



December 22, 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 2008 Surveillance Audit Report for the Michigan DNR. NSF's audit team previously recommended continuing conformance. I am recommending 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 October, 2009. Please let me know when the Michigan DNR team determines these dates.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mike Ferrucci".

Mike Ferrucci, Lead Auditor, NSF-ISR

---



**NSF-ISR, LTD**  
**SURVEILLANCE AUDIT REPORT**  
December 22, 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 20-23, 2008

**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
- "Work Instruction 3.3 Best Management Practices – Road Closures" draft revisions being worked on

**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, five 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 including Additional Notes and Key Evidence  
Appendix VI: Itinerary of Field Stops  
Appendix VII: SFI Reporting Form

**APPENDIX I**



**Surveillance Notification Letter  
and Audit Schedule**



**REVISED FINAL DRAFT: October 20, 2008**

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. 21 to Thursday October 23 as follows:

FMU/ Loc.	Day	Times	Focus Areas
Atlanta	Tuesday Oct. 21	8 – 11 am	Programmatic, CARs, changes
Atlanta		11 am – 5 pm	Field operations
Sault Ste. Marie	Wednesday Oct. 22	8 am – 5	Field operations
Gaylord	Thursday Oct. 23	8 to 9:30 am	District and Unit overview
		10 am-2 pm	Field operations
Gaylord	Thursday Oct. 23	2- 3 pm	Wrap-up discussions and Auditor deliberations
		3 to 4:30 pm	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**

- Management Planning
- 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 selected focus Criteria (P=Principle, C=Criteria):

- 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 2008 Surveillance Audit

**DRAFT Agenda for Michigan DNR 2008 Surveillance Audit**

<u>Atlanta</u>	<u>Tuesday Oct. 21</u>	<u>8 am to 5 pm</u>
<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>	
7:50 am	Arrive at Atlanta Forest Management Unit (FMU) Office	
8:00 am	Opening Meeting and Office Discussions FSC CARs SFI CARs	
11 am	Overview of Atlanta Forest Management Unit and Office Discussions	
11:30 am	Field Visits: Sites selected by local staff	
Noon	Working Lunch: Review Selected Sales and Finalize Field Visit	
12:30 – 5 pm	Field Site Visits	
5 pm	Daily Briefing (Onaway Field Office)	

Evening: Auditors and selected DNR staff travel 1 1 / 2 hours to SSM;

<u>Sault Ste. Marie</u>	<u>Tuesday Oct. 21</u>	<u>8 am to 5 pm</u>
<i>Time</i>	<i>Activity</i>	
7:50 am	Arrive at SSM FMU Office	
8:00 am	Overview of SSM FMU, Office Discussions, Finalize Field Visit	
9:00 am	Depart for Drummond Island	
11:00 am	Field Visits	
Noon	Working Lunch: Review Selected Sales	
12:30 – 5 pm	Field Site Visits	
5 pm	Daily Briefing (DeTour Field Office)	

Evening: Auditors and selected DNR staff travel 2 hours to Gaylord;

<u>Gaylord</u>	<u>Thursday Oct. 23</u>	<u>8 to 4:00 pm</u>
7:50 am	Arrive at Gaylord Operations Service Center	
8:00 am	Overview of Gaylord FMU, Overview of Regional State Forest Planning, Office Discussions, Finalize Field Visit	
9:30 am	Field Visits	
Noon	Working Lunch: Review Selected Sales	
12:30 – 2 pm	Field Site Visits: end with Daily Briefing at final field site	
2 pm – 2:30 pm	Auditor deliberations	
2:30 pm – 3 pm	Office Discussion with FMFM Division Chief Lynne Boyd and Resource Management Bureau Deputy Mindy Koch	
3 pm – 3:30 pm	Final FSC Exit Briefing	
3:30 pm – 4 pm	Final FSC Exit Briefing	

**APPENDIX II**



Corrective Action Requests

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

Company/Location: <u>Michigan DNR</u>	Date: <u>October 23, 2008</u> FRS # <u>5Y031</u>
Auditor: <u>Mike Ferrucci</u>	CAR Number: <u>SFI-2008-01</u>
Location of Finding: <u>SSM, Drummond Island</u>	Previous CAR Number/Date: <u>NA</u>
Discussed with: <u>Dennis Nezych, all audit participants</u>	Nonconformance Type (underline): Major <u>Minor</u>

**AUDITOR FINDING:** Standard Number and Clauses: 2005-2009 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Standard®: SFI Indicator 3.1.1 “Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.” and SFI Indicator 3.2.5 “Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.”

Description: Roads on Drummond Island are not maintained in accordance with BMPs for roads. The current routes used by Jeeps and large 4wd vehicles are, in places, not passable by 2-wd vehicles and have inadequate provisions for drainage (surfacing, road crown, etc). These roads are being upgraded, often with provisions for adequate road surface and/or drainage. Plans are under development to include “challenge road” sections that are not fully drained. There are no existing BMPs or standards for such roads that would ensure environmental protections (while offering the desired recreational experience).

**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.**

There are several interpretations of acceptable road conditions on Drummond Island because of past customary use as well as access needs. Roads have been used for ORV events but are not currently designated as ORV routes. This has resulted in confusion as to which standards should apply. In addition, some staff did not believe BMP issues actually existed on Drummond Island roads, for two reasons: 1) the close-to-surface bedrock and solid bottoms to the pools of water on most forest roads, 2) the pools are self-contained and sedimentation does not flow into water bodies or regulated wetlands.

For the most part, forest roads on Drummond Island have existed in their present location for decades. The topographic maps from the 1950’s and 1960’s label most of these as Jeep Trails because of the rocky and muddy conditions on the island. These natural conditions, along with the rapidly increasing use of the trails over the last several years for permitted motorized events, coupled with the departure of the ORV Tech and the Fire and Recreation Supervisor at about the same time, severely taxed our ability to keep up with issues associated with Jeep Trails. Additionally, forest certification of the State Forest System prompted the Department to devote attention to the road and ORV management issues on Drummond Island.

In 2007, a concerted attempt was made by FMFM to work with Wildlife Division, Law Enforcement Division and Fisheries Division to designate an official ORV Route. The DNR Divisions interpreted the language of the ORV law differently. The issue was in regard to whether ORV routes could only be located on State Forest Roads or other roads passable by conventional 2 wheeled vehicles. This resulted in a suspension of all discussions until a Department interpretation of the law was provided by memo from Resource Deputy Director Mindy Koch on June 4, 2008 (copy attached).

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 District Trails Analyst has recently been hired and the Sault Ste. Marie FMU Fire and Recreation Supervisor position has been filled on a permanent basis. Approximately \$150,000.00 in total was allocated for ORV remediation and/or Jeep Trail upgrade on Drummond Island.

A DNR Drummond Island Work Group has been appointed and charged with the review of the recreation and transportation system, which includes resource protection considerations. The Work Group’s focus is on where ORV routes will be located and how many miles will be established. Leadership’s expectation is a consensus product. The Work Group is comprised of DNR staff from the Resource Divisions and representatives of the various local interest groups including the Drummond Island Sportsmen’s Club, Snowmobile Club, ORV Club, ORV Trails grant sponsor, local business people, Township Supervisor, The Nature Conservancy, general landowners, and the Drummond Island Tourist Association. Other members include off-island user groups including the Great Lakes 4wd Association, Jeep Jamboree USA and Hummer Club International. Updates on the first

meeting were provided to the DNR's ORV Advisory Board at their November 5, 2008 meeting. Agreement on issues was reached after two meetings and a DRAFT proposal is currently being written.

A description of acceptable conditions for ORV Routes on Drummond Island will be developed by the Department after the Work Group plan is accepted. These standards will be implemented and will ensure environmental protections, while offering the desired recreational experience. These standards reportedly exist in other states, and are currently being researched by interest groups and DNR staff who are participating in the Work Group.

**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.

The District Trails Analyst and Forest Management Unit staff will oversee ORV route and road upgrades and the implementation of the Work Group ORV Route plan when developed and accepted. Internal audits will continue to monitor conformance with recreational plans and BMP Standards.

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

The proposed corrective and preventive actions, while complex, appear likely to resolve the non-conformance. Implementation and success regarding closing the gap between the requirements and conditions will be reviewed during the next surveillance audit.

STATUS: Open AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci 12.22.08

**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 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 Nezych, 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:**

Confirmed Michigan DNR press release of April 15, 2008 which announced the completion of the Michigan State Forest Management Plan and its approval by the Director of DNR following approval by the Natural Resources Commission.

