

**MEETING SUMMARY**  
**FOREST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FMAC) MEETING**  
**April 15, 2009**  
**Michigan United Conservation Clubs of Michigan**  
**2101 Wood Street, Lansing**  
**1:00 – 4:00 p.m.**

**FMAC MEMBERS PRESENT**

Mr. Tom Barnes, Chair, Michigan Association of Timbermen  
Mr. Warren Suchovsky, Suchovsky Logging  
Ms. Lynne M. Boyd, Department of Natural Resources (DNR)  
Mr. William Manson, Jr., Michigan Snowmobile Association  
Mr. Desmond Jones, Michigan Tree Farm System  
Dr. Daniel Keathley, Michigan State University  
Mr. William (Bill) Botti, Vice-Chair, Michigan Forest Association  
Dr. Margaret (Peg) Gale, Michigan Tech  
Dr. Katherine (Katie) J. Kahl, Heart of the Lakes (representing Ms. Rachel Kuntzsch)  
Ms. Erin McDonough, MUCC (representing Ms. Amy Spray)  
Mr. Frank Ruswick, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality  
Dr. Donna LaCourt, Michigan Economic Development Corporation (via conf call)

**FMAC ADVISORS PRESENT**

Mr. Barry Paulson, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service,  
Huron-Manistee  
Mr. Andy Henricksen, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service

**FMAC MEMBERS ABSENT**

Mr. Joel Blohm, Great Northern Lumber of Michigan  
Mr. George Berghorn, Michigan Forest Products Council  
Mr. Stephen Shine, Michigan Department of Agriculture  
Mr. Marvin Roberson, Sierra Club  
Mr. Thomas Dunn, American Motorcycle Association, District 14

**PUBLIC ATTENDEES / GUESTS**

Ms. Cara Boucher, DNR  
Mr. Lee Murray, Snowmobile Advisory Committee  
Ms. Amy Eagle, DNR  
Dr. Lawrence Pedersen, DNR

**I. WELCOME**

**Chair Barnes** called the Forest Management Advisory Committee meeting to order at 1:07 p.m. He introduced Mr. Botti as Vice-Chair, and thanked the FMAC for trusting him to lead them for the next few years. He stated he is looking forward to taking the FMAC to the next level.

**Chair Barnes** commented he had planned on compiling the comments regarding the role of the FMAC that were received from the members and provide a report, but will defer until the June 17, 2009 meeting.

**Chair Barnes** introduced Ms. Boucher, State Forester, Ms. Boyd, Chief, Forest, Mineral and Fire Management, and Ms. Korbecki, FMAC Assistant, from the Department of Natural Resources. He asked the FMAC to please contact him via e-mail or phone if they have any concerns. He stated he firmly believes in what the FMAC is doing and that as a whole it can provide the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) with excellent input in regard to forest resources.

**I. ACTION ITEMS:****• Adoption of April 15, 2009 Agenda**

**Chair Barnes** requested comments regarding the April 15, 2009 FMAC meeting agenda; there were none. He requested a motion to adopt.

**MOTION:** **Mr. Suchovsky** moved to adopt the agenda as presented; supported by **Dr. Keathley**.  
**Motion passed unanimously.**

**• Adoption of February 18, 2009 Meeting Summary**

**Chair Barnes** stated according to the FMAC Bylaws, if no comments were received within one week of the meeting the meeting summary will be considered adopted. He requested a motion to adopt.

**MOTION:** **Mr. Suchovsky** moved to adopt the February 18, 2009 FMAC Meeting Summary, supported by **Mr. Jones**.  
**Motion passed unanimously.**

**II. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**III. SNOWMOBILE AND LOGGING CONFLICTS**

**Chair Barnes** reported the above subject was presented at a meeting with Forestry and Natural Resources Commission attendees. The discussion was regarding snowmobiler and logger interaction. **Chair Barnes** noted he would like the FMAC to assist in determining what the conflicts and concerns are out there, and provide recommendation to the DNR and the Michigan Snowmobile Association (MSA). He asked Mr. Manson to explain the difficulties the snowmobilers are experiencing.

