation Committee. Dennis Nezich represents the MI DNR on our committee. We are appreciative of Dennis’ efforts in many areas. He has brought knowledge, expertise and resources to the committee this past year that aren’t available to others. Specifically his work on the MI spill brochure and the DNRs participation in our statewide soil and water quality (BMP) audits that we just concluded. Dennis was a facilitating member of the BMP subcommittee that was formed last fall for this effort. In addition to his involvement he was able to bring other DNR staff into the auditing process which added a broader perspective and expertise to this effort.”</i> Source: Michigan SFI Implementation Committee Chair.</p> <p>The Michigan SFI Implementation Committee is working on a spill brochure for loggers, and Dennis Nezich is taking a lead.</p> <p>Michigan’s SFI Implementation Committee sponsored, and Dennis Nezich is working on a statewide BMP audit program which includes several landowner types. 30 sites were selected (10 in WUP, EUP, and NLP); Dennis Nezich co-led the audit crew for the East Upper Peninsula, which spent 3 days in the field. Audit reports were developed for each site visited; still working on overall audit results and lessons learned. At least 6 DNR employees were involved in the BMP audits.</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. information packets, websites, newsletters, workshops, tours, etc.). | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 special sites and biological diversity issues, such as invasive exotic plants and animals, specific wildlife habitat, Forests with Exceptional Conservation Value, and threatened and endangered species. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | A review of the SFI 2010 Progress Report Form provided evidence of significant support in these 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> |
|--------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 take into account the results of these efforts in planning. | MF | | | | 11 | | | |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| <i>Notes</i> | <p><u>Minor Non-conformance: Absent completion of the Regional State Forest Management Plans, and considering that the BSA process has been reset, conformance with this indicator was not completely demonstrated.</u></p> <p>Traverse City Internal Audit finding regarding lack of interaction between local staff and the development of management plans.</p> <p>Timeline for completion of the Regional State Forest Management Plans has been extended to March, 2013, and the BSA process has been reset.</p> <p>2010: “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 RSFMPs. 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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>17.2</i> | 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. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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>17.2.1</i> | Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as a. field tours, seminars, websites, webinars 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. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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, unions, the public or other Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Overall support for SFI Implementation Committee documented elsewhere in this checklist. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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. SFI Implementation Committees shall submit data annually to SFI Inc. regarding concerns received and responses. | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Not reviewed during 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>18.1</i> | Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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> |
|---------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>18.1.1</i> | Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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>The portion of the Michigan DNR web site where stakeholders can learn about proposed and planned management practices has been updated. The interface has been significantly improved, including a map-based search tool that allows interested parties to easily learn about actions proposed in particular locations.</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> |
|---------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>18.1.2</i> | Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal or independent collaboration. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Notes | <p>“Michigan's nearly 3.9 million acres of State Forest Land are divided into 15 Forest Management Units. See (the department’s website) for a map with web links to descriptions of the various Forest Management Units. Each of the state's 15 Forest Management Units are divided into blocks called compartments. A compartment is typically one to three sections in size. Each forest compartment is formally reviewed once every ten years. Every forest compartment throughout the state is subdivided into forest stands and mapped according to the type of trees in the forest. Each forest stand is evaluated and recommendations for treatment made. Forest inventory, treatment recommendations, and the review process described below normally occurs a year and a half prior to actually entering the stands and conducting treatments. For example, stands being inventoried in 2010 will not be prepared for treatment until the year 2012 (the Compartment Year of Entry). Source: “Managing Michigan’s State Forest: Your Guide to Participation”. Interviews and review of documents confirmed that this process is still in place.</p> <p>The Michigan DNR updated the web site making it easier for anyone with computer and internet access to look at maps, determine which compartment(s) are near their lands or locations of interest, and quickly locate Compartment-level information and prescriptions.</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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| 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> |
|--------|---|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 18.2.1 | 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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>The FSC CAR 3 response provides an exhaustive listing of methods of communication with Michigan Indian Tribes, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michigan DNR maintains a list of Michigan Indian Tribes and contract information for the Tribal Chair and a representative from Tribal Natural Resources; this was provided to the audit team • FMD Field – 2011 Record of meetings, workshops, and other key interaction with Michigan Tribes (4 pages typewritten, supplemented by handwritten notes; one for forestry, one for wildlife, one for fisheries. • Press releases as examples regarding opportunities for public input • Notes regarding dialogue between DNR and tribal representatives over the BSA designation process in fiscal year Nov 2010 to Aug 2011 • Listing of recent Archaeological Exploration Permit Applications <p>The 2010 SFI OFI and related FSC CAR 2010.3 were discussed in the 2011 Management Review</p> <p>Closed the 2010 OFI, which had stated: “ There is an opportunity to improve the Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Michigan Department of Natural Resources to identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites.</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 | 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. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| 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> |
|--------|---|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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, including general descriptions of evidence of conformity and any nonconformities and corrective action plans to address them, opportunities for improvement, and exceptional practices; and h. the certification decision. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| Notes | Provided following 2010 audit and required under NSF audit protocols for this 2011 Surveillance Audit. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | Rachel Dierolf, Manager of Statistics and Labeling, SFI confirmed that the 2010 SFI annual progress report was provided promptly. | | | | | | | | |

