

**Minnesota Forest Resources Council  
Minutes  
Cloquet Forestry Center – Cloquet, MN  
28-29 September 2011**

**Members Present:** Bob Stine (Chair), Wayne Brandt, Bruce Cox, Alan Ek, Dave Epperly, Dale Erickson, Shaun Hamilton, Joel Koemptgen, Darla Lenz (alternate for Jim Sanders), Bob Lintelmann, Gene Merriam, Dave Parent, Shawn Perich, Kathleen Preece, Mary Richards, Mike Trutwin.

**Absent:**

Jim Sanders, John Rajala

**Staff:** Dave Zumeta, Lindberg Ekola, Calder Hibbard, Leslie McInenly, Rob Slesak, Jeff Reinhart

**Staff Absent:** Clarence Turner

**Guests:** Anna Dirkswager (DNR), Barb Tormoehlen (USFS), Bob Krepps (St. Louis County), Brad Matlack (Carlton County SWCD), Steve Betzler (MN Power)

**Chair's Remarks**

Bob Stine opened the meeting with a round of introductions. He noted that this meeting is the annual two-day meeting and will not have many action items. Discussion today will set the stage for action in future meetings.

Bob reviewed suggested meeting dates for 2012 and asked members to let him know of any conflicts. Meeting dates will be set in the next few weeks.

**Public Communication**

None.

**Approval of the 25 May 2011 Minutes**

Shaun Hamilton moved to approve, and Dave Epperly seconded, the 25 May 2011 MFRC minutes. *The minutes were approved.*

**Approval of the 28-29 September 2011 Agenda**

Dave Epperly moved to approve the 28-29 September 2011 MFRC agenda. Mike Trutwin seconded the motion. *The agenda was approved.*

**Executive Director Remarks**

Dave Zumeta reported that, since the last meeting, Governor Dayton appointed a new Council Chair and reappointed eight other Council members. In addition, Dave reviewed the list of members with terms that will expire in 2012 and noted that applications will be due in late November.

Dave reported that the state shutdown had some negative impacts on continuity of work for the Council. The MFRC has not met in four months and some momentum on issues was interrupted. Dave asked Dale Erickson to comment on the impact of the shutdown on loggers. Dale Erickson responded that the shutdown had a negative impact on loggers, resulting in a lawsuit. There was quite a bit of

angst because a serious commitment of state dollars was not met. Dale's operation ceased for a week. Dale felt the shutdown reduced consumer confidence in the state.

## **Committee Reports**

### *Personnel and Finance Committee*

Bob Stine distributed a document from the Personnel and Finance (P&F) Committee. The MFRC budget has been reduced for this biennium and most of the reduction in funds will come out of the monitoring program. There has been a temporary addition of staff (Jeff Reinhart) but the additional salary is paid for by a federal grant to support the landscape program.

### *Site-level Committee*

Dave Parent reported that the Site-level Committee held three meetings over the summer. Summaries of the meetings were available in the mailing materials. Dave also commented that new ash management guidelines for private landowners were available on the back table.

Rob commented on the change in the monitoring budget. With our current funding, we can't conduct monitoring as designed. The DNR has requested that the Council provide a formal letter indicating it is okay to not conduct monitoring in 2013. They would also like the Council to identify a formal process to restructure the monitoring program. Approval of the letter would be an action item at next meeting.

Gene Merriam asked for clarification on the content of the proposed letter. Rob responded that the letter will recognize budget constraints on the monitoring program and indicate it is acceptable to defer monitoring for one year due to a lack of funds (the DNR currently has a Memorandum of Understanding with the Council to conduct biennial monitoring). Gene asked why the Council would want to be in that position. Rob responded that he is not clear the Council does want to be in that position; this is something that the DNR has requested from the Council. Gene stated that statute compels the Commissioner to do the monitoring; there is no authority for the Council to waive that requirement. Rob agreed, but noted that the statute says nothing about the frequency of monitoring. The Council would be responding to the MOU regarding the frequency of monitoring. Gene responded that he has no problem with recognizing budget constraints and that the program as designed has current constraints and a lack of appropriations. He was not comfortable with the idea that the Council would say that it is okay for the DNR to skip monitoring. As desirable as it would be to do the monitoring as designed, we recognize that something needs to change.

