

**SUMMARY COMMENTS**

**Morgan Monroe State Forest      Compartment 8 Tract 8      30 Day Comment Period Ending: 5/31/2016      Comments Received: 2**

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

Summary of Comments	Division of Forestry Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern of potential impact to interior species, Indiana and Northern long eared bat and other RTE species. Recommends detailed environmental inventory of birds, wildlife and plants be conducted/included in DRMG.</li> <li>• Concern on impacts to soil and water resources and effective implementation and monitoring of BMPs. Suggests riparian areas be avoided or buffered during harvests</li> <li>• Concerns about long term forest sustainability and harvest levels on State Forests.</li> <li>• Contends the removal of Ash through the prescribed harvest will not slow the spread of Emerald Ash Borer. Suggests harvest of Ash may reduce ash genetic diversity important to long term survival of the species.</li> <li>• DRMG does not evaluate area potential for High Conservation Value or old forest designation.</li> <li>• Concern potential spread of invasive species as result of management activity. Supports efforts to control invasives (by manual methods only).</li> <li>• Concern DRMG 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 on climate change.</li> <li>• Opposes the harvest prescription within the RMG due to potential impacts to plants, animals, habitat and ecological services. Supports the retention of snags and other habitat features.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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. No HCVF or old growth forests were noted on this tract.</li> <li>• Further information on direct and indirect impacts on species and habitats are found in the Indiana State Forest Environmental Assessment. <a href="http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-StateForests_EA.pdf">http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-StateForests_EA.pdf</a></li> <li>• Implementation of the RMG will utilize guidance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service and other sources to avoid take impacts to the Indiana bat and other listed species.</li> <li>• 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. BMP guidance can be found at: <a href="http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-2005_Forestry_BMP_Field_Guide.pdf">http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-2005_Forestry_BMP_Field_Guide.pdf</a></li> <li>• Indiana State Forests contain approximately 1.15 billion board feet of timber. Managed harvest levels on State</li> </ul>

	<p>Forests are set at a level to insure long term sustainability. These levels are periodically reviewed as new inventory data is collected. See <a href="http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-State_Forest_CFI_Report_2010_2014.pdf">http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-State_Forest_CFI_Report_2010_2014.pdf</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Invasive species presence and control needs will be monitored as part of normal operations. A variety of management measures are considered in an overall integrated pest control strategy, including manual controls, defensive plantings and treatments with approved herbicides. Strictly manual measures are seldom effective control strategies by themselves.</li><li>• EAB is widespread throughout Indiana, including heavy presence in Monroe, Brown, Morgan and surrounding counties. <a href="http://www.in.gov/dnr/entomolo/5349.htm">http://www.in.gov/dnr/entomolo/5349.htm</a> . Recruiting ash regeneration is an expected and desired outcome of the prescribed treatment. While the prescription will remove many infected Ash trees it will not slow the spread of EAB. The prescription will not and is unable to remove all Ash trees.</li><li>• Assessing climate change and carbon sequestration is beyond the scope of tract level RMGs.</li><li>• The prescribed management activities are consistent with silvicultural principles, promotes habitat diversity and supported by inventory data and field assessments. The concerns expressed have been considered and may be further addressed during plan implementation.</li></ul>
--	---