

Western Upper Peninsula Citizen Advisory Council (UPCAC)

Meeting Minutes

Monday, September 12, 2011

5:30-6:00pm EST DNR Division Reports * 6:00-8:00pm EST Official Council Meeting
Michigan Tech University's Memorial Union Building, Houghton, MI

Council Members Present

| | |
|----------------|----------------------|
| David Anderson | George Lindquist |
| David Anthony | Jim Lorensen |
| Don Britton | Rory Mattson |
| Jerry Divine | G. Dale McNamee |
| Floyd Dropps | Jim Schmierer |
| Larry Heathman | Robert "Skip" Schulz |
| Mick Jarvi | Warren Suchovsky |
| Dave Johnson | Phil Wirtanen |
| Marty Johnson | |

Council Members Excused

Chauncey Moran

Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Staff Liaisons

Stacy Welling, Upper Peninsula Regional Coordinator, Marquette
Sgt. Steve Burton, Law Enforcement Division, Marquette
Kristi Dahlstrom, Executive Division, Marquette
George Madison, Fisheries Division, Baraga
Tim Melko, Field Operations & Facility Management, Marquette
Steve Milford, Forest Management Division, Newberry
Debbie Munson Badini, UP Communications Representative, Marquette
Tom Paquin, Recreation Division, Marquette
Bill Scullon, Wildlife Division, Baraga
Eric Thompson, Forest Management Division, Marquette

Special Guests

Natural Resources Commissioner J.R. Richardson, Ontonagon

DNR Division Reports

Stacy Welling provided an overview of the Citizen's Advisory Council to those who haven't attended previously. She acknowledged and thanked the staff from Michigan Technological University for their hospitality and use of the meeting space. She asked if anyone would like to speak publicly or ask questions to please fill out a comment card at the entrance of the room.

DNR written staff reports were provided to Council members on September 6, 2011. The following are updates to those reports.

- ***Stacy Welling, U.P. Regional Coordinator:*** Ms. Welling stated that the wolf delisting comment period has been reopened. The NRC meeting will be held on September 15 in Sault Ste. Marie at Lake Superior State University. In addition, the Moose Advisory Council met

again. This group was formed out of legislation and was tasked with looking at the possibility of a limited moose hunt. They are giving a presentation at the NRC meeting on Thursday.

- **Sgt. Steve Burton, Law Enforcement Division:** Sgt. Burton stated he had no additional information to add to Law Enforcement's report.
- **Eric Thompson, Forest Management Division:** Mr. Thompson stated that he has recently been appointed the Western U.P. Acting Supervisor. He had no additions to his report.
- **Bill Scullon, Wildlife Division:** Mr. Scullon stated that he is attending on behalf of Mr. Craig Albright. Mr. Scullon added that there was a bear attack today in the Newberry area and provided a brief description of the details. A press release will be issued soon. Commissioner Richardson questioned what projects have been completed and/or implemented. Mr. Scullon stated there have been several successful deer habitat projects; in the Ewen area with help from the Ontonagon Chapter of UP Whitetails, planting of oak trees with the Straights Area Sportsman Club, and an apple orchard planting project in Dickinson County with the Conservation District.
- **Tom Paquin, Parks & Recreation Division:** Mr. Paquin stated he had no additional information to add to his report.
- **George Madison, Fisheries Division:** Mr. Madison, who is here in Ms. Jessica Mistak's absence, noted that Fisheries has added two new employees since the last meeting, a tech at the Crystal Falls office and a biologist at the Newberry office. There are plans to do more hiring for the Western U.P. The fall trout planting season is starting; the local Copper Country Chapter of Trout Unlimited is providing assistance in several locations, including Twin Lakes State Park. Mr. Lindquist asked if there has been any stress seen on the fish due to the warm waters. Mr. Madison replied that brook trout are most affected. They are just downloading data now and with the drought, the trout streams seem to be suffering. This is also the purpose for the trout planting this fall. There will be good fishing opportunities this fall. Commissioner Richardson is helping with a project as well. Commissioner Richardson stated that in partnership with the Ontonagon Sports Fisherman Association, fish incubator boxes are being built using astro turf (a piece of turf was displayed) which helps the growing process. If the project is successful, schools will become involved in building more boxes. Partnerships will then be sought with local clubs to help with brook trout planting. He stated it is a good effort with sports groups to boost fisheries. Grass roots are on the ground and it is a good partnership with the Tribes. He offered to answer any questions after the meeting.
- **Debbie Munson Badini, U.P. Communications:** Ms. Munson Badini stated that the next episode of Ask the DNR on WNMU-TV13 will be held on September 29 at 8pm with a rerun scheduled for the next day at noon. Topics will include a forecast into deer season, small game, laws, etc. She encourages everyone to call in with questions, which will be answered live on the air.
- **Tim Melko, Operations & Facilities Management:** Mr. Melko stated that he had no additions to his report.

