

**Joy Brewer**

---

**From:** Nick Tonkin <ntonkin@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 5, 2016 12:50 PM  
**To:** Rep. Scott Dianda (District 110); Joy Brewer  
**Subject:** SB 1187, SB 39 and SB 40

Dear Legislators of the Western Upper Peninsula,

I want you to know that I am very opposed to the passage of SB 1187, SB 39 and SB 40.

As a retired professional Forester, I am convinced these bills are not good for forest resource nor for the people of the Western U.P.

Sincerely,

Luther N. Tonkin  
Watersmeet, Michigan  
906-544-2184

## Joy Brewer

---

**From:** Glen Matthews <gmatthews24@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 6, 2016 11:10 PM  
**To:** Rep. Andrea LaFontaine  
**Cc:** Rep. Bruce Rendon; Rep. John Kivela (District 109); Joy Brewer  
**Subject:** Senate Bills 39 and 40

I've learned that the House Natural Resources Committee is meeting tomorrow to discuss Senate bills 39 and 40. Combined, these bills are long and complex and impact Michigan forest management in confusing and negatives ways. SB 39 in particular reads as if it is a list of personal grievances against the ownership and professional stewardship of public forests.

I live in Cheboygan County and can assure you that access to abundant public land for many recreational uses, besides timber production, is a key driver of our economy and supports the quality of life that we enjoy. Under current law and guidelines, the state forest system is not an impediment to local economies. I can immediately think of two formerly state-owned parcels in the Indian River area that were converted to private or township ownership to support justifiable development under current conditions. At the same time, there are other parcels of land that have been added to the state forest system, mostly properties interior to or abutting state land, which benefit public use and resource management.

An additional negative outcome of passage of these bills is an increase in bureaucracy. Read them carefully. A great deal of new reporting and additional procedures are prescribed. Taken as a whole, this is clearly micromanagement.

I suggest eliminating all of SB 39 except for the portions that address the first three bullets in the Senate Fiscal Agency bill analysis. Land management and acquisition strategy would have to be brought to the legislature on a scheduled interval for review and endorsement. Current legislative bodies could interpret strategies based on contemporary needs and values. SB 40 has no redeeming value and simply converts the value of divested land to managements costs, like selling rooms in your house to pay the taxes.

If nothing is going to forestall the passage of these bills, consider one amendment suggestion: Under the measure that would require local government approval for new land acquisition in a unit where public ownership exceeds 33%, delete township and only retain county. Including townships would be very burdensome and archaic.

Thankyou for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Glen Matthews  
2020 Resort Road  
Alanson, MI 49706

231-412-0833

## Joy Brewer

---

**From:** Robert Evans <revans@fast-air.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 5, 2016 10:20 AM  
**To:** Joy Brewer  
**Subject:** SB39 and SB40

Hello – please pass this email message along to the appropriate person or persons.

I am strongly opposed to both SB39 and SB40. These bills would push the state to sell off public land with little regard to its quality, give local governments the ability to halt a land transaction and mandate a high level of timber harvest. It also includes the anti-science biodiversity language that was vetoed by the Governor last year.

Public land is one of our greatest assets, and should not be sold off or managed in a manner that disregards their long terms ecological benefits. SB39 and SB40 are ill-advised pieces of legislation that should never have gotten to this stage in the first place.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Evans  
Iron River, MI

## Joy Brewer

---

**From:** Nancy Leonard <nancy@einerlei.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, December 5, 2016 8:54 PM  
**To:** Joy Brewer  
**Subject:** objection to SB 1187, SB39, and SB40

Please take note of and present our objections to the above-mentioned bills to State Senator, Tom Casperson.

Bill SB 1187 is essentially the same bill overwhelmingly rejected by voters November 2014. It is also similar to the petition used to pass Public Act 281 (2014) which was deemed unconstitutional by the Michigan Court of Appeals on 11/23/2016. Wolves are an endangered species and deserve to exist in their last remaining original homeland.

SB 39 and SB 40 would rob lands from the public. Local governments would have an inordinate power to halt a land transaction. And, the anti-science language was vetoed by our Governor last year.

With great concern,

Bill and Nancy Leonard  
11176 Middle Point Rd.  
Eagle Harbor, MI 49950