GENERAL MANAGEMENT REVIEW
HURON-MANISTEE NATIONAL FOREST
MAY 6-17, 1985

Review Team: Floyd J. Marita AUG 07 1985

FLOYD J. MARITA, Deputy Regional Forester, Leader

WAYNE K. MANN, Forest Supervisor, Huron-Manistee NF's

JACK A. GODDEN, Director, Aviation and Fire Management

CHARLES NEWLON, Director, Office of Information

JAMES DURDAN, Forester, Recreation, Range, Wildlife, and Landscape Management

Other Team members were out of the office. I will send a sign sheet when they return.

Joni Sue

REVIEW REPORT
GENERAL MANAGEMENT REVIEW
OF
HURON-MANISTEE NATIONAL FORESTS
MAY 6-17, 1985

By: Floyd J. Marita - Team Leader
Wayne K. Mann - Member
Jack Godden - Member
Charles Newlon - Member
James Durdan - Member

Prepared by: Floyd J. Marita
Team Leader

8/7/85
Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction
II. Summary of Review
III. Commendations

A. Awards and Recognition
B. Fire Management
C. Land and Resource Management Planning
D. Land Acquisition and Adjustment
E. General Housekeeping
F. Forest Administration and Operations
G. Human Resource Programs
H. Recreation Statistics
I. Wildlife - Timber Management Coordination
J. Meeting Increased Timber Demand
K. District Activity Reviews
L. Information Management
M. District Management Teams
N. Road Construction Costs
O. Lumberman's Monument

IV. Major Issues

A. Work Planning
B. Rivers Management
C. Management Improvement and Organizational Responsiveness
D. Kirtland's Warbler Management
E. Engineering
F. Line/Staff Priority Setting
G. Caberfae Special Use Administration
H. Transportation System Pre-construction Costs
I. Outdoor Cleanliness Ethic
J. Oak Regeneration Administrative Study
K. Risk-Taking in Contracting

V. Minor Issues

A. Work Hour Scheduling
B. Visits to the Field
C. Road and Trail Signing
D. Internal Understanding of the Forest Land and Resource Management Plan
E. Safety Equipment
F. Uniforms
G. Gravel Pit Management and Common Variety Mineral Jurisdiction
H. Key Contacts, District
I. Establishing Standards of Cooperative and Volunteer Work
J. Special Studies
K. Planning, Organizing, and Setting Priorities

VI. Opportunities

A. Response to Market Demand in Land and Resource Management Planning
B. Cooperation with Ferris State College in Land Survey
C. Information Sharing
D. Minimum Level of Visitor Information at Ranger Station Entrances

VII. Appendix

A. Review Plan
B. Itinerary
C. External Contact List

REVIEW REPORT

I. Introduction

A. Type of Review: General Management Review

B. Unit: Huron-Manistee National Forest

C. Review Team: Floyd J. Marita, Deputy Regional Forester, Resources, R-9

Wayne K. Mann, Forest Supervisor, Huron-Manistee National Forests

Jack A. Godden, Director, Aviation and Fire Management, R-9

Charles Newlon, Director, Office of Information, R-9

James Durdan, Recreation Staff, Recreation, Range, Wildlife, Landscape Management, R-9

D. Date of Review: May 6-17, 1985

E. Previous Similar Review: GII-1974

F. Description of Review Process: This review was conducted for the purposes of evaluating: management quality on the Huron-Manistee National Forest; the effectiveness of Regional and Forest objectives, policies, and procedures; and whether delegated authorities and responsibilities are being appropriately carried out. The review concentrated on activities and responsibilities which will significantly affect the Forest over the next decade.

A GMR review plan was developed and provided to the Forest and each Staff Director in the Regional Office for review and comment. Comments were incorporated into the final review plan when appropriate and approved by the Regional Forester. An itinerary was developed providing for an entrance conference with the Forest Supervisor and the primary staff, interviews with staff officers, visits to the Districts, and an exit conference (see itinerary appendix).

The commendations, major issues, minor issues, and opportunities in this report are derived from an analysis of interviews and observations in the field with in-service personnel, the public, and representatives of State government.

II. Summary of the Review: Objectives

A. Evaluate management effectiveness in developing and administering sound resource management plans, policies, and techniques used in reaching key decisions.

B. Analyze the Forest's key management problems and identify the appropriateness of corrective actions.

C. Determine how effectively the Forest is dealing with workforce and skill needs in light of organizational needs, budget, and personnel ceilings. Review recent organizational changes, workforce planning, and staffing controls.