| | 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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | A completed copy of the SFI 2010 Progress Report Form was provided to Lead Auditor immediately upon request. | | | | | | | | |

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 | 11 | | | | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | See indicators. Michigan has a very strong program, with one Minor Non-conformance described 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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 20.1.1 | System to review commitments, programs and procedures to evaluate effectiveness. Note: For multi-site programs the auditing requirements of Section 9 or the ISO MD-1 requirements must be followed (see Multi-site Checklist); at a minimum internal audits or monitoring that spans all sites and addresses the relevant part of the SFI Standard is expected. | MF | 11 | | | | | | |
| <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). The Forest Certification Coordinator tracks progress on dealing with and closing all NCRs, internal or external. This has resulted in regular, and often significant, program improvements. One example involves revisions to Form R-4050 to make it easier and more efficient to use (stemming from NCR# 54-2008-6 at Atlanta, and perhaps other NCRs). Note: The NSF third-party audit and the MDNR 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 | 11 | | | | | | |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| <i>Notes</i> | <p>Michigan Department of Natural Resources has a robust and very well documented process of conducting internal audits and Internal NCRs. The Forest Certification Coordinator tracks NCRs using “Status” spreadsheets.</p> <p>The auditor reviewed the Internal Audit Reports for) Gaylord, Shingleton, and Escanaba (Summer 2010) and for Crystal Falls, Traverse City, and Newberry (2011). 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.</p> <p>Evidence of management review system’s general effectiveness includes the revisions to the process for completing the Regional State Forest Plans, with revisions to Work Instruction 1.3 and the timeline approved by the SWC.</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> |
|--------------|--|--------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | | | | 11 | | | |
| <i>Notes</i> | <p><u>Minor Non-conformance: Annual review has not led to effective follow-up for one repeated internal audit NCR.</u></p> <p>Michigan DNR Management Review Report February 17, 2011 describes a comprehensive overview of the program, including Internal and External Non-conformances, Opportunities for Improvement, Observations, Decisions, direction, responsibility, and time lines in response to findings, and recommendations for revisions needed in Work Instructions. This management review is robust and commendable. However there have been several, related internal audit findings which have been issued repeatedly that have not been resolved.</p> <p>Supervisors at Forest Management Units have developed habits of reviewing past internal audit reports and re-reviewing selected findings, even several years after they have been formally closed. For example, at the Atlanta Forest Management Unit, Internal Minor CAR 54-2008-1 involving staff familiarity with Work Instructions and relevant plans is still considered by the manager in his work to train and manage his staff.</p> | | | | | | | | |

Multi-site Certification – Two Options

A multi-site organization is defined as an organization having an identified central function (hereafter referred to as a central office – but not necessarily the headquarters of the organization) at which certain activities are planned, controlled or managed and a network of local offices or branches (sites) at which such activities are fully or partially carried out.

Option 1: Alternate Approach to Multi-site Certification Sampling based on the Requirements for the SFI 2010-2014 Program, Section 9, Part 5.1 & Appendix 1

- a) What specific activities are planned, controlled or managed at the central office?
Budgeting, inventory, support for research, management review, policies, procedures, guidance, and management planning.
- b) For each activity, provide evidence:
See main checklist on preceding pages.

General Eligibility Criteria:

A legal or contractual link shall exist between all sites.

