*Minnesota Forest Resources Council*
DRAFT Minutes
Shoreview Community Center
March 20, 2013

**Members Present:** Bob Stine (Chair), Susan Solterman Audette, Greg Bernu, Forrest Boe, Wayne Brandt, Alan Ek, Dale Erickson, Shaun Hamilton, Gene Merriam, Dave Parent, Shawn Perich, Kathleen Preece, Mike Trutwin

**Members Absent:** Darla Lenz, Bob Lintelmann, Bob Owens, Mary Richards,

**Staff Present:** Dave Zumeta, Lindberg Ekola, Calder Hibbard, Rachael Nicoll, Rob Slesak, Clarence Turner

**Guests:** Rich Baker (MN DNR), Anna Dirkswager (MN DNR), Amber Ellering (MN DNR), Don Janes (private landowner), Commissioner Barb Naramore (MN DNR), Bob Tomlinson (MN DNR), Caitlin Dryler (law student)

**Chair's Remarks**
Bob Stine opened the meeting with a round of introductions and mentioned members who were absent.

**Public Input/Communication to the Minnesota Forest Resources Council**
None.

**Approval of January 23, 2013 Meeting Minutes***
Wayne Brandt approved, and Alan Ek seconded, the January 23, 2013 meeting minutes. *The minutes were unanimously approved.*

**Approval of March 20, 2013 Meeting Agenda***
Mike Trutwin approved, and Wayne Brandt seconded, the March 20, 2013 meeting agenda. *The agenda was unanimously approved.*

**Executive Director Remarks**
Dave Zumeta yielded his time to Forrest Boe and Wayne Brandt to provide an update on the current legislative session. Forrest mentioned that the DNR is currently monitoring several bills. The 2013 Forestry Bill would allow the exchange of road easements, provide technical alterations to the Forest Management Investment Account (FMIA) and make several changes to timber sale practices. The DNR is also monitoring proposed modifications to the Sustainable Forest Incentive Act (SFIA), including the removal of the program's acreage cap. They're also watching the Forest Trust Lands Bill, which limits costs that may be assessed against permanent

school trust lands to no more than 30 percent of the revenue earned. This could be problematic. Lastly, they're following the Bonding Bill, which appropriates money for reforestation as well as forest roads and bridges. Governor Dayton's proposed supplemental budget for the 2014-2015 biennium would grant an additional $2 million per year to the Division of Forestry. Forrest views this increase as a step in the right direction, as it would largely offset structural deficits in the FMIA and allow the division to hire an additional 15 DNR foresters. Forrest hopes the current budget situation is as low as we will get and hopes for improvements from here.

Wayne is working with others to gain additional funding for silviculture and inventory work, and he is moving to obtain a modest budget increase for the MFRC. Wayne also hopes to acquire money for the Interagency Information Cooperative and thinks the policies under consideration at the legislature are in good shape. He is optimistic about the removal of the SFIA cap and is watching several bills related to lands with conservation easements. A Legislative Valuation assessment could significantly shape how these easements are valued in the future.

Wayne also noted that industrial electric rates have gone up 55 percent over the past 10 years, eroding the competitive advantage Minnesota forest industry previously enjoyed. And finally, he mentioned that Calder Hibbard and Dave Zumeta have visiting the Capitol to provide information. Legislators have found this useful in forming a better base of knowledge.

Kathleen Preece spoke about her experience at the "Forestry at the Capital" day with the Bemidji Forestry Affairs Council and Grand Rapids Chamber of Commerce. DNR Commissioner Tom Landwehr, Forrest Boe and Craig Schmid spoke about forestry issues, and visitors spoke with legislators. Kathleen believes that they made an impact, leaving information about the Council and the Minnesota Forest Resources Partnership (MFRP).

**Committee Reports**

*Personnel and Finance*

The P&F Committee has not met since the last Council meeting.

*Site-Level*

The Site-level Committee has not met since the last Council meeting.

*Landscape Planning/Coordination*

Shaun Hamilton said that the Committee met last week, on March 12. Lindberg Ekola provided draft meeting minutes as a handout.