Call To Order

The Western UPCAC meeting was called to order at 5:45 pm EST (4:45pm CST) by **Facilitator Phil Wirtanen**.

Adoption of Agenda

Facilitator Wirtanen asked for a motion to approve the agenda as presented. **Mr. Britton** motioned to adopt the agenda as submitted; **Mr. D. Johnson** supported the motion. **Mr. Schultz** requested the addition of ORV Issues Recap to #3 under New Business. **Facilitator Wirtanen called for a vote on the motion to approve the agenda with the additional agenda item requested by Mr. Schulz. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Absent: Mr. Moran. Motion carried.**

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Facilitator Wirtanen stated that members had an opportunity to review the minutes via email and asked if there were any further edits needed. **Mr. Dropps** stated that in the minutes there were references in which questions were asked, and it was written as those questions were made to him and he didn't respond, but they were responding to the Chair. He would like it removed from the record and is requesting that it not appear in that format in the future. He stated that it should be that any questions go to the Chair and the Chair is to answer or pass it to a member to answer; there should be no cross-talk or reference that no one responded. Several members asked what page of the minutes were in question. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that the meeting is run according to Roberts Rules of Order, and it is always a question as to how absolute the Council wishes to be with the Rules of Order. **Facilitator Wirtanen noted Mr. Dropps concern and asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Schmierer motioned to approve the July 18, 2011 Western UPCAC meeting minutes; Mr. Anderson supported the motion. Ayes: All. Nays: None. Absent: Mr. Moran. Motion carried.**

Public Comments on Agenda Items Only

Facilitator Wirtanen stated that he received one comment card in regards to the Copperwood presentation from Mr. Cox. **Mr. Cox** stated that he would prefer to comment after the presentation if acceptable; **Facilitator Wirtanen** agreed. **Facilitator Wirtanen** asked if there were any other public comments at this time; none were presented.

Old Business/Council Subcommittee Updates

1. **Old Business:** **Facilitator Wirtanen** asked if there were any comments on Old Business at this time; none were brought forth.
2. **Subcommittee Meeting Updates:** **Facilitator Wirtanen** indicated that there are currently two existing subcommittees: wildlife and walleye. He stated that Mr. M. Johnson has agreed to chair the wildlife subcommittee and he has an update to provide.

Mr. M. Johnson distributed a summary of the first meeting in which he and Mr. Heathman attended. They determined that the subcommittee's role will be (as stated on the handout)...*"in an advisory capacity to the Western UP Citizen's Advisory Council, and as directed by the Council, will discuss topics that need further review outside of council meetings with the understanding that the subcommittee will review the topic, receive adequate advisement from DNR staff if needed (biologists, etc.), and bring any summations, suggestions, or recommendations back to the Council for action if needed"*.

Mr. M. Johnson stated that despite the low attendance at the first meeting, he is sure that there will be more participation in the future when getting into subject matters. He mentioned rather than having a meeting in one central location, he feels it would be more convenient to hold meetings by phone conference. However, he is open to suggestions; meetings at the DNR office are also a possibility. He asked the Council what would be the best time to hold the phone conferences or meetings. He stated he spoke with Facilitator Wirtanen about taking agenda items from the Council if they can't be resolved at the Council meetings. The subcommittee would then come back to the Council with their recommendation or resolution and the Council can take it from there. At future subcommittee meetings, he would appreciate more participation.

Facilitator Wirtanen stated that the attempt Mr. M. Johnson made earlier to get people involved was met with less than enthusiasm, but this could have been because the purpose may have been vague. He asked the Council if there is a general agreement for the need of the subcommittee and what their tasks should be. **Mr. Lindquist** thanked Mr. M. Johnson for taking this on this role. He suggested holding a phone conference during the week, late in the afternoon around 3pm (2pm CST) for an hour, may be preferable for most.

Facilitator Wirtanen asked how many could attend at that option, by show of hands; majority of the Council agreed. **Mr. Suchovsky** stated he prefers early morning or late evening. **Mr. Mattson** noted that it comes back to the original question of what the topic of discussion would be. There are a lot of meetings to attend. If there is a meeting set up to discuss a certain topic, then the Council needs to know. A lot of time is spent on a topic when the DNR is already meeting about it. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that was the experience with the deer subcommittee; there was a lot of time and effort spent discussing the baiting issue.

