

COMPARTMENT REVIEW RECORD OF CHANGES AND DECISIONS

Cadillac Forest Management Unit

2016 Year-of-Entry

Location: Cadillac Public Library, Cadillac, MI

Date: September 10, 2014

The following documents the changes and decisions made at the Compartment Review to the Inventory Database, Reports, and Compartment Maps presented at Open House, for the Cadillac Forest Management Unit Compartment Review. This document is the official record of changes and decisions.

Attendees: David Fisher (FRD); Tom Haxby (FRD); Steve Eisele (FRD); Jim Malloy (FRD); Mike Lesinski (FRD); Cheryl Nelson (FRD), Scott Throop (FRD); Bill Sterrett (FRD); Derek Cross (FRD); Blair Tweedale (FRD); Joe Ventimiglia (FRD); Peter Kailing (WLD); Erin Victory (WLD); Mark Knee, (WLD); Keith Kintigh (WLD); DiAnn Stanulis (FRD/WLD), Vernon Richardson (WLD); Patrick Potter (FRD); Todd Neiss (PRD)

Comments from Open House and E-Mail

There were 14 people signed in at the Open House.

The Grand Traverse Band (GTB) of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians submitted the following comments:

Aspen regeneration stands should not exceed 10 acres without a shelter belt attached to the older age class stands. This allows grouse, song birds and other animals to access older age stands for forage, escape cover, and potential nesting. All aspen stands should have drumming logs and the "tops" left in-place for a horizontal and vertical structure and the lower (near ground) level.

Down woody debris is a critical component for a wide range of habitat needs from dispersal of rain, reducing erosion, nutrients, and cover. Down woody debris, particularly as in-tact tops with vertical height provide grouse cover from raptors, drumming logs, and provides subnivanian prey habitat for weasel, marten, and medium size predators such as bobcat and red fox. There can be a substitute for leaving all tops intact by leaving one representative whole tree per acres in the stand as a cover for chipping operations; however this is not as effective for cover as all tops left in place.

Openings in aspen and jack pine stands are a functional component for grouse, deer, woodcock, and turkey. The edges of openings allow for the regeneration and propagation of blackberry and other forbs which attract grouse and turkey, forbs and grasses for deer, and leks for woodcock.

Comments continued on next page.

Riparian corridors along lakes and streams need increased buffer widths to provide additional coarse woody debris recruitment in-stream, large woody debris on the riparian interface, stream shading, wider wildlife travel corridors, increase habitat for furbearers, and a longer connection of older age class forest types mixed with younger age classes created by natural disturbance. There is a great concern of GTB to increase protection of cold water streams in the face of climate change. GTB recommends that third order streams and larger have buffers 600' beyond the valley wall or flood plain. While there can be limited management activities in bottom lands, it should be non-commercial, and actually should allow natural forces (wind throw, beaver, ect.) to provide the process.

The U.S. Forest Service places a high standard in regards to archeological survey along large and medium sized river corridors. The Big Manistee and Pine Rivers seem to have high archeological values on Forest service lands; once crossed onto State of Michigan owned lands a denotation of "no known archeological sites in this compartment" is the standard response, so log up to 150' of the rivers' edge is the standard procedure. The question may be if we don't look for archeological sites standard BMP's apply. Perhaps among other influences and guiding principles archeological surveys may indeed be needed before prescriptions are written.

Chipping seems to be the absolute lowest bottom value to any public owned forest uses. Leaving tops intact for wildlife cover, erosion control, decompose, or use in prescribed fire is a far better use of forest material than chip into a box truck and leave the landscape bare or a slight residue covering. If the harvesters want to chip; they can chip the pulp stick or log but the tops need to left intact on the ground. If, this cause hardship on the contract then perhaps let the forest go through the natural forest succession or determine a better strategy than chipping.

Karen Sobotker commented that the land should be used to grow industrial hemp.

Steve Thibideau commented on the low fish numbers in the Hodenpyle and Tippy backwaters.

Dana Ferrell wrote in support of continued clear cutting in Missaukee County to provide early successional habitat needed for grouse and other wildlife.