*Information Management Committee*

Kathleen Preece informed the Council that Information Management Committee has not met since the last Council meeting, twice cancelling meetings due to bad weather.

**Written Communications to the MFRC**
None.

**Committee of the Whole: DNR land asset management**
Shaun Hamilton and Dave Zumeta introduced Bob Tomlinson, Land Asset Manager of the DNR Division of Lands and Minerals. Shaun promoted the concept of viewing all state lands as assets and managing them accordingly. Involvement in the DNR strategic land asset management (SLAM) program will lend an opportunity for interaction between the Landscape Committee and regional committees, and for the DNR to consider asset management across landscape scales and ownerships to maximize benefits.

Minnesota is a land-rich state, but the DNR could do better in managing its land as an asset and look for opportunities to buy, sell and exchange land as well as obtain easements. Bob explained that the SLAM program focuses on managing the spatial location of land, not just its resources. A major objective of SLAM is to improve relationships between various levels of government through coordinated management while simultaneously increasing revenues for all levels of government.

Bob described efforts of the land asset management program in northern Minnesota related to Molpus lands and potential land exchange opportunities in Lake County. The DNR is undertaking mineral evaluations in Lake County to maintain areas with mineral potential for the state. This is an important consideration for sale and exchange of state lands. Other important factors include ecological, recreational, and forestry values.

Another project involves reviewing 220,000 acres of Potlatch lands, with a focus on priority parcels to protect in perpetuity. The DNR is working with Potlatch to see which lands the company would be willing to sell. In the Sax-Zim bog north of Duluth, the DNR is pursuing an exchange of peat lands for more productive lands. Dave Zumeta noted that this bog is unique in the entire nation for birding, and has become a national birding hot spot because of the concentration of rare bird species it supports. The peat land is not high value timber land, however, so this exchange makes a lot of sense and would be good for wildlife habitat protection and recreation. Shawn noted that there may be a net loss for St. Louis County. Bob responded that the county board is supportive of the project, in part, because 1000 acres of this peatland will become private land that will still be managed for wildlife values through a purchase by the Conservation Fund.

Dave Parent noted that the Richard J. Dorer Memorial Hardwood Forest (RJD) in southeastern Minnesota was formed for watershed/water quality protection and asked if this focus will continue. Bob replied that he's sure this will continue as the DNR now has a greater opportunity to review land purchases and consolidations more will have more money for buying land than in past decades. Reviewing RJD lands strategically makes sense now.

Benefits of SLAM include: 1) better relationships; 2) increased potential for harvest of summer wood through improved access; 3) reduced time for marking timber sale boundaries; 4) fewer land exchange complications and inefficiencies; 4) maintenance of high value land or land with special considerations; and 5) increased competitiveness for funding opportunities.

Susan Solterman Audette provided feedback for SLAM metrics, noting that many people don't consider wildlife to be a direct asset, but it is. She recommended including language for wildlife corridors. Bob responded positively, and added that SLAM would also address climate change considerations as improved forest connectivity increases ecosystem resiliency. Dave Zumeta mentioned improved access for recreational birding, hunting and other used, and that increased use would be beneficial to the tourism economy. The DNR could measure this and do case studies. Dave Parent commented that increased access reduces a sense of isolation for private landowners and recreational users. Forrest mentioned the need to look at objectives when developing metrics for measuring success, and Bob agreed.

Gene Merriam asked to what extent the cross-disciplinary jurisdiction of this program will affect management. Bob replied that the legislature rarely appropriates funds to exchange and sell land. Forestry has the greatest opportunity because they have the most lands, but the burden shouldn't fall on forestry. The effort should be spread department-wide. Gene said that he thinks this is a great effort, and that the current administration is already showing a lot of leadership. He noted the challenge in becoming more efficient is balancing efficiencies with the reason these lands were purchased or donated by someone in the first place.