Facilitator Wirtanen asked what the Council envisions the wildlife subcommittee to work on. He stated that it seems appropriate to tackle issues on more of a local level; it would be beyond the Council to tackle a statewide issue. Turkey habitat was suggested as a possible topic. **Mr. Suchovsky** stated that it may be better to establish an ad hoc committee to work on an issue that comes up at Council meetings at the time it's discussed; **Facilitator Wirtanen** agreed. **Mr. Schmierer** stated that perhaps the subcommittee could be involved in providing background information on wildlife and wildlife management issues for the Council. A lot of material is presented without many references. **Mr. Dropps** stated that the walleye subcommittee distributed several reports and no one read them. To have someone spend thousands of hours gathering information for the Council not to read it is time not well spent. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that Mr. Suchovsky suggested an ad hoc committee format and Mr. Schmierer suggested the subcommittee be charged with bringing more detail on the topic to the Council in order to help make a better judgment. Discussion ensued regarding a good time for a subcommittee meeting. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that for purposes of getting an agreement, it will be the primary function of the subcommittee to develop in greater detail information necessary to form a better judgment; timing will be left to the subcommittee chair to determine. The Council agreed; no motion was necessary per the Council. **Facilitator Wirtanen** asked Mr. M. Johnson to continue in his efforts.

Facilitator Wirtanen stated that the second subcommittee in existence is the walleye subcommittee. There was a vote at the last meeting, and he believes there is no further point of business that the Council needs to be involved with at this point. **Mr. Dropps** clarified what the Council originally supported regarding the wildlife management plan.

New Business

1. **Priority Items for Future Meeting Agendas:** **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that he had asked Mr. Lorensen to bring his thoughts pertaining to the Council's future direction. He stated Mr. Suchovsky and the Council completed a topic/issue survey two years ago, which was distributed to the Council at the last meeting. There are now several new members and it will be a new year. One relatively critical issue, in his mind, is forestry management; it is a very meaningful topic that has an impact on the counties the Council represents. **Mr. Dropps** mentioned that in his opinion there needs to be more of a localized function. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that the Council's Charter does not specify whether there is a regional or statewide role. There is no reason that the Council needs to be state, regional, or county exclusive.

Mr. Lorensen stated that, as a new member, he found it difficult to prep for the Ironwood meeting. The meetings have a lot of importance, but in terms of getting a grasp of an issue, the Council hasn't done a lot of proactive work. So that the Council can give the DNR constructive advice, he suggested looking at the issues before the Council, establishing a priority list, and using that list in selecting major agenda items in the future. This would enable the Council to better organize meetings and would give the DNR an opportunity to make arrangements to have expert staff present at meetings that require specific information. If the Council is interested, he would be willing to help put together a new list by getting a sense of what the priorities should be.

Mr. Mattson stated that he likes that idea and it has been brought up previously. The agenda this evening included 45 minutes of business; it doesn't allow much time to get to the issues. He stated that in the three years that he has been a Council member, he has been very vocal about what needs to be accomplished. He stated he would rather tackle things that the public wants the Council to tackle than drive three hours to spend more hours at a meeting and accomplish nothing. The walleye subcommittee was perfect example of a lot of time spent on an issue without a resolution being sent to the DNR. He would like to see a big change. **Mr. Schulz** stated he agrees with Mr. Mattson, but the Council did make recommendations/resolutions on three other topics that were unanimous; however, one person in the DNR disagreed and it didn't go any farther.

Facilitator Wirtanen reminded the group that the Council's capacity is to advise, not to dictate. It is the Council's responsibility to come up with a resolution or recommendation on an issue, and it's up to the DNR or NRC to determine whether to accept it. The primary function is one of influence through advisory comment. He stated that he doesn't think there is any question that each member's voice is heard. **Mr. Mattson** stated that in his words then, if their response is no, then the Council is not being heard. **Facilitator**

Wirtanen stated that there is nothing stating that the DNR is required to respond back to the Council. **Mr. Dropps** stated that it is up to the facilitator to bring a response back to the Council. **Mr. Lorensen** stated that it ought to be the expectation that the Council receives feedback. The DNR won't always adopt what the Council suggests; if a resolution is forwarded to the DNR, then it should be understood that the Council is owed a response and an explanation, despite whether or not the Council agrees with the response.

Ms. Welling asked Facilitator Wirtanen if there was a specific time when a response to a recommendation or resolution was not received. **Mr. Schulz** stated that he [the Council] shouldn't have had to wait two years to get a response. **Ms. Welling** responded that the Council did receive letters of response to their resolutions regarding ORV bridge usage, ORV trail ID system, and event permits, and explained the follow-up that was done. She asked what issue didn't receive a response; **Mr. Schulz** stated that a response was not provided right away to the presentation he gave with three issues. When he brought up the event process a few meetings ago, that was when he [the Council] found out it was in administrative process; they should've been told that two years ago.

Commissioner Richardson stated the NRC appreciates the feedback that they receive from the Council. He suggested, rather than arguing, developing a mechanism what will work best for the Council to submit recommendations and receive responses. **Mr. Lorensen** stated he would be glad to set up a process and to set priorities for issues. **Mr. Anthony** suggested the establishment of a liaison to bring the Council's work to the NRC to ensure a respectable response is received. **Mr. Mattson** added that examples should also be given. **Commissioner Richard** stated the best example is not to only ask a question. **Mr. Mattson** stated he watched the walleye process hit a wall, and the DNR asked the subcommittee to wait and they will present a plan to review; nothing came back until the final plan was given to the Council. **Commissioner Richardson** stated time can't be reversed; he suggested using that example to figure out a system that will work for this Council and move forward.