**Mr. Manson** said there are issues every year. Michigan has 64 different grant sponsors. The MSA has tried each year to get the public to attend DNR compartment reviews so the public could comment on areas that would be affected but without much success. **Mr. Manson** stated that communication between the DNR and the clubs is causing problems. The dilemma is the time from the contract to when the work actually takes place, and coordination between DNR field contacts. The general feeling is if the clubs could work with the loggers to reroute the trails to make it accessible they (the clubs) would be satisfied.

**Mr. Suchovsky** commented the difficulty the loggers run into is they may have a contract for a year or two, and have no idea when they may be going in to do the work; much of it is market dependent. He agreed with Mr. Manson there is a need for better communication. **Mr. Suchovsky** also stated the loggers need to be more consistent with posting signs while they are completing a job.

**Mr. Manson** asked if the DNR could notify grant sponsors where the sales are, and what roads will be closed so they can reroute the trail. **Ms. Boucher** responded the difficulty the DNR has is at any given time, there are 1,000 to 1,200 acre sales; to track down exactly when they are going to be worked on can be difficult. She also agreed this conflict is something that needs to be worked on. **Mr. Manson** suggested the land manager knows when a trail is going to be involved, and it would be helpful if they would be more proactive when working with the sponsors. He stated if a sponsor is advised, they can go out prior to the trail being closed and find an alternative route. **Dr. Gale** inquired if MSA or the DNR can work with the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) to put the snowmobile trails on their website, and have MDOT work with information from the loggers to create an interactive map; the idea being to see if MDOT will partner with the loggers.

**Ms. Boucher** responded that the DNR does not have a database with all the access roads and snowmobile trails located on state land as of yet. She stated the DNR does have a layer of the designated snowmobile trails and she would have to work with Mr. Jim Radabaugh, State Trails Coordinator, on the trails to try to determine which trails intersect with timber sales. **Ms. Boyd** stated the idea of working with MDOT at this time would not be beneficial for the DNR because of their engineering standards; the DNR and MDOT have not been able to come to an agreement on public vs. other roads.

**Vice-Chair Botti** asked if this is a subject that should be presented at the DNR compartment reviews; **Mr. Manson** responded that it has been discussed at the compartment reviews but the problem is the time lapse between reviews and actual sales, which causes loss of information. **Chair Barnes** stated part of the problem is sales are seasonal; companies may have 3-year contracts, but actually only have 18 months to complete the contract. He suggested getting a list of sales to distribute to the clubs, and then request local meetings to determine approximately when they logger thinks the sale will be taking place which would give time for the sponsor to determine an alternate route prior to the start of the sale. **Mr. Manson** commented 90% of the sales are not issues but a small percentage of trails get shut down or the clubs aren't notified in time to get an alternate route in place. **Chair Barnes** stated the biggest thing for the loggers is communication; they feel they can operate in harmony with the snowmobilers but it's a matter of getting the logistics worked out so everyone is safe.

**Ms. Boucher** suggested working on making the process more automated. She indicated the DNR Recreation Specialists have opportunities to work with the sponsors more closely, as well as the recreation manager or the land manager when making an alternate route. She stated she will follow up with the software and try to come up with other ideas to assist with this issue.

**Mr. Suchovsky** asked who a snowmobiler would contact to check on trail conditions; **Mr. Manson** suggested checking with their place of lodging or a local Chamber of Commerce. He also stated there have been a few websites that have started having trail conditions posted, and recommended both Grand Marais and Keweenaw's websites. **Mr. Suchovsky** also expressed the feeling that most are multi-use trails and need to be considered in the future.

**Chair Barnes** stated he will be working, in conjunction with the DNR, to solve some of these issues. He asked Ms. Boucher and Ms. Boyd to look at alternatives and schedule a meeting in the fall to see what the FMAC can come up with as far as where and when work will be done, and find a way to list it. **Chair Barnes** asked for any additional comments; there were none.

#### IV. WOODY BIOMASS UPDATE – Cara Boucher

**Chair Barnes** gave the floor to Ms. Boucher.

**Ms. Boucher** reported the DNR has been working the last year on statewide guidance for the process of woody biomass harvesting in the state. At the end of February 2009, the DNR held a couple of meetings to finalize the draft guidance; about 25 people attended. She stated several members of the FMAC have been involved and they would be holding Go-to-Meetings next week to discuss the most recent draft, and to try to come up with a final draft. **Chair Barnes** asked Ms. Boucher if the current draft has been sent to the FMAC members; **Ms. Boucher** responded she will be presenting the draft document to the FMAC at the June 17 FMAC meeting.

