



January 10, 2008

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

Dear Mr. Nezich,

Attached is the 2007 Surveillance Audit Report for the Michigan DNR. NSF's audit team previously recommended continuing conformance. NSF has found that your SFI program is in continuing conformance with the 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard®. Congratulations!

The report includes a "SFI Surveillance Audit Summary for Public Disclosure" (Appendix IV). This must be provided to SFI, Inc. at least two weeks before making any public statements about the audit results. I can take care of this if you authorize me to do so.

The next Surveillance Audit is scheduled for late August or early September, 2008. I understand that the Michigan DNR team will meet soon to help determine these dates.

Once again it has been a pleasure to work with you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael Ferrucci". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor  
NSF-ISR



**NSF-ISR, LTD  
SURVEILLANCE AUDIT REPORT**

January 10, 2008

**A. Program Participant's Name:** Michigan DNR

**FRS #1: 5Y031**

**B. Scope:**

Land management on 3.9 million acres of Michigan State Forests (excluding long-term military lease lands) and related sustainable forestry activities under the 2005-2009 Edition of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard.

- No Change  
 Changed (revised scope statement also noted on FRS)

**C. NSF Audit Team:**

Lead Auditor: Mike Ferrucci

Auditor: Dr. Robert Hrubes

**D. Audit Date(s):** October 30-November 2, 2007

**E. Reference Documentation:**

2005-2009 SFI Standard@  
Michigan DNR Forest Certification Work Instructions, Date Revised: various

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

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

**G. Changes to Operations or to the SFI Standard:**

Are there any significant changes in operations, procedures, specifications, FRS, etc. from the previous visit?  Yes  No If yes, provide brief description of the changes:

- Continuing modest modifications to procedures, work instructions, protocols

**H. Other Issues Reviewed:**

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

**I. Corrective Action Requests: (see also Appendix IV)**

**Corrective Action Requests issued this visit:**

1. CAR SFI 2007-01 INSERT

- Corrective Action Plan is not required.  
 Corrective Action Plan is required within sixty days of this visit (for Minor Nonconformances).  
CARs will be verified during the next Surveillance Audit.  
 Corrective Action Plan is required within thirty days of this visit (for Major Nonconformances).  
The auditor will make arrangements to verify the corrective action has been effectively implemented. All major nonconformance(s) must be closed by the auditor prior to the next scheduled surveillance audit by a special verification visit or by desk review, if possible.

Any Corrective Action Plans should be mailed to:

Mike Ferrucci, 26 Commerce Drive, North Branford, CT 06471

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

MAJOR(S):   0   MINOR(S):   1  

In addition, two new Opportunities for Improvement (OFIs) were identified.

**Appendices:**

- Appendix I: Surveillance Notification Letter and Audit Schedule  
Appendix II: Corrective Action Requests  
Appendix III: Attendance  
Appendix IV: Public Surveillance Audit Report  
Appendix V: Audit Matrix

**APPENDIX I**



**Surveillance Notification Letter  
and Audit Schedule**



**REVISED FINAL DRAFT: October 8, 2007**

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

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

Dear Mr. Nezich:

We are scheduled to conduct the Annual Surveillance Audits of the Michigan DNR on Tuesday Oct. 30 to Friday Nov. 2 as follows:

FMU/ Loc.	Day	Times	Focus Areas
Traverse City	Tuesday Oct. 30	8 – 11 am	Programmatic, CARs, changes
Traverse City		11 am – 5 pm	Field operations
Cadillac	Wednesday Oct. 31	8 am – 5	Field operations
Roscommon	Thursday Nov. 1	9 am – 11am	Planning Meeting
Gladwin		Noon to 5 pm	Field operations
Lansing	Friday Nov. 2	8 – 10 am	Wrap-up discussions
Exit Briefing		10 – 11 am	Report results

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

**Special Issues**

- Funding
- Recreational Use Management

**SFI Program:**

- Verify effective implementation of the corrective action plans from the previous NSF audit; and
- Review progress on achieving SFI objectives and the management review of your SFI Program;
- Review selected components of your SFI program;

**FSC Program:**

- A focused assessment of the status of outstanding corrective action requests. Assess selected forests against a portion of the FSC Lake States Standard. Operations will be assessed against Criteria and Indicators of the standard where non-conformances were observed in the original assessment, as well as the following Criteria (P=Principle, C=Criteria):
 

P1: C1.1, C1.5	P4: C4.2, C4.4	P5: C5.3, C5.5
P6: C6.1	P7: C7.2	P9: C9.4
- Review of any changes within DNR (e.g., staffing, land acquisitions, planning documents) that are pertinent to the certification.

**Logistics**

- As during the certification audit we should plan to have lunch on site to expedite the visit.
- We will travel in your vehicle(s) each day during the audit, but will require transportation to a car rental location in Lansing at end of the audit.
- We ask that you provide hardhats.

**Field Site Selections**

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

**Documentation Requested**

When we arrive each day please provide documentation for the selected sites similar to that provided for the certification audit (maps, project descriptions, and contracts). We would also need copies of the draft or recently completed management plans and any other information that would help us determine conformance to the certification requirements.

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

Sincerely yours,



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

Dr. Robert Hrubes  
Senior Vice-President SCS  
2200 Powell St. Suite Number 725  
Emeryville, CA 94608  
[rhrubes@scscertified.com](mailto:rhrubes@scscertified.com)  
510-452-8007 Mobile: 510-913-0696

Enclosure: Draft Agenda for Michigan DNR 2007 Surveillance Audit

**DRAFT Agenda for Michigan DNR 2007 Surveillance Audit**

Traverse City                      Tuesday Oct. 30                      8 am to 5 pm

<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>
8:50 am	Arrive at Area Forestry Offices
8:00 am	Opening Meeting and Office Discussions FSC CARs SFI CARs
11 am	Overview of Traverse City forest management; discussions
Noon	Working Lunch: Review Selected Sales and Finalize Field Visit
12:30 – 5 pm	Field Site Visits
5 pm	Daily Briefing (final field site)

Evening: Auditors and selected DNR staff travel ~50 miles/ 1 hour to Hampton Inn, Cadillac;  
Tentative: Auditors briefly visit Cadillac Area Open House (4-7 pm)

Cadillac                                      Wednesday Oct. 31                      8 am to 5 pm

<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>
7: 50 am	Arrive at Area Forestry Offices
8:00 am	Opening Meeting and Office Discussions
9:30 am	Review Selected Sales and Finalize Field Visit
10 – 4:30 pm	Field Site Visits
4:30 -5 pm	Daily Briefing (office)

Evening: Auditors and selected DNR staff travel ~60+miles/75 minutes to Days Inn, Grayling

Roscommon                                      Thursday Nov. 1                      8 am – 11am

<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>
8:50 am	Arrive at Area Forestry Offices
9:00 am	Observe Planning Meeting
11 am	Leave for Gladwin, lunch during drive

Michigan DNR October 2007 Surveillance Audit

<u>Gladwin</u>	<u>Thursday Nov. 1</u>	<u>12:30 to 5 pm</u>
<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>	
12:30 pm	Arrive at Area Harrison Field Office, Gladwin FMU Overview of area Forest Management Program	
1:30 pm	Review Selected Sales and Finalize Field Visit	
2 - 5pm	Field Site Visits	
5 pm	Daily Briefing (final field site)	

Evening: Auditors and selected DNR staff travel 120 miles, 2 hours to Quality Suites, Lansing  
Auditor private discussion

<u>Lansing</u>	<u>Friday, November 2</u>	<u>8 am to 11 am</u>
<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>	
8 – 10 am	Auditor deliberations and additional meetings as needed	
10 – 10:30 am	Final SFI Exit Briefing	
10:30 – 11 am	Final FSC Exit Briefing	

## APPENDIX II



# Corrective Action Requests

**Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)**

Company/Location: <u>Michigan DNR</u>	Date: <u>October 30, 2007</u> FRS # <u>5Y031</u>
Auditor: <u>Mike Ferrucci</u>	CAR Number: <u>SFI-2007-01</u>
Location of Finding: <u>applies system-wide</u>	Previous CAR Number/Date: <u>NA</u>
Discussed with: <u>Dennis Nezich, all audit participants</u>	Nonconformance Type (underline): Major <u>Minor</u>

**AUDITOR FINDING:** Standard Number and Clause: 2005-2009 SFIS Indicator 1.1.1: A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation)."

Description:

The state-wide forest management plan has not been updated since 1983, although a critically -needed draft plan is nearly complete. This keystone document ties together the many elements of planning at various spatial scales; providing critical "Statewide Management Direction" including desired future conditions, goals, objectives, standards and guidelines for the management of recreation, vegetation, watersheds, rare species, land ownership and use, minerals and geology, forest pests, fire, the transportation system, law enforcement, governmental and tribal relations, research and education, and special resource areas.

If necessary, please attach a separate report addressing the following three items:

**1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY**– Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.

A statewide forest management plan (SFMP) had been drafted, released to the public, and comments taken, but revisions and a subsequent release was postponed to sort through proposed revisions to the closely-linked ecoregional planning process. There were two major revisions proposed to the ecoregional planning process. One was to include a Management Area concept which would be a central building block in the ecoregional plans. The other was to split the ecoregional plans into two documents, an ecoregional plan and a regional state forest management plan. These changes were approved in the summer of 2007. Recognition of these changes has been incorporated into a revised State Forest Management Plan along with other revisions based upon public comments and the new revised plan is now going through the approval process.