Mr. Dropps stated that there doesn't need to be a debate. He asked Mr. Lorensen to add the invasion of Asian carp to the topic list.

Mr. Lorensen asked Ms. Welling to send out the agenda topic list that that was established two years ago to everyone for review. He stated he will use his services at the college to evaluate and rate the list. He will then put something together that the Council might want to consider for the process. If that's agreeable, he will have it ready for next meeting.

Mr. Mattson stated he doesn't agree with what Mr. Lorensen said; that he is going to take all those agenda items and then give it to Ms. Welling to see if they are appropriate. **Mr. Lorensen** interjected, stating he asked Ms. Welling to resend the list to the Council, not to review it. He will prepare a revised list of priorities to discuss at the next meeting and develop a schedule.

Mr. Divine stated that while it is important to discuss these items amongst themselves, it is also important to ask the audience/public for input. There might be additional items that

come up that may be good for the Council to review and it should be on each agenda. **Facilitator Wirtanen** agreed.

Mr. Suchovsky stated in regards to the previous response discussion, over the years, the Council received several response letters when the Council wrote to the legislators and the DNR, which was pretty regularly, and the Council did get a response each time. In regards to the previous list of agenda items, he reminded everyone that the list was put together two years ago and some of the items may not be relevant; there may be new important items that need to be added. He would suggest taking a look at the current interest in revitalizing the utilization of Michigan's resources to create wealth in this state. He stated he thinks the work Mr. Lorensen is proposing is on the right tract. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that the general consensus is to agree.

2. Follow-Up Topics:

- Invasive Species: **Ms. Welling** stated that a presentation was provided in January in Crystal Falls and a copy of that presentation is in the meeting packets. She also contacted Sarah Lesage, DEQ expert in this matter, and she was unable to attend, but she did provide a handout with her contact information in the meeting packet. In regards to Mr. Jeff Pytlarz's (*Invasive Species Control Coalition of Watersmeet*) request to coordinate permits with DEQ, the DNR is a separate agency. She spoke to Jim Dexter, Acting Chief of Fisheries, and he stated that when the DNR does the same type of work, the same permit process has to be followed. The last time she spoke with Mr. Pytlarz, he was going to contact the DEQ. The DNR as an agency does not have any influence over the permits. If anything is not covered in the handout for invasive species or if the Council would like the topic as a future agenda item, let her know.

- Menominee River Headwaters Project: **Mr. Milford** stated there have been questions regarding the nature of the project, what is happening with it, etc. He hoped to have Ms. Kerry Wieber present as she can provide information relating to the funding aspect of the project, but she couldn't attend due to another meeting. If there are funding questions, he may defer the questions until she can be present. He provided an overview of four area maps to help explain the project: Paint River Tract, Net River Tract, Hemlock River Tract, and the entire Menominee River Headwaters Forest Project. The maps (displayed on slides and as a handout in the meeting packet) shows what the state has, what the state is looking to acquire, and overall, what the project will look like as a whole. He reviewed each slide/tract and described the areas that are state land, areas that are private land, and what the state is hoping to acquire in fee ownership.

Mr. M. Johnson asked if the Net River Tract land is owned by one company; **Mr. Milford** replied yes. He stated they plan to take all state parcels and use them as an exchange for a larger chunk of ownership. Before the exchange, they looked at purchasing a conservation easement, using Trust Fund money and other funds; Ms. Wieber's knowledge is more comprehensive if more information is needed. This project will provide more consolidation ownership that would protect public access, ensure the ability to hunt, fish, trap, and provide management for timber harvest.

Mr. Suchovsky asked in regards to public access if this is different than CFA land. **Mr. Milford** stated yes; access would need to be identified. **Mr. Suchovsky** asked if the project's 7-9 miles of trails are protected. **Mr. Milford** replied that there are some snowmobile trails in which easements will be retained.

Mr. Dropps asked what type of timber is present on the properties. **Mr. Milford** stated that for the most part, a big chunk in the south end is young aspen; further up the grade in the north, it transitions to very nice hardwoods. The owners who had it before managed it well as it is not heavily cut over. On the river, more aspen is present. There are some cedar stands and deer yards which are not able to be cut down with the trade. **Mr. Dropps** asked if there was an appraisal done on the two properties; **Mr. Milford** stated yes.

Mr. Lindquist stated he is concerned with the wording and setup of the conservation easement as there have been several problems with those. **Mr. Milford** stated that they are still working on the language; he believes it will be written very well. The deer yards are a little bit tough, trying to protect them and at same time allow harvest. Ultimately, more is being protected.