D. Determine the effectiveness of the Forest Supervisor, his staff and District Rangers towards: 1) Accomplishment of National direction and the Regional Forester's objectives; 2) adherence to policy; 3) the quality of results achieved.

E. Evaluate the effectiveness of District Ranger decisions and actions as they affect the quantity and quality of work produced.

F. Evaluate service to the publics, the extent of public involvement, and Good Host ethic.

G. Evaluate the effectiveness of the Forest in the area of employee performance, career development, training, and welfare.

III. Commendations

A. Awards and Recognition - The Huron-Manistee National Forest has an exemplary awards and recognition program. The Forest Supervisor, with Management Team participation, takes many opportunities to recognize individual performance through performance ratings, awards for special acts, special safety awards, and individual letters of recognition. The program and its value is respected by Forest personnel.

B. Fire Management - Fire management on the two National Forests is of high quality. The ICS (Incident Command System) is in place and the use of central dispatching is working well. The Forest is using contracts in innovative ways in fire activities and is doing a credible job with prescribed fires.

C. Land and Resource Management Planning - Development of the Forest Plan is going well. The Draft Plan is out for public review, the I&I plan is well developed, and public participation is strong. All indications are that the Draft Plan has done a credible job in addressing the issues and concerns in making the process understandable. The Plan is site specific and has had involvement of the majority of Forest personnel during its development. There is a high level of confidence and commitment by the personnel who participated in its development.

D. Land Acquisition and Adjustment - We commend the Forest for aggressively pursuing land acquisition and adjustment. There is a good understanding of land and land acquisition/exchange activities on the Forest.

The Bliss Lake land exchange on the Harrisville Ranger District, which included the exchange of inaccessible and scattered tracts, is particularly noteworthy. Only the persistence of the District Ranger, the Forest staff, and Forest Supervisor with the help of the Regional lands staff brought this unusual and difficult case to completion.

E. General Housekeeping - Throughout the Forest the review team observed offices and warehouses that were particularly clean and well organized. Forest vehicles were clean and well maintained, with seat belts clearly in use. The Baldwin Ranger District warehouse is an example of an advanced and well organized warehouse facility which effectively services Forest Service field programs.

F. Forest Administration and Operations - The Forest has recently given attention to the Administration and Operations program both in construction and maintenance. They have shown innovation in using the present facilities and in designing cost effective modifications.

The Forest has carefully studied problems with the telephone communications system in the Supervisor's Office and on individual Ranger Districts. That study was particularly noteworthy because it identified many overcharges and an obsolete method of quality control.

G. Human Resource Programs - The Forest is making use of a wide range of human resource programs. Individuals working under the Volunteers in the National Forests, SCSEP, recent YCC and YACC, and community employment programs were visible throughout the Forest. These individuals are well integrated into the workforce, given particular recognition, and made to feel a part of the Forest's organization.

H. Recreation Statistics - Forest statistics describing recreation use and activities are current, detailed, and extremely thorough. These statistics give a high degree of confidence in the level of recreation activities throughout the Forest. They provide a statistical base as good or better than any of the team members have observed in the Region.

I. Wildlife-Timber Management Coordination - The Forest has a large timber sale program and an important wildlife resource. Project activities and the planning process demonstrate a close coordination and working relationship. It was a pleasure to observe District personnel describe how these activities ensure a well coordinated, integrated management program. Leadership from the Supervisor's Office is clearly visible on the Ranger Districts. Its presence demonstrates flexibility yet with a reasonable adherence to standards. The shared-service biologist has worked well and District personnel are complimentary of this individual's contributions.

J. Meeting Increased Timber Demand - The 1973 and 1979 National energy crises had a dramatic impact on the Forest's timber management program by increased demand for hardwoods. The recent thrust for forest products utilization has increased the demand for aspen and recent market changes have shifted demand back to pine products.

We compliment the Forest for recognizing these diverse and changing needs, for working closely with the forest product users, and adjusting their sale program to meeting these demands. The Forest has also responded in a timely manner to the Regional Forester's request for increased productivity and a sale program that addresses the below-cost timber sale issue.

K. District Activity Reviews - We compliment the Forest for its pre-scheduled district activity reviews. Reviews are led by a District Ranger or Forest staff with participation by the Forest Supervisor and Deputy Forest Supervisor during the review or at closeout. Action plans are developed as required for all activity reviews and these are monitored by the team leader or Deputy Forest Supervisor to ensure accomplishment.