**2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. **Please include expected completion date.**

A new revised plan was distributed for information purposes to the Statewide Council on December 4, 2007. It was accompanied by a description of remaining tasks for completion of the SFMP and a ten-page summary of changes to the original draft. The revised Plan is to be taken up for approval by the Statewide Council at its January meeting, followed by submission of the draft to the NRC for information in February, 2008 and approval by the Director expected in March, 2008. Discussion of the SFMP is also scheduled to take place with the Forest Management Advisory Committee in February.

*(note: we could attach the summary of changes and/or "Remaining Tasks for Completion of the SFMP")*

**3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

*(probably not applicable, depending on response to item 2 – M.Ferrucci note)*

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S PLAN:**

Approved: The plan shows how this issue will be resolved by March, 2008.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci December 22, 2006

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S COMPLETED ACTION:**

STATUS: \_\_\_\_\_ AUDITOR/DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

**STATUS LEGEND:** OPEN = CA Plan Accepted **CLOSED** = CA implemented, verified & accepted **REJECTED** = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected

**Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)**

Company/Location: <u>Michigan DNR</u>	Date: <u>October 27, 2006</u> FRS # <u>5Y031</u>
Auditor: <u>Mike Ferrucci</u>	CAR Number: <u>SFI-2006-01</u>
Location of Finding: <u>Upper Peninsula</u>	Previous CAR Number/Date: <u>NA</u>
Discussed with: <u>Mike Paluda, Dennis Nezich</u>	Nonconformance Type (underline): Major <u>Minor</u>

**AUDITOR FINDING:** Standard Number and Clause: 2005-2009 SFIS Indicator 2.3.6: Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.

Description: The criteria for allowable ruts are not clear.

If necessary, please attach a separate report addressing the following three items:

**1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY**– Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.

Draft rutting specs (see attached) in line with those used in Minnesota and Wisconsin were drafted earlier this year for inclusion into an updated version of our BMP manual; however, the completion, approval and dissemination of the manual will not occur until 2007 because it was held up while our lead person was unavailable to the project

**2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

With the return of the lead on the BMP manual this Fall, we are moving forward with the reviews of a draft of the manual and anticipate it being disseminated this spring, including training by land management personnel on rutting and other concerns incorporated in the manual. In addition, new rutting specifications will be incorporated into State of Michigan timber sale contracts.

**3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

Criteria for rutting will be incorporated in the updated BMP (draft attached); even if these are modified in the course of internal and external reviews of the updated bmp manual, final criteria will be approved and staff will be trained on them by spring and then again through audit training in the summer and/or early fall.

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S PLAN:**

The corrective and preventive actions described above are appropriate. Plan approved; implementation to be reviewed fall 2007.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci December 22, 2006

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S COMPLETED ACTION:**

Based on a review of the adopted "Interim Rutting Guidance", "Vegetative Erosion Control Guidelines", and "Rutting and Timber Sale Contracts" provisions as well as interviews with field staff the non-conformance is closed. Michigan DNR now has clear, easily understood criteria defining acceptable limits of rutting during timber harvesting. The interim guidance will eventually be incorporated into updated statewide BMPs, to be published as a "Soil and Water Quality Manual".

STATUS: Closed AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci, October 30, 2007

**STATUS LEGEND:** OPEN = CA Plan Accepted **CLOSED** = CA implemented, verified & accepted **REJECTED** = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected

**DRAFT RUTTING ATTACHMENT - CAR Number: SFI-2006-01**

Rutting occurs when soil strength is not sufficient to support the applied load from vehicle traffic (see Figure 14). Rutting affects aesthetics, biology, hydrology, site productivity and vehicle safety. Where channelized flow to an open water body occurs, rutting can result in contributing sediment into an open water body. While not always a water quality issue, rutting is certainly a sign that ongoing forest operations need to be modified to prevent further damage to soil and forest management resources. Table 5 provides guidelines as to what is excessive rutting under varying conditions, operational requirements, and under what conditions is site remediation called for, and for when it is best to just leave the ruts as they are at present.



**Figure 1. Haul Road Rutting Damage**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Soil disturbance is Excessive if:</b>	<b>Immediate Action</b>	<b>Restoration</b>
Anywhere	A gully or rut of any depth channelizing flow to an open water body, (i.e. stream, lake or open water wetland)	Stop operations. Assess the situation. Install silt fence at appropriate intervals (depending on length of gully or rut) or deposit slash in the gully or rut to prevent further movement of sediment.	After anti-erosion materials are installed, repair gullies and ruts. Disk and plow gullies and ruts. Seed and mulch per prescribed seeding mixtures. Silt fence should be left in place until grass is firmly established.
Roads and Landings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In a riparian management zone (RMZ) or wetland, a gully or rut is 6 inches deep and 25 feet long.</li> <li>In an upland area (outside of RMZ), a gully or rut is 12 inches deep and 50 feet long.</li> </ul>	Stop equipment use. Install silt fence or slash in gullies or ruts to prevent further erosion.	<p>Where water quality will not be affected, remediation may not be necessary. Land manager must review site conditions and determine if site remediation would cause more damage to soil resources and site productivity than leaving ruts as they are.</p> <p>If a rutted road must be used to move forest products, the land manager should consider the application of stone 1-3 inches in diameter within rutted areas to prevent further rutting. The land manager should also consider if vehicle safety is an issue as the result of ruts in a forest road.</p>
Skid trails and harvest areas	Gully or rut is 12 inches deep and 50 feet long.	Stop Operations.	Stop operations until conditions improve. No restoration is if such action may cause more damage to site.

**Corrective and Preventive Action Request (CAR)**

Company/Location: <u>Michigan DNR</u>	Date: <u>October 27, 2006</u> FRS # <u>5Y031</u>
Auditor: <u>Mike Ferrucci</u>	CAR Number: <u>SFI-2006-02</u>
Location of Finding: <u>Upper Peninsula</u>	Previous CAR Number/Date: <u>NA</u>
Discussed with: <u>Mike Paluda, Dennis Nezich</u>	Nonconformance Type (underline): Major <u>Minor</u>

**AUDITOR FINDING:** Standard Number and Clause: 2005-2009 SFIS Indicator 3.1: Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.

Description: There was insufficient evidence of a plan (timeline and resources) to address transportation system BMP issues (see Michigan Water Forest Practices page 25, section 3, Maintenance of Forest Roads).

If necessary, please attach a separate report addressing the following three items:

**1) ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS BY COMPANY**– Include potential causes & assurance problem does not exist in other areas.

The state forest system is spread across a vast territory. Differences in soil, slope, and other geomorphic characteristics along with differences in human pressures/uses results in a spectrum of possible resource damage impacts. The inventory, management and maintenance of transportation/roads is typically addressed locally. Information as well as prioritization for repair related to water quality is also held locally at the FMU level. Budget however is established statewide.

Each FMU addresses water quality concerns as part of its routine work. The root problem and challenge is to compile and evaluate potential water quality concerns statewide in order to prioritize and address those that pose an immediate threat to human or natural resource health. The DNR focus of attention has been on establishing a well-documented bmp and resource damage information collection system. This will provide the basis for the prioritization of corrective actions and identification of required additional resource needs. Our next step will be to find additional resources to address reported problems.

**2) CORRECTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

Now that the department has a well-defined information collection system in place and we have established the scope of the BMP problem, we are employing a 2-tiered approach for restoration. First, FMFM has allocated operational funds to fix the highest priority problems identified in the RDR system. Secondly, we are communicating with the department and the legislature about the needs for additional funding. In addition, an internal work group will be convened to conduct a broad scale review of forest roads, trails etc. This group should be convened in the first quarter of 2007 (calendar).

**3) PREVENTIVE ACTION BY COMPANY** – Based on the Root Cause Analysis, the following action has been planned/taken to correct the problem. Please include expected completion date.

DNR will continue to train employees to identify and address reported RDR problems, and the adequacy of resources and on-the-ground corrective actions will be evaluated at annual DNR management reviews.

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S PLAN:**

The corrective and preventive actions described above are appropriate. Plan approved; implementation to be reviewed fall 2007.

Auditors will assess progress towards more closely matching funding with actual needs as identified by information collected.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci December 22, 2006

**AUDITOR REVIEW OF COMPANY'S COMPLETED ACTION:**

This issue was discussed during the SA, with extensive review of data provided before and after the audit. Significant resources have been made available to address road-related RDRs. Supplemental information was particularly useful in helping the Lead Auditor conclude that the corrective action plan has been implemented. There is a continuing concern that the serious financial and budget difficulties being faced by the State of Michigan may derail significant progress recently made on this long-standing problem. The audit team will consider this issue once again during the 2008 Surveillance Audit.

STATUS: Closed AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci November 21, 2007

**STATUS LEGEND:** OPEN = CA Plan Accepted **CLOSED** = CA implemented, verified & accepted **REJECTED** = C/A Plan or Implementation rejected



**APPENDIX III**



*Attendees and Participants*

## APPENDIX IV



# SFI Surveillance Audit Summary for Public Disclosure

The SFI Program of the Michigan DNR has demonstrated continuing conformance with the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard®, 2005-2009 Edition (SFIS), according to the NSF-ISR SFIS Certification Audit Team.

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources manages 3.9 million acres of State Forest land throughout the northern two-thirds of Michigan, using an interdisciplinary approach to integrate the harvesting of forest products, the provision of wildlife habitat, the protection of special sites, and the provision of extensive recreational opportunities. A variety of forest products are produced, including timber, pulpwood, firewood, cabin logs, poles, and other specialty products. Michigan DNR's SFI Program is managed by Dennis Nezich, Forest Certification Specialist.