Mr. Divine asked several questions: where did the seeds for the project originate, where did the push come from, if minerals rights have been leased on these lands, and if another company acquires the surface rights, how does that affect the project. The conservation easement does not allow for the development of mineral rights. **Mr. Milford** stated that the project started when the timber company was disposing of the land. The conservation fund who was working with the Tribe approached the DNR to work with them as plans fell through with the Tribe. And because federal forest legacy money was available, they were able to expand the project.

Mr. Schulz stated that there is a main connecting snowmobile trail to Ironwood in the Paint River Tract; if those 2-3 miles were to not be available, it would be detrimental. **Mr. Milford** stated that they are very aware of the trail connectivity in the project area. Discussion ensued about retaining easements for trails. **Mr. Milford** stated there will be a net gain of state ownership. It was mentioned that there may be a loss of taxes as well.

Mr. Schmierer asked about CFA taxes. The swamp tax payment is a split and does not come from timber harvest. **Mr. Suchovsky** stated that the swamp tax is tax reverted lands, etc. He explained how the revenues work. When talking dollars, the conservation fund and forest legacy funds are federal in scope, from offshore gas and oil leases. It does not come from general fund tax dollars and not from State of Michigan-generated tax revenues. Often times, local government thinks of extra tax revenues, however, the added revenues from this type of development are outstripped from those types of revenues in a short time.

Mr. Lorenson stated that what Mr. Milford is talking about is very positive. It would behoove the DNR to have a good sense of what the trade-off is. He stated there is a block in the current legislature that is not very supportive of the state acquiring additional lands and wondered about discussions with those folks.

Mr. McNamee stated that he wanted to address information that was provided to the Council previously, what is the Living Legacy Program and how does it figure in to this project. He stated that Director Stokes' letter says the BSA was changed to the Living Legacy Program. **Mr. Milford** stated that the Living Legacy Program has nothing to do with this project or the forest legacy funds; **Mr. Suchovsky** pointed out that it is two entirely different things. He stated, however, that Mr. McNamee raises a good point with the overall confusion. Discussion ensued regarding these issues. Mr. Milford stated that in regards to funding for this project, 12,000 acres are being exchanged, which are valued a little less because rights are being retained in that property. Then federal forest legacy money was pursued; 75% comes from the federal fund (offshore money), and for the remainder of project, trust fund money has been applied for. **Mr. McNamee** asked what strings are attached to the federal money. **Mr. Milford** stated it has to be managed for forest management and a third match is required. **Mr. Suchovsky** stated it needs to be managed for timber production. He stated that future legislature and citizens groups need to change the definition of timber management. **Commissioner Richardson** stated that one advantage for state acquired land is public access; if an individual buys that land, there is no public access. **Mr. Divine** noted in the past, there were timber companies that wanted to acquire a solid block of this land and the NRC turned it down. It provides a little background on how things come back around; it's probably the same land. **Facilitator Wirtanen** indicated that the Council will now have to move to the next agenda item due to time constraints.

Mr. Mattson stated he would like more specific detail. **Ms. Welling** suggested sitting down separately with Mr. Milford or Ms. Wieber to go over specific questions due to time constraints. **Mr. Mattson** stated he wants the information given to the entire Council, not just himself. He said he will provide his questions to Facilitator Wirtanen. **Mr. Dropps** wanted to know if there was anything relating to fisheries, etc. with this project. **Mr. Suchovsky** suggested using Survey Monkey to get questions from all members and give it to Ms. Wieber.

3. Additional Agenda Items Added by the Council

- ORV Signage Update (Mr. Schulz): **Mr. Schulz** provided an update from his discussion with Jim Radabaugh regarding the ORV signage issue that was discussed at the last meeting. He clarified the side-by-side icon. In regards to the trailing committee/signing committee, there has been no progression in two years because of the health condition of one of the individuals involved and a reassignment has not occurred. It is not a dead issue. The subcommittee will reconvene at a later time. He also would like to commend two people below the bridge for safety, Mr. Andrew Turner and Mr. John Morey. In addition, 2 days ago his group worked with forestry in Baraga and opened a brand new

trail that connects 2 of the 3 state parks that are open to ORV's in Michigan. Help from 3 people is all it took and it's done. He commended Mr. Don Mankee and the forestry staff in Baraga.

DNR Reports on Requested Information

Facilitator Wirtanen stated that there is a handout for each of the items listed on the agenda: 1. Fisheries Division Procedures for Regulation Changes; 2. BSA's/Living Legacies Letter from Director Stokes; 3. White Nose Syndrome in Bats; 4. Commercial Forest Act. He asked the Council if handouts would suffice or if further discussion is needed. **Mr. Mattson** asked if the Council would like further discussion, could it be scheduled as an agenda item at a future meeting; **Facilitator Wirtanen** agreed. It was mentioned that the BSA's/Living Legacies is a topic that warrants further discussion.

