

FOREST MANAGEMENT AND STUMP-TO-FOREST GATE CHAIN-OF-CUSTODY SURVEILLANCE EVALUATION REPORT

Michigan Department of Natural Resources Michigan State Forests

Michigan, USA

SCS-FM/COC-00090N

1732 W. M-32

Gaylord, MI 49735

Keith Kintigh, MI DNR Forest Resources Division

kintighk@michigan.gov

CERTIFIED	EXPIRATION
31 December 2015	30 December 2020

DATE OF FIELD EVALUATION
10-12 October 2018
DATE OF LAST UPDATE
18 October 2018

SCS Contact:

Brendan Grady | Director
Forest Management Certification

+1.510.452.8000

bgrady@scsglobalservices.com

SCSglobal
SERVICES
Setting the standard for sustainability™

Foreword

2000 Powell Street, Ste. 600, Emeryville, CA 94608 USA
 +1.510.452.8000 main | +1.510.452.8001 fax
www.SCSglobalServices.com

Cycle in annual surveillance evaluations				
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd annual evaluation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 rd annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 th annual evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (<i>expansion of scope, Major CAR audit, special audit, etc.</i>):
Name of Forest Management Enterprise (FME) and abbreviation used in this report:				
Michigan Department of Natural Resources, MI DNR or DNR.				

All certificates issued by SCS under the aegis of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) require annual evaluations to ascertain ongoing conformance with the requirements and standards of certification. A public summary of the initial evaluation is available on the FSC Certificate Database <http://info.fsc.org/>.

Pursuant to FSC and SCS guidelines, annual / surveillance evaluations are not intended to comprehensively examine the full scope of the certified forest operations, as the cost of a full-scope evaluation would be prohibitive and it is not mandated by FSC evaluation protocols. Rather, annual evaluations are comprised of three main components:

- A focused assessment of the status of any outstanding conditions or Corrective Action Requests (CARs; see discussion in section 4.0 for those CARs and their disposition as a result of this annual evaluation);
- Follow-up inquiry into any issues that may have arisen since the award of certification or prior to this evaluation; and
- As necessary given the breadth of coverage associated with the first two components, an additional focus on selected topics or issues, the selection of which is not known to the certificate holder prior to the evaluation.

Organization of the Report

This report of the results of our evaluation is divided into two sections. Section A provides the public summary and background information that is required by the Forest Stewardship Council. This section is made available to the public and is intended to provide an overview of the evaluation process, the management programs and policies applied to the forest, and the results of the evaluation. Section A will be posted on the FSC Certificate Database (<http://info.fsc.org/>) no less than 90 days after completion of the on-site evaluation. Section B contains more detailed results and information for required FSC record-keeping or the use by the FME.

Table of Contents

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY	4
1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
1.1 Evaluation Team.....	4
1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation	5
1.3 Standards Used	5
2. CERTIFICATION EVALUATION PROCESS	5
2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes.....	5
2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems	11
3. CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	11
4. RESULTS OF EVALUATION	11
4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations	11
4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period.....	12
4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations	12
4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations	17
5. STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS	18
5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted	19
5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses	19
6. CERTIFICATION DECISION	19
7. ANNUAL DATA UPDATE	19

SECTION A – PUBLIC SUMMARY

1. General Information

1.1 Evaluation Team

Auditor name:	Beth Jacqmain	Auditor role:	FSC Lead Auditor
Qualifications:	<p>Beth is a Certification Forester with SCS Global Services. Master of Science in Forest Biology/Ecology from Auburn University and Bachelor of Science in Forest Management from Michigan State University. Beth has 20+ years’ experience in forestry including public land management, private consulting, and private corporate forest management working with landowners and harvest crews. Qualified ANSI RAB accredited ISO 14001 EMS Lead Auditor and a FSC Lead Auditor for Forest Management/Chain of Custody. Audited and led FSC evaluations, harvest and logging operations certification evaluations, and joint PEFC and ATFS certifications. A 10-year member of the Forest Guild, 20-year adjunct-Faculty with Itasca Community College, Natural Resources Department. Beth’s experience is in forest management and ecology; ecosystem silviculture; the use of silviculture towards meeting strategic and tactical goals; nursery/tree regeneration; wildland fire fighting; forest timber quality improvement, conifer thinning operations, pine restoration, and fire ecology in conifer dominated systems. Beth has audited throughout the United States and in Australia, Fiji Islands, and New Zealand.</p>		
Auditor Name:	Mike Ferrucci	Auditor role:	SFI Lead Auditor
Qualifications:	<p>Mike is qualified as a RAB-QSA Lead Auditor (ISO 14001 Environmental Management Systems), as an SFI Lead Auditor for Forest Management, Procurement, and Chain of Custody, as an FSC Lead Auditor Forest Management and Chain of Custody, as a Tree Farm Group Certification Lead Auditor, and as a GHG Lead Auditor. Mike has led Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) certification and precertification reviews throughout the United States. He has also led or participated in joint SFI and Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certification projects in nearly one dozen states and a joint scoping or precertification gap-analysis project on tribal lands throughout the United States. He also co-led the pioneering pilot dual evaluation of the Lakeview Stewardship Unit on the Fremont-Winema National Forest.</p> <p>For 12 years Mike was the SFI Program Manager for NSF – International Strategic Registrations responsible for all aspects of the firm’s SFI Certification programs. In that role Mike developed and managed one of the largest forest and chain of custody certification programs in the U.S.</p> <p>Mike has conducted Chain of Custody audits for all segments of the forest products industry, including printers, corrugated and box producers, integrated paper companies, paper distributors, solid wood mills, engineered wood products facilities, brokers, and distributors. In audits with pulp mills, corrugated producers, and box plants Mike has addressed the issues involving recycled content. Mike has also conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in 4 countries and 33 states.</p> <p>Mike Ferrucci has 37 years of forest management experience. His expertise is in sustainable forest management planning; in certification of forests as sustainably</p>		

	<p>managed; in the application of easements for large-scale working forests, and in the ecology, silviculture, and management of mixed species forests, with an emphasis on regeneration and management of native hardwood species. Mike has conducted or participated in assessments of forest management operations throughout the United States, with field experience in 4 countries and 34 states. Mike has been a member of the Society of American Foresters for over forty years. He is Past Chair of the SFI Auditor’s Forum. Mike is also a Lecturer at the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, where he has taught graduate courses and workshops in forest management, harvesting operations, professional forest ethics, private forestry, and financial analysis.</p>
--	--

1.2 Total Time Spent on Evaluation

A. Number of days spent on-site assessing the applicant:	3
B. Number of auditors participating in on-site evaluation:	2
C. Number of days spent by any technical experts (in addition to amount in line A):	0
D. Additional days spent on preparation, stakeholder consultation, and follow-up:	2
E. Total number of person days used in evaluation:	8

1.3 Standards Used

All standards used are available on the websites of FSC International (www.fsc.org) or SCS Global Services (www.SCSglobalServices.com). All standards are available on request from SCS Global Services via the comment form on our website. When no national standard exists for the country/region, SCS Interim Standards are developed by modifying SCS’s Generic Interim Standard to reflect forest management in the region and by incorporating relevant components of any Draft Regional/National Standard and comments from stakeholders. More than one month prior to the start of the field evaluation, SCS Draft Interim Standards are provided to stakeholders identified by FSC International, SCS, forest managers under evaluation, and the FSC National or Regional Office for comment. SCS’s COC indicators for FMEs are based on the most current versions of the FSC Chain of Custody Standard, FSC Standard for Group Entities in Forest Management Groups (FSC-STD-30-005), and FSC Accreditation Requirements.