**Update on Northeast Landscape Plan revision process**

Shaun introduced Lindberg Ekola, the MFRC Landscape Program manager. Lindberg mentioned that MFRC landscape plans are the highest scale forest plans in the state, covering a very large area. Given this context, there is a need for an elevated level of thinking. Lindberg emphasized three aspects of the plan revision process: 1) potential native plant community (NPC) mapping with NRRI to provide a solid ecological foundation and a landscape perspective; 2) an overlay of economic analysis with Ecological Classification Systems (ECS) by layering Forest Inventory and Analysis data over ECS data to allow committee members to determine how these different ECS sections/subsections function, make comparisons over time between sections and consider ecological and economic tradeoffs; and 3) the development of economic scenarios (the 2003 Northeast Landscape Plan did not include this). Jim Skurla with the Labovitz School of Business and Economics at University of Minnesota Duluth is developing these scenarios with guidance from an economic scenario ad hoc committee and assistance from Clarence Turner.

In response to a question from Mike Trutwin, Lindberg said that the revised plan will take into account the generation of power from woody biomass. In response to a question from Bob Stine, Dave Zumeta said that there has been extensive participation by multiple DNR divisions,

environmental interests, forest industries, MLEP and other interests, and that the plan revision committee is a very engaged, active group. Shawn Perich noted that he didn't hear any mention of tourism. Lindberg replied that tourism is very important in this area, and that several recommendations in the plan will address tourism. Continuing, he said that we are developing a plan revision that will be useful to a diverse set of partners, and that to some degree it will be a "wish-list" because there are so many stakeholders. Partners will have conflicting desires, but we're looking for solutions that provide mutual benefits solutions. Shaun Hamilton noted the importance of water quality and this landscape's world-class water resources. Lindberg said that Dr. Sandy Verry has contributed to including watershed considerations in the plan revision, but there will be some complications. Bob reminded Council members that we need to encourage open dialogue, understand participants and their views.

**Site-level Committee recommendation to create ad hoc committee for field guide content and to develop guideline implementation goals**

Bob Stine introduced Rob Slesak, MFRC Site-level Program Manager, who talked about creating a field guide and guideline implementation goals. Dave Parent said the most contentious issue in this process has been setting goals, and in management, it is important to gather data on success and areas in need of improvement. Rob indicated that the proposed ad hoc committee will have two tasks: 1) development of the field guide; and 2) development of guideline implementation goals to create a standard and see how well we're doing. Dave Zumeta added that there is a statutory basis for setting implementation goals as well.

Many stakeholder comments said that the guidebook was difficult to use and requested development of a field guide. At the December 2012 Personnel and Finance Committee meeting, the committee approved initiation of a process for field guide development and set a $5,000 limit for this task. MLEP has already begun to solicit input on the field guide from its members, and the MFRP and Council members will soon have the opportunity to provide comments as well. Gene Merriam added that we knew we couldn't accomplish everything immediately in the context of high budget demands, but we have begun the initial steps.

Anna Dirkswager asked if the Site-level Program has explored options for doing an online application. Rob replied that they submitted a proposal to the LCCMR involving this, but it was not considered for funding. The eventual intended outcome is for the creation of two products: a field guide plus interactive web-content. Dave Parent mentioned that this dual-product outcome recognizes the generational gap, and, as Bob Stine noted, a gap in internet accessibility in the woods. Shawn Perich asked if the updated field guide will be in a three-ring binder, and Rob answered that there are no plans to publish a hard copy. However, he is currently working with DNR creative services to update the original guideline PDF file with the revised language and guideline changes. This is an interim solution, and it will only be available in electronic format. Bob said that it would cost at least $50,000 to print hard copies of the

updates. Shawn suggested that we could convert the guidebook to an e-reader relatively inexpensively.

Rob then provided an overview of previous implementation goals of the monitoring program. There is a lot of data, but not a lot of interpretation. However, we have seen some consistent trends in the monitoring reports. Goals will need to asses suitability of implementation and be used to target outreach. It is not practical to create a goal for every guideline, but goals will be created for a subset of the guidelines. Key considerations include existing laws and regulations, flexibility, current practices and conditions and ecological and economic factors.

