

# FOREST, WETLANDS, AND HABITAT • A • SYST

FOR FOREST, WETLANDS AND HABITAT LANDOWNERS

FAS 115 · October 2022



**For MAEAP Verification:  
Contact the MAEAP Office at the  
Michigan Department of  
Agriculture & Rural Development  
(517) 284-5609**



**MICHIGAN STATE** | Extension  
**UNIVERSITY**



# FWH System Improvement Action Plan

Risk Question	List high-risk practice(s) from FWH♦A♦Syst and medium-risk practices that do not meet MAEAP requirements	Required for MAEAP verification?	Management practice to reduce risk. (Include potential sources of technical and financial assistance.)	Action plan	
				Planned completion date	Indicate date when completed
1.01	Example: Landowner does not have a Land Management Plan.	Yes	Work with a natural resource professional to develop a Land Management Plan.	Feb. 2022	<b>(v)</b> Completed March 18, 2022

## FWH System Improvement Action Plan

Risk Question	List high-risk practice(s) from FWH♦A♦Syst and medium-risk practices that do not meet MAEAP requirements	Required for MAEAP verification?	Management practice to reduce risk. (Include potential sources of technical and financial assistance.)	Action plan	
				Planned completion date	Indicate date when completed

## FWH System Improvement Action Plan

Risk Question	List high-risk practice(s) from FWH♦A♦Syst and medium-risk practices that do not meet MAEAP requirements	Required for MAEAP verification?	Management practice to reduce risk. (Include potential sources of technical and financial assistance.)	Action plan	
				Planned completion date	Indicate date when completed

I understand that this management system assessment (FWH♦A♦Syst) and corresponding FWH System Improvement Action Plan were developed on the basis that I have disclosed, to the best of my knowledge, all information pertaining to my forest, wetlands and/or habitat operations.

Property Address: Latitude: \_\_\_\_\_ Longitude: - \_\_\_\_\_  
 Street \_\_\_\_\_  
 City \_\_\_\_\_  
 State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_  
 Watershed Name \_\_\_\_\_

Producer's Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date \_\_\_\_\_  
**FWH♦A♦Syst conducted by:**  
 Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Title \_\_\_\_\_  
 Organization \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

MAEAP Verification Action Plan	Date
Target date for MAEAP verification of <b>Cropping System</b>	
Target date for MAEAP verification of <b>Farmstead System</b>	
Target date for MAEAP verification of <b>Livestock System</b>	
Target date for MAEAP verification of <b>Forest, Wetlands &amp; Habitat System</b>	

*For MAEAP verification, contact MAEAP office at the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development: 517-284-5609*

## Introduction

The Forest, Wetlands and Habitat♦A♦Syst (FWH♦A♦Syst) tool will assist you in developing and implementing a management plan that prevents contamination of groundwater and surface water resources and maintains your forest, wetlands and/or habitat. The FWH♦A♦Syst will assess your current management practices and identify alternative management practices that, when implemented, will ensure that you are following Michigan Forestry Best Management Practices for Soil and Water Quality on Forest Land and the American Forest Foundation Standards of Sustainability.

**The Michigan Agriculture Environmental Assurance Program (MAEAP)** is a comprehensive, proactive and voluntary environmental pollution prevention program. It takes a systems approach to assist landowners in evaluating their farms for environmental risks. The systems include Forest, Wetlands and Habitat; Livestock; Farmstead; and Cropping. The on-site risk evaluation uses specific tools for each system: The FWH♦A♦Syst for forests, wetlands and habitat; the comprehensive nutrient management plan (CNMP) or Livestock♦A♦Syst for the livestock system; the Farm♦A♦Syst for the farmstead system and the Crop♦A♦Syst for the cropping system. Environmentally assured systems are eligible for various incentives and recognitions.

The Michigan Right to Farm Act authorized the Michigan Commission of Agriculture and Rural

Development to develop and adopt Generally Accepted Agricultural and Management Practices (GAAMPs) for farms and farm operations in Michigan. These voluntary practices are based on available technology and scientific research to promote sound environmental stewardship. The FWH♦A♦Syst is consistent with the identified practices.

**The Michigan Right to Forest Act**, Public Act 676 of 2002, was enacted to protect those who practice forestry from nuisance lawsuits if their practices conform to Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs). These GAFMPs were developed by a 19-member Forest Management Advisory Committee whose charge was to assist the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) in “balancing the environmental, social and economic issues surrounding forest management.” The GAFMPs are organized into the categories of visual change, noise, removal of vegetation and the use of chemicals. The current Right to Forest GAFMPs are posted on the MDNR Forest Management Advisory Committee website: [www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,4570,7-153-65134\\_65140---,00.html](http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,4570,7-153-65134_65140---,00.html)

Landowners who complete the FWH♦A♦Syst will be able to determine what management and recordkeeping changes (if any) will be needed for their forest management systems to be environmentally assured through MAEAP. Once a landowner develops and implements a Forest Management Plan (FMP) to address the risks indicated by the FWH♦A♦Syst assessment, they can contact the Michigan Department of

Agriculture and Rural Development (MDARD) to request a MAEAP FWH System verification (517-284-5609). An MDARD verifier will schedule a site visit to complete the verification process.

Public Act 451 of 1994, Part 82 “Conservation Practices” ensures the confidentiality of the producer information you provide to MDARD for system verification. Any information connected with the development, implementation or verification of a conservation plan or conservation practice is confidential.

The owner of a MAEAP-verified system will be eligible for incentives and can enjoy the peace of mind that comes from knowing that their forest management system is sustainable. Verified systems are positioned to achieve regulatory compliance with state and federal environmental laws.

Similar incentives are available for landowners who have environmentally assured their Cropping, Livestock and Farmstead Systems. Contact your local Conservation District, Michigan State University Extension or Natural Resources Conservation Service representative for a list of currently available incentives and information on how to get started.