Yes No Evidence the authority of the Michigan DNR and the powers to manage these lands extend across all sites. "Sites" are considered, for purposes of this checklist, to be the state forest system; those forest management units that have been combined for management are considered to be a site.

The scope and scale of activities carried out by participating sites shall be similar.

Yes No Evidence All sites (Forest Management Units) are very similar in size, scope of activities, and use the same policies, procedures, etc.

The management system framework shall be consistent across all sites (allowing for site level procedures to reflect variable local factors).

Yes No Evidence Field observations confirmed that land management is carried out for the same goals and using the same procedures and tools at all sites. See main checklist.

Central Function Requirements:

Provide a commitment on behalf of the whole multi-site organization to establish and maintain practices and procedures in accordance with the requirements of the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence: The commitment is documented in the Michigan DNR Director's directive to pursue dual certification (SFI and FSC) dated 10.20.10.

Provide all the sites with information and guidance needed for effective implementation and maintenance of practices and procedures in accordance with the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence: Guidance flows through various channels, with the Forest Certification Committee and the Management Review Committee (aka The Integration Committee) being central to the management of certification-related issues. The Michigan DNR has a comprehensive set of Work Instructions which detail a broad range of procedures, including provisions specific to certification. Field personnel know what they need to do.

Maintain the organizational or contractual connection with all sites covered by the multisite Organization including the right of the Central Function to exclude any site from participation in the certification in case of serious non-conformities with the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence Michigan DNR has the legal authority to exclude sites as needed.

Keep a register of all the sites of the multi-site organization, including (for SFI 2010-2014 Standard) the forest area associated with each participating site.

Yes No Evidence A detailed list of lands within the scope is included in the documentation, and summarized in the scope statement.

Maintain an internal audit or monitoring program sufficient to provide annual performance data on overall organizational conformance with the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence Monitoring protocols are varied and widespread, with a focus on timber harvests and vegetation treatments. The internal audit program covers the complete range of issues and activities, including activities conducted at the dispersed sites (field) and those managed centrally.

Maintain an internal audit or monitoring program sufficient to provide periodic performance data on overall organizational conformance with the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence Periodic monitoring, coupled with annual internal audits and regular monitoring, appears to meet the requirements.

Operate a review of the conformity of sites based on results of internal audit and/or monitoring data sufficient to assess Organizational performance as a whole rather than at the individual site level.

Yes No Evidence Management review

Establish corrective and preventive measures if required and evaluate the effectiveness of corrective actions taken.

Yes No Evidence Corrective and preventive measures stemming from the internal audits have been issued, and are revised regularly. Issues raised during third-party audits are addressed with other issues from internal audits or in various program's reviews and management processes. A review of the three internal audit reports (Traverse City, Crystal Falls, Newberry) demonstrated that many internal NCRs (corrective action requests) were issued, and some were elevated to "statewide" status.

Establish procedures for inclusion of new sites within the multi-site organization including an internal assessment of conformity with the standard, implementation of corrective and preventive measures and a requirement to inform the relevant certification body of changes in participation prior to including the sites within the scope of the certification.

Yes No Evidence All appropriate lands are included; when lands are purchased they are added as appropriate. Auditors work with Michigan DNR each year to understand scope.

Individual Site Functions and Responsibilities

Sites implement and maintain the requirements of the relevant standard.

Yes No Evidence Field reviews and interviews; see main checklist.

Sites respond effectively to all requests from the Central Function or certification body for relevant data, documentation or other information whether in connection with formal audits or reviews or otherwise.

Yes No Evidence Sites appear to comply with changes in the program driven by third-party audits, internal audits or other centrally-directed changes.

Sites provide full co-operation and assistance in respect of the satisfactory completion of internal audits, reviews, monitoring, relevant routine enquiries or corrective actions.

Yes No Evidence Sites are compliant and cooperative with centrally-issued directives. Dennis Nezich provided his "CAR Tracking Form" for the past three years. This form shows that the units have been responding to internal audit NCRs.

Sites implement relevant corrective and preventive actions established by the central office.

Yes No Evidence Responses to CARs indicate sites implement CAR plans which stem from third-party or internal audits. Dennis Nezich provided his "CAR Tracking Form" for the past three years. This form shows that the units have been responding to internal audit NCRs.