NSF-ISR initially certified the Michigan DNR to the SFIS on December 9, 2005. This report describes the third follow-up Surveillance Audit conducted to track progress towards closing the Minor Non-conformances, to review progress towards implementing the "Forest Certification Work Instructions", to assess the DNR's management review system and its efforts at continuous improvement, and to review other SFI requirements as appropriate.

The surveillance audit was performed by NSF-ISR on October 30 through November 2, 2007 by an audit team headed by Mike Ferrucci, SFI Lead Auditor and Dr. Robert Hrubes, FSC Lead Auditor. These auditors fulfill the qualification criteria for conducting SFIS Certification Audits contained in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Audit Procedures and Qualifications (SFI APQ). The objective of the audit was to assess continuing conformance of the firm's SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2005-2009 Edition. The next surveillance audit is scheduled for October, 2008.

This program is being audited under the standard surveillance audit option provided in the SFI program. The scope of the audit was land management on 3.9 million acres of Michigan State Forests and the related sustainable forestry activities covered by the SFIS. The audit focused on aspects of forest management involving outstanding "Corrective Action Requests" (CARs) as well as planning, inventory, operations, recreation, the program of "Resource Damage Reports", internal auditing, and management review results. In addition, SFI obligations to incorporate continual improvement systems, to make proper use of the SFI logo and to provide a public summary of audit reports were also reviewed. Field inspections occurred in sites selected by the audit team within the Traverse City, Cadillac, and Gladwin Forest Management Units. A morning was also spent at the Roscommon office observing a scheduled compartment review in which Michigan DNR local and regional staff from various divisions finalized compartment plans for several compartments. The audit concluded at the DNR's state offices in Lansing involving discussions with senior leadership as well as several staff specialists.

All of the Performance Measures within SFIS Objective 8 (involving procurement of wood) were outside of the scope of the Michigan DNR SFI program and were excluded from the scope of the SFI Certificate. No indicators were modified from the standard set in the other SFIS Objectives (1-7 and 9-13).

### **SFIS Surveillance Audit Process**

The review was governed by a detailed audit protocol designed to enable the audit team determine continuing conformance with the applicable SFI requirements. The process included the assembly and review of audit evidence consisting of documents, interviews, and on-site inspections of ongoing or completed forest practices. Documents describing these activities were provided to the lead auditor in advance, and a sample of the available audit evidence was designated by the lead auditor for review. The NSF-ISR Audit team all reviewed all open minor non-conformances and the relevant corrective action plans.

The possible findings for specific SFI requirements included Full Conformance, Major Non-conformance, Minor Non-conformance, Opportunities for Improvement, and Practices that exceeded the Basic Requirements of the SFIS.

### **Overview of Audit Findings**

The Michigan DNR's SFI Program was found to be in continuing conformance with the SFIS Standard. The review during the October 2007 S.A. showed that the department has implemented the corrections for both previous non-conformances. These are summarized below.

2006-01: Criteria for protection of soils from rutting during timber harvests were not clear. Michigan DNR developed and implemented interim rutting guidelines and the issue was resolved.

2006-02: Indicator 5.3.3:

Verified the effective implementation of the corrective action plan during the October, 2007 Surveillance Audit. Michigan DNR continues to seek funding to implement restoration of resources whose sub-standard condition has been catalogued by use of "Resource Damage Reports". While much work remains, the audit team was convinced that a good start has been made and that additional resources will be allocated to restoration, particularly for ORV-related impacts to roads, trails, soils, and wetlands.

The NSF-ISR SFI Certification Audit Team found one new minor non-conformance and two opportunities for improvement. The Minor Non-conformance issued during this audit is described below:

1. CAR SFI 2007-01: SFI Indicator 1.1.1 requires management planning to cover a variety of resource issues. While most aspects of the planning requirement are met, many plans are somewhat out of date. The draft "State Forest Management Plan" is a critical element for the overall management program but it has not been finalized or approved.

The DNR has developed a plan to address this issue, with an expected date of March, 2008 for the release of an approved State Forest Plan (which is to be approved by the Natural Resource Commission first). Progress in implementing the planned corrective action will be reviewed in the next surveillance audit.

Two new opportunities for improvement were also identified:

OFI SFI-2007-01 – Indicator 2.1.5: "Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested." There is an opportunity to improve the analysis of cover type changes desirable or needed to meet overall state forest management goals. This analysis is expected to be at the core of the three regional state forest plans; delays in completing these plans may require interim measures to meet this indicator and the overall planning requirements in indicator 1.1.1.

OFI SFI-2007-02 – Indicator 2.3.7 "Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently." There is an opportunity to improve the timeliness of road closures.

### **Positive Practices in the Michigan State Forest System**

The sustainable forestry program of the Michigan DNR has many clear strengths which factored strongly into the finding of continuing conformance with the certification requirements. The audit team found that the Michigan DNR has made significant improvements in its already strong performance by continuing to implement and improve its comprehensive management review program, by increasing resources devoted to management plan updates, by completion of a draft Michigan Statewide Forest Plan, and by creating special task forces to consider BMP and ORV issues.

Further, the team has found that the SFI Standard continues to be exceeded in the following areas:

- Assignment of certification responsibilities (work instructions) within the DNR is superb;
- Sustainable harvest levels are conservative, and can clearly be sustained;
- No exotic species are planted;
- The forest health and protection programs provide exemplary Integrated Pest Management;
- BMP monitoring through the new Resource Damage Report system is exemplary;
- Protection of rare, threatened, or endangered species is a major focus throughout the program;
- Biodiversity protections are robust and well-designed;
- Clearcut size is far lower than the 120-acre maximum average; and
- Public recreation opportunities are high-quality, diverse, and widely available.

### **Relevance of Forestry Certification**

Third-party certification provides assurance that forests are being managed under the principles of sustainable forestry, which are described in the Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard as:

#### **1. Sustainable Forestry**

To practice sustainable forestry to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by practicing a land stewardship ethic that integrates reforestation and the managing, growing, nurturing, and harvesting of trees for useful products with the conservation of soil, air and water quality, biological diversity, wildlife and aquatic habitat, recreation, and aesthetics.

#### **2. Responsible Practices**

To use and to promote among other forest landowners sustainable forestry practices that are both scientifically credible and economically, environmentally, and socially responsible.

#### **3. Reforestation and Productive Capacity**

To provide for regeneration after harvest and maintain the productive capacity of the forestland base.

#### **4. Forest Health and Productivity**

To protect forests from uncharacteristic and economically or environmentally undesirable wildfire, pests, diseases, and other damaging agents and thus maintain and improve long-term forest health and productivity.

#### **5. Long-Term Forest and Soil Productivity**

To protect and maintain long-term forest and soil productivity.

#### **6. Protection of Water Resources**

To protect water bodies and riparian zones.

#### **7. Protection of Special Sites and Biological Diversity**

To manage forests and lands of special significance (biologically, geologically, historically or culturally important) in a manner that takes into account their unique qualities and to promote a diversity of wildlife habitats, forest types, and ecological or natural community types.

## **8. Legal Compliance**

To comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws, statutes, and regulations.

## **9. Continual Improvement**

To continually improve the practice of forest management and also to monitor, measure and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.

*Source: Sustainable Forestry Initiative® (SFI) Standard, 2005–2009 Edition*

### **For Additional Information Contact:**

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

Dennis Nezich, Forest Certification Specialist  
Michigan Department of Natural Resources  
1990 US-41 South, Marquette, MI 49855  
906-228-6561  
[nezichd@michigan.gov](mailto:nezichd@michigan.gov)

**APPENDIX V**



**Audit Matrix**

NSF-ISR auditors use this document to record their findings for each SFIS Performance Measure and Indicator.

If a non-conformance is found the auditor shall fully document the reasons on the Corrective Action Request (CAR) form. N/A in the Auditor column indicates that the associated Performance Measure or Indicator does not apply.

Findings are indicated by a date or date code: Audit Date-March 2006 Date Code- 6a; Audit Date-Oct. 2006 Date Code- 6

Surveillance audits involve a partial review, so not all requirements are audited each visit. This portion of the matrix provides an overall record of audit findings over time. This ensures that all requirements are audited within the five-year life of the certificate.

**Objective 1: To broaden the implementation of sustainable forestry by ensuring long-term harvest levels based on the use of the best scientific information available.**

Performance Measure/ Indicator	Audit- or	--- Indicate Only One ---				OFI
		FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
<b>1.1</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.</i></b>					
1.1.1	A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a. a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation).	MF	g: 6a, a-g: 6		7	6
1.1.2	Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.	MF		6, 7		
1.1.3	A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.		7			
1.1.4	Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.		7			
1.1.5	Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.		7			

**Objective 2: To ensure long-term forest productivity and conservation of forest resources through prompt reforestation, soil conservation, afforestation and other measures.**

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
<b>2.1</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.</i></b>		7				
2.1.1	Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.	MF	G: 6a, 6, 7				
2.1.2	Clear Requirements to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct under-stocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration	MF	G: 6a, 7				
2.1.3	Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.	MF		6, 7			
2.1.4	Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.	MF	6, 7				
2.1.5	Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.	MF	7				7
<b>2.2</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.</i></b>						
2.2.1	Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.	MF	7				
2.2.2	Use of least toxic and narrowest spectrum pesticide narrowest spectrum and least toxic pesticides necessary to achieve management objective.						
2.2.3	Use of pesticides registered for the intended use and applied in accordance with the label requirements.						
2.2.4	Use of Integrated Pest Management where feasible.	MF		6			
2.2.5	Supervision of forest chemical applications by state-trained or certified applicators.						
2.2.6	Use of best management practices appropriate to the situation; for example: adjoining landowners or nearby residents notified of applications and chemicals used; appropriate multi-lingual signs or oral warnings used; public road access controlled during and after applications; streamside and other needed buffer strips appropriately designated; positive shut-off and minimal drift spray valves used; drift minimized by aerially applying forest chemicals parallel to buffer zones; water quality monitored or other methods used to assure proper ...						