## What is the Forest, Wetlands and Habitat Assessment System?

The Forest, Wetlands and Habitat♦A♦Syst (FWH♦A♦Syst) is a series of risk questions that help you assess how effectively your management protects the environment and incorporates Best Management Practices.



The risk questions are grouped into five sections:

FWH System Improvement Action Plan	
1	Sustainable Non-Agriculture Land Management
2	Forestry
3	Wetlands (Forest and Non-Forested) and Water Management
4	Non-Forested Upland Habitat
5	Other Environmental Risks in the FWH System

The risk questions in each section correspond to the principles for each standard. The risk question answers indicate whether management practices have a low, medium or high risk of contributing to unsustainable or environmentally harmful management. Landowners are generally recommended to adopt the low-risk management practices. The questions that address management practices that are regulated by state or federal law indicate **illegal practices with black bold print**.

Risk questions that address management practices covered by the Michigan Right to Forest Act indicate the risk level required for consistency with the identified practices with **bold blue italic print**.

Finally, a blue box indicates the management level(s) required for MAEAP verification.

MAEAP verification requirements are aligned with state and federal environmental regulations, the Michigan Right to Forest GAFMPs, the MDNR and Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy, Michigan Forestry Best Management Practices for Soil and Water Quality and the American Forest Foundation Tree Farm System Standards of Sustainability. Reference information for the risk question is provided in the far-right column. The letters represent the guidance found in Table 2. This will provide the basis for awarding environmental assurance through MAEAP. Your forest and natural resource representative, both public and private, can assist you to make the appropriate management changes to become environmentally assured through MAEAP.

### How Does FWH♦A♦Syst Work?

Answer the risk questions by selecting the answer that best describes management practices used on your property. Indicate your risk level in the column to the right. All answers are confidential.

Skip any questions that do not apply to your land management system. After completing each section of risk questions, list the practices that present a high risk in the FWH System Improvement Action Plan, which is printed inside the front cover of this bulletin. Also include any medium-risk practices that do not meet MAEAP verification requirements.

In the FWH System Improvement Action Plan List:

- Management practice(s) that you plan to implement that will reduce the identified risk.
- Sources of technical and financial assistance.
- Target date for accomplishing the changes.

### American Tree Farm System

The FWH♦A♦Syst builds upon the American Tree Farm System’s Standards of Sustainability (American Forest Foundation, 2015) and adapts it for Michigan landowners. MAEAP encourages forestland owners to also enroll separately in the American Tree Farm System as it provides third-party certification and other services for forestland owners, at no additional cost. Interested landowners can learn more about the American Tree Farm System and their Standards of Sustainability at [www.treefarmssystem.org](http://www.treefarmssystem.org).

### A Few Final Words

The key to FWH♦A♦Syst is that you implement the actions you have identified to reduce the environmental risks. Some of the stewardship practices that will reduce risks may cost very little and take very little time to implement. Other practices may involve additional costs and may not be implemented for a few years. It is important, however, to have a plan to follow. Once you have developed a plan and have implemented changes to address the risks, you are ready for MAEAP verification for your FWH System.

# Sustainable Non-Agriculture Land Management

RISK QUESTION	Low Risk – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT</b>					
<b>1.00)</b> Has there ever been a formal Right to Farm or Right to Forest complaint at this property?	There has never been a Right to Farm or Right to Forest complaint or the complaint was not verified or the concern was resolved.		There was a formal Right to Farm or Right to Forest complaint and the concern was not resolved. <sup>12,20</sup>	Producer's verbal indication of complaint history.	
<b>1.01)</b> Is the landowner implementing a Land Management Plan (LMP)?	Landowner has an up-to-date LMP and is making a reasonable effort to follow the implementation schedule.	Landowner has an up-to-date LMP but has not implemented the plan.	Landowner does not have an up-to-date LMP.		
<b>1.02)</b> Does the Land Management Plan (LMP) adequately address the landowner's objectives and priorities relating to forests and wetlands, as well as wildlife and associated habitats?	Landowner objectives are in writing and outlined in the LMP.	Landowner has objectives, but not in writing.	Landowner has not considered objectives.		
<b>1.03)</b> Does the Land Management Plan (LMP) address specific desired future conditions, and is it adaptive in response to future events or changing objectives?	LMP addresses specific desired future conditions and is adaptive in response to future events or changing objectives.	LMP addresses active and adaptive management and/or general guidance about desired future conditions but they are not specific to each management unit.	No information about desired future conditions is in the LMP.		
<b>1.04)</b> Is the Land Management Plan (LMP) based on professional guidance and science?	Yes, LMP is based on professional guidance and science.		Landowner does not have an LMP.	Table 2: W	
<b>1.05)</b> Does the landowner regularly monitor for changes that could affect resources on the site or goals?	The landowner (or their agent) monitors the property at least annually for changes that could affect resources or landowner goals.	The landowner (or their agent) monitors less than annually.	The landowner (or their agent) does not do any monitoring.		

A boxed risk level indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Bold black print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