Option 2: NSF-ISR Multi-site Certification Justification based on MD1: 2007

Sampling and Non-sampling

Option 1 was selected; Option 2 questions were deleted.

End of Multi-site Checklists

Appendix IV



Field Sites and Attendees

Field Sites for Tuesday October 18, 2011 – Cadillac FMU

Dave Fisher, Cadillac FMU Unit Manager

C140, (discuss C111), C138, C 129 planting sites, and roads/bridge

1. Long Lake Motorcycle Trail and Parking Lot: under director's order for Motorcycles only
2. April Snow Aspen/oak: Marked, uncut oak seed tree treatment, trees to be retained marked with green paint
3. Manton Field Office: Three large, sturdily-constructed fire-fighting vehicles, trailer-mounted fire plow, separate shed for paint storage
4. Morrisy Creek Bridge:
5. US 131 to North Missaukee Trail: well-signed, reasonable maintenance
6. East Side Aspen: marked clearcut, one unit of two mostly without retention based on biologist recommendations, except along trail and road for visual reasons.
7. Over the Bridge Mix (Sale Number 63-039-11-01): 30 acre marked partial harvest; discussed retention of legacy trees, snags, den trees and other wildlife trees.
8. Planting Site (FTP C63-693): Clearcut off-site Jack Pine, trenched and planted 15,000 red pine 2-0 seedlings obtained from Michigan DNR nursery; planting report.
9. C129 Red Pine CC: 129-acre active strip clearcuts of red pine; alternating strips were cc and then planted 10 years ago; inspected logging equipment but operators had left.
10. C129 15 Rd. Pine: 128-acre active marked Red Pine thinning; Bishballe Forest Products, Inc. Interviewed Troy Bishalle and Kenny Meigs. Trained person is Ben James, Biewer Sawmill who visits the site two times weekly.

Field Sites for Wednesday October 19, 2011 – Atlanta FMU

Cody Stevens, Atlanta FMU Unit Manger

(RH) East Team: C88, C89, Snowmobile ORV/RDR repairs, 1 active sale, Wildlife Flooding

(MF) West Team: C12, C121, C125prescriptions relating to KW, planting, roads/bridges, hardwood thinning if possible

1. Access road to Avery Lake Campground: road reconstruction , including regrading, crowning, and installation of ditch drainage to prevent road drainage water from entering lake.

2. Avery Lake Campground: boat launch and well-maintained campground.

3. SCA/ERA (Rich Conifer Swamp) for Sage Lake Swamp, also proposed as a BSA: 145 acres; G4/S3, Quality Rank BC; reviewed documentation of reasons for selection and management needs contained within the Cedar Swamp ERA Management Plan developed during Compartment Review 10.16.2007; closed canopy 100+ year old cedar with super-canopy large white pine. Stands of older white pine, oak, red pine as well as various age classes of aspen are in the surrounding uplands, but none of these stands are prescribed for harvest in the YOE 2009 cycle. Deer herbivory noted causing lack of cedar regeneration within the ERA... “Stands 54, 128, 228 have steep topography and access problems. In those stands there should be a focus on uneven-aged management and dry mesic conifer restoration.” Reviewed the compartment listing of stands to confirm that this recommendation was included in each stand within the compartment plan.

The next three sites were in Compartment 12

4. Compartment 12 Oak: TS 54-047-09-01, Payment Unit #2, Stand 84 - Partially completed oak preparatory cut and Aspen CC, marked to cut, also cut all Aspen and red maple; compliant retention patch with snags, down dead, some Aspen, maple, and large Oak.

5. Maestro Mix TS 54-009-09-01and Prescribed Burn FTP W54-909: 32 acre TS (only 250 cords) to help maintain opening, and follow-up prescribed burn completed last week to control brush, maintain open areas, and enhance native grasses. This was a complex and somewhat challenging site to burn, with some hills, some understory burning in a pine plantation, and burning of slash and varied grass/brushland. Detailed burn plan reviewed and discussed. Burn walked to assess results; concur with Fire Program supervisor that objectives appear to have been met.