Shaun Hamilton asked how this approval of deferring monitoring would be communicated to legislature and Governor. Rob responded that this decision relates only to the MOU between the Council and DNR.

Dave Parent stated that this is an issue of oversight and the intent of the communication with the Commissioner is to reinforce the decision to regrettably postpone the monitoring. Dave Epperly stated that the DNR does not want to avoid the responsibility of monitoring and suggested that the letter should be structured around addressing how we can work together to establish an action plan.

Wayne stated that monitoring is the underpinning of the MFRC guidelines; the whole approach requires monitoring on a regular basis. He suggested that some guidelines should be monitored every two years

and some could follow a less frequent schedule. Wayne was uncomfortable with skipping monitoring entirely.

Alan Ek asked for clarification on the change in the monitoring budget. Dave Zumeta responded that the monitoring budget is currently below half of what it was in previous years. Overall, the Council budget has been cut by 26 percent since 2010. We cannot keep doing everything. Alan suggested that the Council should address options or alternatives for monitoring sooner rather than later. Rob responded that a deferral of monitoring would provide time to evaluate the program and come up with ways to do the monitoring more efficiently and effectively, adding that this discussion is already in the works. For this monitoring round, we have about a fifth of the money that was available in the past. Dave Epperly added that continuous improvement is critically important; there may be more efficient ways to conduct monitoring and there may be things we do not want to monitor as frequently. This would be an ideal time to evaluate the alternatives as well as options for funding to sustain the program.

Wayne asked whether there would be an opportunity to partner with existing certification audits. If so, the DNR monitoring effort could concentrate on non-certified lands. He noted that an evaluation of the monitoring program was conducted three years ago.

Joel Koemptgen stated that the evaluation of monitoring should go forward with or without a letter to the DNR. He would be inclined to support the concept of the letter if it were made in consultation with MFRC staff and key leaders. If the decision was made just within the confines of the DNR, he is not as inclined to agree to a cut of that size to the site-level program. Wayne responded that the DNR did not let the Council know there was going to be such a large cut to the MFRC budget.

Bob indicated that staff would work to develop a letter that acknowledges there is not enough money to do monitoring as has been done in the past and will develop a plan given the current budget.

#### *Landscape Committee*

Shaun Hamilton distributed an update from the Landscape Committee, which included information on the Northeast Landscape Plan update and the Climate Change Response Framework (CCRF). Leslie McInenly added that the Landscape Program will host a Northern Summit meeting of the three northern regional landscapes on October 25<sup>th</sup>. The focus of the summit will be to provide an update on the CCRF and to solicit input from managers for the development of a Forest Adaptation Resource document.

#### *Information Management Committee (IMC)*

Kathleen Preece asked Calder Hibbard to provide an update on IMC activities. Calder reported that the IMC has been developing background information on policy issues for Council consideration. The IMC has developed recommendations regarding the prioritization of issues to be addressed by the Council. Recommendation will be reviewed during the afternoon discussion.

#### **Written Communications to the MFRC**

Dave Zumeta distributed three documents: a thank you letter from Al Sullivan to Council members, a press release from the Department of Agriculture regarding Thousand Cankers Disease, and copies of the MFRC Public Concerns Registration Process report.

### **Committee of the Whole: Priority Forest Policy issues from a multi-state regional perspective**

Dave Zumeta introduced Barb Tormoehlen, US Forest Service (USFS) Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry Field Representative. Dave invited Barb to provide a regional perspective on priority forest issues as a foundation for the Council's discussion on policy issues.