**Bold italic blue print** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).



## Sustainable Non-Agriculture Land Management (continued)

RISK QUESTION	LOW RISK – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT (CONTINUED)</b>					
<b>1.06)</b> Are property boundaries known and marked?	Property boundaries are known and were established by a licensed surveyor.	Property boundaries have been agreed upon by landowner and neighbors, but no official survey has been conducted.	Property boundaries are not known.		
<b>PROTECT SPECIAL SITES</b>					
<b>1.07)</b> Has the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) been contacted and the database checked for property covered under this land management plan (LMP)?	SHPO has been checked, results are found in the LMP and, if applicable, the landowner minimizes impact to the site.	SHPO has been checked, results are found in the LMP, however, the landowner does not minimize impact to the site.	<b>SHPO has not been checked.</b> <sup>1</sup>	Table 2: M & D	
<b>1.08)</b> Are any special sites designated by the landowner on this property?	If yes, the special site(s) has been identified, documented in the LMP and the landowner minimizes impact to the site.		If yes, the special sites(s) has been identified, but not documented in the LMP and landowner minimizes impact to the site.		
<b>AIR, WATER AND SOIL PROTECTION</b>					
<b>1.09)</b> Does the landowner follow the Michigan Forestry Best Management Practices for Soil and Water Quality?	Yes.		No.	Table 2: C	
<b>1.10)</b> Have streams, lakes, ponds, and wetlands; including but not limited to: bogs, fens, swamps, marshes, or vernal pools, been noted or mapped in the Land Management Plan (LMP)?	If present, streams, lakes, ponds and wetlands have been noted or mapped in the LMP. Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) are described in the LMP and implemented. Prior to any management activities, a plan that follows Michigan Forestry Best Management Practices for Soil and Water Quality is developed and communicated.	Streams, lakes and ponds have been identified on the property. No management plan has been developed. Qualified logging professionals are used for timber harvests.	Streams, lakes, ponds have not been identified.	Map in Land Management Plan. And/or Supplemental MI EGLE Wetland Mapper Documentation And/or Written Documentation within LMP. Table 2: B	

A boxed risk level indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Black bold print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

**Blue italic print** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).

## Sustainable Non-Agriculture Land Management (continued)

RISK QUESTION	LOW RISK – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>AIR, WATER AND SOIL PROTECTION (CONTINUED)</b>					
<b>1.11)</b> Have designated trout streams, natural rivers, wild and scenic rivers discussed and mapped in the Land Management Plan (LMP)?	If present, designated trout streams, natural rivers, and wild and scenic rivers have been discussed and mapped in the LMP. Riparian Management Zones (RMZs) are discussed and/or mapped in the LMP. RMZ's have been implemented.	Landowner is aware that designated trout streams, natural rivers, wild and scenic rivers exist on the property, but no management plan has been developed or implemented.	Designated trout streams, natural rivers, and wild and scenic rivers exist on the property, but landowner was not aware of the designation. <sup>7, 13, 14</sup>	Documentation and map in LMP. Table 2: B, G, and H	
<b>1.12)</b> Is there an unused well located on the property?	No unused well or abandoned well properly sealed.	-Unused well temporarily abandoned properly: Meets minimum isolation distances. -Is disconnected from any water distribution piping. -Has the top of the casing securely capped.	<b>Unused, unsealed well located on site.</b> <sup>21</sup>	Unused well(s) properly sealed.	
<b>1.13)</b> If required, have soil erosion and sedimentation control permits been obtained?	Required permits have been obtained. No erosion or sedimentation is apparent.	Required permits have been obtained. Minimal erosion or sedimentation is apparent.	<b>Required permits have not been obtained, or there is evidence of significant erosion or sedimentation.</b> <sup>15</sup>		
<b>1.14)</b> Are roads and trails established and maintained to avoid soil erosion?	Roads show minimal gulying or resulting sedimentation. Construction and maintenance has been done in accordance with Michigan Forestry Best Management for Soil and Water Quality.	Some construction and maintenance have been done in accordance with some Michigan Forestry Best Management Practices for Soil and Water Quality.	Soil erosion, gulying or sedimentation is occurring, and road needs to be relocated.	Table 2: B and C	

**A boxed risk level** indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Bold black print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

**Bold italic blue print** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).

## Sustainable Non-Agriculture Land Management (continued)

RISK QUESTION	LOW RISK – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>AIR, WATER AND SOIL PROTECTION (CONTINUED)</b>					
<b>1.15)</b> If used on the property, how is prescribed burning performed?	Prescribed burning is done according to the approved Land Management Plan (LMP) and with pre-fire planning, which conforms to the Michigan Forestry Best Management Practices for Soil and Water Quality and a burning permit is obtained if required.	Prescribed burning is done with pre-fire planning but does not conform to the Michigan Forestry Best Management Practices for Soil and Water Quality and no burning permit was obtained if required.	Prescribed burning is done without an approved LMP or pre-fire planning and does not conform to the Michigan Forestry Best Management Practices for Soil and Water Quality and <b>no burning permit was obtained.</b> <sup>16</sup>	Table 2: C and H	
<b>1.16)</b> If used on the property, how are pesticides applied?	Pesticides are applied in accordance with Michigan Forest Best Management Practices for Soil and Water Quality and with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved labels and by persons appropriately trained, certified, licensed and supervised, etc. Accurate records are maintained of all applicable applications of pesticides for at least three years.	Pesticides are EPA-approved, but not used in accordance to Michigan Forest Best Management Practices for Soil and Water Quality or State Law.	<b>Pesticides are not applied in accordance with EPA or State regulations and Michigan Forestry Best Management Practices for Soil and Water Quality.</b> <sup>5</sup>	Pesticide records for the past three years on file (or plans for records). -Date of application -Time of application -Pesticide brand/product name -Pesticide formulation -EPA registration number -Active ingredient(s) -Restricted-entry interval (REI) -Rate per acre or unit -Crop, commodity, stored product, or site that received the application -Total amount of pesticide applied -Size of area treated -Applicator's name -Applicator's certification number -Location of the application -Method of application -Target pest -Carrier volume per acre MDARD Pesticide Certification and Licensing Requirements MDARD pesticide Laws and Regulations Table 2: J and K	

A boxed risk level indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Black print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