Performance Measure/ Indicator	Audit -or-	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
		FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
2.2.6	...equipment use and stream protection of streams, lakes and other waterbodies; chemicals stored at appropriate locations; state reports filed as required; or methods used to ensure protection of federally listed threatened & endangered species					
<b>2.3</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.</i></b>					
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.	MF	7			
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.	MF	G: 6a			
2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.	MF, RH	6, 7			
2.3.4	Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).	MF	G: 6a, 7			
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.	MF	G: 6a, 6, 7			
2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.	MF	G: 6a, 7		6	
2.3.7	Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.	MF, RH	6, 7			7
<b>2.4</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests and diseases to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.</i></b>	MF		7		
2.4.1	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.	MF	G: 6a	6, 7		
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.	MF	G: 6a	6, 7		
2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.	MF	G: 6a	6, 7		
<b>2.5</b>	<b><i>Program Participants that utilize genetically improved planting stock including those derived through biotechnology shall use sound scientific methods and follow all applicable laws and other internationally applicable protocols.</i></b>					
2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology.					

**Objective 3: To protect water quality in streams, lakes and other water bodies.**

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	--- Indicate Only One ---				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>FC</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
<b>3.1</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws and meet or exceed Best Management Practices developed under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved state water quality programs other applicable federal, provincial, state or local programs.</i></b>						
3.1.1	Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.	MF	7			6	
3.1.2	Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.	MF	G: 6a				
3.1.3	Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc.).	MF, RH	6				
3.1.4	Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.	MF	G: 6a	6, 7			
<b>3.2</b>	<b><i>Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.</i></b>	Mf	7				
3.2.1	Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.	MF	6, 7				
3.2.2	Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.	MF	6, 7				
3.2.3	Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.	MF	6, 7				
3.2.4	Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.	MF	6, 7				
3.2.5	Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.	NA					

**Objective 4: Manage the quality and distribution of wildlife habitats and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity by developing and implementing stand- and landscape - level measures that promote habitat diversity and the conservation of forest plants and animals including aquatic fauna.**

Performance Measure/ Indicator	Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
		FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
<b>4.1</b>	<b><i>Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.</i></b>					
4.1.1	Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types, at stand and landscape levels.	MF	G: 6a, 6			
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.	MF	G: 6a	6, 7		
4.1.3	Plans to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities. Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies			6, 7		
4.1.4	Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat elements (e.g., snags, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees, nest trees).	MF	G: 6a, 7			6
4.1.5	Assessment, conducted individually or collaboratively, of forest cover types and habitats at the individual ownership level and, where credible data are available, across the landscape, and incorporation of findings into planning and management activities, where practical and when consistent with management objectives.	MF	G: 6a, 6			
4.1.6	Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.	MF, RH	6			
4.1.7	Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact, and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities.	MF	7			
4.1.8	Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.	MF, RH	6			
<b>4.2</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology, and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.</i></b>	MF	7			
4.2.1	Collection of information on critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping, or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing nonproprietary scientific information, time, and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.	MF	G: 6a, 7			
4.2.2	A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.	MF	G: 6a, 6, 7			

**Objective 5: To manage the visual impact of harvesting and other forest operations.**

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	--- Indicate Only One ---				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>FC</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
<b>5.1</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.</i></b>	MF	6, 7				
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.	MF	6, 7				
5.1.2	Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.	MF	6, 7				
<b>5.2</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.</i></b>						
5.2.1	Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.	MF		6, 7			
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.	MF	6, 7				
<b>5.3</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.</i></b>						
5.3.1	Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF	6				
5.3.2	Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF	6				
5.3.3	Trees in clearcut harvest areas are at least 3 years old or 5 feet high at the desired level of stocking before adjacent areas are clearcut, or as appropriate to address operational and economic considerations, alternative methods to reach the performance measure are utilized by the Program Participant.	MF	G: 6a, 6				

**Objective 6: To manage Program Participant lands that are ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important in a manner that recognizes their special qualities.**

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit -or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>FC</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
<b>6.1.</b>	<i>Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.</i>						
6.1.1	Use of existing natural heritage data and expert advice in identifying or selecting sites for protection because of their ecologically, geologically, historically, or culturally important qualities.	MF	6				
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.	MF	6				

**Objective 7: To promote the efficient use of forest resources.**

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit -or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>FC</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
<b>7.1</b>	<i>Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and "in-woods" manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives.</i>	MF	7				
7.1.1	Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include provisions to ensure a. landings left clean with little waste; b. residues distributed to add organic and nutrient value to future forests; c. training or incentives to encourage loggers to enhance utilization; d. cooperation with mill managers for better utilization of species and low-grade material; e. merchandizing of harvested material to ensure use for its most beneficial purpose; f. development of markets for underutilized species and low-grade wood; g. periodic inspections and reports noting utilization and product separation; or h. exploration of alternative markets (e.g., energy markets).	MF	G: 6a, 6, 7				

**Objective 9: To improve forestry research, science, and technology, upon which sound forest management decisions are based.**

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit -or</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>FC</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
<b>9.1</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations provide in-kind support or funding, in addition to that generated through taxes, for forest research to improve the health, productivity, and management of forest resources.</i></b>	MF	7				
9.1.1	Current financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research will include some or all of the following issues: a. forest health, productivity, and ecosystem functions; b. chemical efficiency, use rate, and integrated pest management; c. water quality; d. wildlife management at stand or landscape levels; e. conservation of biological diversity; and f. effectiveness of BMPs.	MF	6, 7				
<b>9.2</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations develop or use state, provincial, or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.</i></b>	MF	7				
9.2.1	Participation, individually or through cooperative efforts or associations at the state, provincial, or regional level, in the development or use of a. regeneration assessments; b. growth-and-drain assessments; c. BMP implementation and compliance; and d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners.	MF	7				

**Objective 10: To improve the practice of sustainable forest management by resource professionals, logging professionals, and contractors through appropriate training and education programs.**

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or-	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
<b>10.1</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.</i></b>	MF	7				
10.1.1	Written statement of commitment to the SFI Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood procurement staff, and field foresters.	MF	6, 7				
10.1.2	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.	MF		6, 7			
10.1.3	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF	G: 6a, 7				6
10.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF	G: 6a, 6, 7				
<b>10.2</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall work closely with state logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.</i></b>						
10.2.1	Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers' training courses that address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI Program;</li> <li>b. BMPs, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance, &amp; retirement;</li> <li>c. regeneration, forest resource conservation, and aesthetics;</li> <li>d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat;</li> <li>e. logging safety;</li> <li>f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations, wage and hour rules, and other employment laws;</li> <li>g. transportation issues;</li> <li>h. business management; and</li> <li>i. public policy and outreach.</li> </ul>	MF	G: 6a, 6, 7				

**Objective 11: Commitment to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.**

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>FC</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
<b>11.1</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.</i></b>						
11.1.1	Access to relevant laws and regulations in appropriate locations.	MF	G: 6a				
11.1.2	System to achieve compliance with applicable federal, provincial, state, or local laws and regulations.						
11.1.3	Demonstration of commitment to legal compliance through available regulatory action information.						
11.1.4	Adherence to all applicable federal, state, & provincial regulations and international protocols for research & deployment of trees derived from improved planting stock & biotechnology.						
<b>11.2</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state, and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates.</i></b>						
11.2.1	Written policy demonstrating commitment to comply with social laws, such as those covering civil rights, equal employment opportunities, antidiscrimination and anti-harassment measures, workers' compensation, indigenous peoples' rights, workers' and communities' right to know, prevailing wages, workers' right to organize, and occupational health and safety.	MF	6				

**Objective 12: To broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by encouraging the public and forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry and publicly report progress.**

Performance Measure/ Indicator	Audit -or	--- Indicate Only One ---				OFI
		FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
<b>12.1</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, and the American Tree Farm System® and other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.</i></b>					
12.1.1	Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.	<b>MF</b>	G: 6a, 6, 7			
12.1.2	Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners.					
12.1.3	Support for the development and distribution of regional or statewide information materials that provide landowners with practical approaches for addressing biological diversity issues, such as specific wildlife habitat, critically imperiled or imperiled species, and threatened and endangered species.					
12.1.4	Participation in efforts to support or promote conservation of working forests through voluntary market-based incentive programs (e.g., current-use taxation programs, Forest Legacy, or conservation easements).	MF	6			
12.1.5	Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders. Consider the results of these efforts in planning where practical and consistent with management objectives.	MF	7			
<b>12.2</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education, and involvement related to forest management.</i></b>					
12.2.1	Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs).	MF	6, 7			
12.2.2	Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as a. field tours, seminars, or workshops; b. educational trips; c. self-guided forest management trails; or d. publication of articles, educational pamphlets, or newsletters; or e. support for state, provincial, and local forestry organizations and soil and water conservation districts.					
12.2.3	Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.	MF	G: 6a	6, 7		

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	--- Indicate Only One ---				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
<b>12.3</b>	<b><i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.</i></b>	MF	G: 6a, 7				
12.3.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.	MF, RH	6, 7				
12.3.2	Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.	MF, RH	6, 7				
<b>12.4</b>	<b><i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.</i></b>	<b>MF, RH</b>	6, 7				
12.4.1	Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to a. understand and respect traditional forest related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and c. address the sustainable use of nontimber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands.	<b>MF, RH</b>	6, 7				
<b>12.5</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, the public, or Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.</i></b>						
12.5.1	Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.	MF	6, 7				
12.5.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.	MF, RH	6				
<b>12.6</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.</i></b>	MF	7				
12.6.1*	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report. (*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)	MF	6, 7				
12.6.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.	MF	7				
12.6.3	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard	MF	6, 7				

**Objective 13: To promote continual improvement in the practice of sustainable forestry and monitor, measure, and report performance in achieving the commitment to sustainable forestry.**

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or-</u>	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>FC</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
13.1*	<i>Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.</i> (*This Performance Measure will be reviewed in all audits.)	MF	G: 6a				
13.1.1	System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.	MF	G: 6a, 6				
13.1.2	System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.	MF	G: 6a				6
13.1.3	Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.	MF	G: 6a, 6				

Michigan DNR October 2007 Surveillance Audit

Lead Auditor may choose to delete the requirement partially or fully to shorten the document, and/or to remove any requirements listed above as being "Not Applicable". The full requirements are listed in the first section of the matrix above, which is not to be so edited.)