<p>Standards used NOTE: Please include the full standard name and Version number and check all that apply.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC US Forest Management, V1-0
	<input type="checkbox"/> SCS COC indicators for FMEs, V7-0
	<input type="checkbox"/> FSC Trademark Standard (FSC-STD-50-001 V2-0)
	<input type="checkbox"/> FSC standard for group entities in forest management groups (FSC-STD-30-005), V1-1
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other:

2. Certification Evaluation Process

2.1 Evaluation Itinerary, Activities, and Site Notes

October 10, 2018 – Roscommon Management Unit	
FMU / location / sites visited	Features of Interest / Notes
Program-wide Opening Meeting 8:00 am – 10:00 am	Introductions, client update, review scope of evaluation, audit plan, intro/update to FSC and SCS standards, confidentiality and public summary, conformance evaluation

Both Auditors (all sites)	methods and review of open CARs/OBS, emergency and security procedures for evaluation team, reviewed audit itinerary.
Roscommon Management Unit	Overview of unit's land base and forest and land management programs.
Site 1: Keno Hardwoods	21-acre timber sale marked and sold but not harvested. Marking of this northern hardwood stand to a residual basal area of 80 to 100 square feet per acre with some canopy gaps is consistent with silvicultural guidelines. Confirmed removal of poor-quality, lower vigor trees and retention of some trees with habitat value.
Site 2: Keno Oil Aspen, Unit 1	90.5 acre, 4-unit timber sale marked and sold but not harvested. All units are Aspen-dominated stands prescribed for clearcutting with various types and patterns of retention. Confirmed Unit 1 has two interior "islands" marked for no treatment and one edge area also excluded. The islands have lowland brush or grass cover, while the edge area contains timber representative of harvest area.
Site 3: Running Deer Red Pine	25-acre red pine predominant stand was clear cut in the 2016-2017 winter, with follow-up chipping of tops during May 2017. Site-preparation furrowing done in the fall of 2017, but planned spring 2018 planting did not occur due to lack of planting stock. Site received chemical herbicide site preparation in September 2018 to prepare for spring 2019 planting, using planting stock from a large, commercial nursery.
Site 4: Roscommon Red Pines Natural Area/ERA and Trail	Small parking area, 1.3-mile trail, and core area of old-growth (140 + years old) red pine and white pine with associated species comprising a dry northern forest. This special site is reserved from timber harvest and managed to allow natural processes, control invasive species, and monitor conditions. The Roscommon Red Pines ERA Plan has been completed and is undergoing final review.
Site 5: Rasmer Trespass	A trespass originally closed in July 2017 following survey work. The owner of the adjoining property continues to trespass despite two surveys (one by MiDNR and one by a surveyor for the owner) which show the same results. Matter was referred to a Conservation Officer. Access to a nearby timber harvest affected with no impact.
Site 6: Cut Units 7 & 8, School Road KW Sale	Completed harvests in Units 7 (37 acres) and 8 (11 acres) of a mature red pine-dominated stand near an area long managed for Kirtland's warbler (KW). KW is federally-listed, but under consideration for de-listing after decades of management to create dense, pure stands of Jack Pine. These units were prescribed an alternative treatment promoting red pine natural regeneration and including the retention of scattered, large mature red pine as an attempt to balance habitat, esthetic, and economic goals. Observed many young red and jack pine that loggers avoided. Scarification between this regeneration will promote more natural pine regeneration. Post-harvest esthetics far superior to normal KW jack pine treatments.
Site 7: Unit 9, School Road KW	This 98-acre unit was sold but not yet cut. The prescription is to clear cut, scatter the tops, scarify, and allow natural regeneration.
Site 8: Unit 11, School Road KW	This 97-acre unit was sold but not yet cut. The prescription is to clear cut, leaving several uncut patches dominated by red pine, and then trench and plant jack pine in the conventional KW opposing weave pattern.
Site 9: Unit 12, School Road KW	This 66-acre unit was sold but not yet cut. The prescription is to clear cut, leaving several uncut patches dominated by red pine, and then trench and plant jack pine in the conventional KW opposing weave pattern.
Site 10: Unit 9, Boy Scout Aspen	This 6.5-acre unit was clear cut harvested during the summer of 2018. Many mature oak trees were retained comprising near-shelterwood level structure. There are many oak stump sprouts and oak seedlings, with Aspen root suckers less prevalent.
Site 11: Unit 8, Boy Scout Aspen	This 6.6-acre unit was clear cut harvested during the summer of 2018. Scattered mature oak trees were retained. There are some oak stump sprouts and oak seedlings, with Aspen root suckers more prevalent. The wood from these and other units was moved to an existing grassy opening, preventing compaction that often leads to significant delays in natural regeneration.

Site 12: Unit 11, Boy Scout Aspen	This 33-acre unit was clear cut harvested during the summer of 2018. Retention includes scattered and clumped trees, but unit is generally very open. Aspen root suckering covers entire unit.
Site 13: Unit 1, Landfill Oak	This 37-acre unit was recently thinned to a residual of 70 square feet of basal area per acre. Tops have been piled and are awaiting a follow-up chipping operation. No rutting and minimal damage to residual trees were observed.
Site 14: Unit 2, Landfill Oak	This 37-acre unit was recently thinned to a residual of 40 square feet of basal area per acre, with some larger red pine trees marked for retention. No rutting and minimal damage to residual trees were observed.
Site 15: Nine Mile Pit	A long-term lease for mining of gravel located beneath sand. A mining and reclamation plan is in place.
Site 16: Nine Mile ERA Complex	This ERA includes protected natural communities including muskeg, fen, poor fen, and pine-dry mesic forest. It was viewed from a distance and its management, monitoring, and conditions were discussed. The Nine Mile Complex ERA Plan has been completed and is undergoing final review.
October 11, 2018 – Grayling Management Unit	
Grayling Management Unit	Abbreviated opening meeting for this MU. Overview of unit’s land base and forest and land management programs.
Jacqmain, West Tour	
Site W1: DeWard Orchard	Historical orchard site. Wildlife objectives, 209 acres managed as grassy openings. Examined Unit 32, prescribed burn and records. North 48 acres, clearcut, trenched, sprayed planted to red pine. Spraying authorized through variance protocols (Variance, C72-0852, documents/records). Good growth on planted pines. Prescribed burn done in 2015 to set back woody succession/knapweed and promote native grasses. Examined ERA burn planning, prescription, and conditions of burn records. Discussions: Inventory, Year of Entry (YEO) scheduling.
Site W2: 72-006-16-01 Comp 210 Upland Mix Thin	Open and active sale - harvest completed 2018, not yet closed. Crown thinning next to a clearcut, 31 acres, adjacent to private land. Some damage to residual trees that had been detected, recorded, and addressed by timber administrator during the harvest. Discussions: beech bark disease, green-up requirements, boundary marking.
Site W3: 72-10-16-01 Kolka Creek Red Pine	-Inspected portable bridge, natural river interface as access to red pine stand for thinning. Very carefully thought-out use of portable bride. Trail and road had many past ORV damage issues, despite use of boulders and other means to block access to trail across Kolka Creek. Examined and discussed the 35' portable bridge for road used to access "island" across creek where red pine stand was located. Permit for water, Permit Number 15-20-0023-P, issued by the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Issued 8/10/2015 included plans and conditions, Expires 8/10/2020 allowing the installation of the temporary bridge. RDR report for ORV damage. Discussions: red pine thinnings, roads, logging contracts, ORV damage, safety/radio communications in low-cell coverage areas. -Active sale, 150 acres. Shut down because of recent, heavy rains. Examined area already harvested and portion marked but not yet cut, confirmed crown thinning primarily for crop tree release but also using thinning-from-below and removing “worst first”. -Logger interview. Confirmed map/contract, PPE. Interviewee was not a Qualified Logger, other person in 2-man crew is Qualified but was not on-site because it was shut down. Spill containment supplies confirmed. CoC documents.
Site W4: 72-032-16-01 Wild Rooster Mix	Recently completed harvest, 35 acres. Thinning with vernal pools and bog. Examined red painted boundary buffer around vernal pool and clumped green tree retention. Site has an oil and gas interface (pipe) and snowmobile trail which were considered during set up and protected during harvest. Units adjacent to SSURGO Hydric Soils