**Blue italic print** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).

## Sustainable Non-Agriculture Land Management (continued)

RISK QUESTION	LOW RISK – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>AIR, WATER AND SOIL PROTECTION (CONTINUED)</b>					
<b>1.17)</b> If fertilizer or other nutrients are applied, what soil nutrient management records are kept?	Records of soil test reports and quantities of nutrients applied to individual areas are maintained.	Partial nutrient management records are kept. Complete nutrient management records will be kept in the future, for review at the time of reverification.	Minimal or no nutrient management records kept.	Three years of records – or five years, if applying manure – or plans to begin keeping records. Soil fertility tests and/or plant analysis results. Date(s) of application(s). Nutrient composition of fertilizer or other material used. Amount of nutrient-supplying material applied per acre. Method of application and placement of applied nutrients. Vegetative growth and cropping history of perennial crops.	
<b>1.18)</b> Have soil types been identified and mapped for the property covered under this land management plan (LMP)?	Yes, they have been identified and mapped.		No, they have not been identified or mapped.	Table 2: MM	
<b>1.19)</b> Have resource concerns been identified in the Land Management Plan (LMP)?	A site assessment occurred, and no resource concerns were found, or resource concerns and actions are being taken according to LMP recommendations.	Yes, resource concerns have been identified and there is intention to follow up.	A site assessment has not been conducted to search for resource concerns OR Yes, resource concerns have been identified, but there is no intention to follow up.		
<b>1.20)</b> How are habitat priorities determined?	Within the context of federal and state law, landowner's interest in and goals for specific wildlife species are outlined in a Land Management Plan (LMP) and actions are included in the plan to achieve those goals.	The landowner's species and/or habitat priorities are identified but are not addressed or not fully addressed in an LMP.	Species and habitat priorities are not identified.		

**A boxed risk level** indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Bold black print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

**Bold italic blue print** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).

## Sustainable Non-Agriculture Land Management (continued)

RISK QUESTION	LOW RISK – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>AIR, WATER AND SOIL PROTECTION (CONTINUED)</b>					
<b>1.21)</b> Does the land management plan (LMP) provide management strategies for addressing unwanted pests, pathogens and vegetation?	Management strategies for integrated pest management to address unwanted pests, pathogens and vegetation is addressed in the LMP and is being implemented.	Management strategies for integrated pest management to address unwanted pests, pathogens and vegetation is addressed in the LMP but not yet being implemented.	The LMP does not provide management strategies for addressing unwanted pests, pathogens and vegetation.	Table 2: L, D and NN	
<b>HABITAT RESTORATION AND DEVELOPMENT</b>					
<b>1.22)</b> How are adverse impacts to federal- or state-listed threatened and endangered species avoided?	A database assessment and/or on-site inventory are completed. If listed species are thought to be present, then Best Management Practices (BMPs) are included in a Land Management Plan (LMP) and are properly implemented on the property.	A database assessment and/or on-site inventory are completed. If listed species are thought to be present, then BMPs are included in an LMP. At a minimum, no action is taken that will adversely impact the species or habitat.	No assessment has been completed, potential status of listed species on the property is unknown and no consideration of listed species is made when habitat is altered on the property. OR <b>Action is knowingly being taken that adversely impacts listed species.</b> <sup>2, 3</sup>	Table 2: A, D, N, LL & NN	
<b>1.23)</b> How are rare or sensitive habitats addressed on the property?	A database assessment and/or on-site inventory are complete. If rare or sensitive habitats are thought to be present, especially Michigan Natural Features Inventory S1 and S2 types, then applicable management practices are included in a Land Management Plan (LMP) and are properly implemented on the property.	A database assessment and/or on-site inventory are complete. If rare or sensitive habitats are thought to be present, then Best Management Practices are included in an LMP. At a minimum, no action is taken that will adversely impact the habitat.	No assessment exists, potential status rare or sensitive habitats on the property are unknown and no consideration of these habitats are made when habitat is altered on the property. OR Action is knowingly being taken that adversely impacts the habitats.	Table 2: A, D, N, LL & NN	
<b>1.24)</b> Is the land managed with consideration for migratory birds?	Land is managed to maintain and enhance migratory bird populations and habitat.	Land is managed without harm to migratory bird populations and habitat.	<b>Land is managed in a manner that is detrimental to migratory bird populations and habitat.</b> <sup>4</sup>	Table 2: A, D, N, LL & NN	

A boxed risk level indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Bold black print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

**Bold italic blue print** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).

## Sustainable Non-Agriculture Land Management (continued)

RISK QUESTION	LOW RISK – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>HABITAT RESTORATION AND DEVELOPMENT (CONTINUED)</b>					
<p><b>1.25)</b> How are nuisance non-native and invasive terrestrial and aquatic species on forestlands, wetlands, and other non-agricultural areas addressed on the property?</p>	<p>Nuisance non-native and invasive terrestrial and aquatic species are identified, mapped, or described for each cover type or management unit on the property. All areas are actively being treated as described in the Land Management Plan (LMP). Invasive terrestrial and aquatic species occurrence and location is being reported to the Midwest Invasive Species Information Network (MISIN). Nuisance non-native and invasive terrestrial and aquatic species are not being moved in violation of State law.</p>	<p>Nuisance non-native and invasive terrestrial and aquatic species are identified, mapped, or described for each cover type or management unit. Treatment activities outlined in the LMP are being appropriately implemented. Nuisance non-native and invasive terrestrial and aquatic species are not being moved in violation of State law.</p>	<p>No effort has been made to identify and map invasive species and no treatment action is being taken.  <b>Nuisance non-native and invasive terrestrial and aquatic species are being moved in violation of State law.</b><sup>11, 17</sup></p>	<p>Table 2: O and P</p>	

A boxed risk level indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Bold black print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

**Bold italic blue print** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).



## Sustainable Non-Agriculture Land Management (continued)

RISK QUESTION	LOW RISK – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>HABITAT RESTORATION AND DEVELOPMENT (CONTINUED)</b>					
<b>1.26)</b> Are the condition and health of forestlands, grasslands, wetlands and all other habitat types being addressed on the property in relationship to the landowner's priority wildlife species?	Successional stages, restoration potential, resource health and long-term management are outlined in a Land Management Plan (LMP) and actions are included in the plan to achieve those goals.	Successional stages, restoration potential, resource health and long-term management are not outlined in an LMP or actions are not included in the plan to achieve those goals.	Successional stages, restoration potential, resource health and long-term management are not being addressed.	Table 2: B	
<b>1.27)</b> Have all cover types/ecosystems/habitat types (lakes, streams, wetlands, grasslands, shrubland, forestland, etc.) been correctly identified and mapped as part of the Land Management Plan?	Yes, all have been identified and mapped.		No, they have not been correctly identified.	Map in Land Management Plan.  Table 2: B, R, S, T, U & V	
<b>1.28)</b> Is the landowner aware of programs that may assist with wildlife habitat improvement (e.g., Partners for Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Habitat Grant Program, Forests for Fish, Farm Bill financial and technical assistance)?	Yes, the landowner is aware of all programs and is utilizing those that fit goals or conducting similar practices on their own.	Yes, the Land Management Plan identifies potential programs, but none have been put into practice.	No, the landowner is not aware of programs that could help reach objectives.	Table 2: B, Q, R, S, T, U, V & W	