Requirement	Finding	Notes
1.1		<b><i>“Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.”</i></b>
1.1.1	MIN	<p>“A long-term resource analysis to guide forest management planning at a level appropriate to the size and scale of the operation, including: a periodic or ongoing forest inventory; b. a land classification system; c. soils inventory and maps, where available; d. access to growth-and-yield modeling capabilities; e. up-to-date maps or a geographic information system (GIS); f. recommended sustainable harvest levels; and g. a review of nontimber issues (e.g., pilot projects and economic incentive programs to promote water protection, carbon storage, or biological diversity conservation).”</p> <p><u>Minor Non-conformance SFI-2007-01: The state forest management plan has not been updated since 1983. This keystone document ties together the many elements of planning at various spatial scales; the 2006 draft provides critical “Statewide Management Direction” including desired future conditions, goals, objectives, standards and guidelines for the management of recreation, vegetation, watersheds, rare species, land ownership and use, minerals and geology, forest pests, fire, the transportation system, law enforcement, governmental and tribal relations, research and education, and special resource areas.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revised Work Instruction 1.3Ecoregional Planning to guide the regional planning process, eventually will roll 1.3 into a statewide policy.</li> <li>• Confirmed the concept of “Management Areas” developed, reviewed with stakeholders, staff, Michigan Forest Management Advisory Committee and the “statewide council” which approve the concept at its June 5, 2007 meeting. Management areas to be 10,000 to 100,000 acres and deal only with vegetation management. Other issues will covered at broader spatial scales within the three regional state forest plans.</li> <li>• Currently working on two types of plans:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ecoregional Resource Plans – broader and more strategic, issues across all ownerships, and</li> <li>2. Regional State Forest Management Plans – more of a focus group approach, written by Ecoteams; to be completed by the end of 2008 for EUP, WUP, NLP</li> </ol> </li> <li>• The Regional SF MPs are critical for mapping overall state forest direction down to specific areas and for helping guide tactical decisions that will be made at the local or field level.</li> <li>• Management plans for this land base include a multitude of planning documents and guidance at many scales (see initial certification report). These are updated at various times. Confirmed one such update by review of “DRAFT 1 10/18/2007 A Concept of Management For the Pigeon River Country 2007 Update (Originally adopted in 1973 and amended in 1983)”.</li> </ul>
1.1.2	EXR	<p>“Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exceeds the Requirement: Sustainable harvest levels are conservative, and can clearly be sustained</li> </ul>
1.1.3	C	<p>“A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operations Inventory is the current inventory and harvest scheduling protocol. IFMAP, a more robust protocol, is being rolled out. Using either IFMAP or OI, inventory is conducted on 10% of the compartments each year. This work is assigned a very high priority, and inventory work is consistently up to date.</li> <li>• Growth is determined by use of FIA data.</li> </ul>
1.1.4	C	<p>“Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inventory update covered above.</li> <li>• Harvest planning is based on compartment inventory; harvests are recalculated for all stands within the inventoried compartments based on harvest criteria (stocking levels</li> </ul>

		<p>for thinning/selection harvests, time intervals for pine thinning, and rotation age and health factors for even-aged treatments). Confirmed up-to-date prescriptions for all compartments selected for field review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of documents, interviews, and observation of an open house session (Cadillac FMU) and a compartment review session (Roscommon FMU) confirmed that harvests are revised and recalculated on 10% of the compartments each year by means of an open and transparent, interdisciplinary process.</li> </ul>
1.1.5	C	<p>“Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation of all forest practices is superb. Fertilization or other growth accelerating treatments do not drive harvest levels; thinning (residual stocking levels) and planting (ensuring full stocking) do affect calculated harvest levels, but only after the growth effects are apparent. The thinning and planting programs appear to be on schedule for most accessible, operable stands.</li> </ul>
2.1	C	<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall reforest after final harvest, unless delayed for site-specific environmental or forest health considerations, through artificial regeneration within two years or two planting seasons, or by planned natural regeneration methods within five years.”</i></b></p>
2.1.1	C	<p>“Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Described in stand prescriptions. Planting plans including site preparation described on FTP forms.</li> </ul>
2.1.2	C	<p>“Clear Requirements to judge adequate regeneration and appropriate actions to correct understocked areas and achieve desired species composition and stocking rates for both artificial and natural regeneration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed by interviews and field inspections a robust program to regenerate stands.</li> </ul>
2.1.3	C	<p>“Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.”</p> <p><u>Exceeds the Requirement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Observations confirmed native species are planted extensively, that no exotics are planted, and that exotic trees and plants are actively removed or their spread is limited. DNR policy discourages the planting of exotic tree species.</li> </ul>
2.1.4	C	<p>“Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Observations at active and recently completed harvests confirmed that measures are taken to protect desirable advance regeneration and that sensitive understory species (for example white pine) do survive following even aggressive overstory removals.</li> </ul>
2.1.5	OFI	<p>“Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.”</p> <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve the analysis of cover type changes desirable or needed to meet overall state forest management goals. This analysis is expected to be at the core of the Regional State Forest Plans; delays in completing these plans may require interim measures to meet this indicator and the overall planning requirements in indicator 1.1.1.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extensive analysis and specialist reviews precede all harvest decisions, with particular care taken when species composition changes are planned, expected, or facilitated. Broad management guidance exists that will ultimately result in somewhat increased efforts towards targeted changes in stand composition; until this guidance is elaborated with completed Regional State Forest Management Plans that include quantitative guidance regarding approximate targeted acreage of cover type maintenance, expansion, conversion, or natural succession the management program can not be considered to be fully functional, especially regarding the ecosystem-management goal.</li> </ul>

2.2		<b><i>“Program Participants shall minimize chemical use required to achieve management objectives while protecting employees, neighbors, the public and the forest environment.”</i></b>
2.2.1	C	<p>“Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foresters strive to avoid prescribing chemical use; prescriptions are designed to accomplish site preparation through fire or mechanical methods.</li> <li>• Staff expressed concerns about adequate funding for prescribed fire; senior managers described recent higher priority given to silvicultural prescribed fire. More attention should be given to this issue during the 2008 audit.</li> </ul>
2.3		<b><i>“Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.”</i></b>
2.3.1	C	<p>“Use of soils maps where available.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soils maps used in compartment planning.</li> </ul>
2.3.2		<p>“Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
2.3.3	C	<p>“Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.</li> </ul>
2.3.4	C	<p>“Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
2.3.5	C	<p>“Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
2.3.6	C	<p>“Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.”</p> <p><u>Closed Minor Non-conformance SFI 2006-01: Based on a review of the adopted “Interim Rutting Guidance”, “Vegetative Erosion Control Guidelines”, and “Rutting and Timber Sale Contracts” provisions as well as interviews with field staff the non-conformance is closed. Michigan DNR now has clear, easily understood criteria defining acceptable limits of rutting during timber harvesting. The interim guidance will eventually be incorporated into updated statewide BMPs, to be published as a “Soil and Water Quality Manual”.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field foresters are aware of the new policies described above.</li> </ul>
2.3.7	OFI	<p>“Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.”</p> <p>There is an opportunity to improve the timeliness of road closures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenges exist in closing roads. Except for emergencies road closures are approved only after a public process and multi-division consultation, generally keyed to compartment review meetings. Not all staff attend these meetings; law enforcement staff are most likely to be absent, which is understandable given their staffing levels and broad responsibilities. Required approval by Ecoteams, while an important part of a robust review that considers cumulative effects and broader land management implications, can further add to delays.</li> </ul>
2.4	EXR	<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall manage so as to protect forests from damaging agents such as environmentally or economically undesirable wildfire, pests and diseases to maintain and improve long-term forest health, productivity and economic viability.”</i></b></p> <p><u>Exceeds the Requirements: Confirmed that the exemplary practices of the Michigan DNR described in the certification audit report continue.</u></p>