Barb provided an overview of national and regional perspectives on forest policy as well as the establishment and mission of the USFS. While the issues addressed by the USFS have changed over the past 100 years, there are common issues that are just as important today as when the National Forest system was established (e.g., jobs, water, fire). On a national level, ecological restoration, enhancing water resources, responding to climate change, threats (e.g., fire and invasives), community-based stewardship, job creation, woody biomass, and valuation of ecosystem services are all important forest policy issues.

Shaun asked about the USFS role in addressing aquatic invasives. Barb responded that the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative has had a significant focus on aquatic invasives and, at smaller scale, aquatic invasives are being addressed in watersheds. Darla Lenz added that the National Forests partner with local groups to address aquatic invasives. Barb noted that, from a headwaters perspective and a habitat restoration perspective, addressing aquatic invasives is very important. The issue is addressed through projects funded by the USFS or through partnerships with other entities.

Dave Parent asked whether the USFS has been able to apply a market value to ecosystem services. Barb responded that market valuation has been difficult without regulation. Within urban landscapes there has been a focus on water services. The market value of wildlife habitat as provided on hunting grounds is a good example, but placing a price on services is really difficult.

Priorities within the Midwest echo national priorities. During the development of the state forest action plans, forest planners identified priorities best addressed on a multi-state level. The Minnesota Forest Action Plan identified several key issues: 1) maintenance of Minnesota's forest land base, 2) maintenance and protection of water quality and quantity, 3) forest health and productivity, 4) reducing wildfire risks, 5) mitigation of and adaptation to climate change, 6) support of a healthy forest products industry, 7) use of woody biomass for energy, 8) maintenance and enhancement of rare ecological features, 9) recreational use of forest lands, and 10) urban and community forestry.

Barb distributed an RFP from the Northeastern Area. The RFP is seeking proposals within three categories: fire, stewardship, urban and community forestry, and forest health issues excluded from the third category below; hazardous fuels mitigation; and forest health management and treatment projects. She suggested that anyone interested in submitting a proposal should contact Dave Epperly (all proposals for Redesign funds must be submitted through the State Forester). Dave Epperly added that the proposals are competitive and must address the issues and strategies identified in the Forest Action Plan. Mary Richards asked whether landscape committees can apply for the Redesign funds. Barb responded that they can put in a request to Dave Epperly, but they must address priorities.

### **Communication from regional committees to the MFRC regarding priority forest policy issues**

Shaun Hamilton stated that Council members all received letters from the six regional landscape

committees. The letters provide regional recommendations regarding priority policy issues for Council consideration. Shaun commented that funding for the landscape program was one of the consistent themes identified in the letters.

Lindberg Ekola distributed two documents: a description of collaborative projects and a summary of regional policy priorities. He provided a brief background on the structure of the landscape program and acknowledged the advisory role of the regional committees. Lindberg reviewed the process the committees have used to prioritize goals, projects and issues. He then reviewed the phases of landscape management and current status of plans and implementation projects. Lindberg reviewed types of committee projects (e.g., outreach and education, research and development, opportunity area projects) and then highlighted the four major policy areas identified by each committee:

Northeast - *forest health and productivity, water quality, the forest products industry, and parcelization/fragmentation.*

Northern - *forest health, the forest products industry/woody biomass, parcelization/forest fragmentation, and tax policy.*

North Central - *forest health and productivity, land administration, parcelization, forest fragmentation, and water resources.*

East Central - *forest health/private forest management, market development, parcelization/forest fragmentation, and water quality and forests.*

Southeast - *forest health/climate change/invasive species, parcelization, value of sustainably managed private forests, and water quality.*

West Central - *forest-based economic development, forest health/water quality, parcelization/fragmentation, and private forest management.*

Lindberg thanked the Council for the opportunity to provide input. Shaun added that none of the issues fit neatly into distinct categories. There may also be issues that are more applicable to certain landscapes. Shaun asked the Council to consider opportunities to address issues at different scales.

Mike Trutwin commented that the matrix and map provided on the issues summary document were very helpful. He asked for more detail regarding specific needs related to climate change. Lindberg responded that climate change concerns for committees are often related to issues of forest productivity and invasive species. The landscape program is getting a good start on addressing climate change through the Northeast Landscape Plan update and coordination of the CCRF.

