

SUMMARY COMMENTS

Morgan Monroe State Forest Compartment 13 Tract 1 30 Day Comment Period Ending: 1/15/2015 Comments Received: 3

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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes prescribed timber harvest, stating State Forests should be preserved from harvests as much as possible. Cites general concerns on impacts to climate change, environmental pollution, wildlife, invasive species, forest ecosystems, and aesthetics. • Concern on impacts to backcountry areas. • Would like more information on specific measure taken to manage potential impacts. • Would like comment period to be longer than 30 days. • Concern on impacts to soil erosion, sedimentation and effective use of BMPs. Sites tract riparian areas and single sinkhole. • Concern of potential impact to endangered/threatened species. Recommends detailed environmental inventory of birds, wildlife and plants be conducted/included in DMG. • Commenter would like more details than provided in the guide as it relates to wildlife and timber inventories and assessments. • Concern on potential spread of invasive species as result of management activity. • Objects to harvest and utilization of Ash trees ahead of Emerald Ash Borer infestations. Concern that removals will eliminate potentially resistant trees and not slow the spread of EAB. • Concurs with some report of conditions within the RMG, but questions need of prescribed management to achieve desired results. • Concerned about utilitarian terminology used to describe trees and forest conditions and that full range of values are not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no designated backcountry recreation areas on this tract • The 30 day public comment period will remain as standard procedure. However, if individuals have information that is pertinent and specific to the tract they can present that information at anytime. (e.g. Cemetery information) • Best management practices will be implemented and monitored to address the soil erosion and sedimentation concerns. Riparian areas and sinkhole were specifically noted in the RMG. BMPs will be required of operator and included in timber sales contracts. DoF will respond to reported BMP departures. • The management guide provides an overview of wildlife and timber resources rather than full data and details utilized for guide development and implementation. Timber inventory and wildlife data/assessments are available. • Habitats, communities and species are considered as part of the management planning process. Along with field observations, Natural heritage data has been reviewed to check for threatened or endangered bird and wildlife species on or near the management unit. Concern also addressed in the DoF Environmental Assessment. • Implementation of the RMG will utilize guidance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service and other sources to avoid take impacts to the Indiana and other listed bat species.

Indiana Department of Natural Resources
Division of Forestry
State Forest Resource Management Guide Public Comment Summary

<p>considered. Concern about utilitarian (tree farm) management philosophy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concern RMG does not address impacts on climate change and carbon sequestration. Suggests DoF put in place evaluation standards to consider the cumulative impacts of all state and federal forest management projects across the state.• Apposes prescribed managed harvest	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Invasive species presence, management and control are incorporated in the RMG.• EAB is now found in 82 of Indiana’s 92 counties. And, in all counties where State Forests are located except, Parke County. http://www.in.gov/dnr/entomolo/files/ep-EABstate.pdf Since State Forests are a relatively small part of the forest make up in Indiana the removals of Ash under these salvage operations will have little impact of slowing the spread of EAB across the State. Slow the spread benefits would be limited to localized benefits (tract and compartment level) and those affects are not expected to be long lasting given current spread of EAB in Indiana. Prescribed regeneration opening will capture some ash seed and regeneration which will escape the initial wave of EAB. Most ash trees in this tract won’t be harvested. Recruiting Ash regeneration ahead of the EAB wave is an expected and desired outcome of group selection silviculture.• The RMG uses forest terminology which integrates many considerations including biological, human utility and more. The scope of considerations are not always fully portrayed by the terminology.• Assessing climate change and carbon sequestration is beyond the scope of tract level RMGs.• The prescribed management activities are consistent with silvicultural principles and supported by inventory data and field assessments. The concerns expressed have been considered and may be further addressed during plan implementation.
---	--