	and wetland exclusions. Within vicinity of Massasauga occurrence. Discussions: recreation, RTE, vernal BMPs.
Site W5: 72-005-16-01 Comp 210 Hdwd Peninsula	Recently completed hardwood thinning, 108 acres. Within vicinity of Eastern Massasauga occurrence. Contract marked. Some marked trees to be cut were left on site but fell within allowance of contract and not a hindrance to meeting silvicultural objectives. Discussions: Silviculture review, RTE, contractors, Indigenous consultations
Site W6: Compartment 175/Stand 20: KW Management, interplanting of JP with RP	Kirtland’s warbler (KW) management area with clearcut done in 2015 (72-041-14-01) and replanted in 2017 to KW specifications (W72-800). Considerations for sale include visual management, horse trail crossings. Examined planted area that was planted with a relatively new “pilot” approach of primary jack pine planting with every 5 th tree planted a red pine seedling (rather than jack pine only). Objectives included visual/structural diversity preferred by recreational users, species diversity, and improved economic production. Discussions: Recreation/stakeholder input processes, regeneration monitoring, KW monitoring.
Site W7: Compartment 175/Stand 20: Campground, River stabilization	Campground review, access site, horse trail use, and camper use. Recreation issues & Natural Rivers. This state forest campground runs along a natural river. Inspected a restoration project for stream bank protection done with help. Reviewed the UMRA and RDR report.
Site W8: D4-11 T25N R4W Sec 11: Restoration of the Marathon Science Well Site	Well pad restoration site was inspected as well as access road restoration and new gate installation. The site was the location of a retired well-research rig. Site cleared, leveled and reshaped, and reseeded. Seed growth sufficient and no issues. Design specifications, communication records, permit application and requirements were examined. Discussion: monitoring systems for gas and oil well pads, BMPs for road construction and water quality protection, DNR road maintenance and RDR program.
Site W9: T24N R4W Sec 14: C72-840 Spray site	Site harvested in 2017 under “72-018-15-01 Nold No 7 Red Pine”. Aerial sprayed Aug 7, 2018. To be trenched for planting RP spring 2019. Examined documentation for planning and spray. Discussions: spray contracts, road BMPs, monitoring spray contracts.
Road review (unscheduled)	Comp. 195, Sec. 25, N Section line, SWSW. Crossdrain 251. Road inspection. Discussion: BMPs for water quality protection, DNR Road maintenance program.
Site W10: 195: 35-14- 01 Walk A Walking Stick Pine completed Sale	Sale completed end of 2017 in 82 acres. ERA. There is a heavy recreational pathway and sale was carefully planned with Park Manager. Examined intermittent stream area. Discussion: Water protections, BMP road requirements
Mike Ferrucci, East Tour	
Site E1: Lofty Oak Pine Mix Sale	Completed 136 acre timber sale. Units 3, 4, and 5 were reviewed; all were clear cut with retention of 6 large red pine and 1 oak tree per acre. Observed ample oak sprouting and small oak seedlings, although foresters will wait until oaks are 4 feet tall before formally designating the regeneration to meet stocking standards. The permanent two-track forest road accessing this site is rutted and has inadequate drainage in places.
Site E2: FTP-C72-838	Red Pine Stand 30, Compartment 217 was clear cut and chipped in 2016-2017. Due to several MNFI hits and potentials from the GDSE layer a MNFI Natural Community Survey was completed by a contractor, but no rare species were observed. Proposed treatments including herbicide, trench, and plant will proceed.
Site E3: Potter’s Lowland Mix	Initial sale proposal was modified due to include similar stand from adjacent compartment, then further modified when the adjacent Lewiston Grade Swamp ERA Rich Conifer Swamp Natural Community had a boundary expansion. The proposed treatments in three small stands were dropped to expand the buffer after consultation with specialists; portions of these three stands outside the expanded

	buffer will be treated during the next cycle in conjunction with treatments of adjacent uplands.
Site E4: Banana Pine Sale	Sold, uncut 187 acre timber sale in an area with heavy recreational use, primarily on horse trails used also for hiking. Reviewed the harvest prescription and marking in an 81 acre well-stocked, planted pole timber stand of red and jack pine that comprises Payment Units 1, 2, and 3. All jack pine and marked red pine (not many) will be harvested. Discussed several approaches taken to inform the general public.
Site E5: Parmalee Red Pine sale at Parmalee State Forest Campground	This completed timber harvest was carefully-planned and implemented to support recreation sites including a rustic campground, a picnic area, an iconic trout stream, and the snowmobile/horse trail. Payment Unit 2 has 9 acres including the campground; it was row- and free-thinned, with slash lopped low or moved away from campsites. Tree marking emphasized removal of hazard trees and reserving healthy, well-spaced trees at a lower stocking than normal for timber growing emphasis. Payment Unit 1, also 5 acres, was free-thinned to 120 square feet of basal area per acre, more conventional. Recreation managers and trail staff supported the project and led public outreach work.
Site E6: Bailey Road RDR Site, RDR ID#72014682017090	The MDNR Conservation Officer report illegal ORV use on a very steep portion of powerline row causing significant erosion damage. Using ORV restoration funds the site was seeded and two rows of large boulders were installed to block further use. Enforcement action has also occurred, and follow-up visits are planned.
Site E7: Frost Pocket ERA and Barrens	The natural history, ecology, and management of this 1,600 acre barrens complex was described by involved foresters, fire officer, wildlife biologist, and trail personnel. Units 1, 2, and 3 were viewed and treatments, including harvests and prescribed fire, were discussed. The 1997 Frost Pocket Pine Barrens Management Plan and a draft ERA amendment detail the natural history, management prescriptions, and monitoring history and plan.
Site E8: C14 Oak Harvest	This two-unit sale was active on the day of the audit. Interviewed the processor operator who is a Qualified Logging Professional through Michigan Forestry Education training. Significant portions of the logging access road are rutted, with attempts to drain the road not being effective due to regular soaking rainfall. The rutting depth is limited by a compact clay layer. The logging contract requires the purchaser to grade and restore the road upon completion of the harvest. There are no wetlands or streams near the road, which is on nearly level ground, and limited movement of mud off the road (only where drainage swales are working). The harvest area is on elevated ground, mostly with better-drained slopes. Rutting and mud in the harvest area are limited to the truck loading area and some of the primary yarding (skid) roads.
October 12, 2018 – Sault Ste. Marie Management Unit	
Roscommon Management Unit Both Auditors	Abbreviated opening meeting for this MU. Overview of unit’s land base and forest and land management programs.
Jacqmain, West Tour	
Site W1: Long Life Mix 45-118-14	Final Harvest, set up not yet cut on 40 acres. Marked to keep, retaining conifers of specified size classes, conifer regeneration, marked dominant aspen green trees on a spacing basis, and other requirements. Objective is “Mackinac Mixed-species Management” which means silviculture prescription is designed to produce a mixed conifer-hardwood stand. Winter only harvest using winter Road through private for access. Examined “Compartment Review” and “Records of Changes and Revisions”. Discussions: green tree retention, forest inventory rules and monitoring.
Site W2: Lily Lake Mix SBW 45-105-16	Hardwood final harvest, 103 acres. Mackinac Mix Management, Private Access, Winter Road, SBW. Discussions: rutting, road BMPs and construction.