### **Strategic Determination of MFRC Policy Priorities**

Kathleen Preece, as Acting Chair of the Information Management Committee (IMC), listed and thanked the IMC members for their work over the past year to compile information on various policy issues. After reviewing the information over the course of the year, the IMC is recommending that the Council consider the following issues for priority attention in the next few years: *forest health threats, health of*

*the forest products industry, climate change, and forestland retention.* She asked Calder to review each issue individually and to describe the degree to which the IMC is recommending they be addressed.

Calder reviewed the four topics, stating that the health of the forest products industry is a new issue. The IMC is recommending that the issue of climate change be broadened to include adaptation and resilience. The committee is recommending a focus on implementation of policy recommendations in the forestland retention report (versus getting more information).

Calder then provided some background on MFRC policy issue definition and prioritization over the past decade. The ultimate goal of today's meeting is to come up with a list of recommended policy priorities and, perhaps, some action ideas. Discussion will inform an action item for the Council to decide upon at the November MFRC meeting. Calder then reviewed past MFRC policy direction, current issues and accomplishments. He also reviewed decision criteria developed by the Council during the last vetting of priority issues and asked members to suggest any revisions.

Dave Parent suggested that the Council should consider whether the economic environment has changed significantly since the last time an issue was evaluated to help determine the relevance of the issue. Shaun suggested that priority issues could be classified or reframed as issues of policy, priority activities, and gaps in research. He noted that the issues could be reframed in a manner that resonates more with the public. Calder responded that the intent of the discussion is to get to the same place by identifying the priority issues and then ferret out actions.

Bob asked whether the decision criteria imply that our role is to identify 1) things that the Governor and legislature will agree with or 2) things that need to be addressed. Wayne responded that the goal is to identify issues the Governor and legislature would consider important and, by addressing, the outcome will provide value. Dave Zumeta asked Wayne to comment on how the criteria may apply to the issue of climate change. Wayne responded that the important consideration is to identify what the Council will do to address the issue that is unique and will provide value that will not otherwise be provided. Shaun added that characterizing and communicating the issue (e.g., as a forest health issue) will be important. Bruce Cox stated that climate change is not palatable to everyone and commented that field folks are asking what effect climate change will have on management actions. As a county land commissioner, Bruce has not been able to provide an answer but he suggested that if the Council collectively agrees that the issue is important, we may get to an acceptable answer.

Joel commented that he does not see the scientific process included in the criteria. Dave Zumeta responded that the scientific basis for an issue is a consideration of the Council and could be included in the criteria.

Dale Erickson questioned the amount of emphasis that should be placed on government or legislative priorities and noted that the legislature can turn over quite rapidly.

Other suggestions included the need for a common understanding of good policy (operational and strategic) and a consideration of whether member and staff time would be used effectively to address an issue.

Wayne stated that he likes the criteria as developed in 2008. Mary suggested that the first consideration should be whether the Council feels the issue is a priority. If so, the Council should then determine whether there is scientific justification. If the need is justified, then perhaps the Governor and legislators can be convinced that the issue should be a priority. Wayne responded that the Council exists because the Governor and legislature established the MFRC. Kathleen replied that the Council should not avoid a priority issue if we determine the Governor will not be interested.

Bob Stine reviewed the comments made by Council members and suggested that the criteria are a set of principles which may be weighed differently by different members.

Calder then asked the Council to revisit old priority issues to determine whether they still need to be addressed or if they ought to be revised.

Forestland Base – Calder asked whether the forestland base should still be considered a priority issue. Dave Parent asked whether timberland is implied or whether forestland refers to the broader forestland base. Dave Zumeta responded that the forestland base reflects both timberland and other forestland; key issues relate to the timber base, recreational access, and ecological services.

Wayne stated that the forestland base will always be an important issue but asked what the Council may address that will provide new information and important outcomes. Forest taxation may be an area to address. The legislature and Governor gutted the SFIA for larger landowners and there is not extensive use of the program by other landowners.