Special Presentations

1. *Timber Relationships with the State*: **Ms. Welling** welcomed and introduced Dr. Robert Froese, a forestry professor at Michigan Technological University in Houghton, who is here to provide his presentation on *Sustainability of Forest Products in Michigan*. **Dr. Froese** stated he is happy to attend the Council meeting and share the results from recent research at MTU that highlights the results of forest practices. He stated that if there are any questions from the presentation, feel free to contact him.

Dr. Froese explained that biomass (waste wood material from lumbering and wood processing) is an option because atmosphere carbon is recycled. Biomass may be sourced from native forests, i.e. mill wastes, logging residues, and low-value trees, with logging residues being most valuable. Pulpwood is more valuable than hog fuel and sawlogs are even more valuable than hog fuel. He stated that there is an undervalued opportunity in Michigan; he presented a graph showing the potential biomass that could be cut. A comparison between Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota measuring net growth, mortality, and removals depends on perspective. He stated that U.P. landowners behave differently when compared to state and federal land harvesting (higher) and mortality rates (lower). **Mr. Suchovsky** asked about the definition of hardwood; **Dr. Froese** described it as dominate hardwood such as ash and aspen. **Mr. Mattson** asked if NIPF was included or is it only CFA land; **Dr. Froese** replied that everything was lumped together. **Mr. Lindquist** asked what the mortality rates include; **Dr. Froese** stated that it is merchantable timber (roundwood 5"). **Mr. Suchovsky** stated that the graph presented is very interesting, indicating that the state is utilizing half of its inventory. **Dr. Froese** presented the next slide which indicated diverse land ownership across the U.P. between state, federal, large corporations, small CFP and other. He stated that the USDA's website can be utilized for FIA data searches or MTU's FBIS (Forest Biomass Inventory System) website can be utilized to perform biomass queries for Michigan (<http://fbis.mtu.edu>). He demonstrated ways to utilize the website to generate summaries. In 2010, harvest practices in northern hardwood dominated stands were examined. On average, it was determined that landowners are good stewards. A key was developed for potential silvicultural goals listing possible scenarios for northern hardwood stands. At 82%, the state exceeds the minimum retention levels for sustained production from northern hardwoods. DDW (down dead wood) was estimated; slash loads

increase with basal areas removed. He indicated that sustainability may be defined by mineral nutrients. The final slide included the *Michigan Woody Biomass Harvesting Guidelines*, developed by the DNR's Forest Management Division, listing 7 guidelines for removal of wood from forest settings using sustainable forest management principles and practices. **Mr. Suchovsky** questioned why jack pine sites aren't included when retaining 1/3 of logging residue; **Dr. Froese** stated that it was one statement listed he doesn't agree with. **Mr. Suchovsky** stated he was involved with the committee who developed the 1/3 guideline and provided a historical perspective.

In summary, **Dr. Froese** indicated that Michigan has a significant supply of biomass materials that could be burned to produce energy in a responsible way.

Mr. Schulz asked, based on Dr. Froese's global warming comment, if burning wood (biomass) is better than fossil fuels; **Dr. Froese** stated yes. **Mr. Mattson** asked if the threat of other products is under normal economic conditions, not federal subsidies; **Dr. Froese** stated yes. He noted he would be happy to share his presentation with Mr. Mattson.

Facilitator Wirtanen questioned what grade would be given for revenue generation and sustainable yield. **Dr. Froese** replied there is an argument to be made as forests are being managed near their potential with long term sustainability in mind. There are many considerations. The State is not exploiting the stands of Michigan.

Mr. Suchovsky asked, in regards to the slide on the nitrogen cycle, if calcium was also reviewed. **Dr. Froese** stated that calcium is a concern and they did review it, but did not include a slide. **Mr. Suchovsky** also asked, in regards to the 800 million cubic feet harvested per year statewide, what the comparison would look like if the area reviewed was 75 miles out from Sagola, Quinnesec, and Escanaba compared to statewide. **Dr. Froese** explained it would look very different. **Mr. Mattson** asked what the timetable is for the aspen study; **Dr. Froese** replied there is a 3-year time horizon.

Facilitator Wirtanen thanked Dr. Froese for his presentation; he stated it was very much what the Council needed to hear, with great insight. Thinking of revenue generation in the state and opportunities to provide all the other practices that are wanted on state land, this is an opportunity where one can see the balance. Forestry management is a critical area in the DNR's responsibilities.