Site W3: Leveille Road	Hardwood stand that had salvage of beech after beech bark mortality. Harvest followed by brush knockdown, and oak/white pine planting done in open areas and gaps that were made by salvage. Forester brought area to attention to Integrated review identifying potential concerns for hawk nests in area, so sale was modified to time of year that also minimized bark slippage and deer yarding. Detailed Integrated Review report included and reviewed. Discussions: RTE, Integrated Review process, special monitoring projects, regeneration survey schedules, insect and disease.
Site W4: Overwatch Pine 45-114-17	Set up, not yet cut. Red Pine Thinning, 88-acre area acquired in 1996. Examined Unit 1, approximately 90-year-old stand, 14 acres. Every 3 rd row thin. This is part of Compartment 202 which has HCVA-Dedicated Management Area (DMA) "Simmons Woods".
Site W5: Deadzone Mix 45-113-17	Open sale, 183 acres. "Hardwood and Mackinac Mix Management" using group selection in a northern hardwood stand. All deciduous >2 dbh to be cut, keeping all cedar and hemlock in stand and green tree retention based on size/spacing. Snag and den trees retained as in all other final harvest sales examined thus far.
Site W6: Seiners Point - Simmons Woods, (HCVF, RSA)	ERA, Natural Area, Old Growth, Invasive Species, ORV. Includes four natural communities: wooded dune and swale, interdunal wetland, limestone cobble shore, and open dunes. Has rare natural communities as well as high quality representative sample areas (RSAs). Reviewed documentation including long history of conservation for this area. Detailed discussions of HCVF monitoring including review of ERA monitoring plan. Monitoring plan specifies monitoring/management of illegal ORV use, invasive species, rare species, old growth, and tree/forest regeneration. Natural areas locations and profiles are available online here, https://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,4570,7-350-79133_79200---,00.html .
Mike Ferrucci, East Tour	
Site E1: Giddings Road Project	Capital outlay road project; multiple unit haul route;
Site E2: Loud Hound Aspen Mix	Active timber sale; Aspen management
Site E3: Partridge Pine, Unit 4	Open sale, 121 acres. Crown thinning in red pine stand.
Site E4: Red Pine Release, C132, Stand 25, Dinky Lake Road	This 4-year-old, 42-acre Red Pine planted stand is scheduled for chemical release. It had been site preparation sprayed with Rodeo on 9.23.13, trenched and then planted during March 2014. 36 acres are on the PAP for helicopter release spray in 2019.
Site E5: Red Pine C132, Stand 16, Dinky Lake Road	This 13-year-old, 35-acre Red Pine planted stand is fully-stocked with free-to-grow trees of excellent form and vigor. After harvest (former Spooky Pine Sale) the site was burned, trenched, and planted. YOE 2016 prescribed treatment lists monitoring for release and for RHPS and treat as needed.
Site E6: Strouble Lake, Hendricks Township	Hendricks Township requested ability to charge use fees for improved recreation site which now includes boat dock, picnic and camping areas. Arrangement was originally a "Use Permit", then considered a "Public Use Deed", and now have a conveyance subject to reverter clause to accommodate these desirable uses. Facilities are well-designed, built, and maintained.
Site E7: Meteor Mix, Unit 1	This 4-acre unit had a regeneration with retention harvest, with successful Aspen root suckering and ample retention of green trees and standing and down wood.
Site E8: Meteor Mix, Unit 6	This 13-acre unit had a selection harvest completed in a hardwood stand. Forestry and wildlife goals have been met, including targets for residual stand density, structure, species diversity and wildlife habitat retention elements such as snags and some live trees with features of use to wildlife (branchy crowns, decadent portions).
Site E9: Research Area, Dr. Mike Waters,	This site is part of a very large replicated study to assess alternative silvicultural methods to regenerate hardwood stands impacted by deer browsing. The treatment

Michigan State University	here is seed tree harvest with removal of most branches and slash, which were piled outside the plot because the chip market had been lost at the time of harvest.
Site E10: Strictler GEMS	The Strictler Grouse Enhanced Management Site (GEMS) plan was reviewed and discussed with the author. This is one of 19 such sites located on Michigan State Forests. Goals include management for grouse habitat, improved grouse hunting opportunities, and education. A well-designed, colorful information kiosk is supplemented by web-based technology including Avenza pdf maps available for quick download onto smart phones.
Site E11: Gem Stone Aspen Sale	Sold but uncut 6-unit regeneration treatment, most units in Aspen stands of varied ages, following detailed grouse enhancement management plan linked to the compartment plan.

2.2 Evaluation of Management Systems

SCS deploys interdisciplinary teams with expertise in forestry, social sciences, natural resource economics, and other relevant fields to assess an FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies. Evaluation methods include reviewing documents and records, interviewing FME personnel and contractors, implementing sampling strategies to visit a broad number of forest cover and harvest prescription types, observing implementation of management plans and policies in the field, and collecting and analyzing stakeholder input. When there is more than one team member, each member may review parts of the standards based on their background and expertise. On the final day of an evaluation, team members convene to deliberate the findings of the assessment jointly. This involves an analysis of all relevant field observations, interviews, stakeholder comments, and reviewed documents and records. Where consensus among team members cannot be achieved due to lack of evidence, conflicting evidence or differences of interpretation of the standards, the team is instructed to report these in the certification decision section and/or in observations.

3. Changes in Management Practices

- There were no significant changes in the management and/or harvesting methods that affect the FME’s conformance to the FSC standards and policies.
- Significant changes occurred since the last evaluation that may affect the FME’s conformance to FSC standards and policies (*describe*):

4. Results of Evaluation

4.1 Definitions of Major CARs, Minor CARs and Observations

Major CARs: Major nonconformances, either alone or in combination with nonconformances of all other applicable indicators, result (or are likely to result) in a fundamental failure to achieve the objectives of the relevant FSC Criterion given the uniqueness and fragility of each forest resource. These are corrective actions that must be resolved or closed out before a certificate can be awarded. If Major CARs arise after an operation is certified, the timeframe for correcting these nonconformances is typically shorter than for Minor CARs. Certification is contingent on the certified FME’s response to the CAR within the stipulated time frame.