**Ms. Boucher** stated some of the discussion groups covered what the definition of biomass is. There are many definitions; it can go from the trunk of the tree down to the root systems, to stumps, to needles and on. The group tried to break it out and look at the considerations related to using different elements and what sort of things you should think about when using specific parts. The recommendation was, in most guidance, the suggestion is you start out taking between 1 to 6 tops

of trees that are harvested; depending on the site, either work up or down. The group suggested staying with something that is easy to implement, i.e. every 3 trees cut leave 1 of the tops, or every 6 trees cut leave 1 top. **Ms. Boucher** reported it has been good process with many different interests involved. **Chair Barnes** requested the FMAC be allowed to come up with a recommendation to the DNR before the draft document goes through the review process. **Chair Barnes** thanked Ms. Boucher for her update.

#### V. **BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION PLANS**

**Chair Barnes** introduced Mr. Pedersen and Ms. Eagle who is heading up the biodiversity conservation planning process.

**Mr. Pedersen** stated the DNR started in the early to mid-90s designating potential old growth areas. Over the years the DNR formed a public advisory team (PAC). Gradually there were more and more acres accumulated and over 300,000 acres were identified as potential old growth areas. When forest certification became a requirement for the state, it sharpened the DNR's focus in this area. Late last year, Ms. Eagle returned to the DNR and now there is a biodiversity conservation planning process which fits in with other planning processes.

**Ms. Eagle** stated the overall goal of the process is to find a way to conserve the full native biological diversity of the state. The DNR has other programs, some species specific, all with the effort to conserve biodiversity. This process is looking at biodiversity and how the DNR can conserve different variations of ecological systems. It will hopefully also be conserving the different species and the genetic diversity of the species that occur within the systems. The process the DNR is working on now is trying to identify the best places to conserve example of these systems in the state. Together these example areas will form a network of functional, representative areas on the landscape called Biodiversity Stewardship Areas (BSAs).

**Ms. Eagle** commented that the focus is on state lands but the DNR is aware that different types of ecosystems does not occur just on state land. The DNR needs to work with other partners and landowners in a cooperative manner, but this process does not dictate how private landowners can manage their land.

**Ms. Eagle** reported the DNR worked with an original Public Advisory Team beginning in the early 2000's to provide guidance on how the DNR should go about preserving biodiversity. This Team's recommendations were used to develop the Biodiversity Conservation Planning Process. In 2007, the DNR formed a new Public Advisory Team and has worked with them to create an implementation plan which is fine-tuned for people who will actually be doing the work. The implementation plan provides guidance and criteria for selecting BSAs. DNR GIS staff has completed an analysis to identify potential BSAs. Field staff has also been asked for recommendations, and other partners have been asked for any analyses they have done, as well suggestions for biodiversity conversation areas.

**Ms. Eagle** stated within each ecoregion, the DNR will be putting together a core design team. This team will be responsible for designing a recommended set of BSAs in their region. The team's responsibility will be to use the guidance document to ask questions such as *where are the best areas within the ecoregion; what areas do we already know about; and are there certain types of systems that need to be looked at*. The team's recommended set will go through a DNR internal and public review and then will be presented to the statewide council (SWC) for approval. Once approved by the SWC, the DNR will begin talking about management objectives and goals. This will be linked to all ownership ecoregional planning and all planning processes within the DNR. A review will be conducted every ten years to determine if the areas being worked on are still the most beneficial; it will be an ongoing discussion over time.

**Ms. McDonough** questioned the reasoning behind starting this process; **Ms. Eagle** responded it goes back a long time. Early on it was stakeholder driven to look for areas with potential old growth and identifying those areas so management could proceed in a way that was correct for those conditions. Eventually it was decided that there are many unique regions and it was essential to find a way to represent the full biodiversity of the state. At one point there was a lot of activity which eventually lulled, then with forest certification requirements in the state it was realized there are certain standards that if this process is implemented it will assist in meeting certification standards. **Ms. Boucher** added there are statutes that direct the DNR to do this type of work.