STATUS: Closed AUDITOR/DATE: Mike Ferrucci, April 16, 2008

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



## APPENDIX III



## 2008 Michigan DNR Audit – Meeting Attendance Sheets

**Location: Atlanta, MI****Date: October 21, 2008**

Name	Organization	Title/position
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR	SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Auditor
Dr. Robert Hrubes	SCS	FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Auditor
Kyle Meister	SCS	FSC Trainee Auditor
Dennis Nezich	DNR - FMFM	Forest Certification Specialist
Penney Melchoir	DNR – Wildlife	Field Operations Supervisor
Larry Pedersen	DNR - FMFM	Acting Forest Resources Management Section Leader, Lansing
William O’Neill	DNR – FMFM	LP Field Coordinator
Cara Boucher	DNR – FMFM	Acting State Forester, FM2
Dayle Garlock	DNR – FMFM	District Forest Manager, ELP
Paige Perry	DNR – FMFM	Trails Program Analyst, ELP
David Price	DNR – FMFM	Certification Planner
Joe Soncrainte	DNR – FMFM	Fire Officer Supervisor
Keith Kintigh	DNR – Wildlife	Wildlife Ecologist
Jim Bielecki	DNR – FMFM	District Silviculturalist
Jennifer Kleitch	DNR – Wildlife	Wildlife Biologist
Robert Theiner	DNR – FMFM	Forest Technician, Atlanta
Laurie Marzolo	DNR - FMFM	Unit Manager, Atlanta
Tim Cwalinski	DNR – Fisheries	Fisheries Biologist, Gaylord
Cody Stevens	DNR - FMFM	Forester, Atlanta
Rich Barber	DNR - FMFM	Forester, Atlanta
Tim Paulus	DNR - FMFM	Forest Technician, Atlanta
Marty Osantowski	DNR - FMFM	Fire Officer, Onaway
Rich Stowe	DNR - LED	DNR Conservation Officer

**Location: Sault Ste. Marie, MI****Date: October 22, 2008**

Name	Organization	Title/position
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR	SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Auditor
Dr. Robert Hrubes	SCS	FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Auditor
Kyle Meister	SCS	FSC Trainee Auditor
Dennis Nezych	DNR - FMFM	Forest Certification Specialist
Penney Melchoir	DNR – Wildlife	Field Operations Supervisor
Larry Pedersen	DNR - FMFM	Acting Forest Resources Management Section Leader, Lansing
Erynn Call	DNR – Wildlife	Wildlife Biologist
Pat Hallfrisch	DNR - FMFM	Unit Manager, Sault Ste. Marie
Sherry MacKinnon	DNR – Wildlife	Wildlife Ecologist/ Acting T&E coordinator
Charlie Vallier	DNR – FMFM	Fire Supervisor, Sault Ste. Marie
Dan Moore	DNR – FMFM	Recreation Specialist, EUP
Don Kuhr	DNR - FMFM	District Timber Mgt Specialist, EUP
Rob Katona	DNR – FMFM	ORV Trail Analyst
Terry Minzey	DNR – Wildlife	Dist. Wildlife Supervisor, EUP
Kyle Publiski	DNR – Conservation Officer	LED, Chippewa, Mackinac
Jason Caron	DNR – FMFM	Forester, Sault Ste. Marie
Jeff Wise	DNR – FMFM	Forester, Sault Ste. Marie
Wally Binder	DNR – Conservation Officer	Areas 2-3 LAW Supervisor
Brian Burford	DNR – FMFM	Fire Officer, Sault Ste. Marie
Neal Godby	DNR – Fisheries	Fish Biologist, Gaylord
Mike Paluda	DNR – FMFM	Field Coordinator, UP
Chuck Lanning	DNR - FMFM	Fire Officer, DeTour

**Location: Gaylord FMU, MI****Date: October 23, 2008**

Name	Organization	Title/position
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR	SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Auditor
Dr. Robert Hrubes	SCS	FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Auditor
Kyle Meister	SCS	FSC Trainee Auditor
Dennis Nezhich	DNR - FMFM	Forest Certification Specialist
Penney Melchoir	DNR – Wildlife	Field Operations Supervisor
Larry Pedersen	DNR - FMFM	Acting Forest Resources Management Section Leader, Lansing
John Pilon	DNR – FMFM	Forest Planner
Joyce Angel-Ling	DNR - FMFM	Unit Manager, Gaylord
Jim Bielecki	DNR – FMFM	Silviculturalist
Keith Kintigh	DNR - Wildlife	Ecologist, NEMU
Mark Monroe	DNR – Wildlife	Wildlife Technician, Gaylord
Dave Borgeson	DNR – Fisheries	Fisheries Unit Supervisor
Neal Godby	DNR – Fisheries	Fish Biologist, Gaylord
Paige Perry	DNR – FMFM	Trails Program Analyst, ELP
Brian Mastenbrook	DNR – Wildlife	Wildlife Biologist
Dayle Garlock	DNR – FMFM	District Forest Manager, ELP
Dan Pearson	DNR – Fisheries	Natural Rivers
Robin Pearson	DNR – FMFM	Recreation Specialist
Dan Heckman	DNR – FMFM	Forester, Indian River
Shannon Harig	DNR – FMFM	Forester, Indian River
Greg Gatesy	DNR – FMFM	Forester, Gaylord
Kim Lentz	DNR – FMFM	Forest Technician, Gaylord
Rick Barta	DNR – FMFM	Forest Technician, Gaylord
Don Klingler	DNR – FMFM	Fire Supervisor, Gaylord
Tim Greco	DNR – FMFM	Forester, Gaylord

**Exit Briefing****Location: Gaylord, MI****Date: October 23, 2008**

Name	Organization	Title/position
Mike Ferrucci	NSF-ISR	SFI Lead Auditor, FSC Auditor
Dr. Robert Hrubes	SCS	FSC Lead Auditor, SFI Auditor
Kyle Meister	SCS	FSC Trainee Auditor
Dennis Nezich	DNR - FMFM	Forest Certification Specialist
Penney Melchoir	DNR – Wildlife	Field Operations Supervisor
Larry Pedersen	DNR - FMFM	Acting Forest Resources Management Section Leader, Lansing
Keith Kintigh	DNR – Wildlife	Ecologist, NEMU
Joyce Angel-Ling	DNR - FMFM	Unit Manager, Gaylord
John Pilon	DNR – FMFM	Forest Planner
Jim Bielecki	DNR – FMFM	Silviculturalist
Mike Paluda	DNR – FMFM	Field Coordinator, UP
Tim Reis	DNR – Wildlife	District Supervisor
Dave Borgeson	DNR – Fisheries	Fisheries Unit Supervisor
Neal Godby	DNR – Fisheries	Fish Biologist, Gaylord
Paige Perry	DNR – FMFM	Trails Program Analyst, ELP
Laurie Marzolo	DNR – FMFM	Unit Manager, Atlanta
Dayle Garlock	DNR – FMFM	District Forest Manager, ELP
Mindy Koch	DNR	Resource Management Deputy
Lynne Boyd	DNR – FMFM	Chief, FMFM
Robin Pearson	DNR – FMFM	Recreation Specialist
Russ Mason	DNR - Wildlife	Chief, Wildlife Division
Doug Reeves	DNR - Wildlife	Assistant Chief, Wildlife Divi
David Price	DNR – FMFM	Certification Planner
Kim Herman	DNR - FMFM	Monitoring Specialist
Sherry MacKinnon	DNR - Wildlife	Wildlife Ecologist/ Acting T&E coordinator
John Hamel	DNR - FMFM	District Planning and Inventory Specialist
Terry Minzey	DNR - Wildlife	District Supervisor. EUP
Cara Boucher	DNR – FMFM	Acting State Forester, Lansing
Mike Donovan	DNR - Wildlife	Resource Specialist
Kerry Fitzpatrick	DNR - Wildlife	Habitat Specialist

## 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 Nezych, 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 21-23 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 agency's SFI Program to the requirements of the Sustainable Forestry Initiative® Standard, 2005-2009 Edition. The next surveillance audit is scheduled for October, 2009.

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 Atlanta, Sault Ste. Marie, and Gaylord Forest Management Units. The audit concluded at the DNR's offices in Gaylord involving discussions with senior leadership followed by a closing meeting.

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 to 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. A review prior to the audit, confirmed during the October 2008 surveillance audit, showed that the department has implemented the corrective plan for the previous non-conformance, which is now closed:

2007.01: While most aspects of the planning requirement are met, many plans were somewhat out of date. The draft "State Forest Management Plan" is a critical element for the overall management program but at the time of the 2007 audit it had not been finalized or approved. The plan was finalized late in 2007 and approved by the Michigan DNR Natural Resources Commission in April, 2008. The plan is being implemented.

In addition, the Michigan DNR addressed the two opportunities for improvement which were identified during the 2007 audit:

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 was 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; a review of drafts of the guidance for management areas within regions indicates that cover type changes and quantified goals for these and other plan elements are expected to be a major part of the plans currently being drafted.

OFI SFI-2007-02 – Indicator 2.3.7 "Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently." There had been concerns from managers regarding the timeliness of road closures. The department has implemented a number of changes to speed the process of closing roads when resources are threatened.

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

SFI 2008.01: SFI Indicator 3.1.1 requires a "Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities." SFI Indicator 3.2.5 states "Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures." Roads on Drummond Island are not maintained in accordance with road BMPs for roads. The current routes used by Jeeps and large 4wd vehicles are, in places, not passable by 2-wd vehicles and have inadequate provisions for drainage (surfacing, road crown, etc). These roads are being upgraded, often with provisions for adequate road surface and/or drainage. Plans are under development to include "challenge road" sections that are not fully

drained. There are no existing BMPs or standards for such roads that would ensure environmental protections (while offering the desired recreational experience).

The DNR has developed a corrective action plan to address this issue. Progress in implementing the planned corrective action will be reviewed in the next surveillance audit.

Five opportunities for improvement were also identified:

OFI SFI-2008.01: SFI Indicator 1.1.2 requires “Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.” There is an opportunity to improve the information in management plans regarding planned harvest levels.

OFI SFI-2008.02: SFI Indicator 2.3.6 requires “Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.” There is an opportunity to improve by completing biomass harvesting guidelines.

OFI SFI-2008.03: Indicator 2.2.6 requires “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 equipment use and stream protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies; chemicals stored at appropriate locations; state reports filed as required; or methods used to ensure protection of federally listed threatened & endangered species.” There is an opportunity to improve consistency of paperwork and required notifications involving chemical use.

OFI SFI-2008.04: Indicator 3.1.4 requires “Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.” There is an opportunity to improve the consistent use of the Resource Damage Report (RDR) process.

OFI SFI-2008.05: Indicator 4.2.2 requires “A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.” Indicator 9.1.1 requires “Current financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research will include ... d. wildlife management at stand or landscape levels; ...” There is an opportunity to improve the process for disseminating information gained through in-house research.