Minor CARs: These are corrective action requests in response to minor nonconformances, which are typically limited in scale or can be characterized as an unusual lapse in the system. Most Minor CARs are the result of nonconformance at the indicator-level. Corrective actions must be closed out within a specified time period of award of the certificate.

Observations: These are subject areas where the evaluation team concludes that there is conformance, but either future nonconformance may result due to inaction or the FME could achieve exemplary status through further refinement. Action on observations is voluntary and does not affect the maintenance of the certificate. However, observations can become CARs if performance with respect to the indicator(s) triggering the observation falls into nonconformance.

4.2 History of Findings for Certificate Period

FM Principle	Cert/Re-cert Evaluation	1 st Annual Evaluation	2 nd Annual Evaluation	3 rd Annual Evaluation	4 th Annual Evaluation
P1					
P2					
P3					
P4	Obs 4.4.a	Obs 4.4.a	Obs 4.1.b		
P5			Mn 5.3.b		
P6	Obs 6.3.h; Obs 6.6.e; Mn 6.7.a		Mn 6.5.b; Emergency Dero, 6.6.a		
P7	Mn 7.1.p				
P8	Obs 8.5.a				
P9	Obs 9.1.b/c				
P10					
COC for FM					
Trademark					
Group					
Other					

4.3 Existing Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2017.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	4.1.b
Background/ Justification: Biologists, other specialists, foresters and technicians have degrees from institutions known to have strong programs in the various fields; an unusually diverse collection of colleges are represented. Most members of the forestry management team all have at least BS in	

<p>Forestry degrees from SAF-accredited programs. Some staff in each division and at all levels have multiple and/or advanced degrees. Interviews also revealed that most staff have long experience in their jobs and/or previous jobs with relevant, related duties. Staff have the opportunity to take specialized training, and the organization provides regular formal internal training, with a particularly strong and well-documented fire training program (many of the skills learned in the fire program readily transfer to other duties). The many interdisciplinary meetings and less-formal interactions among wildlife biologists, fisheries biologists, recreation specialists, ecologists, planners, foresters, and forestry specialists ensure that informal and on-the-job training that occurs is regular, broad, deep, and very effective. Overall the FME is in conformance with this Indicator.</p> <p>However, internal audits found that training plans were not always in place and that there are some gaps in implementation of training. For example, the Crystal Falls Internal Audit Report contains the following: “Requirement of Audited Standard/Work Instruction: 8.1.1.d “Supervisors will determine job training needs in conjunction with employees. As part of the annual performance appraisal process, supervisors must identify employee training needs per DNR Personnel Manual 21.10.02 and divisions’ policies. Observed Nonconformity: Forest Resources Division staff has not had an annual performance appraisal in over a year; therefore, training needs have not been adequately identified.” The Draft 3 Grayling Audit Report contains two Minor Conformances directly related to training and others which could be related to training needs (corrective plan is not in place). Likewise, the Traverse City Audit Report Draft 3.1 includes several findings related to training.</p> <p>Efforts to address these self-identified training issues are underway. Training scheduled in 2018 will address Biodiversity and sale administration, per information from DFR and as listed in “2018 Annual Training PlanV2_JP updates”. This is an observation because overall because the DNR does offer training and, through their internal auditing process, have already identified and begun actions to address this gap.</p>	
<p>Observation: FME must offer forest work in ways that create high quality job opportunities for employees. This indicator includes the following specific to “high quality job opportunities” referring to the way in which work is packaged and offers capacity for growth and development. Specific indicators for this include: training opportunities are in place for employees.</p>	
<p>FME response (including any evidence submitted)</p>	<p>Documents: <i>Timber Sale Administration and BMPs</i> training Agenda and Participant list; <i>Biodiversity Management on State Forest Lands</i> Agenda and Participant List; progress report on the development of a classification-specific training guide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MDNR conducted four 2-day District Trainings in July and August on Timber Sale Administration and BMPs. Training was mandatory for Foresters and Forest Techs and included both classroom and field components. • MDNR conducted 2 Regional trainings on Biodiversity Management on State Forest Lands in August. • The classification guide is designed to summarize minimum training requirement by classification and describe current opportunities to assist with development/updating of individual training plans.
<p>SCS review</p>	<p>Training offerings were reviewed and participation by appropriate personnel were confirmed. Topical areas were sufficient and interviews with forestry staff demonstrated knowledge of content. Discussions with staff regarding implementation of training technical knowledge in the field and implementation of techniques support and warrant closure of this CAR.</p>

Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>
-----------------------	---

Finding Number: 2017.2	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	5.3.b
<p>Non-Conformity: Baraga Quattro’s First Timber Sale (Sale Number 11-013-16), Units 5 and 6 have multiple sections of skid trails with rutting that exceeds the MDNR’s limit of rutting which is 12-inches deep by 50 feet long. The rutting was not noted in sale administration notes nor was there any evidence of attempts to repair the ruts. Also on the Gwinn Yellow Rock East timber sale, Unit 3, deep but “acceptable” rutting was observed in many locations within the cutting unit, with one location where the limit (both depth and length) was exceeded.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: FME must ensure harvest practices are managed to protect residual trees and other forest resources. Forest resources explicitly include minimizing soil compaction, rutting and erosion.</p>	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	<p>BMP trainings as described in the closure of 2017.1, above.</p> <p>The following corrective actions were completed prior to the 2018 audit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gwinn FMU-Contractor installed water bars and placed slash on the impacted area east of the road. Where the rutting was the worst on the hill south and west of the main road, the area was bladed, ruts filled in and slash placed over the skid trails. Work completed 22 June 2018. • Baraga FMU-No restoration recommended as action may cause more damage to site. From Unit Manager: “Due the very wet nature of this summer the contractor who had cut the sale has not been back in the area to conduct repair work. Keweenaw Co has recorded >20” of rain since 1 June including 6.72” of total rain in 24 hours on 16-17 June 2018 (1000 year rain event) and an additional 3.05” within 24 hours on 12 July 2018.
SCS review	<p>Training information and the site corrective actions taken were reported prior to beginning the field audit. During the audit site inspections included close attention to any potential evidence of rutting at field sites.</p> <p>At sites where some rutting occurred, in each case, foresters had identified, noted and immediately sought corrective actions and completed any remediations confirming functionality of the management system and capacity to minimize soil compaction, rutting, and erosion. Numerous interviews with field staff confirmed consistent knowledge of applicable BMP requirements reflecting the trainings described. All together the FME responses warrant closure of this CAR.</p>

Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>
-----------------------	---

Finding Number: 2017.3	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	6.5.b
<p>Non-Conformity: The road drainage provisions on Little Garlic Forest Road, Gwinn Management Unit are not maintained per Michigan BMPs for “Road Management Measures for Permanent and Temporary Roads”, notably the fourth bullet on page 38: “Perform maintenance when conditions warrant, including ... sedimentation control structures. The auditor observed many potholes (some large), surface water ponding, lack of road crown, some surface road unraveling, and inadequate ditching.</p>	
<p>Corrective Action Request: FME shall ensure forest operations meet or exceed Best Management Practices (BMPs) that address components of the Criterion where the operation takes place including road provisions.</p>	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	Documents: <i>Timber Sale Administration and BMPs training Agenda and Participant list.</i> FME supplied site information and opportunity to inspect sites allowing examination of state permanent roads over the course of the audit.
SCS review	BMP compliance was confirmed for roads inspected during the 2018 audit. Interviews with forestry staff confirmed routine and consistent application of BMP road construction knowledge. FME was able to demonstrate that forest operations, specifically forest road provisions, meet or exceed BMPs specifically in reference to impacting applicable water bodies or impediments to water flow/fisheries, warranting closure of this CAR.
Status of CAR:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