Stakeholder involvement is critical for both field guide and implementation goal development, so it is most efficient for one ad hoc committee to address both. The charge to the committee will be to address tasks 1 and 2, described above. Technical guidance will be important. The MFRC Chair will determine members, and the finalized ad hoc committee will determine the decision and evaluation process in monthly meetings (6-10 total). Dale Erickson mentioned that there is currently no way to measure the effectiveness of specific guidelines. Alan what the implementation goals were in the last revision and what will be different now. In response to a question from Dale, Rob responded that if continuous improvement is a goal, rates of implementation have been very similar across time, and that goal has not been achieved. Alan added that we want to see improved implementation sooner rather than later. Parent said that no goal will be completely achievable, but we do currently measure implementation. Dale posed a question for the Council: which goals do we feel are important without hard research? Bob responded that effectiveness monitoring is very hard to do, and we can't demonstrate this for every guideline but must assume that the guidelines are effective when implemented. Implementation is quite low with some guidelines. If a constraint is beyond our control, it doesn't matter, but we will identify which implementation rates are acceptable.

A real level of effort needs to go into looking at realistic rates of implementation to see what can be considered acceptable rates. Alan asked about the impact of goals on certification -- will it make it easier or more difficult? Dave Parent commented that a third party certifier doesn't need to have intellectual understanding of this. Dave Zumeta thought that certifiers would pay attention to this, and it needs to be part of our considerations. Susan Solterman Audette said she hasn't examined this historically, that these are voluntary guidelines, but that goals likely would be significant to certifiers. Gene said that they will hold land management agencies to some standards. The voluntary guidelines became very important to achieve certification goals and become more than "voluntary." Susan asked how restrictive really, is the response? Is certification ever really in jeopardy? Gene, Forrest and Dave Zumeta all replied that it could be. Susan also asked if these guidelines could make it difficult for the state to get certified. Rob replied that certifiers have no way to know that a specific landowner/certificate holder has achieved a certain percentage of implementation. Greg Bernu added that when auditors come, they don't care about the guideline book, they look at principles in laws and ask how we're

satisfying these. We need to come up with our own auditing systems and measurements. The auditors care only how we're measuring ourselves against the standards we set.

Alan Ek commented that we don't have effectiveness monitoring in place. We need to look at it as a several step process instead of moving straight to setting goals. Bob replied that this will be a complicated process, but this is what we'll be talking about. Dale asked what the $5,000 would cover. Rob replied that we will likely exceed that budget with travel and other expenses. Forrest asked that as we define things with low compliance, how will we communicate this to various groups? How are we providing the next level of training? He would really like Rob to work with Rebecca Bernard to see what this will mean for DNR guidelines and certification. Rob replied that the whole point of this process is to identify realistic goals so that we can effectively target education and outreach to the areas that need it. The SFRA lays out a clear path to how this whole system is supposed to work – the Partnership is in charge of implementation, and we plan to work more closely with them. The first step is to provide the Partnership with implementation goals with which they can work. Dave Zumeta added that if implementation of certain guidelines has been low, training will be focused on those areas in subsequent years. This system has not been as effective as we would have hoped given inconsistent levels of implementation and funding, but there have been significant attempts at providing training.

Gene said that the reference to 89A.05 subs. 3 of the SFRA reminded him of the multidimensional aspects of the voluntary guidelines, where the council was charged to see how effective they are and assess suitability of implementation. This is similar to current efforts to control agricultural runoff – a last chance for voluntary measures. It is our responsibility to see if they're working and report to governor as outlined in the SFRA. We need to ask: how good is good enough? Rob replied that we're taking the information we have to set reasonable, achievable goals. Bob added that we don't currently have goals. Forrest countered that we do have indicators, and we know that significant, adverse effects are not happening.