**Mr. Ruswick** asked if the forest service is involved; **Ms. Eagle** responded it is involved but at this time does not have staff on the core design team, which includes landowners, the Nature Conservancy, the rough Grouse Society, and a Department of Environmental Quality staff member. The tribes have also been invited to participate.

**Dr. Gale** asked how the DNR deals with the fact that a large part of biodiversity may be in other landowner holdings; **Ms. Eagle** responded the goal is to find the best places for biodiversity conservation. While identifying areas the DNR is asking the core design team to look at long-term objectives including what the ownership is of adjacent lands. The management of ownership and a sense of how long-term that ownership will stay in place are important. The core design teams are also looking for partnerships with other landowners as well as conservation easement for non-DNR managed lands. **Dr. Gale** commented in forestry they used to look at desired future conditions; she would like the core design teams to consider this also. **Ms. Eagle** stated the team is currently looking for the best areas. Although these areas may not be in the best condition at this time, they will have good potential for restoration which is where future condition comes in. **Ms. Eagle** stated she would forward the guidance documents to Ms. Korbecki to send to the FMAC.

**Vice-Chair Botti** stated he is pleased with the approach that was proposed by the team. The idea of allowing things to happen naturally as well as mimicking the natural occurrences makes him optimistic that this is a realistic project.

**Mr. Suchovsky** stated this has already happened in some areas of the Eastern Upper Peninsula. He commented there was a meeting in Marquette where landscape planning was discussed and a number of people were thinking along the same lines. He asked if there were any plans for Keweenaw County in the future. He commented that most of the virgin pine in the area is dead and there is no recruitment on the ground. He stated systems move around, so it is important to keep the dynamics of the systems and how the planning process will begin in mind to consider that.

**Dr. Kahl** asked if the public advisory team or the core design team is the main group; **Ms. Eagle** responded the guidance criteria was developed by DNR staff and the public advisory team, and that the core design team is now applying that guidance in the selection of BSAs.

**Chair Barnes** stated that part of the charge of the core design team is to look at data layers available to us, consider what the best case scenario is, and talk with people to find out if they think there are better areas and if it is a good representation of a region's biodiversity. This feedback will be brought back to the team by members and they will try to reach an agreement. There is a need to get planning done because of certification requirements and this has created a time crunch; to save time, the public advisory team recommended first identifying potential BSAs through analysis and then present to the core design team for assessment. Since this initial effort will be rushed, the core design teams in the three northern ecoregions will come up with an initial set of BSAs and then reevaluate in three years. The DNR is looking at using everyone, all sectors and stakeholders who are willing to put the time into it, which will include multiple meetings per month. Participants came in with different visions, but the DNR feels it is moving in the right direction although it is going to be difficult to meet all the deadlines.

**Ms. Eagle** stated after BSA designations are completed, management objectives for DNR-managed portions of these lands will need to be identified. Some areas will be overlapping with other designations that already have management plans or objectives identified, but a lot will not have any objectives or goals. These will need to be looked at on a case-by-case basis. Areas with overlapping designations that have a compatible objective to this process may not require as much effort to identify objectives. In some cases, the current objectives may not be appropriate for biodiversity conservation goals and will need to be changed. Each division is responsible for coming up with objectives for their individual areas. The DNR wants to include this information in the regional state forest management plans.

**Ms. Boucher** commented the DNR needs to take this process and lay it on top of existing processes to try to avoid creating a lot of new processes if possible. **Ms. Eagle** stated this will not take away other values of the land, but there is still a need to question how other activities and values will affect the biodiversity conservation; if there will be a negative impact, the DNR will have to look into whether changes can be made to make the activity more compatible, or in some cases accept that it can't happen. **Ms. Boyd** added these are not set-asides or off-limits; the DNR will be actively managing these areas. **Ms. Eagle** stated that all management tools are on the table and available for use. The process will be reassessed in 2012 and then a 10-year cycle will begin.

**Mr. Suchovsky** questioned percentages; **Ms. Boucher** responded the 10 percent number that comes up everywhere deals with wilderness and natural areas which states *no more than 10 percent of the state can be classified thus*. It does not apply to this process. In the 1990s, people thought old growth areas could not be touched. They have learned that this creates areas that are not as functional, as things change over time.