L. Information Management - Information management is given a high priority on the Forest. The Forest Management Team has directed this area be addressed by the AIMS (Automated Information Management System) Counsel. This Counsel functions as an approving and recommending body of information systems, software inventory, and development of new programs. The Forest has been able to initiate an inventory of software without its Data General system being fully operational.

M. District Management Team - The review team observed a healthy team atmosphere and active staff participation on most ranger districts. Particularly noteworthy are White Cloud, Baldwin, and Tawas Ranger Districts. The Harrisville Management Team was outstanding. The atmosphere of commitment and full participation of all members including volunteers and SCSEP employees was clearly visible as were activities to ensure integration and cost effectiveness.

N. Road Construction Cost - We compliment the Forest and particularly engineering for the cost effective road construction taking place. Final construction of roads is inexpensive, suitable to the terrain, and fits the standard of only what is necessary.

O. Lumberman's Monument - The Forest and the Tawas Ranger District are to be complimented for their leadership, initiative,and quality control in forming the Huron-Manistee Interpretive Association. Engineering is complimented for the architectural design and improvements to Lumberman's Monument.

IV. Major Issues

A. Work Planning

1. Overview. The commitment to recognized standards of work planning vary considerably from the Supervisor's Office to the district level. Project work plans are essentially financial statements and lack the documentation necessary to assure predictable results. Post-project evaluation (critique) is recognized as necessary, but is absent throughout the organization.

In the recreation and wildlife areas, there is a lack of ownership to the respective program budget. This problem is compounded by the fact that district line and staff are not involved initially in the budget allocation and project identification processes.

2. Situation.

a. Project Work Planning. Project work plans (PWPs) essentially are used as budgeting documents. PWPs lack the specificity necessary to communicate the intent of the planner and the elements essential to doing the job. These elements include material specifications and source, job specifications, skills and equipment required, job hazard analysis, record of accomplishment and expenditures, and integration of Human Resource Programs.

Although the Forest Recreation Staff Officer is aware of what comprises an appropriate PWP, he has not been able to convince line that appropriate documentation in PWPs is essential to quality program management.

There is a general feeling at the field level that the elements of a PWP vary according to whether we are contracting the job, assigning it to volunteer crews, or doing it through force account personnel.

In all cases, the adherence to perceived job standards was assured by frequent visits to the job site by the ORA or technician in charge of the project. For projects not covered by the recreation operations plan, no job standards were in evidence.

The consequence of incomplete project work plans are: (1) The Assistant Rangers have to "baby sit" the job to assure that results are appropriate to the "plan"; (2) project crews cannot work effectively without the direct guidance of the Assistant Ranger or lead recreation technician; (3) there are fuzzy lines of responsibility and accountability; (4) there is a high chance of project failure if key people are transferred, retired, or are otherwise removed from the scene.

b. Project Selection. Consistency in budgets have allowed most staffs to establish district allowances without preparatory 1900-4's and priority setting by districts. Present selection of projects do not appear to be linked with any long or wide range of objectives. Historical budgets, tenure, experience, and personalities of staff and sub-staff have greater influences on project selection than District Ranger/staff involvement in the planning and budgeting process. While District Rangers question some of the project selections, this type of decision making perpetuates the existing distribution of workload and may not deal with cost effective projects.

c. Project Critique. No formal direction or system exists on the Forests which provides for an evaluation (critique) of completed projects. Line staff at the Supervisor's Office and district levels recognized the need for project critique but stated there wes not enough time to carry out this essential element of the management process.

As a result, problems and attributes that surface during the course of a project are not formally recognized and are therefore unavailable for incorporation into subsequent planning efforts.

d. Field Involvement in Supervisor's Office Budget Allocation and Project Selection Process. The extent of involvement in the initial budget allocation and project selection process varies from one staff group to another. In timber management, where personnel are working with hard and recurrent targets from a 5-year action plan, involvement is considered adequate. In recreation and wildlife, however, initial budget allocations and project selections are preceived by the field as being done by the respective staff officers with little or no input from district personnel. As a result of the preceived lack of ownership in the allocation and project selection processes, District personnel are either ignoring or only partially completing many assigned targets.

In the wildlife program, it was noted that projects lack an economic analysis and a rational basis for treatment. Projects instead are based on a continuum of what has been done in the past.

e. Line Commitment to Completion of Budgeted Projects. Line commitment is lacking to the completion of projects in "soft target" areas such as recreation. The recreation budget at the Supervisor's Office level is very precise. It identifies specific projects and dollars to accomplish each project. According to the Recreation Staff Officer, the accomplishment of assigned targets in recreation is inconsistent from one district to another. This problem is primarily a result of the district's lack of ownership in the initial allocations and project selection process. It should be noted that a Forest task force has been initiated to address this and other related project planning problems.

