

SUMMARY COMMENTS

Greene Sullivan State Forest **Compartment 2 Tract 3** **30 Day Comment Period Ending: 4/10/2015** **Comments Received: 1**

The table below is a summary of public comments received concerning the draft Resource Management Guide. The public comments received have been reviewed in their entirety and given due consideration summarized in the Division of Forestry response below.

Comment Summary	Division of Forestry Response
<p>Comment Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern on soil impacts, effective implementation of BMPs and potential impacts to lakes • Disputes importance of early successional habitat and role of the State Forest to provides this habitat. Concern that proposed management would have fragmentation impacts to wildlife. • Discourages measures to control Wild Grapevine due to wildlife benefits • Concern on management approach for wildlife legacy trees, snags and cavity trees. Recommends no tree cutting. • Concern on impacts to species diversity, forest resiliency and genetic diversity. • Concern there is a predominantly utilitarian (tree farm) management philosophy • Concern on impacts to recreation, existing trails and aesthetics. Recommends excluding tracts that receive heavy recreational use from the regular harvest cycle • Claims RMG cites urban sprawl and fragmentation impacts from Columbus. • Supports efforts to control invasive (by manual methods only) • Recommends that cumulative impacts on climate change and carbon regimes be evaluated • Opposes prescribed timber harvest. Proposes tract to grow for another management cycle in order to help stabilize and replenish the depleted soils. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best management practices will be implemented and monitored to address the soil erosion and sedimentation concerns. BMPs will be required of operator and included in timber sales contracts. DoF will respond to reported BMP departures. • Habitats are considered during development and implementation of the RMG. The management approach encourages a diversity of age classes and successional stages. Grapevine control measures specifically call for retention of a vine component. • The impacts on biodiversity, habitats, forest health and resiliency are important considerations during the development and implementation of the RMG. • Recreation use is addressed in the RMG. There are no recreation trails on the tract. The prescribed management will improve recreation access within the tract. • Urban sprawl, fragmentation concerns, and Columbus, Indiana are not referenced in this RMG. Columbus is many counties east of the property. • Invasive species presence and control needs are incorporated in the RMG. Strictly manual measures are not practical give the extent of infestations. • Assessing climate change and carbon sequestration is beyond the scope of tract level RMGs. • The prescribed management activities are supported by inventory data and field assessments. The concerns expressed have been considered and may be further addressed during plan implementation.