Keith Terwilliger provided the following comments via e-mail:

- Logging companies be held responsible for better cutting management with brush and limbs. So much is left behind creating long-term fire hazards, destroying native vegetation and creating unnatural habitat for scavenger-type animals
- Aging forests especially softer woods are becoming a safety and fire hazard. High winds are pulling down 25 year old and up poplar and birch. Making general visits to those locations dangerous. Also, the fallen wood creates hazardous fire conditions.
- It would be wonderful for a work program in conjunction with our current entitlement programs to build a work force to first maintain our current woodlands and then explore the replanting of native and quite possibly even some foreign, but disease resistant timber that would not compromise the chemistry of Michigan forests

Tony Fox of Bisballe Forest Products provided written comments at the Open House as follows:

- Unhappy with 26,000 acre set-aside to address FSC's CAR on last audit. Stated that MDNR should not be FSC certified.
- Mentioned recent correspondence with Doug Heym regarding zero tolerance on damage to residual trees. Felt that it is unreasonable and unattainable.

Comments continued on next page.

- Sale prospectus distribution needs to be streamlined and an effort placed on a steady flow. Sales with poor access should be advertised at appropriate times.

Ryan Prough provided the following comments via e-mail:

- The more clearcutting you can do in wet areas the better! I know some of these areas are harder to harvest, but seem to produce more birds.
- Any planting of fruiting trees and shrubs would be great too.

Changes to be made: *(This is the record of official changes to the maps and database).*

Compartment 22

Add wildlife narrative more specifics on language for grouse specs or that all aspen stands will have consideration for grouse habitat unless otherwise specified.

Compartment 24

Stand 31 – Add a winter or summer only specification.

Stand 7 – West side, remove old POG designation.

Stand 20 – Change age on stand to the aspen age.

Stand 19 – Change to no retention due to small stand and conversion to jack pine.

Compartment 34

Add wildlife narrative more specifics on language for grouse specs or that all aspen stands will have consideration for grouse habitat unless otherwise specified.

Compartment 37

Stand - Drop trench and plant prescription

Stand 31 – Is an area to address, need to code a site Condition or a treatment.

Stand 45 – Add treatment for wildlife opening.

Compartment 51

Stand 40 – Do a site visit and determine management direction including possible wildlife habitat for upland brush or timber management potential.

Stands 23 and 24 – Add prescriptions for wildlife openings.

Stand 74 – Change site condition to a soft factor. Add in notes to push treatment from stand 85 into stand 79 where possible.

Stand 33 – Change to a final harvest and replant.

Compartment 62

Stand 23 – Consider cutting the same time as adjacent private property owner. Create a treatment and remove the site condition.

Compartment 81

Stand 54 – Remove hard factor limit (unavailable site condition).

Recommend 40 acres in NW portion of the compartment for disposal.

Note that there may be additional areas of phragmites near the others in the two small areas of stand 37.

Stand 34 may have phragmites and if found, do a chapter 7 to treat with herbicides.

Compartment 93

The decision was to put the isolated and low areas on the west side of this compartment up for disposal. MDOT may be interested in this as wetland mitigation.

Add road to map leading to the Reedsburg Dam.

Add a prescription for the flooding area for the potential of a drawdown during the management cycle.

Make sure that there are buffers on treatments adjacent to water.

Compartment 96

Stand 80 – Remove site condition.

Stand 44 – Discussed putting in a temporary bridge, but finally decided that it could hold for another 10 years.

Compartment 106

Stands 16 & 17 – Change treatment to a final harvest, roller chop and replant red pine. Do not use herbicides that could inhibit development of the hardwood understory.

Stand 88 – Add comment to treatment to check for the possibility of an active eagle nest before proceeding with the sale and treat accordingly.

Consider adding specifications for retention and structural diversity in treatment prescriptions.

Compartment 121

No changes.

Compartment 128

No changes.

As the Compartment Review Meeting Facilitator, I certify that the above changes have been agreed to.

Tom Haxby
Name


Signature

Inv. and Planning Specialist
Title

9/16/2014
Date