A boxed risk level indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Bold black print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

***Bold italic blue print*** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).

## Sustainable Non-Agriculture Land Management (continued)

RISK QUESTION	LOW RISK – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>CONTRACTING</b>					
<b>1.29)</b> Does landowner engage qualified natural resource professionals and qualified contractors that carry appropriate insurance and comply with appropriate federal, state, and local regulations?	Landowner engages qualified natural resource professionals and qualified contractors that carry appropriate insurance and comply with appropriate federal, state and local regulations.		Landowner does not engage qualified natural resource professionals and qualified contractors that carry appropriate insurance and comply with appropriate federal, state and local regulations.	Table 2: W	
<b>1.30)</b> Does the landowner retain appropriate records for forest product harvests and other management activities?	Landowner retains appropriate records for forest product harvests and other management activities.	Landowner has no records but plans to retain appropriate records for future activities.	Landowner retains no records for forest product harvests and other management activities.		
<b>1.31)</b> Does landowner or a designated qualified natural resource professional ensure that forest product harvests and other management activities conform to the management plan?	Landowner or a designated qualified natural resource professional ensures that forest product harvests and other management activities conform to the management plan objectives.		Landowner does not ensure that forest product harvests and other management activities conform to the management plan objectives.		
<b>Forestry</b>					
<b>2.01)</b> Is the forestland enrolled in a sustainable forest certification program (e.g., Tree Farm, Sustainable Forestry Initiative, Forest Stewardship Council)?	Forestland is enrolled in a sustainable forest certification program.	Forestland is not enrolled in a forest certification program.	Forestland owner is not aware of certification programs.	Table 2: X, Y, and Z	
<b>2.02)</b> Is the forestland owner aware of available forestland tax incentive programs (e.g., Commercial Forest Program, Qualified Forest Program) or financial assistance programs such as Environmental Quality Incentives Program?	Forestland owner is enrolled in programs appropriate to their objectives.	Forestland owner is knowledgeable about some available programs, but is not enrolled in programs that fit management objectives.	Forestland owner is not aware of any available programs.	Table 2: T, AA, and BB	

**A boxed risk level** indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Bold black print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

**Bold italic blue print** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).

## Forestry (continued)

RISK QUESTION	LOW RISK – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>REFORESTATION AND AFFORESTATION</b>					
<b>2.03)</b> Do understocked areas exist where productive forest is the desired future condition?	No.	Yes.			
<b>2.04)</b> Is reforestation or afforestation achieved by a suitable process that ensures desired future conditions?	Forestland or potential forestland has achieved a planned, adequate stocking of desired species reflecting the landowner's objectives and appropriate to the site and resource conditions.	Forestland or potential forestland is in the process of achieving adequate stocking of desired species that reflect the landowner's objectives, and are appropriate to the site and resource conditions.	No plan is in place to achieve desired future conditions. <b>AND</b> There is inadequate stocking.	Table 2: DD	
<b>OTHER FORESTRY</b>					
<b>2.05)</b> What is the visual sensitivity of the site?	Least sensitive (by Michigan's Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices [GAFMPs] definition).	Moderately sensitive (by GAFMPs definition).	<i>Most sensitive (by GAFMPs definition).</i>	Table 2: CC	
<b>2.06)</b> Does forestland owner manage the visual impacts of forest management activities consistent with the size of the forest, the scale and intensity of forest management activities, and the location of the property?	Forest management activities apply visual quality measures compatible with appropriate silvicultural practices and meeting Visual Quality Criteria in Michigan's Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).	Forest management activities apply some visual quality measures compatible with appropriate silvicultural practices and GAFMPs.	Forest management, activities do not apply visual quality measures compatible with appropriate silvicultural practices and GAFMPs.	Table 2: CC	
<b>2.07)</b> Is timber harvesting conducted in compliance with Forest Management Plan and does it maintain the potential of the property to produce forest products and other benefits sustainably?	Yes.		No.		

A boxed risk level indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Bold black print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

**Bold italic blue print** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).

## Forestry (continued)

RISK QUESTION	LOW RISK – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>OTHER FORESTRY (CONTINUED)</b>					
<b>2.08)</b> Is a timber sale contract used when harvesting timber?	A timber sale contract was prepared by a professional forester.	A timber buyer or the forest owner prepared a timber sale contract.	Timber harvests are conducted without a written timber sale contract.		
<b>2.09)</b> If timber harvesting is done, is a harvest plan map prepared that details harvest boundaries, exclusion areas, sensitive sites, roads and landings?	A harvest plan map is prepared that contains all pertinent information.	Written plan not in place. Oral harvesting plan discussed with contractor.	Harvests are done without a harvest plan map.		
<b>2.10)</b> Is the landowner aware of logger credentialing programs?	Yes.		No specific qualifications are required of logging contractors.	Table 2: EE	
<b>2.11)</b> Do all management activities, including timber harvesting conform to Michigan Forestry Best Management Practices for Soil and Water Quality (a.k.a. Best Management Practices [BMPs])?	All management is done in accordance to Forest Land BMPs.	Some, but not all, BMPs are addressed.	Management activities are conducted without regard to BMPs.	Table 2: C	
<b>2.12)</b> Do all management activities conform to Michigan’s Right to Forest Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs)?	<i>All management activities conform to GAFMPs.</i>	Some, but not all management activities conform to GAFMPs.	Management is done without regard to GAFMPs.	Table 2: CC	
<b>2.13)</b> Are silviculturally appropriate techniques used for the removal of vegetation or timber?	<i>Adheres to Right to Forest Act GAFMPs or other system as recommended by natural resource professional.</i>		Silviculture is not considered when harvesting.	Table 2: CC	
<b>2.14)</b> If conducting biomass harvesting, does it comply with Department of Natural Resources Biomass Harvesting Guidance?	Yes, it complies.		No, it does not comply.	Table 2: FF	