2.4.1	EXR	<p>“Program to protect forests from damaging agents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection programs for fire and pests are robust and well integrated into decision-making and implementation. Fire staff work closely with biologists and foresters.</li> </ul>
2.4.2	EXR	<p>“Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.</li> </ul>
2.4.3	EXR	<p>“Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forestry and fire are managed within the same agency, FMFM. Michigan DNR is the lead agency for fire and pest prevention and control.</li> </ul>
2.5		<p><b><i>“Program Participants that utilize genetically improved planting stock including those derived through biotechnology shall use sound scientific methods and follow all applicable laws and other internationally applicable protocols.”</i></b></p>
3.1		<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall meet or exceed all applicable federal, provincial, state and local water quality laws and meet or exceed Best Management Practices developed under Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-approved state water quality programs other applicable federal, provincial, state or local programs.”</i></b></p>
3.1.1	C	<p>“Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.”</p> <p><u>Closed Minor Non-conformance SFI-2006-02:</u>  <u>This issue was discussed during the SA, with extensive review of data provided before and after the audit. Significant resources have been made available to address road-related RDRs. Supplemental information was particularly useful in helping the Lead Auditor conclude that the corrective action plan has been implemented. There is a continuing concern that the serious financial and budget difficulties being faced by the State of Michigan may derail significant progress recently made on this long-standing problem. The audit team will consider this issue once again during the 2008 Surveillance Audit.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See excerpts from “Michigan Department of Natural Resources - Forest Certification SFI CAR 2006.2 – Addendum” at the end of this table; these provide a summary of budgets for roads and trails maintenance and repairs.</li> <li>• The Resource Damage Report (RDR) system has been implemented successfully. Field staff are routinely using the system to report on erosion and sediment control repairs needed. Managers use the system to assess overall budget needs and to prioritize repairs.</li> <li>• As of the opening meeting there were 970 open RDRs with an estimated cost of \$11 million to resolve.</li> <li>• Funding for repairs continues to be problematic, but appears to be sufficient to maintain the “status quo”: resource conditions are stable, in that new RDRs are balanced by repairs, meaning that a backlog remains but much work has been done.</li> <li>• Special “road and bridge funding” has been made available by reallocating operations budgets over the past two years. In Fiscal Year 2006 \$500,000 was available and in FY 2007 280,000 was available for unit managers to address their priority RDRs. Due to a statewide budget crisis there are not likely to be such funds in the 2008 budget.</li> <li>• Special grants and other recreation-related programs provide a more robust, but somewhat less-flexible, source of funds to address RDRs. A long list of such projects was provided.</li> <li>• Some RDRs are addressed as part of routing maintenance.</li> <li>• Reviewed Off-Road Vehicle Strategy Task Force Report 5-25-06; overall strategy was approved by FMFM Management team June 2006; leadership asked for a plan</li> <li>• DNR then prepared “Managing Illegal Off-Road Use Action Plan” October 12, 2006 divided into 3 sections by agency responsible: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Office of Communication (OC)</li> <li>○ FMFM, and</li> <li>○ Law Enforcement Division (LED)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have gotten started on the plan, perhaps 40% done, would like to have been further along 1 year out; by next year should be up to 75% done</li> <li>• Working on an update to their Comprehensive ORV plan, to be provided to NRC in the spring of 2007</li> </ul>
3.1.4	EXR	<p>“Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exceeds the Requirement: Resource Damage Report system is exemplary</li> </ul>
3.2	C	<p><b><i>“Program Participant shall have or develop, implement, and document, riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation and other applicable factors.”</i></b></p>
3.2.1	C	<p>“Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed that the riparian/wetland protection program still functions well.</li> </ul>
3.2.2	C	<p>“Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by field observations at sites visited in 2007 SA.</li> </ul>
3.2.3	C	<p>“Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.</li> </ul>
3.2.4	C	<p>“Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by field observations at sites visited in 2007 SA.</li> </ul>
3.2.5	N.A.	<p>“Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.”</p>
4.1		<p><b><i>“Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.”</i></b></p>
4.1.2	EXR	<p>“Program to protect threatened and endangered species.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exceeds the Requirement: DNR has a long history of establishing Natural Areas and other sites where habitat is protected for imperiled species and communities, and this track record is continuing. The team received further evidence of the roll-out of the fairly new Biodiversity Conservation Planning process intended to address the appropriate means of protecting samples of representative communities.</li> </ul>
4.1.3	EXR	<p>“Plans to locate and protect known sites associated with viable occurrences of critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities. Plans for protection may be developed independently or collaboratively and may include Program Participant management, cooperation with other stakeholders, or use of easements, conservation land sales, exchanges, or other conservation strategies.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exceeds the Requirement:</li> <li>• G1, G2, and G3 natural communities that have an EO Rank of A or B are all protected as Ecological Reference Areas (ERA); almost all communities identified ranked as A or B and thus are being protected at the highest level</li> <li>• G1, G2, and G3 natural communities that have an EO Rank of C are being considered for restoration</li> <li>• Baseline ecological reference areas (Plant Communities) from MNFI database as of July 2005 if it was S or G 1, 2, or 3 and A or B were identified for review; contract is being implemented (MNFI paid by FMFM)</li> <li>• Michigan DNR contracted with MNFI to revisit field sites; 90, or half have been field checked to date; confirmed work plan including statement of need, timeline and budget</li> <li>•</li> </ul>

4.1.4	C	<p>“Development and implementation of criteria, as guided by regionally appropriate science, for retention of stand-level wildlife habitat elements (e.g., snags, mast trees, down woody debris, den trees, nest trees).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Within-Stand Retention Guidance” dated 10.05.06 forms the criteria; field observations at all sites visited confirmed that stand level retention has been implemented for many years</li> </ul>
4.1.7		<p>“Participation in programs and demonstration of activities as appropriate to limit the introduction, impact, and spread of invasive exotic plants and animals that directly threaten or are likely to threaten native plant and animal communities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New “Interim Rutting Guidance – Vegetative Erosion Control Guidelines Appendix” for state forest land (effective August 13, 2007) emphasizes the use of native species, with exceptions for non-invasive exotics when rapid cover is needed and no alternative exists.</li> </ul>
4.1.8		<p>“Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foresters strive to avoid prescribing chemical use; prescriptions are designed to accomplish site preparation through fire or mechanical methods. (Relates to SFI Indicator 2.2.1 “Minimized chemical use required to achieve management objectives.”)</li> <li>• Staff expressed concerns about adequate funding for prescribed fire; senior managers described recent higher priority given to silvicultural prescribed fire. More attention should be given to this issue during the 2008 audit.</li> </ul>
4.2	C	<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall apply knowledge gained through research, science, technology, and field experience to manage wildlife habitat and contribute to the conservation of biological diversity.”</i></b></p>
4.2.1	C	<p>“Collection of information on critically imperiled and imperiled species and communities and other biodiversity-related data through forest inventory processes, mapping, or participation in external programs, such as NatureServe, state or provincial heritage programs, or other credible systems. Such participation may include providing nonproprietary scientific information, time, and assistance by staff, or in-kind or direct financial support.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of compartment review; confirmed during formal Roscommon Compartment Meeting November 1.</li> </ul>
4.2.2	C	<p>“A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff expertise, Co-Management by Wildlife Division, and involvement of specialists from a range of disciplines comprise this program, which continues to be effective.</li> </ul>
5.1	C	<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.”</i></b></p>
5.1.1, 5.1.2	C	<p>“Program to address visual quality management.”</p> <p>“Incorporation of aesthetic considerations in harvesting, road, landing design and management, and other management activities where visual impacts are a concern.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visual management programs are in place and generally very effective – forests visited were clearly being managed with visual considerations.</li> </ul>
5.2		<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.”</i></b></p>
5.2.1	EXR	<p>“Average size of clearcut harvest areas does not exceed 120 acres, except when necessary to respond to forest health emergencies or other natural catastrophes.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exceeds the Requirement:</li> <li>• The 2006 SFI Annual Progress report submitted in April 2007 included: “average size of stand that was clearcut = 21 acres; average number of clearcut acres per contract = 59 acres”.</li> <li>• 2005 report: “There are two metrics for clearcut size. From 2001 to 2004, clearcut</li> </ul>

		stands grouped by sale ranged from annual averages of 56 to 64 acres; and clearcut stands not grouped by sale (sometimes the stands are not adjacent) ranged from annual averages of 22 to 26 acres. The higher figure is appropriate for reporting on the annual survey.
5.2.2	C	<p>“Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See 5.2.1 above</li> </ul>
5.3		<b><i>“Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.”</i></b>
6.1.		<b><i>“Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.”</i></b>
7.1	C	<b><i>“Program Participants shall employ appropriate forest harvesting technology and “in-woods” manufacturing processes and practices to minimize waste and ensure efficient utilization of harvested trees, where consistent with other SFI Standard objectives.”</i></b>
7.1.1	C	<p>“Program or monitoring system to ensure efficient utilization, which may include...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited that utilization is consistent with available markets. Foresters layout all harvests and work with harvest contractors.</li> </ul>
9.1	C	<b><i>“Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations provide in-kind support or funding, in addition to that generated through taxes, for forest research to improve the health, productivity, &amp; management of forest resources.”</i></b>
9.1.1	C	<p>“Current financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research will include ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed significant and wide-ranging research support by review of “Summary of Sustainable Forestry Research FY 2006”. This document lists ongoing and recently completed research projects by agency (FMFM, Wildlife, Fisheries, Agriculture, Parks and Recreation, Environmental Quality)</li> <li>• Research was organized by the following categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ecological Processes;</li> <li>○ Human Dimensions;</li> <li>○ Chemical Use;</li> <li>○ Forest Management</li> <li>○ Wildlife Management;</li> <li>○ Fisheries Management;</li> <li>○ Environmental Protection;</li> <li>○ Biological Diversity;</li> <li>○ and Social Economic.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Contact information for research directors for the primary land management agencies (FMFM, Wildlife, Fisheries) is provided.</li> </ul>
9.2	C	<b><i>“Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations develop or use state, provincial, or regional analyses in support of their sustainable forestry programs.”</i></b>
9.2.1	C	<p>“Participation, individually or through cooperative efforts or associations at the state, provincial, or regional level, in the development or use of a. regeneration assessments; b. growth-and-drain assessments; c. BMP implementation and compliance; and d. biodiversity conservation information for family forest owners.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research efforts described above are extensive and cover the above issues</li> </ul>