**Mr. Suchovsky** asked if the process will make use of the floristic quality assessment; **Ms. Eagle** answered there is the potential it will be used to assess the current quality and condition of an area when known, and therefore may help with decisions about specific areas.

**Chair Barnes** asked if there were other comments; **Vice-Chair Botti** asked if the old growth rule of the 1990s was still in affect. **Ms. Boucher** answered it is not; since the mid-2000s the DNR has been directing staff to make decisions about old growth areas; if it makes sense to maintain it as a conservation area, do so; if it doesn't, staff has been asked to get it off the books.

**Dr. Kahl** commented while looking at the goal statement, a lot of local land conservancies might have areas of three to five counties with targeted private lands. She wondered if it would be worth local land conservancies to be on the core design team. **Ms. Eagle** responded the DNR has already asked one but they were unable to participate. The DNR has received a lot of other area recommendations from other conservancies and it has been reaching out to them to help identify areas even if they cannot be on the team.

**Chair Barnes** thanked Ms. Eagle and Mr. Petersen. He stated he would like the FMAC to monitor the biodiversity process. **Ms. McDonough** added the public doesn't always understand that this process represents all natural communities, not just old growth, and she would like to see a way to get information to the public early to help them understand the biodiversity conservation process.

## VI. DEER MANAGEMENT UPDATE

**Chair Barnes** stated he would be giving the update in Ms. Spray's absence.

**Chair Barnes** stated as with other management plans developed over the years, a statewide deer advisory team was formed which consists of stakeholders to provide recommendations for the development of a white tail deer state management plan. The first meeting was a couple of weeks ago. DNR Wildlife Division wants more operational recommendations. From the forestry side of it,

the FMAC needs to get a voice out there to be able to sustain our resources and manage deer. There are a number of FMAC members on the team (Tom Barnes, Amy Spray and Marvin Roberson.) **Chair Barnes** reported he could not share recommendations that the advisory team cannot give to the DNR, but he can provide comments to the advisory team from the FMAC.

**Chair Barnes** stated the plan is to have a working document by late summer or early fall. The advisory team hopes to have it before the Natural Resources Commission for the November or December meeting. Comments or feedback should go to Chair Barnes. The advisory team is still trying to determine who should be making recommendations on managing deer on private lands. **Chair Barnes** added other governmental agencies, the forest service, and the United States Wildlife Service are also on the advisory team.

**Mr. Suchovsky** stated he had heard that a couple of deer-oriented groups are not taking this effort seriously. **Chair Barnes** responded if that is the case, it has not been brought to the table at this point; people appear to be on-board with it. **Chair Barnes** will be asking the advisory team if the DNR should be handling this or if some of the outreach programs should be dealing with it. Also, he is questioning if management should be done on a regional level, by Management Unit, etc. At this point, recommendations have been received that could mean drastic changes for the DNR.

**Ms. McDonough** reported the procedure started with a fairly extensive outreach process. They went around the state to get public feedback before even starting the process. **Chair Barnes** added there were approximately 8 meetings across the state; the first initial set of questions was created by public comment.

**Dr. Gale** stated her concerns that we won't get desired conditions because of the deer; she asked if we could come back from a forestry point of view that the deer population is needed to manage the land. **Chair Barnes** replied his concern in going through the ecoregional meetings was they did cover future desire conditions, but the limiting factor in the Upper Peninsula is deer. He asked them what their plan was to take care of the deer population, if they are managing the forest on a sustainable basis, and how to get there with the deer populations that we currently have.

**Ms. Boyd** commented we shouldn't lose sight of deer management because it is becoming a very social issue. Staff is trying to bring it back to be more science driven. There are professional differences of opinion on deer management issues. DNR staff has been instructed that if an agreement cannot be reached, the issue will be moved up the chain-of-command, and Dr. Mason, Chief, Wildlife Division, and Ms. Boyd will provide very specific instructions because both Wildlife and Forest, Mineral and Fire Management staff need to meet their objectives. **Ms. Boyd** stated the NRC keeps hearing there is not enough deer; they set the policy for the DNR. **Ms. Boucher** commented the regional forest plan, when looking at desire future conditions, is trying to bring it all together.