Finding Number: 2017.4	
Select one: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	6.6.a
Non-Conformity: The Michigan Department of Natural Resources permitted use of a pesticide listed in the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticide which is a no-conformity to this indicator. Use was self-reported by DNR on 22 September 2017 in a letter from the Section Manager of the DNR for use of permethrin for public health purposes.	
Corrective Action Request: FME is to ensure no products on the FSC list of Highly Hazardous Pesticides are used (see FSC-POL-30-001 EN FSC Pesticides policy 2005 and associated documents). However, FSC-PRO-30-001 (v1.0), Pesticide Derogation Procedures provides procedures for when, in the event of the interest of public health, Section 9, <i>HHP use mandated or carried out by public authorities</i> may be applied.	
FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	<p>An emergency derogation for use of Permethrin by state health department decree for treatment of confirmed West Nile Virus was filed with SCS. SCS evaluated and approved 3 October 2017.</p> <p><u>Documents submitted:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annex 2 notification and justification.pdf - This includes the original Annex 2 form, and supporting documentation as described below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Letter of notification dated 22 September 2017 from David L. Price, Section Manager of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources for use of permethrin for public health purposes. b. Annex 2, notification of emergency derogation for use of permethrin. c. Notification of elevated human health risk dated 16 August 2017 by the Medical Director and Health Officer of the Department of Public Health of West Nile virus following positive confirmation in horse and avian species in Midland County, Michigan. d. Public notification dated 14 August 2017 providing detailed species and locations for confirmed West Nile virus in Midland County, Michigan and providing safety recommendations for the general population. e. Notice from the state governmental Michigan Department of Human Health confirming first human cases of West Nile Virus in Michigan, dated 31 August 2017. Four cases of human West Nile Virus confirmed in four Michigan Counties. Additionally, avian WNV found in 44 of 83 counties in Michigan. 2. Local government notice-application.pdf - This includes as described below: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notice and plan by local governmental official of intent to spray for mosquito control that would occur on state lands.

SCS review	<p>SCS reviewed all of the above documents, the emergency derogation application approved and submitted to FSC Pesticides Policy Committee 3 October 2017. The Emergency Derogation was approved by FSC 7 November 2017. MI DNR fully conformed to requirements 9.1-9.8 of FSC-PRO-30-001 in reporting use and submitting emergency derogation application within 30 days of use. Additionally, MI DNR excised the property affected (316 acres). Actions taken and documents reviewed confirm the closure of this CAR is warranted as of 7 November 2017.</p> <p>During the 2018 audit full implementation of these changes were confirmed.</p>
Status of CAR:	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Closed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other decision (refer to description above)</p>

4.4 New Corrective Action Requests and Observations

Finding Number: 2018.1	
Select one: <input type="checkbox"/> Major CAR <input type="checkbox"/> Minor CAR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation	
FMU CAR/OBS issued to (when more than one FMU):	
Deadline	<input type="checkbox"/> Pre-condition to certification/recertification <input type="checkbox"/> 3 months from Issuance of Final Report <input type="checkbox"/> 12 months or next regularly scheduled audit (surveillance or re-evaluation) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Observation – response is optional <input type="checkbox"/> Other deadline (specify):
FSC Indicator:	8.4.b
<p>Non-Conformity (or Background/ Justification in the case of Observations):</p> <p>Interviews of Division of Forestry, Parks, and Wildlife Divisions confirmed ongoing efforts to implement strategic plans with objectives related to road inventory and related infrastructure system needs. For example, Management Units are using the Resource Damage Report system, to record and prioritize infrastructure needs. This monitoring indicates an accumulation of road issues across Management Units. The DNR has already Identified road maintenance issues as an area of focus and is currently in process of inventorying, classifying and recording related infrastructure for all roads in the state forest system in response to new legislation, PA 288. This effort is ongoing.</p> <p>Re-construction and maintenance of permanent, open forest roads continues to be a challenge for the DNR. The program would be greatly strengthened by improvements in planning and subsequent implementation of a maintenance program for the permanent road system. During the 2018 audit, many portions of permanent forest roads observed and/or traveled during the audit could be improved for drainage. However, no cases of inadequate road Best Management Practices (BMPs) leading to sedimentation of streams or wetland were observed. Many sections of road are embedded slightly below grade, have two-tracks, have a grading berm, and/or have no crown to disperse surface water. One road for which significant road improvement work is in progress has not been completed or graded in over a year.</p> <p>The DNR should consider strengthening and supporting development of road maintenance planning for forest management staff. This would, in turn, help manage changes expected from PA 288, which is</p>	

highly likely to increase recreational traffic on forest roads. This would also help meet **Objective 4** of the “Forest Resources Division Strategic Plan, 2014-2018”.

In summary, MI DNR monitoring shows accumulating road maintenance needs that suggests the DNR should update its strategic planning relative to road maintenance to address accumulating road quality issues, particularly in consideration of changes driven by PA 288 . Because the FME has already identified this issue, is currently taking actions towards solutions, and is otherwise in conformance with the forest management standard this finding is justified as an Observation rather than a Minor Non-conformity.

Corrective Action Request (or Observation):

Where monitoring indicates that management objectives and guidelines, including those necessary for conformance with this Standard, are not being met or if changing conditions indicate that a change in management strategy is necessary, the management plan, operational plans, and/or other plan implementation measures are revised to ensure the objectives and guidelines will be met. If monitoring shows that the management objectives and guidelines themselves are not sufficient to ensure conformance with this Standard, then the objectives and guidelines are modified.

Changes in objectives and guidelines for the road maintenance program under PA 288 should be considered. MI DNR should also consider changes in management strategies to strengthen the ability for continued conformance with the standard, particularly around provisions relative to road maintenance.

FME response <i>(including any evidence submitted)</i>	
SCS review	
Status of CAR:	<input type="checkbox"/> Closed <input type="checkbox"/> Upgraded to Major <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Other decision (refer to description above)</i>

5. Stakeholder Comments

In accordance with SCS protocols, consultation with key stakeholders is an integral component of the evaluation process. Stakeholder consultation takes place prior to, concurrent with, and following field evaluations. Distinct purposes of such consultation include:

- To solicit input from affected parties as to the strengths and weaknesses of the FME’s management, relative to the standard, and the nature of the interaction between the FME and the surrounding communities.
- To solicit input on whether the forest management operation has consulted with stakeholders regarding identifying any high conservation value forests (HCVFs).

Stakeholder consultation activities are organized to give participants the opportunity to provide comments according to general categories of interest based on the three FSC chambers, as well as the SCS Interim Standard, if one was used.

5.1 Stakeholder Groups Consulted

Principal stakeholder groups are identified based upon results from past evaluations, lists of stakeholders from the FME under evaluation, and additional stakeholder contacts from other sources. Stakeholder groups who are consulted as part of the evaluation include FME management and staff, consulting foresters, contractors, lease holders, adjacent property owners, local and regionally-based social interest and civic organizations, purchasers of logs harvested on FME forestlands, recreational user groups, tribal members and/or representatives, members of the FSC National Initiative, members of the regional FSC working group, FSC International, local and regionally-based environmental organizations and conservationists, and forest industry groups and organizations, as well as local, state, and federal regulatory agency personnel and other relevant groups.