**A boxed risk level** indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Bold black print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

**Bold italic blue print** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).

# Wetlands (Forested and Non-Forested) and Water Management

RISK QUESTION	LOW RISK – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>3.01</b> Are any recent or proposed land management activities that, to the best of your knowledge, require a permit, taking place in wetlands, 100-year floodplains, Great Lakes shorelines, or inland lakes and streams?	No activities that, to the best of your knowledge, require a permit, are taking place in these areas.	A permit was obtained and/or proper agencies were contact.	<b>Activities that require a permit are taking place in these areas, but no permit was obtained.</b> <sup>18</sup>		
<b>3.02</b> Has the quality of the wetlands been assessed and any resource concerns been noted/documentated in the Land Management Plan (LMP)?	If impairments are found, landowner has been provided information and resources to contact proper agency personnel trained in wetland restoration.	Wetlands have been partially assessed.	No.	Table 2: A, C, E, F, G, I, Q, R, T and GG	
<b>3.03</b> Are all wetlands, streams, farm ditches and other water bodies on the property protected from polluted runoff and sediment with conservation practices?	Where applicable, filter strips, riparian buffer strips, grassed waterways and other conservation practices are maintained. No direct discharges of harmful substances into water have been observed. <sup>10</sup>	Where applicable, conservation practices are maintained on some fields.	No conservation practices are maintained. <b>Direct discharges of harmful substances into waters of the state have been observed.</b> <sup>10</sup>	Table 2: A, C, Q, T, and GG	

A boxed risk level indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Bold black print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

***Bold italic blue print*** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).

## Wetlands (Forested and Non-Forested) and Water Management (continued)

RISK QUESTION	LOW RISK – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>3.04)</b> Are wetlands (hydrologically, vegetatively) assessed for restoration potential by agency personnel or others trained in wetlands restoration?	Restoration potential is assessed on all wetland basins. OR A wetlands survey has been completed and no wetlands exist on the property.	Restoration potential is assessed for some wetland basins.	No assessment of wetland basins has been started.	Table 2: F	
<b>3.05)</b> Are wetlands (hydrologically, vegetatively) being restored by or following a plan from agency personnel or other trained in wetlands restoration?	Restoration is being implemented on all wetlands.	Restoration is being implemented on some wetlands.	No restoration has been started on any wetland.	Table 2: B, C, Q, T, and GG	
<b>3.06)</b> Are restored and/or natural wetlands enrolled in a conservation program that offers long-term (10 years or longer) or permanent protection?	All wetland areas and appropriate buffers are enrolled in a conservation program.	Some wetland areas and appropriate buffers are enrolled in a conservation program.	No wetland areas are enrolled in a conservation program.	Table 2: Q, R, U, V, and GG	
<b>3.07)</b> How is aquatic resource management addressed on the property?	Aquatic resource options are identified as well as actions within the plan for all the waters on the property.	Aquatic resource options are identified as well as actions within the plan for most of the waters on the property.	There are no aquatic resource options, or they are not addressed in the plan or if addressed no actions are identified.	Table 2: S, GG, HH, II, JJ, KK, and LL	

**A boxed risk level** indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Bold black print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

**Bold italic blue print** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs).



## Non-Forested Upland Habitat

RISK QUESTION	LOW RISK – 3 (RECOMMENDED)	MEDIUM RISK – 2 (POTENTIAL HAZARD)	HIGH RISK – 1 (SIGNIFICANT HAZARD)	REFERENCE INFORMATION	YOUR RISK
<b>4.01)</b> Does the land management plan (LMP) address the health and current conditions of non-forested upland habitat? If restoration of forested upland habitat is needed, does the LMP provide guidance?	The LMP properly addresses the health and current conditions of non-forested upland habitats and, if needed, provides guidance for restoration activities.		Health and current conditions of non-forested upland habitats are not addressed and no guidance for restoration activities is provided.	Table 2: Q, R, T, and W	
<b>4.02)</b> Are any recent or proposed activities that require a permit occurring in critical dune areas?	There are no critical dunes OR Critical dunes are present BUT no recent activities requiring a permit have, or will, take place.	Habitats are part of a critical dune area, activities requiring a permit have taken place, and a permit was obtained.	<b>Non-forested upland habitats are part of a critical dune area, activities requiring a permit have taken place, and a permit was not obtained.</b> <sup>19</sup>		
<b>4.03)</b> Are non-forested upland habitats being restored by or according to a plan from agency personnel or others trained in habitat restoration or improvement?	Restoration is being implemented on all non-forested upland habitats on the property.	Restoration is being implemented on some habitats on the property.	No restoration has been started on other habitats on the property.	Table 2: Q, R, T, and W	
<b>4.04)</b> Are restored and/or natural habitats enrolled in a conservation program that offers long-term (10 years or longer) or permanent protection?	All non-forested upland habitat areas are enrolled in a conservation program.	Some habitat areas are enrolled in a conservation program.	No habitat areas are enrolled in a conservation program.	Table 2: Q, U, and V	

## Other Environmental Risks in the FWH System

<b>5.00)</b> Are there other activities, products, processes/equipment, services, by-products, and/or waste at this property that pose contamination risk to groundwater or surface water?	No additional risk(s) identified.	Plan to mitigate the identified contamination risk(s).	No plan to mitigate identified contamination risk(s).		
--	-----------------------------------	--	---	--	--

A boxed risk level indicates the level required for environmental assurance verification (MAEAP verification).