- 2. Copperwood Project:** **Facilitator Wirtanen** introduced Council member Dave Anderson who is providing a presentation on the Copperwood Project. **Mr. Anderson** stated that the Copperwood Project is the first 100% copper project in the U.P. and is located in the far western U.P. in Gogebic County. His company, Orvana, started out by being active in the community; the community has had 20 mines in the past and is very supportive of the project. The project will provide direct full-time employment for 200 persons (400 indirectly) for several years. It is similar to the mine in White Pine, but much smaller. It is currently projected to have a life of 15 years. An image showing the formation of layers where copper is present was displayed along with a photo of the underground workings

today. He explained that a continuous miner allows for enhanced safety, more consistent production, and less drilling and blasting. If this method is not successful, they will drill and blast. Environmental studies have occurred over the last 3 years, with a total of \$9 million invested into the project to date. No permits have been filed and there is no construction yet. He provided an overview of surface water monitoring; he stated that none of the surface water bodies within miles of the site are tributaries to the Black River or Presque Isle River. Regular groundwater monitoring is performed. He described the types of environmental studies, including areas of geology, restoration, hydrogeology, and other natural resources such as wildlife and forestry. Mr. Anderson explained the expensive permitting process (Michigan Copper Mine Regulations Part 632), what is needed before the application can be submitted, and what the application must contain. He stated that they are required to have funding for the entire project up front, so that if the company walks away, the state has funding to restore and plant trees. He stated he is a stickler for keeping the land the way it was found. A slide listing support from multiple government agencies was also displayed.

Mr. Schulz asked how big of an area is underground; **Mr. Anderson** replied that it is a mile and a half which is a 10th of the size of the former White Pine mine. **Mr. Dropps** questioned if any of the ore will be produced on site; **Mr. Anderson** stated that it will be concentrated on site, the same as White Pine, and then will be available for sale to anyone that wants to buy it. There will be no heating, roasting, or smelting. **Mr. Suchovsky** asked what other metals are present; **Mr. Anderson** stated that silver is the only other occurrence. **Mr. Anthony** asked about the pureness of the ore; **Mr. Anderson** stated that it is the same grade as found in White Pine. **Mr. Lindquist** asked Mr. Anderson if he has met with conservation groups; **Mr. Anderson** stated that he has met with Friends of Yellow Dog Preserve, UPPC, etc. They haven't all endorsed the project, but he has made an effort to meet with all of them and has been very transparent with the project. **Mr. Suchovsky** asked about the concentration; **Mr. Anderson** stated that it will most likely get trucked offsite in a covered Michigan max. There are a couple of rail opportunities or maybe a Great Lakes freighter. **Mr. Dropps** asked if there were any smelters that applied for permits in the U.P.; **Mr. Anderson** stated he is not aware of any as it is almost impossible to build a smelter in the U.S. There are many other techniques available. He explained that China is a huge threat in this market. **Facilitator Wirtanen** asked if there is surface residual from the mining process itself; **Mr. Anderson** stated there will be left-over tails rock which represents about 30 million tons of waste rock. It will be deposited in a below-grade facility and the waste rock will stay on-site; there will also be a tailings pond.

Facilitator Wirtanen noted that Mr. John Cox could now provide his public comment as mentioned previously. **Mr. Cox** introduced himself as Wakefield Township's supervisor. He stated that Wakefield has a rich history of mining and timber. He has visited the Copperwood project site at the invitation of Mr. Anderson, and on his own, and the site is very clean. He said that Mr. Anderson has been very honest and transparent with the community. The project has been going on for 3 years and the jobs are excellent. All elected officials on the township board support the project. They don't see this as a political or a DNR issue. The citizens really want this project to occur. He stated if there is

anything that the DNR or the Council can do to encourage support of this project, it will help give their citizens jobs and it would really help the town of Wakefield.

Mr. Lindquist asked if anything goes back to the state for mineral or surface rights; **Mr. Anderson** stated that they own all the land. There is no public property involved. The state receives millions of dollars in tax revenue from them. He explained Michigan's copper severance tax. **Mr. Suchovsky** stated that there is a proposed copper zinc mine in his area and one concern is that's it is a foreign company. **Mr. Anderson** stated that Orvana is a Canadian company and is incorporated in Michigan. **Mr. Schmierer** asked how Michigan's regulatory requirements compare with other countries; **Mr. Anderson** stated that Spain is very tough, but set up differently and Bolivia is halfway in between. In the U.S., Michigan's requirements are tougher than Nevada, Colorado, Arizona, Minnesota and Wisconsin in some sense. He's not aware of a tougher state. **Facilitator Wirtanen** thanked Mr. Anderson for his presentation.

Next Meeting/Items for Next Agenda

1. **Next Meeting Date/Time:** **Facilitator Wirtanen** noted that the next meeting will be held on Monday, December 5 in Menominee or Dickinson County. **Mr. Suchovsky** recommended Menominee County at the Powers school; members agreed. DNR Division Reports will be provided at 5:30pm EST and the Council Meeting will begin at 6:00pm EST.
2. **Items for Next Agenda:** **Facilitator Wirtanen** suggested that the next agenda focus on the priorities that Mr. Lorensen establishes from Council input. **Mr. Suchovsky** mentioned that he would be interested in a presentation in the next year that would focus on the forest resource assessment and strategy. He stated there are several opportunities for input from this group. He also suggested deer and crop damage; he could send a draft proposal and send to the Council ahead of a meeting. **Mr. Jarvi** suggested a discussion on sandhill cranes and their devastation of crop lands as well. **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that he will assist Mr. Lorensen in his efforts to expedite the topic survey process prior to the next meeting.