5.2 Summary of Stakeholder Comments and Evaluation Team Responses

The table below summarizes the major comments received from stakeholders and the assessment team’s response. Where a stakeholder comment has triggered a subsequent investigation during the evaluation, the corresponding follow-up action and conclusions from SCS are noted below.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FME has not received any stakeholder comments from interested parties as a result of stakeholder outreach activities during this annual evaluation.	
Stakeholder Comment	SCS Response
None received.	

6. Certification Decision

The certificate holder has demonstrated continued overall conformance to the applicable Forest Stewardship Council standards. The SCS annual evaluation team recommends that the certificate be sustained, subject to subsequent annual evaluations and the FME’s response to any open CARs.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	

7. Annual Data Update

<input type="checkbox"/> No changes since previous evaluation.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information in the following sections has changed since previous evaluation.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Name and Contact Information <input type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scope of Certificate <input type="checkbox"/> Non-SLIMF FMUs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Social Information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pesticide and Other Chemical Use <input type="checkbox"/> Production Forests <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Product Classification <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conservation & High Conservation Value Areas <input type="checkbox"/> Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification

Name and Contact Information

Organization name	Michigan Department of Natural Resources		
Contact person	Keith Kintigh, Forest Certification and Conservation Specialist		
Address	DNR Gaylord Customer Service Center	Telephone	989-732-3541x5016
	1732 W. M-32	Fax	989-732-0794
	Gaylord, MI 49735	e-mail	kintighk@michigan.gov
		Website	http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/

FSC Sales Information

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FSC Sales contact information same as above.			
FSC salesperson			
Address	Telephone		
	Fax		
	e-mail		
	Website		

Scope of Certificate

Certificate Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Single FMU	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple FMU	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group		
SLIMF (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/> Small SLIMF certificate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low intensity SLIMF certificate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Group SLIMF certificate		
# Group Members (if applicable)	NA		
Number of FMUs in scope of certificate	NA		
Geographic location of non-SLIMF FMU(s)	<i>Latitude & Longitude:</i>		
Forest zone	<input type="checkbox"/> Boreal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Temperate	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Subtropical	<input type="checkbox"/> Tropical	
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac			
privately managed	-		
state managed	3,799,368		
community managed	-		
Number of FMUs in scope that are:			
less than 100 ha in area		100 - 1000 ha in area	
1000 - 10 000 ha in area		more than 10 000 ha in area	1
Total forest area in scope of certificate which is included in FMUs that: Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac			
are less than 100 ha in area	-		
are between 100 ha and 1000 ha in area	-		
meet the eligibility criteria as <i>low intensity</i> SLIMF FMUs	-		

Division of FMUs into manageable units:
The State Forest is located throughout the Northern Lower Peninsula (LP) and across the Upper Peninsula (UP). The State Forest is organized into 15 management units, 8 in the LP and 7 in the UP:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lower Peninsula: Cadillac, Gladwin, Roscommon, Grayling, Traverse City, Atlanta, Gaylord, and Pigeon River Country
Upper Peninsula: Sault Ste. Marie, Newberry, Shingleton, Escanaba, Gwinn, Crystal Falls, and Baraga

Social Information

Number of forest workers (including contractors) working in forest within scope of certificate (differentiated by gender):		
male workers: # 550	female workers: # 181	
Number of accidents in forest work since previous evaluation:	Serious: # 17	Fatal: # 0

Pesticide and Other Chemical Use*

Commercial name of pesticide / herbicide	Active ingredient	Reason for use	Unit	Area	Qty by Unit
Aqua Neat	Glyphosate	Invasive Phragmites Control	fl	2.85	9.8
AquaNeat	Glyphosate	Non-Native Phragmites Control	pints/ac	17	6
AquaPro	Glyphosate	Phrag Control	pints/ac	17	6
Arsenal AC	Imazapyr	Utility Maintenance	gal.	11	0.15
Copper Sulfate	EPA Reg No. 73020-2	Walleye Movement	lbs	7	70
Cygnat Plus	Glyphosate	Phrag Control	pint/ac	5	1
Escort	Aminopyralid	Invasive Species Control in ROW	oz/ac	0	2
Escort	Triclopyr	Utility Maintenance	Ounces	6	5
Esplanade	Indaziflam	Utility Maintenance	gal.	2	0.052
Garlon	Triclopyr	Release	gal.	487	166.4
Garlon	Triclopyr	Site Prep	ga.	3	1
Garlon	Triclopyr	Site Prep	gal.	253	144.5
Garlon 3A	Triclopyr	Release	gal.	68	15
Garlon 3A	Triclopyr	Utility Maintenance	gal.	11	1.4
Garlon 3A	Triclopyr	Utility Maintenance	Quarts	101	233
Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr	Release	ga.	51	16.5
Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr	Release	gal.	308	155.5
Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr	Site Prep	gal.	29	14.3
Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr	Utility Maintenance	gal.	73	11
Garlon 4 Ultra	Triclopyr	Utility Maintenance	Quarts	15	82
Milestone	Aminopyralid	Invasive Species Control in ROW	oz/ac	0	7

Milestone	Aminopyralid	Opening/Spotted Knapweed Control	oz.	12	57.5
Prenfish Toxicant	Rotenone	Prep Walleye Pond	gal.	3	2
Prenfish Toxicant	Rotenone	Prep Walleye Pond	gal.	20	7
Ranger Pro	Glyphosate	Site Prep	gal.	33	27
Ranger Pro/Credit 41	Glyphosate	Site Prep	gal.	7	5.25
Rodeo	Glyphosate	Phrag Control	pints/ac	5	6
Rodeo	Glyphosate	Phragmites on Dike	oz.	0	12
Rodeo	Glyphosate	Red Pine Release	gal.	231	139.1
Rodeo	Glyphosate	Red Pine Site Prep	gal.	42	48
Rodeo	Glyphosate	Release	gal	165	61.9
Rodeo	Glyphosate	Release	gal.	749	473.2
Rodeo	Glyphosate	Site Prep	gal	56	42
Rodeo	Glyphosate	Site Prep	gal.	249	191.5
Rodeo	Glyphosate	Utility Maintenance	gal.	13	23.75
Rodeo	Glyphosate	Utility Maintenance	oz.	91	1547
Round Up	Glyphosate	Food Plot	Gallons	55	13.75
Roundup	Glyphosate	Food Plot	gal.	22	11
Stalker	Imazapyr	Utility Maintenance	gal.	73	1.19
Velpar - L	Hexazinone	Red Pine Release	gal.	11	8.5
Velpar L	Hexazinone	Red Pine Release	gal.	33	25.25

*Summarized from the following provided by the MIDNR:



2017-Annual
Summary Pesticide U

Production Forests

Timber Forest Products	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Total area of production forest (i.e. forest from which timber may be harvested)	2.4 million
Area of production forest classified as 'plantation'	0
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by replanting or by a combination of replanting and coppicing of the planted stems	600,000
Area of production forest regenerated primarily by natural regeneration, or by a combination of natural regeneration and coppicing of the naturally regenerated stems	1.9 million
Silvicultural system(s)	Area under type of management
Even-aged management	-