3. Action.

a. Establish a Forest standard for PWPs. PWPs should consider the same elements, information, and specificity found in Forest Service contracts for personal services.

b. When conducting Forest Management Reviews, include a comprehensive review of selected projects using the key management elements: planning, organizing, directing, and controlling.

c. Develop and implement a PWP training session. Follow-up with line/staff reviews of the plans.

d. Establish a standard, formal critique process for completed projects. Develop a cross-walk between the critique process and the planning process.

e. Involve district line and staff personnel in the initial priority setting, project selection, and budget allocation processes.

B. Rivers Management

1. Overview. Rivers are the most important recreation resource on the Huron-Manistee National Forests. There are over 385 miles of canoeable rivers, many of which are recognized for their excellent fisheries. The Michigan DNR continues to stock many of these rivers with Atlantic salmon, summer steelhead, and other species.

The principal rivers on the Forests are as follows:

River	Designation
Pere Marquette	National Scenic River
Au Sable	Partial National Scenic River
Manistee	Partial National Scenic River (Proposed)
Pine	National Scenic River - Proposed
White	Identified State Natural River

Each of these rivers is unique in its characteristics, recreational opportunities, and problems. Each varies in its degree of complexity and management difficulty.

Sixty-six miles of the Pere Marquette River and 23 miles of the Au Sable River are designated as National Scenic Rivers. Fifty-one miles of the Manistee River (which will include the Pine River) is presently being considered by Congress for designation. National Forest System ownership is 22 percent on the Pere Marquette River. National Forest System ownership on the designated portion of the Au Sable, and proposed portions of the Manistee and Pine Rivers is 90 percent or more. This is because approximately 30,000 acres were acquired from Consumers Power Company lands in 1980 and 1984. Other rivers presently being inventoried have different degrees of National Forest System ownership.

Many of the lands acquired on the Au Sable and Manistee from Consumers Power Company have well established access and use. Uses vary from hiking to off road vehicles (ORV's) activity. Conflicts between river users such as riparian owners, fishermen, canoeists, and ORV owners are continuous and very vocal. Controls have been initiated by free permits for the Pine and Pere Marquette Rivers to better manage the use and reduce conflicts between users. Liveries using Forest Service landings for access to the the Pine, Pere Marquette and White Rivers, are under special use permit.

2. Situation.

a. Pere Marquette:

(1) Insufficient land ownership to effectively administer the public use and provide needed recreational facilities - Lack of willing sellers prevents needed land purchases;

(2) Conflicts between fisherman, canoeists, and riparian owners;

(3) Regulation of use through free permits and canoe livery permits;

(4) Conflicts between fisherman over the species of fish being managed by the Michigan DNR;

(5) Land abuse and overuse on National Forest land by fishermen as a result of the present and proposed Michigan DNR stocking programs;

(6) Lack of cooperation and coordinated management between the Michigan DNR, Forest Service, and local governments;

(7) Lack of funding or workload recognition to carryout a management program needed to meet facility and use demands;

(8) Inadequate public education programs to inform the interested publics about the resources, programs, projects and the need for their help and cooperation.

(9) Lack of recreation planning and indentification to address the capital investment needs.

b. Au Sable River:

(1) Past use and access well established prior to National Forest purchase of Consumers Power Company lands;

(2) Roads, trails, and travelways are numerous throughout the river corridor;

(3) Past fish stocking in certain segments of the river has led to land abuse by fishermen resulting in serious soil movements and bank erosion; future stocking of new species will accelerate this problem;

(4) Lack of cooperation and coordinated management between the Forest Service and Michigan DNR;

(5) Lack of adequate planning to identify facility, site correctional, and administrative needs;

(6) Inadequate public education concerning resources, their proper use, and protection.

c. Manistee and Pine Rivers:

(1) Controlling use on the Pine River by a system of free permits and canoe livery permits;

(2) Michigan DNR fish stocking program;

(3) Consumers Power Company's flooding of the Manistee River during power generation which leads to bank erosion and possible conflicts with fisherman use and fish habitat;

(4) Potential Michigan DNR stocking of summer steelhead into the Manistee and/or the Pine River;

(5) Lack of adequate financing and recognition of the user impacts in management of the rivers; lack of adequate planning to identify capital investment needs;

(6) Lack of an aggressive public education program concerning the resources, programs, and management purposes.