Dave Zumeta emphasized that it's important to understand the historical context of this language which was agreed to by industry, environmental groups, and other diverse forest interests. In the context of the GEIS, harvest levels were much higher, and we're now way below even the base harvest level in the GEIS at about 2.6 million cords. Bob suggested that we move ahead with forming this committee and first identify critical guidelines for the field book, then start talking about development of goals. The Council needs to have a conversation about if we can do this or not, but we shouldn't just say we can't. Alan suggested that we first look at the GEIS, as it assumes we understood guideline effectiveness. Rob responded that the Council will use this information to decide what we will ultimately do, figure out which goals aren't being met, and if we can, provide the information to stakeholder and user groups. Shaun suggested that we could have temporal goals. Alan responded that we need to go back to the GEIS for some of those too. Shawn added that if we're going to develop goals, we need to

determine outcomes. Rob replied that that is down the line. This is just the first cut, and perhaps the Council will determine outcomes or charge the Partnership with determining them. Until we know more specifics, we can't set timelines. Shawn asked how can we set goals without dates? Bob replied that he's right, but we will deal with specific target dates for guideline implementation later in the process. Dave Parent said that we do have data for implementation trends. Bob reiterated that this is not an action item, just an informative conversation. He needs to know if someone is very strongly opposed to forming this ad hoc committee. We need it to begin with creating the field guide, then think about goal setting. The Council will discuss this again at the next meeting. No one opposed the formation of the committee.

Forrest mentioned that Assistant Commissioner, Barb Naramore, came to the meeting briefly earlier in the day.

**Guideline monitoring proposal update**

Forrest Boe re-introduced Rob Slesak. The MFRC is charged with oversight and direction of guideline monitoring, and the DNR is charged with programmatic aspects. Rob explained that not only does the SFRA mandate monitoring, it is essential to maintain the voluntary approach of guideline application. However, obtaining program funding has been difficult. Rob and Dick Rossman, BMP Coordinator at the DNR, identified a potential new funding source in the Clean Water Fund. Working in close collaboration, Rob and Dick developed a proposal that was attractive to the Clean Water Council by focusing our monitoring efforts with Clean Water Fund priorities. While this new approach will enhance and expand the existing program, it will still maintain its core functions to meet MFRC and DNR needs. Rob reiterated that the monitoring program will involve the same basic process, but we will now monitor at a watershed scale as well as quantify disturbance by watershed. We will combine information gathered at this watershed level to create a relative assessment of risk to water quality by watershed. Finally, we will target education and outreach efforts based on this assessment of risk.

Third party contractors will monitor 3-4 watersheds per year and collect data from 30 harvest sites per watershed in a rotating cycle. The data collection will maintain the same measurement protocols and include all guidelines. Gene Merriam asked if we will monitor 3-4 of the 81 watersheds per year. Rob explained that we will not collect information from all 81 watersheds, only those that are predominately forested within MFRC landscape regions. Alan commented that we may have trouble finding enough harvested sites. Rob replied that the details still being worked out, but we may combine two or more watersheds if not enough cutting occurs within a given watershed.

Shawn Perich asked if using Amendment funds to supplant general fund dollars is allowed. Rob said that, based on discussions at the DNR, we are not supplanting funds because the program was cut. Although the program still monitors implementation of the guideline and provides

necessary Council information, it has fundamentally changed. Shaun Hamilton asked if a way to spatially select sites exists. Rob explained that site selection is random, with some bias towards water features (to get harvests near water), so yes, there is a way to preferentially select sites. Dave Parent asked if there was any benefit in this approach that might arise in working with other agencies or groups on water quality issues. Rob answered that yes, there will be overlap with PCA's monitoring cycle, which will hopefully be conducive to interaction with them. Rob also indicated that Dick Rossman thinks this is a primary benefit of the approach, as this will allow forestry to be at the table and demonstrate its value to water quality when decisions regarding watershed planning and water quality are being made.

Alan suggested looking at the monitoring data from over the last decade, run a correlation matrix to see what things may be related to watersheds, what might be combined and what we don't need to look at. Rob commented that water quality data is actually quite poor for watersheds in Minnesota. Alan asked how we will link the monitoring data with water quality. Rob responded that the assessment isn't meant to identify actual water quality impacts in any given watershed, but rather rank the watersheds on a relative scale to identify which ones might have the greatest potential for impact. Alan said that he likes this analysis and asked Rob if he would bring it to the Council sometime. Rob replied that this analysis is the basic premise of the modified program.