Clearcut (clearcut size range)	1.7 million
Shelterwood	200,000
Other:	-
Uneven-aged management	-
Individual tree selection	500,000
Group selection	-
Other:	-
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (e.g. nursery, recreation area, windbreak, bamboo, silvo-pastoral system, agro-forestry system, etc.)	-
Non-timber Forest Products (NTFPs)	
Area of forest protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for the production of NTFPs or services	0
Other areas managed for NTFPs or services	0
Approximate annual commercial production of non-timber forest products included in the scope of the certificate, by product type	0
Species in scope of joint FM/COC certificate: (Scientific / Latin Name and Common / Trade Name)	
Black ash (<i>Fraxinus nigra</i>); green ash (<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>); white ash (<i>Fraxinus americana</i>); bigtooth aspen (<i>Populus grandidentata</i>); Trembling aspen (<i>Populus tremuloides</i>); balm of Gilead (<i>Populus balsamifera</i>); balsam fir (<i>Abies balsamea</i>); basswood (<i>Tilia Americana</i>); paper birch (<i>Betula papyrifera</i>); yellow birch (<i>Betula alleghaniensis</i>); white cedar (<i>Thuja occidentalis</i>); black cherry (<i>Prunus serotina</i>); Eastern Hemlock (<i>Thuja Canadensis</i>); sugar maple (<i>Acer saccharum</i>); red maple (<i>Acer rubrum</i>); northern red oak (<i>Quercus rubra</i>); northern pin oak (<i>Quercus ellipsoidalis</i>); white oak (<i>Quercus alba</i>); jack pine (<i>Pinus banksiana</i>); red pine (<i>Pinus resinosa</i>); white pine (<i>Pinus strobes</i>); black spruce (<i>Picea ,mariana</i>); white spruce (<i>Picea glauca</i>); tamarack (<i>Larix laricina</i>);	

FSC Product Classification

Timber products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Species
W1 Rough Wood	W1.1 Roundwood (logs)	All
W1 Rough Wood	W1.2 Fuel Wood	All
W1 Rough Wood	W1.3 Twigs	All
W2 Wood charcoal		
W3 Wood in chips or particles	W3.1 Wood chips	All
Non-Timber Forest Products		
Product Level 1	Product Level 2	Product Level 3 and Species
N1 Bark		

Conservation and High Conservation Value Areas

Conservation Area	Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input type="checkbox"/> ac
<p>Total amount of land in certified area protected from commercial harvesting of timber and managed primarily for conservation objectives (includes both forested and non-forested lands).*</p>	<p>184,000 acres</p> <p><i>Note 1:</i> Areas is comprised of: Dedicated and Proposed Natural Areas, National Natural Landmarks, TNC Natural Area Registry, Critical Dunes, Natural Rivers, Ecological Reference Areas, and Type 1 & 2 Old Growth. <i>Note:</i> These areas are not mutually exclusive of the HCV Types as described below.</p> <p><i>Note 2:</i> This total may or may not match HCV areas as some HCV areas must be managed to maintain, enhance or restore those attributes of interest.</p>

**Note: Total conservation and HCV areas may differ since these may serve different functions in the FME’s management system. Designation as HCV may allow for active management, including commercial harvest. Conservation areas are typically under passive management, but may undergo invasive species control, prescribed burns, non-commercial harvest, and other management activities intended to maintain or enhance their integrity. In all cases, figures are reported by the FME as it pertains local laws & regulations, management objectives, and FSC requirements.*

High Conservation Value Forest / Areas			Units: <input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac
Code	HCV Type	Description & Location	Area
HCV1	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).	Designated Kirtland’s Warbler Management Units, Eastern Massasauga Rattlesnake Managed Lands, and Piping Plover Critical Habitat.	213,022 * ¹
HCV2	Forests or areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.	Common Ecological Reference Areas, Dedicated State Natural Areas (SNAs), State Natural Rivers (SNR), and Dedicated Habitat Areas for Interior Core Forest Species	89,792 * ²
HCV3	Forests or areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.	Critical Dunes, Coastal Environmental Areas, and Rare/Sensitive/Vulnerable Ecological Reference Areas.	107,131
HCV4	Forests or areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).	None located upon the Michigan State Forest system.	0
HCV5	Forests or areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).	None located upon the Michigan State Forest system.	0

HCV6	Forests or areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities).	The Michigan DNR currently utilizes other mechanisms to identify, conserve, and manage areas critical to local communities' traditional cultural identity such as THPO, SHPO, Compartment Review, land use permits, and designation as "Special Conservation Areas".	0
Total area of forest classified as 'High Conservation Value Forest / Area'			338,585 * ³

*¹ The approximately 149,000 of dedicated Kirtland's warbler habitat are intensively managed jack pine stands.

*² Approximately 10,376 acres of dedicated Interior Core Species habitat is available for timber production.

*³ The reported HCV 1-3 categories are not cumulative. The reported 338,585 acres total reflects elimination of 57,060 acres of overlap among the HCV 1-3 categories.

Areas Outside of the Scope of Certification (Partial Certification and Excision)

<input type="checkbox"/> <i>N/A – All forestland owned or managed by the applicant is included in the scope.</i>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Applicant owns and/or manages other FMUs not under evaluation.</i>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Applicant wishes to excise portions of the FMU(s) under evaluation from the scope of certification.</i>	
Explanation for exclusion of FMUs and/or excision:	<p>This certificate excludes: long-term military lease lands, lands leased to Luce County, Wildlife and Fisheries Areas that do not go through the compartment review process, and included in Midland County mosquito control.</p> <p><i>Note 1:</i> The certified State Forest system includes all lands which are inventoried under the MiFi forest inventory system, are identified in a State Forest Compartment, and go through the Michigan DNR compartment review process.</p> <p><i>Note 2:</i> Areas excluded are done so primarily because the DNR does not exercise full control over management activities, or because the purposes for which the lands are held are not necessarily benefited by forest certification (e.g. the lands are not jointly co-managed by the DNR Forest Management and Wildlife Divisions and are devoted primarily to Wildlife or Fisheries management or State Parks).</p>
Control measures to prevent mixing of certified and non-certified product (C8.3):	Any timber harvests in non-certified forests are not sold or advertised as certified. Fisheries Research/ Hatcheries and agricultural areas are outside of the scope of FSC certification as no forest products or services are directly managed.
Description of FMUs excluded from, or forested area excised from, the scope of certification:	
Name of FMU or Stand	Location (city, state, country) Size (<input type="checkbox"/> ha or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ac)

Long Term Military Lease Lands	Otsego, Crawford, and Kalkaska Counties in the Northern Lower Peninsula of Michigan	101,567 acres
Lands Leased to Luce County	Luce County in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan	2,786 acres
Michigan State Park System	Throughout Michigan	286,000 acres
Wildlife Management Units administered by DNR Wildlife Division	Primarily located in the Southern Lower Peninsula of Michigan	350,000 acres
Fisheries Research Areas/Hatcheries	Southern and Northern Lower Peninsula of Michigan	4,145 acres
Lands available for planting to GMO corn/soybeans	Northern Lower Peninsula of Michigan	424 acres
Lands included in contingency adulticide treatment as part of Midland County Mosquito Control Program	Midland County in the Lower Peninsula of Michigan	316 acres