3. Action. Desired actions are both short-term (2-3 years) and long-term (3-10 years).

a. The Forest needs to develop a short term (2-3 years) action plan which addresses the following items:

(1) Identify management and administrative funding needs to the Regional Forester for FY 86 and 87;

(2) Prepare a list of critical capital investment needs for the Au Sable, Manistee, Pere Marquette, Little Manistee, and White Rivers for FY 86 and FY 87. Submit capital investment needs to the Regional Forester by October 1, 1985;

(3) Increase contacts with the Michigan DNR, State legislators, and the Natural Resource Commission about our concerns with present and proposed fish stocking;

(4) Complete the Au Sable Scenic River plan with public and State involvement by 1985;

(5) Complete necessary river plans for the Manistee and Au Sable Rivers within one year of Congressional designation;

(6) Complete river plans for undesignated segments on the Au Sable, Manistee, and Little Manistee;

(7) Develop public educational programs for the rivers;

(8) Acquire critical lands on the Pere Marquette River for recreation facilities construction as identified in the River Management Plan;

(9) Consider competitive special use livery permits for the Pine and Pere Marquette. Competitive permits should also be considered for other rivers as appropriate.

b. The Forest needs to develop a long-term (3-10 years) action plan which addresses the following items:

(1) Continue annual budget request based on capital investment and administrative needs for all rivers;

(2) Continue land acquisition for critical land needs for recreation development on all rivers;

(3) Acquire identified lands in the Consumers Power Company license areas on the Au Sable and Manistee Rivers and identify administrative and capital investment needs;

(4) Acquire Consumers Power Company lands on the Pine River at Stronach Dam site.

(5) Perform an annual review of work planning and accomplishments.

C. Management Improvement and Organizational Responsiveness

1. Overview. Personnel on the Huron-Manistee National Forest have the feeling that Regional Office staff are not sensitive to the Forest's suggestions or requests for assistance. In their view, requests for help or suggestions for productivity improvement receive limited attention, and are often rejected or left unaddressed. Consequently, needed improvements are not made, or if made, not shared with the Regional Office. Equally so, the working relationship between the two organizational levels suffers.

2. Situation. The review team found numerous examples where personnel suggested change or innovative ways of doing business that would allow greater effectiveness and reduction of costs. A number of these involve policy or assistance from the Regional or Washington Offices.

Forest personnel have identified issues or suggested ways for improvement or requested help and were rejected. However, little formality was used to surface the issue. Following rejection by the Regional Office, they dropped the issue and did not address it further. The Forest demonstrated exasperation with the Regional Office over this perceived unresponsiveness.

In a number of cases, the review team found that Regional staff were unresponsive to the Forest's requests. In other cases, the Forest did not adequately staff-out the issue or follow a reasonable procedure in getting the issue addressed by the Forest Supervisor or Regional Office.

A list of the most significant barriers follows.

a. Delegated approval has been given to the Forest Supervisor for land exchanges up to $25,000. Yet both the Regional Office and the Chief's Office review approved land exchange cases and may veto specific cases on occasion.

b. The Forest cannot directly access the Fort Collins Computer Center for Forest road information. Instead, they must go through Regional Office protocol which entails delays, questions, and an unnecessary time commitment. Yet the objective of placing this information at the Fort Collins Computer Center was to gain direct access by Forest personnel and therefore to improve productivity and simplify their jobs.

c. The Forest is unable to access the National Finance Center for personnel information without going through Regional Office protocol, i.e., personal information such as social security numbers, date of birth, sex, service computation date, EEO status, etc. The Forest recognizes the need for security and confidentiality of individual personnel information, yet going through the Regional Office protocol is time consuming.

Even though the Regional Office has total access to the National Finance Center, there still are many requests from the Region for verification of personal information. The only way possible to do so is through a return-request through the Regional Office protocol to the National Finance Center or by keeping a "personal" file at the Forest level. To ensure accuracy and responsiveness to the Regional Office, the Forest keeps a manual of personal information on Forest employees.

d. Regional Office informal requests for information often come directly to Forest staff without going through the formal organizational route. At times, this information is only available from the National Finance Center or Fort Collins, again necessitating a cuff record. These informal requests for information are unscheduled and reports measuring impacts do not take them into account.

e. The Forest Information Management Group Leader and Computer Specialist are reasonably knowledgeable about the use of the Data General. As an example, the Data General "Spreadsheet" was made available to the Forest. In utilizing the spreadsheet, the Forest requested both informal and formal assistance from the Regional Office. The Regional Office responded that they could not support the "spreadsheet." The Regional Office would not allow the Forest to go to the Washington Office or Data General for advice and support. There were other examples dealing with unresponsiveness to their requests in use and maintenence of the DG equipment.

