

MFL Efficiencies Project
Council on Forestry
June 2012

Purpose: Implement efficiencies in Managed Forest Law (MFL) which will:

- reduce DNR time spent in administering the program
- increase statewide consistency in implementation of MFL program
- maintain the Department's statutory obligation to ensure enrollees are sustainably managing their forested land
- maintain the ability of land enrolled in MFL to meet third-part certification standards
- Provide understanding of the issues the Division of Forestry needs to address:
 - Defining the range of acceptable sustainable forestry on MFL lands.
 - Defining how to determine if a proposed silvicultural practice is sustainable.
 - Defining the acceptable range of variability when implementing a silvicultural practice (for all processes including cutting notice approval, management plans approval, etc).

Timeline:

May 2012	Finalize Dovetail Contract
June - August	Dovetail Assessment
September - Nov	Dovetail Analyzes Causes/Develops Solutions
Nov - June 2013	Implementation and Continued collaboration with Dovetail

*Contract
 \$25K total
 2 phases*

Desired Outcomes:

1. Identify a 30% (at a minimum) decrease in time spent to administer and oversee the MFL program.
 - a. Describe alternatives for achieving efficiency gains, outlining pros and cons of each.
 - b. Describe the steps necessary to achieve each efficiency:
 - i. Statutory change
 - ii. Rule change
 - iii. Procedure change
 - iv. Definitional change
 - v. Other
2. Improve consistent oversight of the MFL Program.
 - a. Develop clear and easily understood standards and sideboards that provide a limited variability in interpretation of acceptable forest practices. (2 people can easily come to the same conclusion whether or not standards are being met.)
3. Ensure the ability to meet statutory obligations is continued or strengthened as they relate to wood products produced, landowner objectives are met, accessibility of private property to the public for recreational purposes continues, and forest certification is maintained.
4. Recommend a customer (landowner, logger, cooperating forester) feedback loop on a transactional basis giving the Division the ability to ascertain satisfaction of our

customers and partners with Division of Forestry staff and other involved in the MFL process.

5. Provide the Division with a clear understanding of our customers/stakeholders perspective on what activities and practices the law allows and the manner in which the DNR does, and should do, our work.

Deliverables:

1. Strategies and clearly defined measures for progress.
2. Recommendations on process improvements that, if implemented, would increase efficiency and/or reduce time administering the law.
3. Recommendations on statutory and/or policy improvements that increase efficiency, simplify administration, reduce unnecessary complexity, etc.
4. Recommendations on the best methods to use to implement process improvements.
5. Recommend alternatives for defining the range of acceptable practices that should be allowed under the current MFL.
6. Recommend alternatives for determining if a proposed silvicultural prescription falls within the range of acceptable practices on MFL lands.
7. Recommendations on how to improve consistency of staff decisions as they evaluate the various components of the MFL process (plan approval, silvicultural prescription, cutting notice approval, enforcement actions, etc). Recommend alternatives for defining an acceptable margin of error.
8. Recommendations for creating customer (landowner, logger, and cooperating forester) feedback loops on a transactional basis.
9. Develop consistency control methodology
10. Standardize key processes/items
11. Provide a report summarizing the improvement effort, "lessons learned" and long term recommendations.