### **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 found that the department’s SFI program continues to exceed the requirements of the SFI Standard 2005-2009 in the following areas:

- Assignment of certification responsibilities within the DNR (e.g. work instructions and the regular Forest Certification Updates provided to staff);
- Sustainable harvest levels are conservative, and can clearly be sustained;
- No exotic species are planted, and extensive efforts are made to remove exotic invasive plant species;
- The forest health and protection programs for Integrated Pest Management;
- Protection of rare, threatened, or endangered species;
- Biodiversity protections, including green-tree retention;
- Clearcut size and configuration;
- Public recreation opportunities; and
- Internal audit process and follow-up management review.

## **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, Forestry 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**



Only those documents viewed through the AESOP system are officially controlled. All other copies, whether viewed through another computer program or a printed version, are not controlled and therefore NSF-ISR assumes no responsibility for accuracy of the document.

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	
1.1	<i>Program Participants shall ensure that long-term harvest levels are sustainable and consistent with appropriate growth and-yield models and written plans.</i>			8			
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: 6,8			7	6
1.1.2	Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.	MF		6, 7			8
1.1.3	A forest inventory system and a method to calculate growth.		7, 8				
1.1.4	Periodic updates of inventory and recalculation of planned harvests.		7, 8				
1.1.5	Documentation of forest practices (e.g., planting, fertilization, and thinning) consistent with assumptions in harvest plans.		7, 8				



Only those documents viewed through the AESOP system are officially controlled. All other copies, whether viewed through another computer program or a printed version, are not controlled and therefore NSF-ISR assumes no responsibility for accuracy of the document.

**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> <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>		7, 8				
2.1.1 Designation of all management units for either natural or artificial regeneration.	MF	G: 6a, 6, 7, 8				
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, 8				
2.1.3 Minimized plantings of exotic tree species and research documentation that exotic tree species, planted operationally, pose minimal risk.	MF	8	6, 7			
2.1.4 Protection of desirable or planned advanced natural regeneration during harvest.	MF	6, 7, 8				
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, 8				7
<b>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>						
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.						



Only those documents viewed through the AESOP system are officially controlled. All other copies, whether viewed through another computer program or a printed version, are not controlled and therefore NSF-ISR assumes no responsibility for accuracy of the document.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or-	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
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 ...						8
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>		8				
2.3.1	Use of soils maps where available.	MF	7, 8				
2.3.2	Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.	MF	G: 6a, 8				
2.3.3	Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.	MF, RH	6, 7, 8				
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, 8				
2.3.5	Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.	MF	G: 6a, 6, 7, 8				
2.3.6	Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.	MF	G: 6a, 7			6	8
2.3.7	Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.	MF, RH	6, 7, 8				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, 8			
2.4.1	Program to protect forests from damaging agents.	MF	G: 6a	6, 7, 8			
2.4.2	Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.	MF	G: 6a	6, 7, 8			
2.4.3	Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.	MF	G: 6a	6, 7, 8			



Only those documents viewed through the AESOP system are officially controlled. All other copies, whether viewed through another computer program or a printed version, are not controlled and therefore NSF-ISR assumes no responsibility for accuracy of the document.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		<u>Audit</u> <u>-or</u>	<i>- - - Indicate Only One - - -</i>				<u>OFI</u>
			<u>FC</u>	<u>EXR</u>	<u>Maj</u>	<u>Min</u>	
2.5	<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>						
2.5.1	Program for appropriate research, testing, evaluation and deployment of genetically improved planting stock including trees derived through biotechnology.		NA				



**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>		8				
3.1.1	Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.	MF	7			6, 8	
3.1.2	Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.	MF	G: 6a, 8				
3.1.3	Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc.).	MF, RH	6, 8				
3.1.4	Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.	MF	G: 6a	6, 7			8
<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, 8				
3.2.1	Program addressing management and protection of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones.	MF	6, 7, 8				
3.2.2	Mapping of streams, lakes and other water bodies and riparian zones, and where appropriate, identification on the ground.	MF	6, 7, 8				
3.2.3	Implementation of plans to manage or protect streams, lakes and other water bodies.	MF	6, 7, 8				
3.2.4	Identification and protection of nonforested wetlands, including bogs, fens, vernal pools and marshes of significant size.	MF	6, 7, 8				
3.2.5	Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.	NA				8	



Only those documents viewed through the AESOP system are officially controlled. All other copies, whether viewed through another computer program or a printed version, are not controlled and therefore NSF-ISR assumes no responsibility for accuracy of the document.

**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>		8				
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, 8				
4.1.2	Program to protect threatened and endangered species.	MF	G: 6a	6, 7, 8			
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, 8			
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, 8				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, 8				
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, 8				
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, 8				
4.1.8	Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.	MF, RH	6, 8				
<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, 8				
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, 8				



Only those documents viewed through the AESOP system are officially controlled. All other copies, whether viewed through another computer program or a printed version, are not controlled and therefore NSF-ISR assumes no responsibility for accuracy of the document.

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
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				8

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

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
<b>5.1</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall manage the impact of harvesting on visual quality.</i></b>	MF	6, 7, 8				
5.1.1	Program to address visual quality management.	MF	6, 7, 8				
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, 8				
<b>5.2</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall manage the size, shape, and placement of clearcut harvests.</i></b>		8				
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, 8			
5.2.2	Documentation through internal records of clearcut size and the process for calculating average size.	MF	6, 7, 8				
<b>5.3</b>	<b><i>Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.</i></b>		8				
5.3.1	Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF	6, 8				
5.3.2	Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.	MF	6, 8				
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, 8				



Only those documents viewed through the AESOP system are officially controlled. All other copies, whether viewed through another computer program or a printed version, are not controlled and therefore NSF-ISR assumes no responsibility for accuracy of the document.

**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		Audit -or-	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
6.1.	<i>Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.</i>		8				
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, 8				
6.1.2	Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.	MF	6, 8				

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

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or-	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
7.1	<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, 8				
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, 8				



Only those documents viewed through the AESOP system are officially controlled. All other copies, whether viewed through another computer program or a printed version, are not controlled and therefore NSF-ISR assumes no responsibility for accuracy of the document.

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

Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
9.1	<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>	MF	7, 8				
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				8
9.2	<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>	MF	7, 8				
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, 8				



Only those documents viewed through the AESOP system are officially controlled. All other copies, whether viewed through another computer program or a printed version, are not controlled and therefore NSF-ISR assumes no responsibility for accuracy of the document.

**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, 8				
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, 8				
10.1.2	Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.	MF		6, 7, 8			
10.1.3	Staff education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF	G: 6a, 7, 8				6
10.1.4	Contractor education and training sufficient to their roles and responsibilities.	MF	G: 6a, 6, 7, 8				
<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>		8				
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 a. awareness of sustainable forestry principles and the SFI Program; b. BMPs, including streamside management and road construction, maintenance, & retirement; c. regeneration, forest resource conservation, and aesthetics; d. awareness of responsibilities under the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Canadian Species at Risk Act, and other measures to protect wildlife habitat; e. logging safety; f. U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations, wage and hour rules, and other employment laws; g. transportation issues; h. business management; and i. public policy and outreach.	MF	G: 6a, 6, 7, 8				



Only those documents viewed through the AESOP system are officially controlled. All other copies, whether viewed through another computer program or a printed version, are not controlled and therefore NSF-ISR assumes no responsibility for accuracy of the document.

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

	Performance Measure/ Indicator	Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
<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>		8				
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, 8				



Only those documents viewed through the AESOP system are officially controlled. All other copies, whether viewed through another computer program or a printed version, are not controlled and therefore NSF-ISR assumes no responsibility for accuracy of the document.

**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	
12.1	<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>		8				
12.1.1	Support for efforts of SFI Implementation Committees.	MF	G: 6a, 6, 7, 8				
12.1.2	Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners.		8				
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, 8				
12.2	<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>		8				
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, 8				
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.		8				
12.2.3	Recreation opportunities for the public, where consistent with forest management objectives.	MF	G: 6a	6, 7, 8			



Performance Measure/ Indicator		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
12.3	<i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.</i>	MF	G: 6a, 7, 8				
12.3.1	Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.	MF, RH	6, 7, 8				
12.3.2	Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.	MF, RH	6, 7, 8				
12.4	<i>Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall confer with affected indigenous peoples.</i>	MF, RH	6, 7, 8				
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.	MF, RH	6, 7, 8				
12.5	<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>		8				
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, 8				
12.5.2	Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.	MF, RH	6, 8				
12.6	<i>Program Participants shall report annually to the SFI Program on their compliance with the SFI Standard.</i>	MF	7, 8				
12.6.1*	Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report. (*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)	MF	6, 7, 8				
12.6.2	Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.	MF	7, 8				
12.6.3	Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard	MF	6, 7, 8				



Only those documents viewed through the AESOP system are officially controlled. All other copies, whether viewed through another computer program or a printed version, are not controlled and therefore NSF-ISR assumes no responsibility for accuracy of the document.