Shaun suggested that the title (Forestland base) should be revised to reflect the outcome we want. If we want to “Keep working forests working”, perhaps taxation is a priority issue. Shawn Perich responded that societal changes are influencing who buys land and how it is managed. He suggested that an understanding of societal perspectives is important.

Darla asked what further could be done by the Council to address the issue. Calder responded that regional committees would like to see implementation of the policy options at a local scale. Bruce added that we need to figure out how to implement the suggestions from the parcelization study. Wayne inquired about the role of the Council relative to implementation. Shaun suggested that the Council could endorse and direct the operational activities of the committees. Joel stated that, based on his experience, regional committees are looking for an advocate.

Calder surmised that the Council was not ready to drop the issue from consideration but noted that there may be a need to reframe the issue.

#### Forest Biomass and Biofuels Harvest

Shaun asked whether the Governor’s renewable energy statutes and goals should be referenced as a component of the biomass and biofuels issue. Darla responded that issues of harvest need to be rolled up into consideration of the forest products industry as a whole. She liked the way that the IMC wrapped biomass into the bigger issue (*Health of the Forest Products Industry*). Dave Zumeta concurred,

noting that most woody biomass harvesting will be in conjunction with traditional harvesting. There was similar agreement among Council members.

Bruce suggested that biomass and biofuels should no longer be a priority; the Council appropriately addressed the issue over the past few years. Bob asked how the issue may be framed to identify something the Council can do or advocate. Joel responded that this is one of the issues that the Council has addressed well and it no longer needs to be a priority focus.

Calder commented that woody biomass was addressed in the first bullet under the health of the forest products industry as recommended by the IMC. Mike suggested that woody biomass harvesting may be required to accomplish stand and harvest goals and indicated that the option should not be lost. Dale stated that he does not envision much woody biomass harvesting if current levels are maintained; there is not enough demand to make a significant impact on forest health. In the context of creating jobs and forest health, he suggested woody biomass is a component of the broad forest industry issue.

#### Threats to forest health

Calder reported that the IMC has spent quite a bit of time putting together information regarding the different players and actions surrounding threats to forest health, particularly regarding invasive species. The IMC recommendation was that this should remain a top priority issue.

Shawn stated that there is more to forest health than invasive species. Wayne stated that the Council should address forest health, adding that mortality is galloping ahead in our state.

Dave Epperly commented that forest health has become the way to talk about the issues. In order to maintain health, we need a healthy industry. Bruce suggested that forest health is still relevant but felt that the issue needs to be reframed. Shawn suggested that the Council ought to address the impact of deer on forest health.

Calder noted that forest health means many different things to many people. Previously, the Council used the issue of forest health as an umbrella and identified out specifics to address (e.g., invasive terrestrial plants, insects, and diseases). Shaun suggested that the Council could identify four to six elements of forest health to be addressed via policy. Dave Epperly responded that policy and action items are an issue of scale and noted that some of the forest health concerns can be broken down into regional emphases. He felt that framing the forest health issue and identifying the scope and scale would be a good task for the Council. Bruce suggested that this would be a good opportunity to address forest productivity.

#### Carbon Sequestration and Climate Change

Calder reported that the IMC suggested that carbon sequestration and climate change remain a priority; however, they recommended that the issue should be broadened to address forest resilience and adaptability.

Alan suggested that the issue could be listed as a component of forest health. Joel asked whether the IMC addressed carbon sequestration during their discussion of the issue. Calder responded that the IMC

wanted to broaden out the issue, which he assumed would also include sequestration. Joel felt that the inclusion of sequestration would speak to keeping climate change as an issue separate from forest health. Shaun suggested that the Council could focus on encouraging the use of the tools and information developed through the CCRF. Alan responded that many scientists think initial climate change impacts will be related to invasives and other forest health threats. Wayne added that the Council has addressed carbon sequestration.