**Chair Barnes** stated he would like the FMAC to present their opinion on deer management to Director Humphries, then to the NRC. **Ms. McDonough** stated she would like to see the FMAC recommendations that go to the NRC be to let the deer management process work before preempting our plan. **Mr. Paulson** commented that staff that is working on the deer management plan needs to understand there is another level of people who will be weighing in on it. **Dr. Gale** asked is there is a way to compile numbers; **Chair Barnes** responded that is something that will be addressed.

**Vice-Chair Botti** asked if the FMAC should pursue a statement to the DNR; **Chair Barnes** responded he felt that would be appropriate. He liked the direction Ms. McDonough was going, to allow it to play itself out. **Mr. Suchovsky** stated the FMAC should take a look at what is being developed to identify what the FMAC actually wants to say at this point; **Vice-Chair Botti**

suggested a generic statement. **Chair Barnes** stated he wants to make sure he has approval of the FMAC members to represent them and wants to have a policy in place. **Ms. McDonough** suggested starting a statement to circulate via email before the June 17 FMAC meeting; she nominated Ms. Spray to begin the statement. When Vice-Chair Botti receives the statement from Ms. Spray, he will forward the information to Ms. Korbecki to distribute to the FMAC. Any concerns committee members have should be sent to Chair Barnes and he will compile the concerns to present at the next meeting.

## **VII. FUTURE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Chair Barnes** turned the meeting over to Ms. Boyd.

**Ms. Boyd** reported the DNR has been holding a series of town hall meetings; upcoming meetings include Novi, Grand Rapids, Midland, Marquette and Traverse City. The purpose of the meetings was to determine what the DNR may look like with declining economic resources. **Ms. Boyd** asked the FMAC to think about it and make recommendations to the DNR. The meetings were structured, facilitated meetings, with groups being given exercises to do to. Approximately 50 to 100 people attended the majority of the meetings. The DNR will be doing a summary of issues that will be used in its management planning, and once compiled will be presented to the legislature. **Ms. Boyd** encouraged the FMAC to go to the website to express their opinions ([Michigan.gov/dnrtownhallfeedback.com](http://Michigan.gov/dnrtownhallfeedback.com)).

**Ms. Boyd** stated a task she has in the future is to go out to constituency groups to further the discussion on DNR priorities. She commented this is a sincere attempt to get some idea of public prioritization. She reported there are currently deficits in Parks and Recreation, Law Enforcement, Fisheries and Wildlife, and most likely will be deficits in Forest, Mineral and Fire Management in 2010 and definitely in 2011. Basically the meetings were to show the public the list of programs the DNR is responsible for, and then get the public to decide what their priorities are considering the economic situation.

**Ms. Boyd** reported land and aquatic management, education information, law enforcement and outdoor recreation were four areas that were priorities. **Mr. Suchovsky** expressed the desire to go through this process at the committee. **Ms. Boyd** responded if the FMAC would like to do that she can bring in a facilitator. **Dr. Gale** asked if the DNR has a strategic plan; **Ms. Boyd** answered at this time the DNR has stretch goals and objectives that were laid out at the beginning of Director Humphries's tenure. **Dr. Gale** asked if the intent of the DNR after gathering all the information is to develop a strategic plan; **Ms. Boyd** answered not at this point. She said that since the Governor is taking the state from 18 to 8 departments, it wouldn't be lucrative for the DNR to create a strategic plan until it is determined which departments the DNR might be combined with. **Mr. Ruswick** added there are major changes going on in the state right now. Many departments cannot afford to do the tasks they have been asked to do at this time. The problem as agencies is how to transcend those problems and figure out what services we need to provide for Michigan that will exist 10 or 15 years from now.

## **VIII. ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE**

**Ms. Boyd** reported that Dr. LaCourt is involved in the energy core. Overall the ARRA will benefit the state of Michigan, but most of the funding is going to highways. The DNR will not receive much; some will come from the Michigan Department of Transportation for recreation and trails (Kal Haven, Mackinaw City Trailhead and an MDOT trail have been funded.) Mr. Joe Taylor is the economic stimulus coordinator. He has reported that most of the funding will stay at the federal level. At this point the DNR will have some crews this summer, for one summer only, with no vehicles. The scale is changing all the time.

**Dr. LaCourt** stated besides the DNR, there are private land management components working with conservation districts looking for opportunities to bring in workers temporarily to the conservation districts. The last she heard it was a 12-month project. She is still trying to figure out how many Natural Resource Specialists can be brought in. The lead on this project is the Department of Agriculture.