**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		Audit -or	- - - Indicate Only One - - -				OFI
			FC	EXR	Maj	Min	
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, 8				
13.1.1	System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.	MF	G: 6a, 7	8			
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, 8				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, 7, 8				

**Auditor Notes** (Note to Auditors: The requirements are repeated here {in part or fully} to facilitate the use of this form. The 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	Auditor	Notes
1.1	EXR	<p><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>  <u>Sustainable harvest levels are conservative and can clearly be sustained.</u></p>
1.1.1	C	<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. 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Forest Management Plan - April 10, 2008 (<a href="http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/">http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/</a> )</li> <li>• Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) Management Plan (<a href="http://www.michigan.gov/documents/dnr/ORVPlanApproved_234099_7.pdf">http://www.michigan.gov/documents/dnr/ORVPlanApproved_234099_7.pdf</a>): “Statutory regulation of Off-Road Vehicles (ORVs) began in Michigan with 1975 Public Act (PA) 319 (Act). The Act required the Department of Natural Resources (Department) to develop a comprehensive plan for the management of ORV use of areas, forest roads and forest trails, under the jurisdiction of the Department.”</li> <li>• Compartment-level plans, by year of entry (<a href="http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153-30301_30505_31025-66516--,00.html">http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153-30301_30505_31025-66516--,00.html</a>): “What Forest Management Activities are Occurring? Approved Annual Forest Management Plans - Forest management activities may begin as early as the year listed on the approved plan (Year-of Entry/YOE), and will be carried out during the 10-year period that follows.”</li> </ul>
1.1.2	OFI	<p>“Documentation of annual harvest trends in relation to the sustainable forest management plan.”  There is an opportunity to improve the information in management plans regarding planned harvest levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Michigan DNR prepared 54,700 acres with 862,000 cords for timber sales and sold about 59,233 acres with 896,219 cords in FY 2007-08 (which runs from 10/1/07 through 9/30/08). The department does not have official harvest estimates for FY 2007-08. FY 2006-07 was a lower than average year -- largely due to poor markets -- with a harvest estimate of only 42,784 acres with a volume of 629,367 cords.</li> <li>• Sustainable harvest levels are conservative, and can clearly be sustained, with growth exceeding drain by 1.59. Source: Miles, Patrick D. Nov-07-2008. Forest inventory mapmaker web-application version 3.0. St. Paul, MN: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, North Central Research Station</li> <li>• The stated intent of the MDNR is to include estimates of future harvest levels in the Regional State Forest Management Plans: “during the final public review for the SFMP in March and April of this year, and stakeholder groups specifically wanted the Department to include estimate of future harvest levels in the SFMP. This desire was satisfied by a reiteration of the Department’s intent to include this level of detail at the more appropriate level of RSFMPs. In accepting this concept, stakeholders asked that the process for drafting RSFMPs be modified to incorporate greater public involvement earlier in the plan development process.” Source: Forest Certification Update #15, September 2008.</li> <li>• Confirmed template for the Management Area write-ups to be included for all MAs in Section 4 of the Regional State Forest Plans; this template has numerical goals. This template has been circulated throughout the state and is likely to be adopted in all Regional State Forest Plans. Management Area Briefs content: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Attributes</li> <li>○ Major Cover Types</li> <li>○ Concepts of Management</li> </ul> </li> <li>• It will require an additional 10 months to incorporate BCPP (biological conservation planning process) into the Regional State Forest Management Plans. The</li> </ul>

Michigan DNR October 2008 Surveillance Audit

		<p>department’s stakeholders are uniformly supportive of the reasons for the delay</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical to meeting the re-revised timelines is to accelerate the pace of the BCPP</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>• Confirmed that foresters prioritize the inventory work which kicks of the ten-year management planning cycle for all compartments.</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>• Confirmed by discussions with foresters and by review of compartment plans, harvest prescriptions, and forest treatment proposals</li> </ul>
2.1.2	C	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field observations confirmed adequate regeneration; specialists at the unit and district staff track regeneration sites and follow-up with FTPs as needed</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: Exotic tree species are not planted.</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>• Confirmed by field observations that measures are taken to protect desirable advance regeneration and that sensitive understory species (for example white pine) do survive following even overstory removal harvests or clearcut harvests.</li> </ul>
2.1.5	C	<p>“Artificial reforestation programs that consider potential ecological impacts of a different species or species mix from that which was harvested.”</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. The completion of the state forest management plan and the drafting of regional state forest plans which include “management areas” sections describing cover type change opportunities represent movement towards more fully implementing the ecosystem management goals.</li> </ul>
2.2		<p><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></p>
2.2.6	OFI	<p>“Use of best management practices appropriate to the situation; for example ...”</p> <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve consistency of paperwork and required notifications involving chemical use.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pesticide application records could be improved. According to the summary of Michigan DNR Internal Audit Reports, on occasion: “Pesticide Use Evaluation Reports (PUER) not attached to FTP completion reports (3), public notification</li> </ul>

		process not reviewed and approved (2), PAP prepared but not approved (1), FTP completion report not prepared (3).” (Work Instruction 2.2)
2.3	C	<b>“Program Participants shall implement management practices to protect and maintain forest and soil productivity.”</b>
2.3.1	C	“Use of soils maps where available.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soils maps are used in compartment planning.</li> </ul>
2.3.2	C	“Process to identify soils vulnerable to compaction and use of appropriate methods to avoid excessive soil disturbance.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foresters review all sites prior to harvest and prescribe winter or frozen-only treatment when soils are vulnerable to compaction.</li> <li>• Cut-to-length harvest systems are used for some harvests; running on slash mats minimized soil disturbance.</li> </ul>
2.3.3	C	“Use of erosion control measures to minimize the loss of soil and site productivity.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.</li> </ul>
2.3.4	C	“Post-harvest conditions conducive to maintaining site productivity (e.g., limited rutting, retained down woody debris, minimized skid trails).” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.</li> </ul>
2.3.5	C	“Retention of vigorous trees during partial harvesting, consistent with silvicultural norms for the area.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.</li> </ul>
2.3.6	OFI	“Criteria that address harvesting and site preparation to protect soil productivity.” <u>There is an opportunity to improve by completing biomass harvesting guidelines.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soil rutting and compaction guidelines are in place and being implemented.</li> </ul>
2.3.7	C	“Minimized road construction to meet management objectives efficiently.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In response to an OFI from 2007, “There is an opportunity to improve the timeliness of road closures” the MDNR provided information regarding road closures (see Additional Evidence Item A: FMFM Road Closure Process)</li> </ul>
2.4	EXR	<b>“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.”</b> <u>Exceeds the Requirements: Confirmed that the exemplary practices of the Michigan DNR described in the certification audit report continue.</u>
2.4.1	EXR	“Program to protect forests from damaging agents.” <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 works closely with biologists and foresters.</li> </ul>
2.4.2	EXR	“Management to promote healthy and productive forest conditions to minimize susceptibility to damaging agents.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by field observations at all sites visited.</li> </ul>
2.4.3	EXR	“Participation in, and support of, fire and pest prevention and control programs.” <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		<b>“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.”</b>
3.1	C	<b>“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.”</b>

Michigan DNR October 2008 Surveillance Audit

3.1.1	Min	<p>“Program to implement state or provincial equivalent BMPs during all phases of management activities.”</p> <p><u>SFI-2008.01: Roads on Drummond Island are not maintained in accordance with BMPs for roads. The current routes used by Jeeps and large 4wd vehicles are, in places, not passable by 2-wd vehicles and have inadequate provisions for drainage (surfacing, road crown, etc). These roads are being upgraded, often with provisions for adequate road surface and/or drainage. Plans are in under development to include “challenge road” sections that are not fully drained. There are no existing BMPs or standards for such roads that would ensure environmental protections (while offering the desired recreational experience). See also Indicator 3.2.5.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RDR process continues to accumulate resource damage reports, and progress continues in implementing repairs on the highest priority sites.</li> <li>• Many forest roads on Drummond Island are not properly drained or surfaced. Drummond Island hosts many Jeep-type rally events under special permits. There is also considerable general public use of the roads by ATVs and 4-wheel-drive vehicles, and considerable road damage was observed. RDRs are on file, and road repairs are underway for most of the problematic areas. See also Indicator 2.3.7</li> </ul>
3.1.2	C	<p>“Contract provisions that specify BMP compliance.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed</li> </ul>
3.1.3	C	<p>“Plans that address wet weather events (e.g., inventory systems, wet weather tracts, defining acceptable operational conditions, etc).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foresters identify season of harvest during planning, and then included appropriate conditions in the harvest contract. This is facilitated by the timber management module, which has pre-designed contract clauses including season of harvest.</li> </ul>
3.1.4	OFI	<p>“Monitoring of overall BMP implementation.”</p> <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve the consistent use of the Resource Damage Report (RDR) process.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The RDR process comprises a monitoring program for roads and trails.</li> <li>• The RDR process continues to accumulate resource damage reports, and progress continues in implementing repairs on the highest priority sites.</li> <li>• Source: Summary of Michigan DNR Internal Audit Reports: “Not all employees are consistently reporting observed resource damage (2). Staff confusion exists as to what constitutes reportable resource damage.” (Work Instruction 3.2)</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>• Trained foresters, wildlife biologists, and fisheries biologists work collaboratively to set up (foresters), review, and approve (all three disciplines) all proposed treatments and infrastructure development projects. Site-level planning generally commences with the forest inventory work done in each compartment on the “year of entry” cycle. Resource conditions are discussed during compartment “pre-review; proposed treatments are developed and then shared with the public; and treatments are finalized during compartment review. All three divisions (Forest Management, Wildlife, and Fisheries) are involved in these three planning stages. A focus is on protection of streams, lakes, other water bodies and riparian zones.</li> <li>• Fisheries Division involvement in forestry and management:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide input to forestry during pre-review process</li> <li>○ Pay closer attention to forest harvests or other projects near water;</li> <li>○ Focus on protection of cold-water streams because there are 5 world-class trout streams</li> <li>○ Are working on beaver / trout management to identify streams that are susceptible to warming and resultant loss of habitat if beaver are allowed to alter habitat</li> <li>○ Provide consultation on road upgrades and culvert replacement issues</li> <li>○ Fisheries Division also administers the natural rivers program: private lands zoning for construction or vegetative management within 400 feet on either side of designated natural rivers; also have public land management standards; FC Work Instruction for Intrusive Activities help ensure that</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		these rules are followed; much more protective river buffers within the natural vegetation strips, with less harvesting, less emphasis on early-successional species, and no clear cutting; generally foresters understand the rules and are getting good at developing initial prescriptions which meet the guidelines (less tweaking required).
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>• These features are shown on maps and sale offering and administrative documents (contract specifications). They are generally identified on the ground by paint marks on trees.</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 consistent protection of water features.</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>• Non-forested wetlands of significant size are identified on aerial photos and on harvest area maps and are excluded from harvest areas; when they are enclosed within a harvest area they are “painted out”.</li> </ul>
3.2.5	Min	<p>“Where regulations or BMPs do not currently exist to protect riparian areas, use of experts to identify appropriate protection measures.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Indicator 3.1.1 above. There are no standards for “challenge roads” for off-road vehicles to allow for water challenges while protecting soils and wetlands.</li> </ul>
<b>4.1</b>	C	<b><i>“Program participants shall have programs to promote biological diversity at stand- and landscape- scales.”</i></b>
4.1.1	C	<p>“Program to promote the conservation of native biological diversity, including species, wildlife habitats, and ecological or natural community types, at stand and landscape levels.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wildlife and Fisheries Biologists are available throughout the state forest system.</li> <li>• Wildlife Division is the co-management agency, and signs off on all treatments; Fisheries Division also reviews all projects and provides input.</li> <li>• A process is in place to “bump-up” any conflicts between disciplines at the local level to a higher administrative level; few issues are actually resolved at a higher level, as most are worked out during compartment review</li> <li>• Fisheries Division also administers the natural rivers program: private lands zoning for construction or vegetative management within 400 feet on either side of designated natural rivers; also have public land management standards; FC Work Instruction for Intrusive Activities help ensure that these rules are followed; much more protective river buffers within the natural vegetation strips, with less harvesting, less emphasis on early-successional species, and no clear cutting; generally foresters understand the rules and are getting good at developing initial prescriptions which meet the guidelines (less tweaking required)</li> </ul>
4.1.2	EXR	<p>“Program to protect threatened and endangered species.”</p> <p><u>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.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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> <p><u>Protections extend beyond globally imperiled and imperiled to include state-ranked species for protections.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed that foresters and other specialists review state heritage databases during planning for harvests and other ground-disturbing activities.</li> </ul>