f. Direction from the Regional Office on the Human Resource Program is viewed as overly burdensome and confusing. Staff help in removing these identified barriers is sporadic and promised responses often do not materialize. Seldom does an issue reach the level of the Deputy or Regional Forester. The Forest has not dealt with this issue or used the formal process to the get Forest Supervisor's attention or help from the Regional Forester.

g. The Forest Supervisor does not have access to information on carryover funds in the L&WCF program. This information is closely guarded in the R.O. and W.O., and there appears to be little encouragement from the Washington Office to utilize carryover funds. The Forest Supervisor and staff are sensitive to the need for confidentiality in the respective offices and wish to continue a positive working relationship. While reluctant to be critical of individual staffs creating barriers, they identify these issues as impeding productivity.

The consequences of the Forest not addressing the above issues are a continuation of status quo, the lack of capturing opportunities for productivity improvement, and less than a positive working relationship between individuals in the two levels of the organization.

3. Action. The Forest staff need to address each issue specifically and use the formal communications system in seeking assistance. Their description of issues needs to be specific and suggest ways of improvement or removing the barrier. The Forest Supervisor needs to be involved and to decide which issues warrant attention by the Regional Forester.

The Regional Office needs to be responsive to Forest requests for help and to encourage innovation. The Regional Forester must insure that Forest requests receive attention.

D. Kirtland's Warbler Management

1. Overview. The Huron-Manistee National Forest is managing 53,000 acres of land that has been identified as critical habitat for this endangered songbird. There is a need for establishing quality and quantity criteria for the nesting habitat that would maintain a viable population.

2. Situation. The Kirtland's Warbler population of approximately 215 pairs (1984 census) occurs in an area of land that centers around Mio, Michigan. As identified in the proposed Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, the primary purpose of the Kirtland's Warbler Management Prescription Area is to maintain and develop suitable nesting habitat in compliance with the provisions of Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (PL 93-205) and as outlined in the Kirtland's Warbler Recovery Plan of 1978. The Recovery Team who prepared this plan included the Michigan DNR, Michigan Audubon Society, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Huron-Manistee National Forest, and R-9 personnel.

The Recovery Plan objectives were to maintain or increase the minimum viable population of the Kirtland's Warbler. Goals of 1,100 acres treated annually were assigned to the Forest, with targeted goals also assigned the Michigan DNR. Both the State and the National Forest have had difficulty in meeting their commitments because of depressed markets in jack pine; limitations of personnel, funding equipment, and suitable prescribed burning conditions; philosophical differences relative to burning versus mechanical treatment; backlash from the escaped Crane Lake prescribed habitat burn that caused the Mack Lake wildfire of 24,300 acres in 1980; and the lack of basic research.

Since the mid-sixties, there have been research studies conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Michigan Audubon Society, Michigan DNR, Michigan State University, and North Central Forest Experiment Station. The National Forest has directly supported research studies under cooperative agreements with Central Michigan and Michigan State Universities. These research efforts to date have yet to establish what is the most suitable nesting habitat and what is the best way to achieve, maintain, or better the habitat? Does prescribed fire or fire effects provide optimal benefits? At what intensities and time span? Can mechanical treatment provide similar or like conditions that satisfy habitat needs?

The burn area of the Mack Lake fire is within the identified critical habitat area of the Warbler. East Lansing Fire Research personnel (Project 2101) were immediately involved with this fire the day after the burn and have participated in past fire reviews and analysis. The initial review on fire effects, studies on horizontal roll vortices phenomena that were apparent on this rapid, intense fire, and the General Technical Report (NC-83) published in 1983, have become available for application in fire management. There has been no major effort by the habitat research groups to take advantage of this burn area for its effects on the Warbler.

There is no control committee of designated agency members responsible for the basic research that should support the Recovery Plan, the approved Management Plan and the proposed Forest Plan. The goals of the Recovery Plan should be reassessed to make them more realistic. An accelerated effort is needed to provide basic, cooperative fire research. Possibilities of State of Michigan funding for this accelerated basic research might be available through the State's "Check-off" income tax program.

3. Action.

a. The Forest with assistance of Recovery Team members should designate a small task committee to explore options of accelerating basic research on Warbler habitat.

b. The Forest and Region should sponsor, within one year, a National workshop/symposium for participating agencies to place in perspective the basic research needs of land management agencies.