		substantially.
10.1	C	<b><i>“Program Participants shall require appropriate training of personnel and contractors so that they are competent to fulfill their responsibilities under the SFI Standard.”</i></b>
10.1.1	C	<p>“Written statement of commitment to the SFI Standard communicated throughout the organization, particularly to mill and woodland managers, wood procurement staff, and field foresters.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statement of commitment to certification still applies; staff well-aware of SFI and their roles in meeting certification requirements.</li> </ul>
10.1.2	EXR	<p>“Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exceeds the Requirement: Michigan DNR has a large Forest Certification Action Team and a full-time Forest Certification Specialist. All SFI Indicators and Performance Measures were cross-checked by the MDNR against their current programs, and then a new system of “Work Instructions” was instituted. There is an active working group drawn from across the Michigan DNR with assignments for all SFI Performance Measures and Indicators. All of the SFI Performance Measures and Indicators are contained in a series of Forest Certification Work Instructions</li> </ul>
10.1.3	C	<p>“Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with field staff confirmed strong educational backgrounds and access to training and information.</li> </ul>
10.1.4	C	<p>“Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contractors interviewed were trained.</li> </ul>
10.2		<b><i>“Program Participants shall work closely with state logging or forestry associations, or appropriate agencies or others in the forestry community, to foster improvement in the professionalism of wood producers.”</i></b>
10.2.1, 12.1.1, 12.2.1, and 12.5.1		<p>“Participation in or support of SFI Implementation Committees to establish criteria and identify delivery mechanisms for wood producers’ training courses...”</p> <p>Note: Indicators 10.2.1, 12.1.1, 12.2.1, and 12.5.1 all relate to SFI Implementation Committee activities. Description of evidence is included here for all of these indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Michigan DNR is seeking to ramp-up their participation in the Michigan SIC; confirmed recent meeting of DNR FMFM Division Chief, State Forester, and SIC to address funding issue</li> </ul>
11.1		<b><i>“Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.”</i></b>
11.2		<b><i>“Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with all applicable social laws at the federal, provincial, state, and local levels in the country in which the Program Participant operates.”</i></b>
12.1		<b><i>“Program Participants shall support and promote efforts by consulting foresters, state and federal agencies, state or local groups, professional societies, and the American Tree Farm System® and other landowner cooperative programs to apply principles of sustainable forest management.”</i></b>
12.1.1	C	<p>“Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See 10.2.1 above</li> </ul>
12.1.5	C	<p>“Program Participants are knowledgeable about credible regional conservation planning and priority-setting efforts that include a broad range of stakeholders. Consider the results of these efforts in planning where practical and consistent with management objectives.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Michigan DNR makes extensive use of such analyses during ecoregional planning</li> </ul>

		and some use during compartment planning.
<b>12.2</b>		<b><i>“Program Participants shall support and promote, at the state, provincial or other appropriate levels, mechanisms for public outreach, education, and involvement related to forest management.”</i></b>
12.2.1	C	“Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs).” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See 10.2.1 above</li> </ul>
12.2.3	EXR	“Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.” <u>Exceeds the Requirement: Public recreation opportunities are high-quality, diverse, and widely available.</u>
<b>12.3</b>	C	<b><i>“Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.”</i></b>
12.3.1	C	“Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed extensive outreach efforts for planning decisions at compartment and eco-regional levels.</li> </ul>
12.3.2	C	“Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed extensive public participation efforts and extensive collaboration during the development of the new Soil and Water Quality Manual.</li> </ul>
<b>12.4</b>	C	<b><i>“Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.”</i></b>
12.4.1	C	“Program that includes communicating with affected indigenous peoples to enable Program Participants to a. understand and respect traditional forest related knowledge; b. identify and protect spiritually, historically, or culturally important sites; and c. address the sustainable use of nontimber forest products of value to indigenous peoples in areas where Program Participants have management responsibilities on public lands.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The State of Michigan recently signed a consent decree with 5 tribes that clarifies tribal rights under the 1836 Treaty of Washington. Other tribes are considering signing.</li> <li>• Extensive training for Michigan DNR staff is taking place. The first step involved “train the trainer” sessions. General training for all staff is underway.</li> <li>• Confirmed efforts to provide the public information about the “1836 Inland Treaty Rights Consent Decree”. An example is the 3-page overview “2007 Inland Consent Decree”.</li> </ul>
<b>12.5</b>		<b><i>“Program Participants shall establish, at the state, provincial, or other appropriate levels, procedures to address concerns raised by loggers, consulting foresters, employees, the public, or Program Participants regarding practices that appear inconsistent with the SFI Standard principles and objectives.”</i></b>
12.5.1	C	“Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See 10.2.1 above</li> </ul>
<b>12.6</b>	C	<b><i>“Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.”</i></b>
12.6.1*	C	“Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.” (*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed with SFI, Inc. that report was received on time.</li> </ul>
12.6.2	C	“Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Record keeping is very good; computer systems appear robust and generally effective.</li> </ul>
12.6.3	C	“Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintained by forest certification specialist as well as Lansing office.</li> </ul>

13.1*	C	<b><i>“Program Participants shall establish a management review system to examine findings and progress in implementing the SFI Standard, to make appropriate improvements in programs, and to inform their employees of changes.”</i></b>
13.1.1 13.1.2	C	<p>“System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.”  “System for collecting, reviewing, and reporting information to management regarding progress in achieving SFI Standard objectives and performance measures.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Michigan DNR has developed and implemented a comprehensive internal audit program that is effectively helping to strengthen all programs, including SFI conformance.</li> <li>• “Seven internal audits were conducted in 2006. The Forest Management Units audited included: Crystal Falls, Escanaba, Newberry, Shingleton, Traverse City, Grayling, and Roscommon. Based upon audit results, DNR lead auditors identified five “statewide” non-conformances (see Appendix B) that required focused attention during the 2006 Management Review.”</li> <li>• Michigan DNR is starting to implement a process re-engineering effort (Value Stream Mapping). Initial focus is on planning and implementation of forest management treatments including compartment review process.</li> </ul>
13.1.3	C	<p>“Annual review of progress by management and determination of changes and improvements necessary to continually improve SFI conformance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Management Review process for MiDNR is described in Work Instruction 1.2.</li> <li>• Confirmed by reading “Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Management Review Report, January 30, 2007” which describes 2006 internal and external audits and the results of the formal management review meeting. According to the report “The annual management review will evaluate audit results for state forest operations, evaluate effectiveness of work instructions and non-conformances, and determine changes and improvements necessary for continued conformance.”</li> <li>• The report described 23 changes in the work instructions as a result of the review of programs, procedures, and commitments. All changes to work instructions recommended in the January, 2007 management review report were approved and rolled out to DNR staff on 6-29-07. In addition, the Statewide Council approved a significant revision of work instruction 1.3 ( now titled “Regional State Forest Management Plan Development”) on 10-25-07.</li> </ul>

### Capital Outlay Budget

(Source: “Michigan Department of Natural Resources - Forest Certification SFI CAR 2006.2 – Addendum”)

Since Fiscal Year 2003 Capital Outlay funds for roads, bridges and facilities have been requested by FMFM. In 2007 the Legislature delayed and reduced Capital Outlay appropriations due to significant State of Michigan budget shortfalls. The Governor issued Executive Directives in Fiscal Years 06-08 designed to limit expenditures which has resulted in project delays.

Fiscal Year	Request	Appropriated (Roads/Bridge & Facilities)	Roads & Bridges only	Notes
FY 2003	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$369,000	
FY2004	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$584,000	
FY2005	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$432,000	
FY2006	\$800,000	\$800,000	\$580,000*	*\$382,000 specifically for RDRs
FY2007	\$1,300,000	\$400,000		Budget cuts from Legislature, not passed until FY08

## **Itinerary of Field Stops**

### **Michigan DNR Annual Surveillance Audit**

### **October 30-November 1, 2007**

Note: Confirmed sale documentation for all sites including (as applicable) completion report, field inspection report, contract with sale specific conditions & requirements, timber sale map, pre cruise information, timber sale inspection report, and presale checklist.

#### **Tuesday October 30, 2007 Traverse City FMU**

Site #1 Compartment 44, Dead Horse Jack: Active final harvest mostly Jack Pine some Aspen and hardwood. Interviewed Ron Bundy, family member of purchaser; Ron is SFE trained, runs slasher. Due to limited markets for Jack Pine the logging has been intermittent (have authorization to only deliver 4 loads per month to Weyerhaeuser's Grayling mill).

Site #2 Compartment 44, Williamsburg Oak: Completed summer 2007 oak harvest at intersection of two public roads and with snowmobile trail bisecting; selection treatment including intentional gaps and some shelterwood establishment (heavier cutting); excellent utilization and appearance.

Site #3 Compartment 41, The Wall: Uncut regeneration harvest removing aspen, oak, and maple with significant dispersed and clumped retention. The Vasa Trail, an important recreational pathway, runs through the stand but is well-buffered from much of the visual impact by careful planning including retention (uncut) patches along two significant areas of the trail-harvest interface.

Site #4 Compartment 45, Sand Lake Quiet Area: Drove through this unique (the only such designated) Special Conservation Area. Pitted outwash topography featuring kettle lakes interspersed with maturing mixed pine-oak forests and extensive trail networks for non-motorized recreation draw significant recreational use. Management over past 20 years involved limited aspen regeneration harvests. Also drove past a DNR campground.