Darla was in support of the IMC recommendation to keep climate change a separate policy issue. Wayne inquired whether Council involvement with the CCRF is adequate for this issue.

Dave Zumeta noted that climate change is identified as a high priority at a statewide level (e.g., in the DNR Forest Action Plan and the IMC recommendation) but does not seem to rise to the same priority at local levels (i.e., only the Southeast committee identified it as a priority within forest health). Bruce responded that other issues are of more immediate concern at the local level.

Based on the discussion, Bob Stine indicated that climate change ought to remain on the list of issues for consideration. He then asked Council members to review the landscape committee recommendations and asked members to list additional issues that should be considered by the Council.

#### New Issues

Shawn suggested that the Council should consider the issue of societal changes. The next generation has very different perspectives regarding forest, land, and resource issues. Demographics are changing. At a state and national level there seems to be little understanding or appreciation of conservation. Bruce responded that it could be beneficial to spend some time thinking about the public understanding of what we do and why. Further discussion ensued regarding shifts in forestry program enrollment and resource-related programs, evolving environmental interests, and generational changes.

Joel stated that northeastern Minnesota will be facing huge issues related to non-ferrous mining and suggested that the MFRC will be pulled into the issue as it concerns the relationship between forest cover and water quality.

Wayne Brandt listed a few additional issues for consideration: 1) review of the Sustainable Forest Resources Act (SFRA) and recommendations for statutory changes, 2) options related to forestland property taxation, 3) options and recommendations for public forest management structures, 4) attributes of - and how to attain - a competitive forest products industry, 5) opportunities to increase the supply of certified wood, and 6) the effectiveness of programs designed to mitigate high levels of forest harvest (e.g. Extended Rotation Forests).

Bob asked members to review the list of policy options and identify three or four they want to prioritize for discussion the next day.

#### **Public Communications to the MFRC**

Bob Krepps stated that many of the issues mentioned by Wayne are things he deals with on a daily basis. He mentioned his participation in the all-lands group (a group of managers within the Northeast

landscape) and discussed the value of building off the Northeast Landscape Plan. Bob suggested that the Council should work to bring in additional partners and engage new groups.

### **Member Communications**

Mike Trutwin distributed a handout regarding an upcoming roundtable on biomass (October 13<sup>th</sup> in Cloquet). Kathleen Preece commented that the Minnesota Forest Resources Partnership will meet on October 20<sup>th</sup> in Grand Rapids.

Bob Stine recessed the meeting at 4:15 pm.

### **September 29, 2011**

Bob Stine reconvened the MFRC meeting at 9:00 am. He asked Calder to provide a summary of policy issues prioritized by the Council.

Calder reviewed higher priority issues identified by the Council, including: *forest health threats, forest parcelization, the health of the forest products industry, implications/mitigation of climate change, public understanding/education, water quality and forests, and woody biomass harvesting/energy.* Additional issues that received some interest included: the adequacy of forest information/inventory, changes/losses in fish and wildlife habitat, the definition of forest values, fire considerations, forest productivity, forest recreation, better/integrated planning, increased collaborations and partnerships, maintenance of biodiversity, private forest management, support for forest research, implications of nonferrous mining, forestland taxation, public forestland management, competitive wood supply, increased amount of certified wood, and an SFRA update or modification

Wayne clarified that his suggestion regarding public forestland management was focused on looking at how we are structurally organized for managing public lands.

Shaun asked how an evaluation of the SFRA might be approached. Wayne responded that the Council could evaluate the SFRA and provide a report and presentation to the legislature in 2013 regarding any suggested changes. Dave Zumeta suggested that an update or modification of the SFRA is not an issue but a task that could potentially be addressed by a subcommittee. Wayne agreed.

Dave Parent suggested that forest recreation could be removed from consideration.