E. Engineering

1. Overview. Engineering has been compromised on the Forest and its activities are shrinking in size and importance. The Forest Supervisor has not allowed or required the Forest Engineer to meet his full responsibilities as an effective and contributing member of the Forest management team. Both the Forest Supervisor and Forest Engineer have apparently accepted this diminished role. Consequently there is little innovation, challenge to the system, or use of the Engineering organization to meet resource management objectives.

2. Situation. Engineering on the Forest is characterized by:

a. Professionalism;
b. Accuracy;
c. Long tenure of staff;
d. Firm adherence to Forest Service Manuals and Handbooks;
e. Full and unquestioning acceptance and support of Forest Supervisor's direction;
f. Lack of initiative and poor moral;

g. Lack of encouragement and effort to adjust the program to reflect dynamics of resource and organizational change;
h. An atmosphere lacking confrontation and challenge resulting in a sidetracking of significant issues;
i. Inefficient utilization of staff in support of field activities;
j. Poor utilization of Forest Engineer in resolving major issues;
k. Inability of the Forest Supervisor to effectively communicate is priorities and gain commitment of the engineering staff;
l. A general lack of perception on the appropriate role of engineering staff relative to the Management Team and interaction with the districts.

As a result of the above and the fact that major roads and other structures are now in place, the engineering program plays a minor role in the resource management process.

This diminished role has resulted in a transfer of road maintenance from the C&M units to the ranger districts; an informal temporary road construction program; road pre-construction unit costs greater than the unit cost of construction; and a underlying fear of trying new ways of doing business.

Within the engineering staff group, delegation is maximized as evident by the staff engineers' development of Districts projects. However, they are unsure of their role and responsibilities in the total management program. The staff engineers are disconcerted with this situation and question the value of their contributions. They feel there is little opportunity to positively influence activities on the Forest.

3. Action. The role and status of engineering on the Forest needs to be re-established. This issue needs to be addressed between the Forest Supervisor and Forest Engineer. There must be commitment to change, development of a balanced program and a concerted effort by the Forest Supervisor to reinstate the Forest Engineer as a full and active member of the Management Team.

This will require understanding and acceptance of the engineering roles and responsibilities by the Forest Supervisor followed by a conscious effort by the Forest Engineer to reach out and contribute to Forest goals and objectives.

F. Line/Staff Priority Setting

1. Overview. The review team found a desire by Forest personnel to have a forum for priority setting and issue resolution that would involve a larger segment of Forest employees.

Many of the Forest's personnel do not feel they are entitled to a voice in the Forest's direction, but would value the opportunity to contribute. They have much to offer and their contributions would facilitate resolution of many problems.

2. Situation. The Forest has a contemporary management style of team participation with the Forest Supervisor clearly being the decision maker. On the majority of issues, usually of lessor significance, there is full participation by members of the Management Team and the opportunity for subordinate staff to have input into issues for discussion and/or resolution.

Some issues of major significance, e.g. those involving conflicts or political ramifications, are not afforded the same opportunity for discussion and participation in priority setting or conflict resolution. The issue may be more perceived than real.

The review team found that district activity reviews address district problems and quality control. The Forest Management Team does address major issues such as river management, land and resource management planning, cost reductions, land exchange, etc., through special assignments or task forces. But this is usually after the issue has festered for quite some time and has developed into a problem of significance.

A number of major issues may drag on without clear direction or understanding until the Forest Supervisor decides it is time to address the problem. Sometimes a staff officer or District Ranger initiates action with the Supervisor but it takes a level of frustration before the issue is addressed.

The review team found that considerable improvement and staff commitment could be made if there were a forum for persons lower in the organization to get involved and a decision by the Forest Supervisor to address major issues promptly.

The consequence of not affording greater participation and involvement may mean the Forest Supervisor misses an issue that has potential for significant controversy. A loss of productivity is the result of major issues being addressed belatedly. In addition the organization does not get the benefit from the knowledge of the Management Team.

3. Action. The Forest Management Team needs to provide a forum for greater participation of Forest personnel in issue identification and priority setting of major issues.

G. Caberfae Special Use Administration

1. Overview. The administration of the Caberfae special-use permit has historically been a problem. Some problems have snowballed to major proportions primarily because they were not addressed at their inception in a businesslike manner.

The Forest Supervisor has recently taken a firm but fair position and is getting positive response from the permittee. Soil related problems have been addressed and deadlines for mitigating these problems have been set. However, stabilization of the disturbed soils resulting from recent construction will continue to be a problem and will require continuous attention.

There are lingering administrative problems. Among these are the lack of expertise in winter sports administration, inappropriate implementation of Forest Service policy, and too many people dealing directly with the permittee.