Michigan DNR October 2008 Surveillance Audit

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>
4.1.5	C	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Regional State Forest Management Plans, which will incorporate the results of the biodiversity planning, and which will include direction and planning for management areas, are expected to build on current programs which address this indicator.</li> </ul>
4.1.6	C	<p>“Support of and participation in plans or programs for the conservation of old-growth forests in the region of ownership.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old growth stands are coded and reserved from harvest.</li> </ul>
4.1.7	C	<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>• Programs are in place to treat invasive plant species.</li> </ul>
4.1.8	C	<p>“Program to incorporate the role of prescribed or natural fire where appropriate.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed that prescribed fire is used often, but not as often as specialists would like; the limiting factor is resources to burn at appropriate times, because many fire-staff are busy at these times working to control wildfires.</li> <li>• Recently partners have been identified to support RX burns hope for more burning.</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>• Confirmed that heritage database is checked as a routine part of compartment review.</li> </ul>
4.2.2	OFI	<p>“A methodology to incorporate research results and field applications of biodiversity and ecosystem research into forest management decisions.”</p> <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve the process for disseminating information gained through in-house research. (see also 9.1.1)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the summary of Michigan DNR Internal Audit Reports: “Updated research summary not published in timely manner, report lacks information that facilitates incorporation into DNR activities” (Work Instruction 5.1).</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	C	<p>“Program to address visual quality management.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained foresters plan all harvests; guidelines exist to address visual management; senior managers review all proposed treatments.</li> <li>• Visual management programs are in place and generally very effective – forests visited were clearly being managed with visual considerations.</li> </ul>
5.1.2	C	<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>• Confirmed by field observations of selected sales and observations of large sections of the certified forests observed while traveling between selected audit sites.</li> </ul>
5.2	C	<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> <p><u>Efforts to minimize clearcut size exceed the standard.</u></p>

Michigan DNR October 2008 Surveillance Audit

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on SFI reporting form clearcutting involved 19,390 acres; calculations indicated an average of 35 acres per clearcut; “(average size of stand that was clearcut = 22 acres; average size of clearcut acres per contract = 47)”</li> </ul>
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>All sales are coded as to silvicultural method used, size of stand, and size of contract; some contracts include multiple stands, some of which are adjacent and some are not; the analysis showed that the clearcut size is well below the maximum, and the use of an average is acceptable given the small size of the clearcuts.</li> </ul>
5.3	C	<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall adopt a green-up requirement or alternative methods that provide for visual quality.”</i></b></p>
5.3.1	C	<p>“Program implementing the green-up requirement or alternative methods.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trained foresters, review of all proposed projects by a multi-disciplinary team.</li> </ul>
5.3.2	C	<p>“Harvest area tracking system to demonstrate compliance with the green-up requirement or alternative methods.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed by review of data.</li> </ul>
5.3.3	C	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed by field observations.</li> <li>In the Kirtland’s Warbler Management Area harvest areas must be larger to accommodate the habitat needs of this federally endangered bird; foresters attempt to utilize the retention patches to provide visual buffering where possible.</li> </ul>
6.1.	C	<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall identify special sites and manage them in a manner appropriate for their unique features.”</i></b></p>
6.1.1	C	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed by interviews and by review of planning documents</li> </ul>
6.1.2	C	<p>“Appropriate mapping, cataloging, and management of identified special sites.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maps were provided that showed locations of special sites for all three Michigan Forest Management Units included in the 2008 field audit.</li> </ul>
7.1	C	<p><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></p>
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 and generally quite complete.</li> <li>Foresters layout all harvests and work with harvest contractors.</li> </ul>
9.1	C	<p><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></p>
9.1.1	OFI	<p>“Current financial or in-kind support of research to address questions of relevance in the region of operations. The research will include ...”</p> <p><u>There is an opportunity to improve the process for disseminating information gained through in-house research.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Michigan DNR supports a wide array of research activities.</li> <li>According to the summary of Michigan DNR Internal Audit Reports: “Updated research summary not published in timely manner, report lacks information that facilitates incorporation into DNR activities” (Work Instruction 5.1).</li> </ul>
9.2	C	<p><b><i>“Program Participants shall individually, through cooperative efforts, or through associations develop or use state, provincial, or regional analyses in support of their</i></b></p>

		<i>sustainable forestry programs.”</i>
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>• A: FIA data 5-year analysis report is co-written by Larry Peterson and Doug Heym; it includes an analysis of trends in regeneration;</li> <li>• A and B: Michigan State forest timber revenues supported a 3X intensity of FIA data over a 8-year period ending in 2007.</li> <li>• B: Timber products output surveys and reports to determine drain are paid for by DNR</li> <li>• C: 2000 copies of Soil and Water Manual being printed; then will ramp up the BMP survey</li> <li>• D: Michigan Natural Features Inventory web pages for rare features and species;</li> <li>• D: Biodiversity conservation planning process will address special features across all ownerships.</li> </ul>
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>• The commitment to forest certification of is a part of Michigan state law.</li> <li>• Michigan DNR’s leadership restated the organization’s commitment to certification.</li> <li>• The Wildlife Division has some categories of land where there are concerns about federal or state requirements possibly conflicting with certification requirements, and is reviewing the extent of special situations where in-scope and out of scope issues may exist.</li> </ul>
10.1.2	EXR	<p>“Assignment and understanding of roles and responsibilities for achieving SFI Standard objectives.”</p> <p><u>Exceeds the Requirement: Michigan DNR has a Forest Certification Action Team an active working group drawn from across the Michigan DNR with assignments for all SFI Performance Measures and Indicators and a full-time Forest Certification Specialist.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All of the SFI Performance Measures and Indicators are contained in a series of Forest Certification Work Instructions, which are regularly reviewed and updated. These work instructions provide clear assignment of responsibilities by position.</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>• Staff interviewed were uniformly highly credentialed and knowledgeable</li> <li>• Formal training records are maintained in Lansing; personnel often maintain their own training records.</li> <li>• Requested, received, and reviewed training records from Dan Heckman</li> <li>• According to the summary of Michigan DNR Internal Audit Reports: “Individual training plans (were) not completed.” (Work Instruction 8.1)</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>• All harvesting contractors interviewed (6) were trained or were directly supervised by a trained individual (1).</li> <li>• Training is required.</li> </ul>
10.2	C	<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	C	<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>“DNR continues involvement with the SIC through attendance at meetings and payment of annual dues; however, no other services have been provided.” Source: George H. Berghorn, Director of Forest Policy, Michigan Forest Products Council</li> </ul>
11.1		<b>“Program Participants shall take appropriate steps to comply with applicable federal, provincial, state, and local forestry and related environmental laws and regulations.”</b>
11.2	C	<b>“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.”</b>
11.2.1	C	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Michigan DNR continues to have policies for all of these issues.</li> </ul>
12.1	C	<b>“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.”</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>
12.1.2	C	<p>“Support for the development and distribution of educational materials, including information packets for use with forest landowners.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“The Michigan Department of Natural Resources budgeted approximately \$6.6 million in FY 2006 to support a wide variety of on-going forestry, wildlife and fisheries research projects that are designed to increase knowledge and to improve methods of sustainable management of Michigan’s public lands. Many of these research projects are accomplished in cooperation with State Universities through formal agreements (Partnership for Ecosystem Research and Management (PERM)) and on an as needed call for proposals for subjects of interest. The DNR produces an annual report to document the commitment to sustainable forestry research and to inform discussion on research needs and collaboration opportunities among the DNR Divisions.” source Michigan State Forest Management Plan, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Approved April 10, 2008</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 and some use during compartment planning.</li> </ul>
12.2	C	<b>“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.”</b>
12.2.1	C	<p>“Support for the SFI Implementation Committee program to address outreach, education, and technical assistance (e.g., toll-free numbers, public sector technical assistance programs).”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See 10.2.1 above.</li> </ul>
12.2.2	C	<p>“Periodic educational opportunities promoting sustainable forestry, such as ...”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with foresters confirmed that some foresters work with schools, youth groups, or the general public as time allows promoting forestry.</li> </ul>
12.2.3	EXR	<p>“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></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed recreational facilities at all three units visited, including extensive trails networks, campgrounds, boat launch areas, etc.</li> <li>Reviewed “Handbook of Michigan Off-Road Vehicle Laws</li> </ul>
12.3	C	<b>“Program Participants with forest management responsibilities on public lands shall participate in the development of public land planning and management processes.”</b>