**Bold black print** indicates a violation of state or federal regulation.

**Bold italic blue print** indicates a management practice consistent with a specified Right to Forest Act Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMP)

**Table 1. Legal citations for environmental risks in Forest, Wetlands and Habitat♦A♦Syst**

Footnote	Law	Description
1	National Historic Preservation Act, NHPA of 1996	State Historic Preservation Office
2	Federal Endangered Species Act, Public Act 93-205 of 1973	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
3	Michigan Threatened and Endangered Species	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act Part 365
4	Migratory Bird Treaty Act (1918)	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
5	Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (1947)	U.S. EPA MDARD
6	Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (1968)	DNR, Fish and Wildlife Service
7	National Environmental Policy Act (1969)	U.S. EPA
8	Clean Air Act (1970)	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act Part 31
9	Clean Water Act (1972)	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act Part 31
10	Plant Protection Act (2000)	U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS)
11	Right to Forest Act	MDNR
12	Michigan Natural Rivers	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act Part 305
13	Michigan Designated Trout Streams	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act Part 487
14	Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act Part 91
15	Prevention and Suppression of Forest Fires	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act Part 515
16	State regulation on moving non-native plants and pests	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act Part 324
17	Michigan Wetlands Protection, Michigan Floodplain Regulatory Authority, Michigan Inland Lakes and Streams and Michigan Shorelands Protection and Management	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act Part 303, 31, 301, 323 and 325
18	Sand Dunes Protection Law	Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act Part 353
19	Right to Farm Act	MDARD
20	Public Health Code, Act 368 of 1978	Part 127: Water Supply and Sewer Systems

**Definition Section**

**Land Management Plan:** A customized, written document that reviews, analyzes and describes all non-agriculture land including but not limited to: forests, grasslands, shrublands, and all types of wetlands and water bodies including but not limited to: streams, lakes, ponds, bogs, fens, swamps, marshes and vernal pools.

**Table 2. Additional Resources**

Footnote	Resources	Description
A	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	U.S Fish and Wildlife Service
B	EGLE Wetlands Map Viewer and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory.	Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy (EGLE) Wetlands Map Viewer
C	Michigan Forestry Best Management Practices for Soil and Water Quality	BMP Manual
D	Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Service Forester	Michigan DNR Forest Stewardship Program
E	Wild and Scenic Rivers	Michigan DNR. & U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
F	Designated Trout Streams	Michigan DNR. & U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
G	Inland Trout and Salmon Regulation Maps	Michigan DNR. & U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
H	Michigan DNR Burn Permits	Michigan DNR
I	Michigan DNR Natural Rivers Database	Michigan DNR
J	Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (MDARD) Pesticide Certification and Licensing Requirements	MDARD
K	Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (MDARD) Pesticide laws and Regulations	MDARD
L	Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (MDARD) Integrated Pest Management (IPM)	MDARD
M	State Archaeologist, State Historic Preservation Office of Michigan	State Historic Preservation Office of Michigan
N	Michigan Natural Features Inventory	Michigan State University Extension
O	Midwest Invasive Species Network	Michigan State University, Detection, Identification and reporting of invasive species.
P	Cooperative Invasive Species Management Area	A partnership of federal, state, and local government agencies, tribes, individuals, and various interested groups that manage invasive species (or weeds) in a defined area.
Q	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Partners for Fish and Wildlife	Technical expertise and financial assistance to help private landowners with habitat restoration.

(Continued)

**Table 2. Additional Resources (continued)**

Footnote	Resources	Description
R	Michigan DNR Wildlife Habitat Grant Program	The primary goal of this program is to enhance and improve the quality and quantity of game species habitat in support of specific goals from the Wildlife Division's strategic plan.
S	Michigan DNR Forests for Fish	Michigan DNR
T	Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)	USDA NRCS
U	MDARD Conservation Easements	MDARD
V	The Nature Conservancy (TNC) Conservation Easements	The Nature Conservancy
W	MDARD List of Qualified Foresters by County, USDA NRCS Technical Service Provider Registry, Society of American Foresters Certified Forester, Association of Consulting Foresters, Certified ESP plan writer, Certified Wildlife Biologist, Michigan DNR Registered Forester. An individual recognized by MDARD to write LMPs.	MDARD, USDA NRCS, Society of American Foresters, Association of Consulting Foresters, The Wildlife Society, Michigan DNR
X	American Tree Farm System	
Y	Sustainable Forestry Initiative	
Z	Forest Stewardship Council	
AA	Qualified Forest Program	MDARD
BB	Commercial Forest Program	Michigan DNR
CC	Right to Forest Generally Accepted Forest Management Practices (GAFMPs)	Michigan DNR
DD	Michigan DNR Forest Regeneration Survey Manual	Michigan DNR
EE	Qualified Logging Professionals and Michigan Association of Timbermen, Master Logger Certification	Sustainable Forestry Education. Michigan Association of Timbermen
FF	Michigan DNR Biomass Harvesting Guidance	Michigan DNR
GG	Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE) Water Resources Division	EGLE
HH	Michigan DNR Fisheries Habitat Grant Program	Michigan DNR
II	Michigan Clean Water Corps	
JJ	Michigan Trout Unlimited	
KK	Michigan Lake Stewardship Association	

(Continued)

**Table 2. Additional Resources (continued)**

Footnote	Resources	Description
LL	Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC)	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, provides a great resource to see if any listed species, critical habitat, migratory birds or other natural resources may be impacted by a project in a specified area.
MM	USDA NRCS Web Soil Survey	USDA, User can create a soil map and generate soil reports here.
NN	Michigan State University Extension	Michigan State University, MSUE, features programming and resource for Agriculture, Business and Community, Family, Food & Health, Lawn & Garden, Natural Resources and 4-H and Youth