A land exchange for the ski area has been proposed by the permittee. The Forest is in the initial stages of evaluating this proposal. The exchange out of high value recreation lands would be precedent setting and runs counter to the intent of current Forest Service policy. The Chief would have to approve the exchange.

2. Action.

a. Arrange a detail for winter sports personnel to a high use winter sports district to observe and work with winter sports administrators.

b. Designate one person, preferably the District Ranger, responsible for the administration of the permit. Reinforce this position with the permittee as well as with our staff. This will prevent conflicting direction to the permittee, focus permittee administration responsibilities, and reduce the permittee's opportunities of playing one Forest Service representative against another.

c. Conduct periodic reviews to evaluate the implementation of Forest Service policy. Follow-up as necessary on noted deficiencies.

d. Schedule an activity review during the 1985-86 operating season. Include winter sports personnel from another region and the Washington Office as part of the review team.

H. Transportation System Pre-construction Costs

1. Overview. Road pre-construction costs are approximately twice the construction costs.

2. Situation. The Huron-Manistee National Forest transportation system is in place with almost all arterial and collector roads completed. The remaining road construction needed is the local system which is low standard or Class D.

The Forest has a small engineering organization which includes four professional engineers and three engineering technicians. There are a variety of tasks on the Forest that require engineering services such as fleet management, road inventories, facilities construction and management, and transportation planning.

Historically, Forest road construction/reconstruction has been 35 miles a year. This is approximately the mileage identified in the preferred alternative of the Forest Plan. In FY-86, the number of miles requiring construction/reconstruction dropped to 11 miles of road utilizing formal survey and design techniques.

Road construction is comparatively inexpensive due to flat terrain, generally sandy soils, good drainage, and little vegetation. The average construction unit-cost is $2,000/mile with a range of $1,800 to $4,500/mile. Pre-construction unit-costs average $3,957/mile (actual FY-84 cost).

FY-84 road pre-construction costs include:

Road Location Planning	$ 586./mile
Road Survey	$1,672./mile
Road Design	$1,700./mile
	$3,957./mile

Engineering personnel are doing a quality engineering job. They feel they are following Manual direction and have reduced pre-construction survey and design costs to the minimum acceptable for a timber sale contract specifying road requirements.

Clearly, it is unacceptable for preconstruction costs to exceed construction costs regardless of Manual requirements or standard specifications. The Forest Management Team has not developed specific requirements or innovative ways to restrain pre-construction costs to a reasonable level in comparison to construction costs. Some examples are: Plan and request funding for pre-roading using modified standards and specifications that allow pre-construction goals to be reasonable in relation to construction costs; use non-personalized road construction contracts employing a project engineer; and develop and request approval of modified road specifications for timber sales utilizing specified road requirements.

A special task force chaired by District Ranger Dave Kline has been assigned to address this issue along with a number of other engineering problems.

3. Action. The Forest Management Team should develop a procedure to bring pre-construction costs in a range that is reasonable and commensurate with construction costs.

I. Outdoor Cleanliness Ethic

1. Overview. Forest employees on the Huron-Manistee NF have an outstanding opportunity to be the role model practitioners of a cleanliness ethic leading to a litter free outdoor environment.

2. Situation. National Forests face a similar situation as that of the airline industry. They have found that passengers equate coffee stains on food trays with sloppy mechanical maintenance of the plane. Similarly, manmade litter in the National Forests can be equated by visitors to sloppy forest management. The Forest Service's national symbol, Woodsy Owl, is recognized in over 90 percent of television equipped homes in the U.S. having children under 13 years old. Yet very few Forest Service offices on the Huron-Manistee NF display this symbol, much less post them at campgrounds. "Pack it in-pack it out" signs have long been available but very little evidence of this valuable litter reduction tool was seen or referred to during the GMR.

A number of discarded large appliances were seen on National Forest System land. Several large trash piles were also seen. No mention of these were made by district personnel. The response when asked was, "Oh, we'll pick them up sometime."

This non-action exhibited a "not my job" and a "not my litter" attitude. What made this lack of concern stand out even more was the contrast with clean vehicles and clean work space in Forest offices, warehouses, and other indoor facilities. In addition, a large part of the litter problems facing National Forests outside of Michigan are absent here because of the effective Michigan law requiring a ten cent deposit on cans/bottles.

3. Action.

a. Every Forest employee should feel personally responsible toward a cleaner forest environment. No one should be "above" bending over to pick up after others or to set an example for others to follow.

b. Woodsy Owl and "pack it in-pack it out" symbols, posters, or signs should be displayed where appropriate and litter bags should be used in each Forest vehicle.