12.3.1	C	<p>“Involvement in public land planning and management activities with appropriate governmental entities and the public.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public involvement in public land planning is facilitated by many parts of the department’s web site. One example (<a href="http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153-30301_30505_31025-146029--,00.html">http://www.michigan.gov/dnr/0,1607,7-153-30301_30505_31025-146029--,00.html</a>) is “A Comprehensive Summary of the Department of Natural Resources Planning Process For Natural Resource Management in Michigan”</li> </ul>
12.3.2	C	<p>“Appropriate contact with local stakeholders over forest management issues through state, provincial, federal, or independent collaboration.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MDNR web site (<a href="http://www.michigan.gov/dnr">http://www.michigan.gov/dnr</a>) has a clickable link “We want your input” which provides an easy mechanism for the public to provide comments on forest management planning issues. Current planning topics where comments are sought include the NLP/SLP Regional State Forest Management Plan and the WUP Regional State Forest Management Plan, each of which has a link “Send Your Comments Here”</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	<p>“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.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmed that specific individuals are assigned responsibilities for tribal relations.</li> <li>The State of Michigan recently signed a consent decree with 5 tribes that clarifies tribal rights under the 1836 Treaty of Washington. Confirmed extensive efforts by the State of Michigan to work cooperatively and to ensure that treaty rights of the tribes are being respected</li> <li>Tribes are allowed to write their own permits for tribal members to gather traditional materials, but only after consultation and agreement with DNR’s unit managers.</li> <li>DNR FMFM Unit Manager Survey to track use of the special permitting provisions set up by the “Tribal Consent Decree”; this document summarizes the uptake of the decree’s provisions</li> <li>The annual statewide meeting between MDNR and Michigan tribes was held on 9.3.08. Four of the 5 tribes which are part of the consent decree formed the majority of attendance; there was poor attendance from the non-participating tribes.</li> <li>Confirmed by review of documentation that a summary of the consent decree was developed by MDNR and circulated to the unit managers, with a focus on tribal gathering rights and on provisions to notify tribes of road closures</li> <li>Government to government meetings have occurred between the Wildlife Division and tribes regarding wildlife issues, including a bear consultation meetings</li> </ul>
12.5	C	<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	<p>“Support for SFI Implementation Committee efforts (toll-free numbers and other efforts) to address concerns about apparent nonconforming practices.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See 10.2.1 above</li> </ul>
12.5.2	C	<p>“Process to receive and respond to public inquiries.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MDNR web site (<a href="http://www.michigan.gov/dnr">http://www.michigan.gov/dnr</a>) has a clickable link “We want your input” which provides an easy mechanism for the public to provide comments on a range of issues.</li> <li>In 2007 the MDNR solicited comments on a proposal to classify the State Forest into distinct Management Areas (MAs) for purposes of planning and management. The department’s web site posts the responses, organized as follows: DNR Response to Public Comments on Regional Planning Initiative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MA Attribute Public Review - General Comments</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ MA Attribute Public Review - Ownership Attributes</li> <li>○ MA Attribute Public Review - Social/Economic Attributes</li> <li>○ MA Attribute Public Review - Ecological Attributes</li> </ul>
12.6	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	<p>“Prompt response to the SFI annual progress report.” (*Note: This indicator will be reviewed in all audits.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed by review of 2007 Progress Report Forms submitted to SFI, Inc.</li> <li>• Confirmed with SFI, Inc. their receipt of the report on time</li> </ul>
12.6.2	C	<p>“Recordkeeping for all the categories of information needed for SFI annual progress reports.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Record keeping is very good; computer systems appear to be functioning well, and databases appear to be kept up to date. Categories of information for the report are covered well.</li> </ul>
12.6.3	C	<p>“Maintenance of copies of past reports to document progress and improvements to demonstrate conformance to the SFI Standard.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Past reports are maintained by Dennis Nezich, Certification Coordinator</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	EXR	<p>“System to review commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate effectiveness.” The internal audit process used in this program is a superb approach to reviewing the many Michigan DNR commitments, programs, and procedures to evaluate their effectiveness.</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>• “DNR Internal Audits: In compliance with Work Instruction 1.2, four internal audits were conducted in 2007. The Forest Management Units audited included: Sault Ste. Marie, Gladwin, Traverse City, and Roscommon. Based upon audit results, DNR lead auditors identified five “statewide” non-conformances (see Appendix B) that require focused attention during the 2007 Management Review.”</li> </ul>
13.1.2	C	<p>“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>• The certification coordinator reports regularly on progress towards meeting certification requirements and closing non-conformances. He works closely with the “Forest Certification Implementation Team”.</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 Michigan DNR is described in Work Instruction 1.2.</li> <li>• Confirmed “Michigan Department of Natural Resources Management Review Report January 17, 2008” documenting the annual review. An excerpted from this report: “Management Review Process: Work instruction 1.2 establishes the Management Review process for continual improvement in the management of our Forest Resources. The purpose of the Management Review is to establish a systematic process for gathering information regarding improvement in forest management practices. The review includes a report of the previous year’s implementation efforts to management and a formal management review meeting. 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> </ul>

## Additional Notes and Key Evidence Reviewed

### FMFM ROAD CLOSURE PROCESS

Over the past few years FMFM has developed a road closure process to be used when roads are identified for closure. This process has been in effect since the last external audit and includes both emergency and non-emergency road closure procedures. FMFM has undertaken a number of initiatives to improve the road closure process and procedure, especially its timeliness. Below is a listing of measures the Department has enacted to improve this process:

1. Added staff to the process. Lead staff in this process is Dave Spalding. He is also division lead on litigation and over the past number of years the litigation aspect of his position has grown significantly. To help assist in the road closure process Kerry Grey and Kerry Weiber were assigned to assist lead Dave Spalding in organizing processing all Directors Orders, including road closures. Adding staff to the process has helped organize the process and provide a better system for managing the numerous requests. Unfortunately Kerry Grey left the department but is to be replaced soon.
2. The Pigeon River unit manager position will have added responsibilities for LP road closures and a more comprehensive road closure plan. Twenty percent of the position will be directed toward these tasks. Duties are being added to the position description and will include organizing and tracking submitted road closure requests.
3. Program staff identified all Directors Orders unresolved longer than a year and sent back to the field for verification (these included some older road closure requests). They will be re-submitted in a more organized fashion and tracked separately.
4. FMFM management has re-emphasized road closure process with staff to increase knowledge and familiarity with the process. Most recently it was an agenda item at the statewide managers meeting in September 2008.
5. Developed a standardized form for road closures which requires sign-offs by all affected divisions. Also detailed how emergency road closures are to be handled so immediate action can be taken to deal with emergencies.
6. Developed a form letter to be used for the unit managers to create a letter for a Director's order.
7. Work instruction 3.3 Best Management Practices--Road Closures is being revised and will be a part of the upcoming management review scheduled for January 2009... (Deleted portions pertaining to an attachment).

### 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

### Key Changes over past year

Approval of State Forest Management Plan in April, 2008

Training from state archeologist on cultural resources including FM and Wildlife Division Staff

New division chiefs for Wildlife and for Law Enforcement Divisions

Wildlife Division has been hiring

Michigan's first case of CWD chronic wasting disease

### Updates on CARs and Key Issues:

#### Tribal Consent Decree and Tribal Relations

- Confirmed extensive efforts by the State of Michigan to work cooperatively and to ensure that treaty rights of the tribes are being respected
- Tribes are allowed to write their own permits for tribal members to gather traditional materials, but only after consultation and agreement with DNR's unit managers.
- DNR FMFM Unit Manager Survey to track use of the special permitting provisions set up by the "Tribal Consent Decree"; this document summarizes the uptake of the decree's provisions
- 9.3.08: Held annual statewide meeting between MDNR and Michigan tribes; four of the 5 tribes which are part of the consent decree formed the majority of attendance; otherwise poor attendance
- Confirmed by review of documentation that a summary of the consent decree was developed by MDNR and circulated to the unit managers, with a focus on tribal gathering rights and on provisions to notify tribes of road closures
- Have had government to government meetings of Wildlife Division and tribes regarding wildlife issues, including a bear consultation meetings

#### ORV Planning (FSC CAR 4)

- Plan approved in May, 2008; continuing to implement – perhaps already doing half of the action items, for example: signage and sign work group; upgraded trails to good status
- Confirmed press release announcing approval
- 2008 \$1,000,000 trail maintenance and trail upgrades (typical average)
- All formal trails are now up to at least "good" standard;
- are upgrading signs;
- maps have been improved and are on-line
- Legislature has passed a law (July 17) authorizing counties to open up all county roads for ATV use if they choose to

#### Resource Damage Report (RDR) Update

- Bill O'Neil: one of the most important improvements for MDNR is this process, which allows the department to quantify the problems and to track their improvements
- Each year the ORV program spends a portion of its budget on ORV restoration:  
2006 \$303,500  
2007 \$101,900  
2008 \$145,900  
2009 \$275,000
- Most years the MDNR receives capital outlay funds; for 2009 have allocated over \$1,000,000 for capital outlay for RDR and road projects
- A three-year project started in 2006, \$382,000 , last portion of which is being spent

- Over the last 3 years have spent approximately \$2,314,300 in restoration and repair type activities; there are other activities not included, for example major trail-hardening grant on the Gaylord to Sheboygan Trail also repaired many RDRs as part of the project
- Dale Garlock of FMFM is working with IT department to upgrade the RDR Database
- Uncertain whether RDRs are being repaired faster than new reports are being filed; do know that the rate of new RDRs has slowed considerably

#### SFI OFI 2007-02

“FMFM has undertaken a number of initiatives to improve the road closure process and procedures, especially its timeliness.”