**Ms. Boucher** reported in addition to Mr. Taylor working with the DNR pieces, other monies have went to the forest service; \$250 million for state and private activities and \$250 million for national forests. She stated the old 7-day projects are now 10% projects and all monies went to the west except for Hiawatha. Fuels on the forest service side are still being considered. The National Association of Foresters discussed some of those concerns; all recognizing that the majority of the funding has went west. The forest service was going to announce on March 26 more funding but that has yet to be done. There are still some opportunities available at this time but the DNR doesn't know yet where they will be. **Mr. Paulson** commented on the MSF side the agency as a whole has \$1.15 billion to distribute; \$650 million will go to infrastructure. It will be a few weeks before they hear anything; all federal agencies are going through the same type of experience.

## IX. STANDING AGENDA ITEMS

- **LEGISLATIVE UPDATE**

**Ms. Boyd** referred the FMAC to the handout with the meeting materials; she stated she would be happy to answer questions on if there were any.

**Ms. Boyd** reported the license plate package is moving through the legislature; April 23 is the next scheduled meeting. The DNR has seen a mixed bag of support. The current package is a \$10 fee on license plates; constituents can opt-out of the fee. It will be conducted on the honor system and will allow people into all state parks and boating access sites. A motor vehicle permit remains in effect for all out of state users. The package was initiated by the citizen's advisory committee for state parks.

**Ms. Boyd** stated the budget bill was introduced through House Bill 4446; FMFM is not supporting the boilerplate language. The forestry prescription level would be moved up to 58,000 acres; **Ms. Boyd** believes there is an amendment to what has been introduced thus far. **Chair Barnes** stated the amendment is to change the way the DNR administers their contracts; the first amendment was that all products and all species would be open for bids. The most recent amendment would state that all species that will be harvested on state land will be available for contractors; this amendment goes before the committee when it returns next week. The DNR does not support the amendments because it needs flexibility to manage its contracts.

**Mr. Ruswick** added there is a Bill pending to reverse the Pigeon River Country State Forest Concept of Management.

- **NRC BUDGET REPORT**

**Ms. Boyd** referred the FMAC to the meeting handout and said she would take questions if there were any. There were none.

- **IMPROVING PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROJECT**

**Chair Barnes** asked if anyone had anything to bring forward; there was nothing. This will remain as a standing agenda item.

- **EMERGING DNR ISSUES**

**Ms. Boyd** stated the current issues were covered previously. **Mr. Suchovsky** commented this was an interesting discussion topic. He questioned the forest certification system, including the manufacturing system, and whether the state could afford to continue to be certified under two

systems. He felt the FMAC could use this opportunity to make recommendations to the DNR on certification. He suggested this be a topic at upcoming meetings. **Ms. Boyd** responded she would be attending a Tri-State Forestry meeting at the end of the month. They would be discussing where FSC and SFI are going at this time. The tri-states are accepting some of the new FSC and SFI standards, and not accepting others.

**Dr. LaCourt** stated there are anti-trust issues related to the appraisal process. There should be a way for the DNR to find the market value, not to try to adjust how the market functions.

**Chair Barnes** commented he does not think that is the intention, but there is a strong feeling that the current appraisal prices sent out by the DNR does not reflect the market value. The industry is looking for a better reflection of what the current market trend is. Some members of the industry cannot hit the minimum price on some bids because they cannot make a profit. The industry and the DNR need to figure out a way to narrow that gap; perhaps an appraisal process that reflects and adjusts to the market and still gets a fair market value for the assets of the state.

#### **X. NEXT MEETING AGENDA ITEMS**

Facilitate Session on Forest Certification

Standing Items

Biomass Conservation, Woody Biomass and Deer Management will be moved to standing agenda items

Role of FMAC – Discussion of Comments Received

#### **Next Meeting:**

June 17, 2009

Michigan United Conservation Clubs

2101 Wood Street, Lansing

1:00 – 4:00 p.m.

#### **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

**Chair Barnes** requested a motion to adjourn.

**MOTION:** **Mr. Jones** moved to adjourn the April 15, 2009 FMAC meeting; supported by **Mr. Paulson**.  
**Motion passed unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 3:59 p.m.