Public Comment

Facilitator Wirtanen noted that Mr. Scott Robbins has pre-registered to provide a public comment and is granted 5 minutes for doing so. **Mr. Robbins** stated that he has known many of the Council members for years. He is a 35-year veteran of the wood procurement industry. He moved to Ontonagon in 1979 and worked at the paper mill for 31 years. He spent time in Missoula, Montana and in the southeastern U.S. during the last three years. He now works for the Michigan Forest Product Council, and will be the director of the sustainable forest initiative. As an advocacy group, they work with various aspects of the DNR. The relationship has gotten adversarial. The forest industry is very diverse, cyclical, and very competitive, with the worst down cycle in years. In Michigan, there is a great opportunity to find some common ground and pull together, working towards common goals. There are a few DNR land issues that they have: 1) They are not big fans of BSA's; they think it is quasi-wilderness and should not put it into effect without significant public input. 2) They would like to see the DNR develop an annual harvest level and they are very pleased with the progress in the last few years. 3) They would like to see sale turnout expedited and see some of the backlog eliminated by changing

policies to eliminate those that don't need Lansing approval. 4) They hear from the feds and the state that they can't do more than what they are doing, and yet there are forestry people who can see areas where something could be bid out to allow a company to obtain those goals. They would like to see the concept of stewardship contracting used to help with the backlog of road maintenance issues on state lands. 5) There is a need to identify the total number of acres of state land available for timber harvest and management and to update the DNR software and timeline. There are lots of invasives coming in. The compartment review process doesn't look at enough acres per year--upgrades are needed to the GIS system. This Council is a perfect way to find some common ground. When forest management is on the agenda, he would be more than happy to assist in any way that he can.

Mr. Divine asked if he works with FIA lands. **Mr. Robbins** replied that they are working with Senator Debbie Stabenow to get more money for the national forests. He stated that the private sector could do more for private forest lands. **Mr. Suchovsky** stated this past winter the Michigan Forest Products Council was involved in a workgroup dealing with the qualified forest program and getting more timber off private forest lands. **Mr. Schulz** asked what the group's policy is with motorized use by private landowners. **Mr. Robbins** stated they do work with them; the Forest Council does not have a specific policy on motorized recreation, but he has been in favor all his life. **Mr. Suchovsky** stated that he would like to hear more from Mr. Robbins in the future on specific types of things the Forest Council would envision with the DNR.

Closing Comments

Mr. Suchovsky stated that earlier in the meeting, Mr. Mattson stated he'd like more time for issues during the meeting. New business should go very fast as the homework should've already been done. The presentations provided tonight are where the Council should focus their time. **Mr. Mattson** stated that he didn't mean that it has to be new business or old business; he would like to see the Council work on the issues and accomplish something.

Facilitator Wirtanen stated that this evening's meeting was largely an educational inservice to the Council and he understands that there has to be balance. It is very difficult to make judgment on a point being made by an individual who is going into detail when there isn't a base of information for each Council member. With Mr. Lorensen's project of obtaining and prioritizing items for future agendas, it may take a little initiative on each member's part to get more educated about an upcoming agenda item prior to it being discussed. Tonight he learned so much more about the forestry side of things that he was curious about. It was not a total picture, but it was a great introduction. How the Council moves forward in the future will be determined by the agenda items that are considered and where the Council feels it can make the best judgment in guiding the DNR. It will be an ongoing challenge for the Council to learn to make informed judgments and to manage the meeting time as well.

Mr. Schulz stated the forestry aspect and the mining presentation was fantastic. However, the Council has not discussed the impact that the DNR has on tourism, positive or negative. He would like to see a discussion on that in the future. He stated that it was a good meeting this evening with excellent presentations.

Mr. Dropps stated that the forestry presentation was very interesting. If there are more questions or issues to cover, it may be good to have a subcommittee on forestry. The subcommittee could bring forth the information and look to the Council for guidance. It may also be a good idea to have a subcommittee on mineral rights. He feels there is a need to have more subcommittees overall.

Mr. Divine stated that he feels there is a need to reduce the number of presentations to allow for more important comments.

Mr. Lindquist asked Ms. Welling if Mr. Minzey could attend if and when crop damage and/or DMAP are discussed at an upcoming meeting; **Ms. Welling** agreed.

Mr. Suchovsky stated that during the section of DNR reports, it would be helpful to be able to ask the DNR staff questions after hearing their updates; **Facilitator Wirtanen** stated that his point is well taken. Staff is available, and if there is a specific question on an item that doesn't involve the entire Council, it would be appropriate to ask the staff person after the meeting.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:50pm EST (7:50pm CST).