- Because of workload issues (mostly relating to acquiring railroad rows, with attendant legal and trespass issues) they weren't getting to closures quickly.
- Have added some staff to focus on road closures and road access plans; will reallocate time from the Pigeon River County Unit Manager to organize and track road closures and road access plans throughout the entire Lower Peninsula
- “Work Instruction 3.3 Best Management Practices – Road Closures” draft revisions underway
- From unit manager's viewpoint there is a slow improvement in the process, but they may still be somewhat frustrated by all of the process involved, such as telling the public and the tribes in advance, takes time. Emergency closures are allowed, to be followed-up with a formal procedure.
- Past bottlenecks included getting consensus locally - now can bump-up to higher level; faster implementation of director's orders; new bottleneck involves consent decree tribal notification requirements.

#### Summary of Analysis of Site Disturbing Activities (FSC CAR 2007-01)

- New document, recently approved, “Procedure Checklist” to be used as a guide for DNR staff when proposing and initiating activities. There is a list of actions to be taken during planning stages and operations stages of all projects which modify stands, facilities development or improvement, minerals leasing, or similar activities. Routine maintenance is not included.
- This document should be used by staff to ensure that they follow procedures. However a decision was made NOT to develop this into a formal checklist, mostly due to field-level resistance. As such it has the flavor of something that was done for the certifiers.
- LP Field Coordinator stated that the uptake of this process occurs, through the internal auditing process. To make certain that this happens it will be referenced in the work instructions as a change. Dennis Nezich will include this change on the agenda for the January, 2009 Certification Management Review Team Meeting as a potential change to the work instructions, probably the forest operations work instruction, number 3.1.

#### Woody Biomass Harvesting Guidelines (FSC Rx)

- To date very few biomass/biofuel harvests have been conducted on state forests; some timber sales have provisions that either do not permit chipping at all or permit chipping only of the main bole, but on most conifer sales these provisions are not being used; northern hardwood sales and thinnings do use some of these provisions, so there are some protections currently in place.
- There are existing provisions in the BMPs
- Michigan Forest Finance Authority (appointed by governor) has funded work to develop statewide guidelines so that all lands are covered, not just certified state forest lands
- Will develop written guidelines for all forest ownerships; with a draft set of guidelines due by December, 2008.
- A “Woody Biomass Guidance Group” has been formed including public and private organizations with interests from utilization and conservation. Will have a combination of general specifications and site-specific provisions.

### Improving the Compartment Review Process (FSC CAR 3)

- DNR developed a summary of “Public Involvement and Consultation Activities of the DNR”
- Will continue to have the FMU Open Houses, but will change the format, name, and means of advertising and drawing people in
- Increased use of the web.
- See comments of Dr. Maureen McDonough, MSU at the April 23, 2008 meeting of the Forest Management Advisory Committee (FSC Rec. 1 tab in large white three-ring binder).

### State Forest Management Plan

- Starting to implement the ideas of the plan, often comes up during pre-(compartment) review
- Forest certification update provided a short summary of the key components of the plan
- Changing the process and asking for more time (Feb. timelines indicated completion of Regional State Forest Plans by end of 2008)
- Now won't have the plans done until much later (2 late 2009, 1 in 2010) mostly due to stakeholder concerns regarding more up-front involvement
- May 6, 2008 revised DNR Forest Certification Work Instruction 1.3, Regional State Forest Management Plan Development to provide direction on incorporating new structure and content of RSFMPs.
- Convened “Public Advisory Team” meeting in August to update implementing the biodiversity program and discuss merging the biodiversity process with regional state forest plans
- Northern Lower Peninsula is furthest along on working with public to select sites for inclusion in the network of BSAs; doing planning this way will make the regional plans more substantive and specific, both to know which areas are to be protected and to know the effect on the allowable harvest levels. This will make the plans more comprehensive; putting stakeholders in the BSA process will involve stakeholders sooner in the process.
- Management area boundaries have been done for all three Regional State Forest Plans; for WUP and NLP the draft management concepts have been developed and put on the web site.

## Atlanta FMU Overview and Update

### Forestry

- Three full counties and part of a fourth in ne lower peninsula; low population, very rural; much farming and private forests, hunt club properties
- many private hunt clubs managed for generations for deer; cultural emphasis on deer management almost exclusively is starting to change as public and scientific data are shifting emphasis to management for entire suite of species; Jennifer works to explain this to the deer hunters
- about 300,000 acres of state forestland, concentrated in Montmorency County
- Hills in the southern part of the unit, flatter and wetter in the central and north
- Include significant barrens (pines) in Mont. County but also long-lived hardwoods on moraines
- Have delineated their management areas: Kirtland's Warbler, thunder bay outwash, Avery Hills, Rattlesnake Hills, Au Sable Outwash, Cheboygan Lake Plain, Alpena Lake Plain, Hammond Bay Lake Plain
- Does include major parts of unit within the 1836 Treaty Boundary
- ERAs and HCVAs: largest HCVA is Kirtland Warbler Clear Lake Unit; wooded dune complex, Alvar area, intermittent wetlands areas
- Many Campgrounds, trails for ATVs or ORVs, snowmobiles, horse, mountain biking
- Most RDRs of any FMU; several projects going on; want to link RDRs to their GIS
- Very diverse mix of cover types: 25% Aspen, next most common: Red Pine, Jack Pine, Oak
- Working to even-out the very lumpy age-class distribution for Aspen, lowland poplar, and oak

- Have not been able to regenerate Cedar
- Available acres for harvest ranges from 2,000 to 4,200 acres per year

#### Wildlife: Jennifer Kleitch, Wildlife Biologist

- Varied vegetation and land types; thus varied wildlife; many hunters and many wildlife viewers
- Elk herd is growing; benefits from Aspen management and managed forest openings
- Continue to do deer range improvement projects, have a funding source
- KW management is a priority; most recent census showed highest KW pops ever

#### Fisheries

Tim Cwalinski, Fisheries Biologist for Northern Lake Huron Management Unit

- Work on watershed boundaries; three biologists, three technicians, two supervisors

#### Recreation

Robin Pearson, FMFMD Recreation Specialist:

- involved in a variety of recreational planning and budgeting, attends all compartment reviews and most pre-reviews
- importance of informing recreational users about forest management activities and why
- methods of combining green-tree retention for wildlife with esthetic visual management
- recreation specialists described a number of techniques used to minimize the visual or other impacts of harvesting on trail infrastructure, including buffers, location of loading areas, minimized trail crossing

#### Planning and Inventory in the NL Peninsula (Ecoteam Leader Jack Pilon)

- Management Areas for NLP and SLP Ecoregions: boundaries have been finalized; confirmed maps of these; generally followed ecological sub-subsections; have been reviewed through public and internal review (Ecoregional Planning Team met with all 8 FMUs twice; 900 letters sent, 6 people turned out for initial boundaries of MAs)
- Gladwin FMU administers one management area within the SLP
- Management direction to address cover type management issues; Management Area Briefs content:
  - Overview of ma attributes
  - Major cover types
  - Management Area “Concept of Management” have been developed for all MAs; briefs were developed, posted on internet
  - Presented to internal and external stakeholders
  - Three public meetings, modest attendance
- Asked for 10 months to incorporate BCPP (biological conservation planning process) and their stakeholders are uniformly supportive of the reasons for the delay. Critical to meeting the re-revised timelines is to accelerate the pace of the BCPP.

### **SSM Management Unit**

#### Drummond Island Recreation Issue

- the dispute over ORV Route to accommodate larger vehicles covered during initial briefing, on drive to field sites, and during most the of the day

#### Neil Godby, Fisheries for Northern Lake Huron Management Unit

- Challenges include declining pike populations, need to protect coastal marshes
- Most game-fish populations have been stable, walleye populations are up

- Work closely with FMFM, fisheries comments on compartment review, ask for buffers as needed, focus on use of Best Management Practices

#### Charlie Vallier, Fire Supervisor kicked off a discussion of prescribed burning program

- Have an active prescribed burn program to maintain openings
- Only burned 30 acres in 2008; staffing and funding fairly limited
- Goals of burns: habitat for open-land species (bluebirds, merlins, kestrels, sharp-tail grouse)
- Previously had larger burns (sheep ranch, another)
- What is the impact of not having sufficient resources to do the burns you would like to do?  
In Shingleton the big impact on the Petrol deer yard complex has been to have to try to change the way they manage deer wintering areas to regenerate cedar and especially to protect the cedar that they have already regenerated. Further east they are losing their ability to maintain open and brushy habitats as permanent habitat, will eventually lose that suite of species.
- Why don't more of the unit's burns get funded? Far away, not enough trained people, difficult to implement the burn because it takes time to get people here. Each division ranks their own burns; wildlife focuses more on fire dependent communities, where fire is needed to perpetuate them; rarer communities get funded. Also, for cedar burns there is a very narrow window in terms of conditions. Staff would like to increase the amount of prescribed burning being done. Recently partners have been identified to support RX burns.