Wayne asked for clarification on the issue related to defining forest values. Dave Parent responded that the Council could look at the nationwide survey of woodland owners regarding their values and reasons for owning land. Wayne inquired about the inclusion of ecosystems services. Joel responded that there is a difference between how the public values the forest and how the Council values the forest. He was concerned that the Council is not addressing the fact that a majority of people see more than simply the industrial value of a forest. Dave Epperly responded that the Council was established to deal with the tension between ecological and economic values and suggested that the Council has not adequately addressed the fact the industrial and ecological values are independent. Shaun Hamilton asked whether certification could be the paradigm that demonstrates forest values.

Dave Zumeta suggested that *forest productivity* is a very important issue that is clearly linked with forest health. Dave Epperly added that *quality* must be included in the discussion regarding forest health and productivity. Bob Stine stated that there seemed to be a *forest health issue* and a *forest products industry health issue*.

Dale Erickson suggested that fire is already getting a lot of attention. Dave Epperly agreed and responded that a great deal of Council or staff time addressing fire is not required; however, it is important to understand the impact of fire on management budgets.

Bob Stine asked whether issues of *private forest management (e.g., taxation and management assistance)* are regional in nature. Lindberg responded that there are variations in across the state; it is a very big issue for the southern two-thirds of the state. Wayne suggested the Council ought to spend some time on taxation. Mary added that taxation is a huge issue for resorts. Calder suggested that the Council could focus on private forest management with an emphasis on taxation or treat taxation as a separate issue. Shaun suggested that a linkage between taxation, certified wood supply, and promotion of a competitive wood supply might do a better job of addressing public benefits. Gene responded that the greater linkage is with forest values and social needs. Dave Zumeta suggested that there are pieces of the forestland retention study that need particular attention, including the taxation options. The combination of private forest management, parcelization and taxation is a good grouping.

Dave Epperly stated that we need to find a way to connect forest values with the importance of funding for resource management. Wayne agreed that *forestry program funding* is an important policy issue. Wayne felt that a review of public forestland management structures could address legislative interest in identifying opportunities to do things differently given a limited state budget.

Joel reiterated interest in addressing *nonferrous mining in relationship to the connection between forest cover and water quality*.

Wayne suggested that the Council could describe different *aspects of a competitive wood supply (e.g., timber supply, logger productivity, transportation, etc.)* to identify a host of policy implications. For example, what are the implications of harvesting 15 cords per acre in perpetuity? Dave Zumeta stated that Minnesota is at a competitive advantage with respect to the amount of certified wood and suggested that certification is an advantage upon which to build. Dave Epperly added that smaller landowners need to start seeing some benefit from certification. Shaun responded that there are models (e.g., the American Forest Foundation program and Wisconsin's Managed Forest Law).

Calder asked Council members to comment on the issue of societal change. Mike felt that the issue is something the Council should address. Dave Parent stated that the SFRA may need adjustment to reflect the contemporary environment. Wayne suggested that Council staff could spend some time assess the current research and include a presentation at an upcoming meeting. Dave Zumeta identified intergenerational land transfer and the resulting changes in the demographics of land ownership as a good topic to address.

Calder reviewed the issues that appeared to be of highest priority for the Council, including *forest health, quality and productivity; health of the forest products industry; private forestland retention and management; public forest management structures; water quality and forest connections; and societal change*. Bob Stine stated the *climate change* should remain on the list for consideration. Dave Zumeta suggested that climate change could be incorporated into forest health.

Bob instructed staff to synthesize and integrate the issues to reflect the Council discussion and bring the revised list back to the Council in November. Dave Zumeta responded that he would discuss next steps with staff but anticipated that Council members will receive a refined list with a request for feedback on the issues based on the Council's decision criteria. Staff will incorporate feedback into an action item for the November meeting.

Kathleen Preece thanked Calder for his facilitation of the discussion. Bob Stine thanked Council members and staff for the good discussion.

Wayne Brandt requested that a Personnel and Finance committee meeting be held soon to address the MFRC budget and site-level monitoring.

Lindberg Ekola reported that the North Central committee has offered to host the annual MFRC meeting in 2012.

Kathleen Preece moved, and Mary Richards, seconded adjournment of the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.