We will quantify disturbance patterns both annually, focusing on monitoring watersheds, and biennially, statewide in forested watersheds. The monitoring will consider all disturbances, not just harvests, to develop risk assessment. Forrest said that we've never looked at these patterns before, but they are all impacts on the land. Shaun commented that using disturbance to assess relative risk suggests you are able to determine risk just by the amount of activity, so would we limit forestry activity in a watershed with higher risk? Rob explained that some stakeholders fear this, but that's not the point of this monitoring – it's to target education and outreach using data. With current harvest levels, forestry will not have a large impact on water quality, compared with other land uses. Forestry, especially in Minnesota, is generally on low-end of the risk spectrum. We just want to determine, within forestry, where a management activity falls on spectrum of risk with respect to others. We are not actually estimating risk, just ranking them. This ranking is based on disturbance metrics, guideline implementation and watershed characteristics, including existing land use, geomorphology, road density, cover types, etc.

Shawn added that there are a lot of other requirements to consider, not just water quality. He asked how we will incorporate other statutory requirements. Rob replied that we're still monitoring everything. The funding source requires water quality data, and the report will focus on this, but it will still provide a huge amount of data that is easy to access. The updated monitoring program actually enhances SFRA requirements, and Rob reiterated that the final product will still provide data that is useful to the forestry community, just shifting the scale to

the watershed level. Alan suggested that this additional information could be instructive. He then asked if we are increasing the size of the dataset just to satisfy the Clean Water Fund, or is this meant for our implementation of our site-level guidelines? Rob said that we are doing this to fit the funding source; however, we are also looking at larger view of what the Council does, so it fits with the Council's statutory charge. Shaun suggested that we need a baseline of what's occurred hydrologically, especially in the context of changing rainfall patterns and climate change. Rob acknowledged that that's a good point, but we are projecting relative risk based on implementation and disturbance, so it would be difficult to evaluate. This project is still in the developmental stage without funding, so Rob welcomes questions and comments
Key benefits and outcomes of the updated monitoring program include: 1) a potential source of recurring funds; 2) retention of core functions; 3) more fully comply with statutory requirements; 4) enhancement of voluntary guideline application approach; and 5) watershed level data is useful for management.

Forrest asked for explanation of the new monitoring program as it relates to the work being conducted by the Division of Ecological and Water Resources at the watershed scale? Has anyone compared the impact of forestry activities with agricultural activities in the same watershed? Rob commented that many other activities have a greater negative impact on water quality than forestry, especially when looking at the higher proportion of these other uses on the landscape. We will use the monitoring information to place forestry in the proper context related to watershed impacts, which positions the MFRC and DNR Forestry to be a leaders in water quality issues and will support recognition of forestry as being part of the solution instead of the problem. Funds are not yet allocated for FY13 activities but Resource Assessment is conducting R&D on disturbance assessment with some funds from this biennium. Field monitoring and disturbance assessment will be conducted in FY 2014 and 2015.

**Proposed amendments to the state endangered species list affecting forest-related species**
Bob Stine and Dave Zumeta introduced Rich Baker, Endangered Species Coordinator for the DNR Division of Ecological and Water Resources. Dave explained that he asked Rich to speak about the proposed amendments to the Minnesota endangered species list because several Council and landscape committee members have expressed interest in this topic.

Rich thanked the Council for the opportunity to speak. He noted that it is the DNR's legal obligation under the Minnesota Endangered Species Statute to maintain the endangered species list. He explained the species listing designations and their associated rules. The list was last revised in 1996. The current list has a total 439 species: 242 species of special concern, 101 threatened species, and 96 endangered species. Prior to 1996, the list was heavily dominated by well-known species, especially large mammals. The 1996 revision saw expansion into other taxonomic groups, and the proposed 2013 revision includes more plant, moss and liverwort, fish and insect species. The proposed changes reflect information gathered by the County Biological Survey and its focus on the northeastern part of state. This area will be especially

affected by the changes. Dave Zumeta added that the hardwood forests in the southeast are disproportionally important in terms of species diversity, even though it is a less forested area.