Site #5 Compartment 155 Kalkaska County: Proposed Sale #081, Stand 41: Mixed pine and hardwoods, aspen, maple, and jack pine designated for removal.

#### **Wednesday October 31, 2007 Cadillac FMU**

##### **Morning: Ferrucci and Hrubes**

Site #1 Compartment 114, Cutcheon Red: Red Pine second thinning harvested summer 2007 using shortwood processor; healthy, vigorous residual stand, no damage to stems or ground impacts.

Site #2 Compartment 114, Turner Pineville: completed harvest including clearcut of Jack Pine strips and thinning of interspersed Red Pine strips. Was burned once, will wait up to 4 years and burn again, hoping to get red pine regeneration in the open areas.

Site #3 Compartment 114, Mike and Tony Hardwoods: harvest completed; large single-tree selection hardwood sale some marked, some by designation of species to remove (all red maple, aspen, and beech under 8 inches dbh) with intentional creation of canopy gaps 0.1 to 0.2 acre size. Residual stand composed of vigorous, healthy trees. Observed significant presence of new oak seedlings from 2005 seed year throughout most of the stand.

Site #4 Compartment 114, Ville Turner Aspen: harvest completed, limited retention but ok because this sale was planned in 2003 prior to retention guidelines; excellent regeneration response.

**Afternoon: Ferrucci (Lake County)**

Site #5 RDR Project: Compartment 7, south of 7 Mile Road along Cole Creek and Pine River; damage from road-licensed vehicles accessing informal fishing and camping areas; emergency road closure followed by extensive repair, waterbars, seeding, and removal of trash

Site #6 Compartment 24, Fruiting Fungi: Multiple-unit Active Timber Harvest and logger interview; Harvest Unit 1 Aspen clearcut with scattered retention of marked oak trees, some of which had slight damage from logging; confirmed that the buyer/operator Mike Bean is SFE Trained, and machine operator Steve Zimmerman has the core training. Mike Bean supervises two logging crews and spends about half of his time on the sale.

Site #7 Compartment 24, Fire Starters: planned timber sale, presale underburn completed goal to kill most understory white pine and reduce ground litter to improve oak regeneration, generally met goal except in eastern portion of stand; will then do a shelterwood establishment harvest to remove most non-oak overstory; discussed landscape considerations including need to regenerate some oak and the strong presence of understory white pine as well as adjacent major deer wintering yard. Compartment review notes confirm strong successional tendency towards pine and challenges regenerating oak.

Site #8 Compartment 24, Sawarock Pine: Completed Jack Pine clearcut strips interspersed with thinned red pine strips by removal of all trees from designated rows (one-third thinning). Clearcut areas had some green-tree retention, all areas excellent utilization

Site #9 Compartment 24, Forest Treatment Proposal FTP C63-637: Site preparation by trenching "50% weave" then Red pine plant with some jack pine in frost pockets; discussed and drove by section that has adequate natural regeneration but did not inspect the portion to be treated

**Afternoon: Hrubes**

**Thursday November 1, 2007 Roscommon FMU**

Site # 1 and 2 Roscommon Forest Fire Experiment Station: Review and discussion of site preparation methods, including trenching following the clearcut of a mixed oak-pine stand subject to frost pocket damage of oak regeneration. Will plant red pine on front section to buffer the ground of the station from Kirtland's warbler habitat. Second site was already planted.

**Thursday November 1, 2007 Gladwin FMU**

Site # 1 Compartment 4, north end of Haskell Lake: Observed and discussed ORV damage, which was extensive. Resource Damage Report (RDR) 126A

Site # 2 RDR 18-001-06: More ORV damage

Site # 3 Leota Trail Head ORV parking lot and scramble area.

Site #4 (drive through) Clear-cut Jack Pine stands as part of Kirtland's Warbler habitat management.

Site #5 Compartment 7 Hemi Oak Sale: The second shelterwood entry in an important oak stand (on an isolated oak-dominated moraine in a sea of Jack Pine) essentially a partial overstory removal; logger interviews. Chad Weber, representative of Weber Brothers Sawmill is SFE trained. Joe Brooks, Logger has some training, his loggers (hand felling and bucking) were well equipped with safety equipment

## 2007 Michigan DNR Audit – Meeting Attendance Sheets

**Location: Traverse City**

**Date: Tuesday, Oct. 30**

NAME	TITLE/POSITION
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Auditor
Robert Hrubes	SCS, FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Auditor
Dennis Nezich	Forest Certification Specialist, Michigan DNR
Larry Pedersen	Planning Unit Supervisor, Michigan DNR
William O'Neil	Lower Peninsula Field Coordinator
Mike Donovan	
David Price	Forest Cert. Planner
Cara Boucher	Lansing Section Mgr.
Penney Melchoir	Field Coordinator
Tim Webb	Forester – T.C.
Scott Throop	District Silviculturalist – Timber Management Spec.
Rich Earle	Wildlife Biologist, T.C.
Steve Griffith	Wildlife Tech, T.C.
Roger Hoeksema	FMFM, District Forest Sup.
Larry Visser	Wildlife, Cadillac
Tom Rozich	Fisheries, Cadillac
Dave Johnson	FMFM, Forest Tech
Patrick Ruppen	Forester, T.C.
Ryan Mattila	Forester, Cadillac
Lt Dean Molnar	District Law Supervisor, Cadillac
Paul Simmer	Fire & Rec Supervisor
Jerry Griewe	Forester, Kalkaska
Donna Hagan	Forester, Kalkaska
Scott Lint	Forest Tech, T.C.
Katie Campbell	Motorized Trails Analyst, Cadillac OSC
Todd Neiss	Recreation Specialist, Cadillac OSC
David Price	Certification Planner, Lansing
Tom Haxby	Inventory & Planning Specialist
David Lemmien	Unit Manager TC FMU, FMFM

**2007 Michigan DNR Audit – Meeting Attendance Sheet****Location: Cadillac****Date: Wednesday, Oct. 31**

<b>DIVISION</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>TITLE/POSITION</b>
FMFM, Lansing	Larry Pedersen	Planning & Operations Supervisor
FMFM, Baldwin	Rick Hill	Forester
FMFM, Baldwin	Mindy Rogers	Unit Secretary
FMFM, Baldwin	Bryce Avery	Unit Fire Supervisor
FMFM, Baldwin	Cheryl Nelson	Forester
FMFM Cadillac OSC	Todd Neiss	Rec. Specialist
WD Rose Lake	Penney Melchoir	Field Coordinator
FMFM Cadillac	Katie Campbell	Motorized Trails Analyst
FMFM Manton	Jim Malloy	Forester
LED Cadillac	Michelle Wiegand	Area Law Supervisor
FMFM Manton	David Fisher	Forester
LED Cadillac	Lt Dean Monlar	DLS
Fish Gaylord	Dan Pearson	Natural Rivers
OLAF Cadillac	Sue Sobieski	Secretary
FMFM Cadillac	Andy Church	Forester
FMFM Gaylord	Bill O'Neill	F.C.
WLD Cadillac	Ruthann French	Technician
FMFM Cadillac	Scott Throop	TMS/Silviculturalist
WLD Baldwin	Larry Smith	Wildlife Biologist
FMFM Marquette	Dennis Nezhich	F.C. Specialist (Unit Mgr.)
FMFM Cadillac	Bill Sterrett	Unit Manager
Fisheries Cadillac	Tom Rozich	Unit Manager
WLD Cadillac	Larry Visser	WLD Supervisor
FMFM Cadillac	Roger Hoeksema	WLP Forest Supervisor

**2007 Michigan DNR Audit – Meeting Attendance Sheet****Location: Gladwin****Date: Thursday, Nov. 1**

NAME	TITLE/POSITION
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Auditor
Robert Hrubes	SCS, FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Auditor
Dennis Nezich	Forest Certification Specialist, Michigan DNR
Larry Pedersen	Planning Unit Supervisor, Michigan DNR
William O'Neil	Lower Peninsula Field Coordinator
Penney Melchoir	Field Coordinator
Steven Nyhoff	Forester
Adam Bump	Wildlife Biologist – Bay City
Tim Gallagher	Forest Technician – Gladwin
Katie Campbell	Motorized Trails Analyst
Jeff Vasher	Fire Officer
Chris Damuelt	Fire Officer
Jake Figley	Fire Supervisor
Tim Reis	Wildlife Supervisor
Mark Reichel	Forester
Dean Schelenberger	Wildlife Biologist
Bruce Barlow	Wildlife Tech – Gladwin
Roger Hoeksema	FMFM, Cadillac
Courtney Borgandy	FMFM, Gladwin

**2007 Michigan DNR Audit – Meeting Attendance Sheet****Location: Lansing****Date: Friday, Nov. 2**

NAME	TITLE/POSITION
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR, SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Auditor
Robert Hrubes	SCS, FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Auditor
Dennis Nezych	Forest Certification Specialist, Michigan DNR
Larry Pedersen	Planning Unit Supervisor, Michigan DNR
William O'Neil	Lower Peninsula Field Coordinator
David Price	Forest Cert. Planner
Cara Boucher	Lansing Section Mgr.
Penney Melchoir	Field Coordinator
Lynne Boyd	Chief, FMFM
Donna LaCourt	Assistant Chief, FMFM
Mindy Koch	Resource Management Deputy
Douglas Reeves	Acting Chief, Wildlife
Joseph J. Taylor	Section Manager, FMFM
Steve DeBraebander	Unit Manager, State Trails, FMFM
Steve Kubisiak	Recreation & Trails Program Coordinator
David Freed	Chief, Land & Facilities, DNR
Kerry Fitzpatrick	Habitat Specialist, Wildlife Division