6. Thunderstorm Hardwoods TS 54-042-08-01: Active hardwood thinning covering 60 acres. Interviewed Mark Fuhrman, Catalona Forest Products, operating in-woods processor, has many years of training but not fully-qualified under SFI (other owner Tom Catalano is fully SFI trained); confirmed First Aid Kit but doesn't have a spill kit

7. Tomahawk Flooding SF Campground: In 2010 Michigan DNR completed a comprehensive and high-quality renovation and modernization of campground and boat launch, with some sites and boat launch ADA-compliant.

8. KW Management JP Planting Site: Discussed planning, planting operations, quality control, and periodic survival checks, as well as planting approach for KW. Reviewed planting quality; apparent high survival rate, with some supplemental volunteer natural JP seedlings.
9. 121 Red Pine TS 54-039-09-01: 27 acre completed 3rd row thinning plus cut all Jack Pine. Discussion regarding results, long-term prospects for red pine on this marginal site, residual stocking pattern, and variable-density thinning (unintended but acceptable result).
10. Clear North Jack TS 54-011-09-01 Jack Pine clearcut and follow up FTP C54-926: Sale had provisions for visual and for habitat-driven retention. Trenching complete, planting to follow. Many standing dead snags, more were toppled during trenching.
11. RDR Project On Powerline Row and along County Road 624, RDR Id#54039602005049: Relocated ORV trail, blocked old trail, restored steep, eroding areas and mud hole damage, seeded, large stone blocks to prevent use. Followed up with monitoring and ticketing of unauthorized ORV use. Discussed funding sources for trail maintenance and repair, primarily RIF Grants and ORV grants.

Field Sites for Thursday October 20, 2011 – Traverse City FMU

Dave Lemmien, TC FMD Unit Manager

Sites: C41 Lone Track Hardwood; C42 Active harvest logger interviews, trail; 45 Sands Lake Quiet Area, BSA; C156 2012 YOE discuss planning process; examples of unmaintained two-track roads

1. Compartment 4, Munci Weave TS 61-000-10-01: 71 acre regeneration harvest active; regeneration harvest in oak stand leaving understory pine and some oak; removal of logs and pulpwood nearly complete, with slash being piled for later yarding and chipping; thorough utilization (sold prior to completion of biomass guidelines) and very little damage to residual larger trees and reasonable protection for the many smaller pine trees; very good visual management including buffer along recreational trail (walking and XC skiing).
2. Compartment 41, Lone Track Hardwoods TS 61-000-10-01: 71 acre partial harvest, nearly complete, with active harvesting during audit; marking meets guidelines for northern hardwoods, including some gaps; some residual tree damage but well within specifications; forester is working with logger to ensure that sale requirements are met, including utilization and soil stabilization of skid trails on steep slopes.
3. Sands Lake Quiet Area: 2,700-acre non-motorized recreation area with proposed larger BSA; extensive trail system; challenges with funding for maintenance of non-motorized trails so that wells and bathrooms removed for this year, but funding to be restored next year.
4. Fen: ERA within Sands Lake Quiet Area

Attendees

Abbreviations:

FMD Forest Management Division

WLD Wildlife Division

FD Fisheries Division

Tuesday October 18, 2011 – Cadillac FMU

Opening Meeting / Review of Changes and CARs

Robert Hrubes, SCS Lead Auditor

Mike Ferrucci, NSF Lead Auditor

Nadine Block, SFI senior Director, Government Relations

Ben Silvernail, SFI Intern

*Lynne Boyd, FMD Division Chief

Bill O'Neill, FMD Field Coordinator

Penney Melchoir, WLD Field Coordinator

Debbie Begalle, Acting FMD FRM Section Manager

David Price, Unit Supervisor, Forest Planning and Operations

Dennis Nezich, Forest Certification Specialist

Tom Haxby, WLP Inventory and Planning Specialist

David Shaw, District 4 Law Supervisor

* Did not participate in field visit

District, FMU Overview and Field Visits

All of the above except as indicated by *, plus:

Bill Sterrett, FMD District Supervisor

Scott Throop, FMD Timber Mgt Specialist

Tom Haxby FMD District Planner

Amanda Matelski, FMD ORV Specialist

Rex Ainslie WLD Regional Supervisor

Ashley Hippler, WLD Deer Biologist NLP and UP

Tim Lyon, WLD Wildlife Technician

Mark Knee, WLD Wildlife Technician

Dave Fisher, FMD Unit Manager

Bruce Tower, FMD Fire Supervisor

Joe Ventimiglia, FMD Forester/Technician, Manton Field Office

James Malloy, FMD Forester/Technician, Manton Field Office

Steven Eisele, FMD Forester/Technician, Manton Field Office

Blair Tweedale, FMD Forester

Derek Cross, FMD Forester

Rich O'Neal, Fisheries Division, Central Lake Michigan

Wednesday October 19, 2011 – Atlanta FMU

Robert Hrubes, SCS Lead Auditor
Mike Ferrucci, NSF Lead Auditor
Bill O'Neill, FMD Field Coordinator
Penney Melchoir, WLD Field Coordinator
Debbie Begalle, Acting FMD FRM Section Manager
David Price, Unit Supervisor, Forest Planning and Operations
Dennis Nezich, Forest Certification Specialist
Tom Haxby, WLP Inventory and Planning Specialist
Jeff Stampfly, FMD District Supervisor
Tim Greco, FMD Timber Mgt Specialist
Paige Perry, FMD Recreation Specialist
Rex Ainslie, WLD Regional Supervisor
Brian Mastenbrook, WL Biologist Supervisor

Cody Stevens, FMD Unit Manager
Rob Pelton, FMD Fire Supervisor
Tim Cwalinski, FD Biologist
Jennifer Kleitch, WLD Biologist
Erin Victory, WLD Intern
CO Bill Webster, LED

FMD Foresters/Technicians

Jeff Autenrieth (E Tour),
Richard Barber (E tour),
Derrick Coy (W tour),
Chad Fate (1 site W tour),
Kirby Osvold (1 site W tour)
Greg Rekowski (E tour)

Mark Hansen FMD Fire Officer, Alpena

Thursday October 20, 2011 – Traverse City FMU

Robert Hrubes, SCS Lead Auditor
Mike Ferrucci, NSF Lead Auditor
Bill O'Neill, FMD Field Coordinator
Penney Melchoir, WLD Field Coordinator
Debbie Begalle, Acting FMD FRM Section Manager
David Price, Unit Supervisor, Forest Planning and Operations
Dennis Nezich, Forest Certification Specialist
Tom Haxby, WLP Inventory and Planning Specialist

Bill Sterrett, FMD District Supervisor
Scott Throop, FMD Timber Management Specialist
Tom Haxby, FMD District Planner
Todd Neiss, FMD Recreation Specialist
Amanda Matelski, FMD ORV Specialist
Jason Stephens, IFMAP Specialist

Rex Ainslie, WLD Regional Supervisor
Rich O'Neal Acting Fisheries Division Unit Supervisor
Steve Griffith, WLD Traverse City

DNR FMD Field staff

Dave Lemmien, FMD Unit Manager
Rod Rader, FMD Fire Supervisor
FMD Foresters/Technicians: Pat Ruppen, Scott Lint
Kalkaska Office:
Steve Crigier, Forester, FMD
Katie Armstrong, Forester, FMD

Thursday October 20, 2011 – Closing Meeting

Robert Hrubes, SCS Lead Auditor
Mike Ferrucci, NSF Lead Auditor
Lynne Boyd, FMD Division Chief
Bill O'Neill, FMD Field Coordinator
Penney Melchoir, WLD Field Coordinator
Debbie Begalle, Acting FMD FRM Section Manager
David Price, Unit Supervisor, Forest Planning and Operations
Dennis Nezich, Forest Certification Specialist
Bill Sterrett, FMD District Supervisor
Scott Throop, FMD Timber Management Specialist
Tom Haxby, FMD District Planner
Todd Neiss, FMD Recreation Specialist
Amanda Matelski, FMD ORV Specialist
Jason Stephens, IFMAP Specialist
Rex Ainslie, WLD Regional Supervisor
Steve Griffith, WLD Traverse City
Dave Lemmien, FMD Unit Manager
Patrick Ruppen, FMD Traverse City

By telephone: Cara Boucher, FMD Assistant Division Chief; Cody Stevens, Atlanta FMD Unit Manager; Ron Murray FMD Forest Health, Inventory and Monitoring Unit Supervisor; Steve Milford, E UP FMD District Manager

Appendix V



SFI Reporting Form (no changes)