BUSINESS NAME: \_\_\_\_\_  
 BUSINESS OWNER NAME: \_\_\_\_\_  
 BUSINESS PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 EXTENSION: \_\_\_\_\_  
 BUSINESS WEB SITE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 DESCRIPTION: \_\_\_\_\_

**BUSINESS ADDRESS INFORMATION (Main Office or Home Address)**

(MAILING) STREET: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (MAILING) P.O. BOX: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (MAILING) CITY: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (MAILING) STATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (MAILING) ZIP CODE: \_\_\_\_\_

**OWNERS CONTACT INFORMATION**

SALUTATION: (Circle one) \_\_\_\_\_ HOME PHONE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_  
 MR or MRS or MS MOBILE/CELL NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (MAILING) STREET: \_\_\_\_\_  
 FIRST NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ (MAILING) P.O. BOX: \_\_\_\_\_  
 LAST NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ (MAILING) CITY: \_\_\_\_\_  
 CONTACT ROLE: \_\_\_\_\_ (MAILING) STATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 EMAIL ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_ (MAILING) ZIP CODE: \_\_\_\_\_

**FARM MANAGER CONTACT INFORMATION**

SALUTATION: (Circle one) \_\_\_\_\_ HOME PHONE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_  
 MR or MRS or MS MOBILE/CELL NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (MAILING) STREET: \_\_\_\_\_  
 FIRST NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ (MAILING) P.O. BOX: \_\_\_\_\_  
 LAST NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ (MAILING) CITY: \_\_\_\_\_  
 CONTACT ROLE: \_\_\_\_\_ (MAILING) STATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 EMAIL ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_ (MAILING) ZIP CODE: \_\_\_\_\_

**FARM INFORMATION**

FARM NAME: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (If no physical address, please use Section, Township, Range, and Latitude and Longitude)  
 FARM SITE STREET ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_  
 FARM SITE CITY: \_\_\_\_\_  
 STATE: **MICHIGAN (ONLY)** (Mailing Address May Vary)  
 FARM SITE ZIP CODE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 FARM SITE COUNTY: \_\_\_\_\_  
 FARM SITE TOWNSHIP: \_\_\_\_\_  
 LATITUDE: \_\_\_\_\_ LONGITUDE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 SECTION: \_\_\_\_\_ TIER: \_\_\_\_\_ RANGE: \_\_\_\_\_

(If there is no mailbox at the farm site location or not a place that receives mail.)

FARM MAILING ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (MAILING) STREET: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (MAILING) P.O. BOX: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (MAILING) CITY: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (MAILING) STATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (MAILING) ZIP CODE: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDITIONAL NOTES:





Farm Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Animal Unit (AU) Conversion Factors by Animal Type and Class			
ANIMAL TYPE	CLASS	AVERAGE ANIMAL WEIGHT	QUANTITY
1,000 Beef cattle or cow/calf pairs = Large CAFO	CALF	450	
	HIGH FORAGE	750	
	HIGH ENERGY	750	
	HIGH FORAGE	1100	
	HIGH ENERGY	1100	
	COW	1000	
700 Mature dairy cattle (whether milked or dry cows), or 1,000 Veal calves = Large CAFO	CALF	150	
	CALF	250	
	HEIFER	750	
	HEIFER	1000	
	LACTATING COW	1400	
	DRY COW	1400	
	VEAL	250	
	DRY SYSTEM		
	LIQUID SYSTEM		
	PULLETS		
	ALL		
	55,000 turkeys = Large CAFO	ALL	1000
500 horses = Large CAFO	ALL	1000	
30,000 Laying hens or broilers liquid, or 125,000 Chickens dry (other than laying hens), or 82,000 Laying hens dry = Large CAFO	NURSERY PIG	25	
	GROW-FINISH	150	
	GESTATING	275	
	LACTATING	375	
	BOAR	350	
	OTHER		
2,500 swine each weighing over 55 pounds, or 10,000 swine weighing less than 55 pounds = Large CAFO	ALL	100	
	ALL	100	
10,000 sheep or lambs	ALL	100	
OTHER LIVESTOCK TYPE: OTHER LIVESTOCK QUANTITY:			
OTHER LIVESTOCK TYPE: OTHER LIVESTOCK QUANTITY:			

**Crop Commodities**

CROP NAME	ACRES	CROP NAME	ACRES	CROP NAME	ACRES
Alfalfa		Cucumbers, Fresh		Oats	
Apples		Cucumbers, Pickling		Peaches	
Apricots		Dry Beans		Pears	
Asparagus		Fruit, Other		Potatoes	
Blueberries		Grapes, Juice		Rye	
Carrots		Grapes, Wine		Small Grain, Other	
Cherries, Sweet		Green Beans		Soybeans	
Cherries, Tart		Greenhouse, Annual		Squash/Pumpkin	
Christmas Trees		Greenhouse, Perennial		Sugar Beets	
Clover, Seed		Greens, Herbs		Sunflower	
Corn, Grain		Hay/Pasture		Vegetable, Other	
Corn, Seed		Hops		Wheat	
Corn, Silage		Mixed Garden		Other:	
Corn, Sweet		Nursery		Other:	

**Note: Express acres to the closest quarter acre.**

Notes:

---



---



---



---



---

Farm Name: \_\_\_\_\_

-Blank Page-



MSU is an affirmative-action, equal-opportunity employer, committed to achieving excellence through a diverse workforce and inclusive culture that encourages all people to reach their full potential. Michigan State University Extension programs and materials are open to all without regard to race, color, national origin, gender, gender identity, religion, age, height, weight, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, marital status, family status or veteran status. Issued in furtherance of MSU Extension work, acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Jeffrey W. Dwyer, Director, MSU Extension, East Lansing, MI 48824. This information is for educational purposes only. Reference to commercial products or trade names does not imply endorsement by MSU Extension or bias against those not mentioned. 10:22 – 300 – HJ/--