

SUMMARY COMMENTS

Pike State Forest Compartment 9 Tract 3 30 Day Comment Period Ending: 11/28/2014 Comments Received: 1

The table below is a summary of public comments received concerning the 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.

Comment Summary	Division of Forestry Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes prescribed managed harvest for following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential impacts to forest ecology and habitat. ○ Potential impacts to global environment, climate change and carbon sequestration ○ Potential impacts to wildlife and RTE species (e.g. Indiana Bat). ○ Potential impacts on soils and water quality • Suggests that pine should be allow to die without harvesting. Will get the same results without site disturbance, • Suggestions the Division is placing too much emphasis on oak and hickory at the expense of other native species • Recommends detailed flora and fauna inventory be conducted/included in RMG. • Concern on potential spread and introduction of invasive species as result of management activity. Supports efforts to control invasives (by manual methods only). • Supports the management and retention of snags and cavity trees for wildlife values as outlined in the RMG. • Suggests DoF evaluate impacts on climate change and carbon sequestration. Or, put in place evaluation standards to consider the cumulative impacts of all state and federal forest management projects across the state on carbon sequestration and climate change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the state forest tracts are slowly converting to a climax forest condition which we believe will result in a less diverse forest for both the flora and fauna components. Maintaining and enhancing the oak and hickory components will result in a more diverse forest. • Removing the pine with a harvest will allow the oak component that has become established in the understory to accelerate its growth and quickly replace the pine stand. Planting the pine was a professional management decision then which was a success. Removing it now is also a professional management decision. • As standard practice, the Division of Forestry consults with and utilizes guidance from the US Fish and Wildlife Service and other sources to conserve habitat and avoid take impacts to the Indiana bat. • Habitats, communities and wildlife 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. As a protective measure the location of RTE species (if any) are not disclosed in the RMG. • Detailed flora and fauna inventories are beyond the scope of tract level management guides. • Further information on direct and indirect impacts on species and habitats are found in the Indiana State Forest Environmental Assessment. http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-StateForests_EA.pdf • 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. • Invasive species presence and control needs are incorporated in the management guide. The species noted are widespread in the County. A variety of management measures are considered in an overall integrated

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

	<p>pest control strategy. Strictly manual measures are seldom effective control strategies by themselves.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed management will temporarily disrupt recreational use of the area (primarily hunting and foraging), during which time the area will be closed to public access for safety reasons.• Assessing climate change and carbon sequestration is beyond the scope of tract level RMGs.• State budgeting is outside the scope of RMGs.• Indiana State Forests contain approximately 1.15 billion board feet of timber. Managed harvest levels on State Forests are currently set at a level to insure long term sustainability. These levels are periodically reviewed as new inventory data is collected. See http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-State_Forest_CFI_Report_2010_2014.pdf• 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.
--	---