Rich described the proposed status changes of several forest-related species of interest: the northern goshawk the boreal owl, among others. Shawn Perich noted the steep decline in boreal owl sightings, and asked why it will only be a species of special concern. Rich replied that there is not enough data to support a higher listing as well as a shortage of funding to gather more data. Dave Zumeta also explained the difficulty in surveying these birds because they occur mostly in remote areas and are nocturnal. The boreal owl requires existing cavities in large, old aspen, but also requires 20 - 40 year-old, even-age spruce/balsam fir stands. This species provides a unique opportunity for forestry to have positive impact on habitat for a listed species, but we need more research. Greg Bernu asked how populations outside of Minnesota are considered, and Rich responded that the law only requires consideration of Minnesota's populations as the federal law covers populations across state borders. Rich then spoke about tree species impacted by the proposed changes in the list: butternut and hemlock. Dave Zumeta inquired about the basis of hemlock's status change. Rich explained that this species is vulnerable in the state because it is on the western edge of its range, and small populations can be extirpated rapidly due to random events. Increased severity and length of droughts will also contribute to its vulnerability.

Forest certification and DNR subsection forest resource management plans continue to provide opportunities for early identification of problems and avoidance of impacts to listed species. Rich noted that northern goshawk and goblin fern are common in the Chippewa National Forest, and must be a special management consideration in this area. However, to date, no endangered species permits have been needed by forest industry. Of the 23 permits applied for by other industries to date, 22 have been issued. Rich hopes that the DNR will adopt the proposed amendments by June of this year.

Alan Ek raised issues with methodology of the population surveys. He wondered how many threatened or endangered species Minnesota has lost since the last survey. He also asked how important the listing categories are. Rich responded that there is ongoing survey work, and designations are based on this. The information is not perfect; it is difficult to survey natural populations. DNR does not go back to look at populations after determining designation -- there are limited resources to do so. He estimated that approximately two species have gone extinct during his tenure, but argues that less extinction events mean that we're doing a better job, and the law is working. Alan countered that these categories are subjective and worries that we've added so many species to the list, that people won't pay attention or take it seriously. He is also concerned that the people completing the surveys may not understand how forests are described. People with wildlife biology degrees may have no forestry background, and may have not consulted adequately with DNR Forestry staff to know what kind of forests they're working in. Rich disagreed, saying he believes ecologists have a very good understanding of the

systems in which they're working. They do meet with Forestry staff, but their information needs aren't necessarily about the status of timber and forestry age-classes.

Rich noted that field foresters regularly report northern goshawk stick nests. Alan said it would be helpful to know more about the extent of these surveys because the more you look for the nests, the more likely you are to find them. Rich responded that he was not prepared to go into detail now about these surveys, but invited Alan to come to the DNR headquarters at a later time. The proposal report is NOT meant to be exhaustive. It is only meant as a brief coverage of needs and the reasoning behind listing changes. The DNR has much more information than the endangered species report covers, but resources are too limited to create a more detailed report.

Forrest asked Rich to comment about the number of species added to and subtracted from the list that occur in forested areas -- this would be helpful information for those involved in forestry. What was going on from 2007 to the present? Rich responded that this was a period of steep data acquisition. They got more than 400 comments in 2007, but needed time to process them while simultaneously collecting more data. He realizes that the time-consuming nature of this process is dissatisfying to some people. Shawn asked about the impact of moose listing on tribal management. Rich responded that the bands have their own species codes, and they often match the DNR's codes, but not always. A threatened status designation could end harvest of moose in Minnesota.

Dave Zumeta said that a list of 75 species was e-mailed to Tim O'Hara that are forestry related; however, some were uplisted, others were downlisted and some were proposed but no change in their status occurred. It would be helpful to see what happened with these 75 species and disseminate that information to Council members. Rich said he would send MFRC staff an update that included this information.

**Public communications to the MFRC**
Bob Stine introduced Don Janes, private landowner. There were no other communications.

**MFRC Member Comments**
Mike Trutwin informed the Council that he is working with unions, trying to get people in the forest products industry back to work.

Mike moved, and Gene Merriam seconded adjourning the meeting. *The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.*