#### **Gaylord FMU**

- Extensive recreation program:
  - 9 campgrounds
  - ATV trails, Snowmobile trails
  - North Central State Trail (converted rail corridor) multiple use trail
  - Working on Sheboygan to Alpena rail corridor
  - Third corridor also converging on Mackinaw region
- Main timber type is northern hardwood to north, pine to east, jack pine types to the south
- Fisheries Division has ramped up its efforts to integrate their work on upland forest management with the other divisions; see matrix under 3.2.1 for details

#### **Leadership discussion between the SFI and FSC Lead Auditors and Mindy Koch, Resource Deputy and Lynne Boyd, FMFM Division Chief:**

One: Have you already decided to put ORV Routes on Drummond Island? Yes, consistent with long-term use of Jeeps and Hummers; have approved routes for events. What is the decision space of the advisory team charged with review of the recreation and transportation system? There will be jeep trails; the team's focus is on where the routes will be, how many, and how managed. Leadership's expectation is a consensus product. Lack of clarity of ORV regulations is a complicating factor.

Two: The audit team is struggling with the implications with another extension in the schedule for completing RSF plans. FMFM has committed to the new timeline for planning. Can assurances be provided that all other divisions will commit the necessary resources as a high priority? Of particular concern is the need to ensure that the BCPP/BSA process is accelerated as mentioned in your response to planning CARs. Answer: The department has considered the timeline several times to be certain that adequate time has been built in.

Three: SFI Lead commended the department for rapidly adopting the management area concept, which links ecological concepts with concrete actions on the ground. This approach appears headed towards a

reasonable degree of specificity and quantification of major goals at a workable scale. However, numerical targets (acres or cords) are expected in the Regional State Forest Plans, consistent with, but a further elaboration of, “desired future conditions”. This is an SFI requirement.

Four (discussion): MiDNR’s leadership restated the organization’s commitment to certification. Wildlife Division has some categories of land where there are concerns about federal or state requirements possibly conflicting with certification requirements, and is reviewing the extent of special situations where in-scope and out of scope issues may exist.

### **Closing Meeting Comments from SFI Lead Auditor**

Issues discussed during the SFI closing meeting

- Internal auditing system continues to be a very effective means to meet certification requirements, enable effective organizational change and improvement, and uncover problems and start to develop solutions before the external auditors uncovered them.
- Management area write-ups / guidance documents example (MA 19 Williamsburg Moraine Management Area) provides a useful linkage between statewide and ecoregional goals and compartment level decisions... having this level of guidance and specificity in the Regional State Forest Plans is very important in justifying the delay in completing the plans.
- We continue to emphasize the need to include numerical goals and targets in Regional State Forest Plans. This is a critical element of management plans in terms of clarity to stakeholders.

## APPENDIX VI



# Itinerary of Field Stops Michigan DNR 2008 Annual Surveillance Audit

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 21, 2008 Atlanta FMU**

Site 1 Compartment 63: Doty Lake Prescribed Burn Area: red pine stands clearcut and then burned.

Site 2: Tomahawk Flooding Campground, East Unit: complete renovation of the East and West Units of the campground using trust fund revenues.

Site 3: Tomahawk Flooding Campground, West Unit: planned renovation

Site 4, Compartment 64: Sale 020-2007 “Jack Burgers” Clearcut Mature (60 year old) Jack Pine as part of the Kirtland’s Warbler recovery plan; 75% of area site-preparation and plant at 1,600 tpa to result in average 1,200 tpa with “gaps” to develop appropriate habitat. Site preparation is disk-trenching. Follow-up monitoring of KW populations shows steadily increasing populations.

Site 5 Compartment 63: Sale 031-07 “Tomahawk’s West Aspen Stand 22: Completed clearcut with scattered (oak) and clumped retention. Ample CWD; varied regeneration.

Site 6, Compartment 123 Stand 51 and 148: Completed final harvest relying on natural regeneration, set up and harvested in 2008; also Stand 62 final harvest with planting.

Site 7 Compartment 123 “Red Bear Sale” Active harvest, red pine third-row thinning; Eric Hincka and Todd Hincka harvesting contractors both have had SFI Training.

Stop#8 Onaway Field Office.

**Wednesday October 22, 2008 Sault Ste. Marie FMU**

Site 1: Maxton Plains ERA (Alvar); closed RDR 1170

Site 2: Paw Point ERA and McCormick's March culvert replacement for fish passage

Site 3: Potagannissing Dam and fish passage structure: replace dam with a curved, tiered, fish passage structure

Site 3 b: Sheep Ranch Area (viewed from vehicles): prescribed burning area, burns are less frequent than formerly due to funding, some encroachment by spruce trees and woody brush

Site 3c: Roadside firewood enforcement activities by unit manager and conservation officer

Site 4: Glen Cover (lunch): county road gate, parking area, ORV barriers, RDR 1192

Site 4b: RDR 1195 repaired using filter fabric and much fill (round rock)

Site 5: Compartment 18 RDR 1190, multiple sites requiring rock fords, very minor drainages

Site 6: Jeep trail to Marble Head, multiple stops

Site 7: Road sections south of Marble Head, road repairs planned, reviewed "Drummond Island Restoration and Maintenance Projects", a summary of funded projects, some planned, some completed.

Site 8: Turkey Ranch Timber Sale (45-007-06-01) Compartment 16

**Thursday October 23, 2007 Gaylord FMU**

Site 1: Dog Leg Aspen Sale, Compartment 186: excellent retention in a completed Aspen clearcut, good Aspen regeneration, discussed regeneration monitoring

Site 2: Access Road for several Timber Sales, some still active: not well graded, some abuse by hunters who are baiting sites for bear hunting

Site 3: Far East Aspen Sale # 52-106-07-01, Compartment 186: confirmed sale inspection records and retention islands; past sales did not clearly identify retention patches on maps

Site 4: Michigan State Road Aspen Sale, Compartments 186, 187, 209: Active whole-tree chipping harvest of 35 year-old aspen, large, very busy landing with 2 whole tree chippers; contractor Ed Tulgestka & Sons, logger interview with Sonny Tulgestka confirmed that trained loggers supervise the harvest but not on site at all times;

Site 5: Angusticeps Sale, Cutting Unit 3 (lunch): completed during winter, excellent regeneration

Site 6: Angusticeps Sale, Cutting Unit 2: completed, excellent dispersed retention of large, healthy beech trees, also some snags and a few dying birch trees and larger aspen retained for coarse woody debris.

Site 7: Triple A Oak Sale 52-133-07-01, Compartment 210, Stand 20: active oak seed tree harvest, marked well-spaced and vigorous oak leave trees, designated to leave all red oak less than 10 inches dbh, and all white oak, white pine, and red pine; reviewed the stand prescription comments from the approved compartment plan (proposed treatments with no limiting factors); confirmed the "menu" approach to incorporating sale provisions to match prescriptions, for example slash arrangement to facilitate the planned, post-harvest prescribed burn designed to help oak regeneration.

Site 8: Active partial harvest, interviewed Chuck Bishop, not trained, no first aid kit, had shovel for spill cleanup, the trained person supervising the sale is Randy Nash who is not required to be on the site at all times.

**APPENDIX VII**



**SFI Reporting Form**

**COMPANY CONTACT INFORMATION**

Name of Certified Company		Michigan Department of Natural Resources		
Address	Street, No.	1990 US-41 South		
	City	Marquette	Zip/Postal Code	49855
	State or Province	Michigan		
Contact person		Dennis Nezich		
Telephone		(906) 228-6561	Fax	(906) 228-5245
E-mail	<a href="mailto:nezichd@michigan.gov">nezichd@michigan.gov</a>	Company website	<a href="http://www.michigan.gov/dnr">http://www.michigan.gov/dnr</a>	

**CERTIFICATE INFORMATION**

Forest Certification achieved (SFI, CSA)		SFI	
Certificate number		NSF-SFIS-5Y031	
• Certification Date (mm/dd/yy)	December 9, 2005	Certificate Expiry Date (mm/dd/yy)	December 8, 2010
• Text in Scope Line of Certificate	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.		
• Certification Body Name	NSF-ISR		
• Accreditation Body Name	ANAB		
• Accreditation Number	NSF-ISR 1301672-071107		
<b>Canada Only:</b> Notification Fee Paid	Yes	No	

**CERTIFIED FOREST INFORMATION**

Forest area (to which certification applies)	3,900,000 ACRES	HECTARES	
<b>SFI Certification</b> Breakout by State/Province	State/Province MI ac/ha 3,900,000	State/Province ac/ha	
	State/Province ac/ha	State/Province ac/ha	
Land ownership	% 100 public	% private	
• Is this same area certified to another forest management standard? (mark with an 'x')	X YES NO If Yes, to which standard: CSA SFI x FSC If Yes, what portion of the acres/hectares (and AAC for certificates in Canada) reported on this form was previously certified? acres OR ha AAC		
<b>CANADA ONLY</b> Is the certification located in the Boreal?	% Boreal ( acres) % Boreal ( m3)	% Boreal ( hectares) % Boreal ( m3)	
• <b>CANADA ONLY</b> AAC in m3 (to which certification applies)	(For private lands use annual average harvest.)		