

2015-2019 Strategic Plan Public Input Process



Growing Indiana's
Forests Since 1901

2015 Strategic Plan Public Input Process

Introduction

The Indiana Department of Natural Resources – Division of Forestry prepares a Strategic Plan at approximately 5 year intervals to direct our efforts in the coming years. The *IDNR Division of Forestry Strategic Plan 2008-2013* was produced in 2008. That Plan expired at the end of 2013. Development of this Strategic Plan began in 2014. The table below identifies key steps in the development and implementation of the 2015-2019 Plan.

Date	Activity	Location	Purpose/Outcome
March 13, 2015	Executive Office Strategic Plan Review		Plan Approved
April 16, 2015	Strategic Plan posted on Division Webpage		Introduction of Plan
April 29, 2015	Indiana Forest & Woodland Owners Board Meeting	Spencer, IN	Introduction of Plan
June 16, 2015	State Forest Stewardship Meeting	Morgan-Monroe S.F.	Introduction of Plan
June 18, 2015	Indiana Hardwood Lumbermen’s Association Board Meeting	Indianapolis, IN	Introduction of Plan
June 22, 2015	Indiana Farm Bureau	Indianapolis, IN	Introduction of Plan
June 30, 2015	Indiana Nature Conservancy Staff	Indianapolis, IN	Introduction of Plan
July 15, 2015	Woodland Steward Institute Board Meeting	Teleconference	Introduction of Plan
July 25, 2015	Indiana Wildlife Federation Board Meeting	Indianapolis, IN	Introduction of Plan
August 11, 2015	Press Release Announcing Public Meetings		Introduction of Plan
August 15, 2015	Ruffed Grouse Annual Banquet	Indianapolis, IN	Introduction of Plan
August 20, 2015	Indiana Association of Consulting Foresters	Danville, IN	Introduction of Plan
September 21, 2015	Strategic Plan Public Meeting	Indianapolis, IN	Inform public and solicit comments
September 22, 2015	Strategic Plan Public Meeting	Wabash, IN	Inform public and solicit comments
September 23, 2015	Strategic Plan Public Meeting	Huntingburg, IN	Inform public and solicit comments
September 29, 2015	Press Release Announcing Continuation of Public Input		Inform public and solicit comments
September-October 2015	Public Comment Period Open on Division Webpage		Inform public and solicit comments
November 7, 2015	Indiana Forestry & Woodland Owners Annual Meeting	Jasper, IN	Inform public

Public Input Process

On April 16, 2015, a DNR news release was issued announcing the posting of the IN DNR – Division of Forestry Strategic Plan on the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry webpage (www.in.gov/dnr/forestry). The Plan was made available for public review and comments about the Plan could be submitted through the questions/comments page. The Plan was also made available for public viewing during individual State Forest open house events where staff members were available to answer questions or discuss the content of the Plan. Open houses were held on the following dates:

April 9, 2015, at Greene-Sullivan State Forest

April 18, 2015, at Yellowwood State Forest for Morgan-Monroe SF and Yellowwood SF

April 29, 2015, at Owen-Putnam State Forest

May 11, 2015, at Deam Lake State Recreation Area for Clark SF and Deam Lake SRA

May 14, 2015, at Jackson-Washington State Forest for Jackson-Washington SF and Starve Hollow SRA

September 17, 2015 at Harrison-Crawford State Forest

September 24, 2014 at Ferdinand State Forest

Martin State Forest and Selmier State Forest held their open house events in conjunction with the opening day of the Martin County Fair (July 10, 2015) and the Jennings County Fair (July 6, 2015), respectively.

A formal solicitation of public input began in August with the announcement of three public input sessions to be held in September (a news release was issued Aug. 11, 2015). The public meetings were held across the state to provide additional input opportunities for Indiana citizens. The first public meeting was held in Indianapolis on Sept. 21, 2015, at the Indiana State Museum. The second public meeting was held in northern Indiana at the Honeywell Center in Wabash on Sept. 22. The third meeting was located in the southern part of the state at the Cool Springs Education Center in Huntingburg on Sept. 23. A total of 176 people (excluding Division of Forestry employees) signed the attendance record.

The meeting began with a presentation by the Division staff covering each section of the Plan in detail. Participants who wanted to speak were given the opportunity; however, due to the number of interested parties and in concern of time, each individual was allotted two minutes. As participants entered the meeting halls they were presented with a comment sheet and question cards. The question cards were collected at the end of the Division presentation and if time allowed after open comments the cards were read and the questions addressed. The comment sheets were collected during the meeting or could be filled out and mailed to the Division. Public comment was also solicited through the Division website until the end of October, and information about the Strategic Plan was disseminated through several non-governmental organizations, such as the Indiana Forest Alliance and the Indiana Forest and Woodland Owners Association.

Staff from the Division compiled all verbal comments received at the meetings and from later phone conversations, the written comments from the meeting, and the written comments that were mailed to the Division or submitted through the Division webpage. A total of 228 individuals/entities submitted written or verbal comments. Each individual who submitted

written or oral comments was assigned a respondent number. Comments were then summarized and sorted based upon the following categories: State Forest Properties (with subcategories of Forest Resource Stewardship, Land Ownership and Acquisition, Recreation, Communication and Administration, and General State Forest), Private Forestlands Management (with subcategories of Retaining Working Forests and Current Levels, Accelerate the Restoration of Indiana's Private Forest to Insure Long-Term Forest Health, Protection Forest Resource Sustainability & Improving Forest Resource Awareness, and General Private Forestlands Management), Fire, Community and Urban Forestry, Conservation Education, Nursery, and Division of Forestry. Each comment was carefully considered, and written responses were developed. A summary of the comments along with the Division's response is part of this report. Respondent numbers for individuals who submitted a comment within a topic are listed at the topic's heading.

In addition, 78 question cards were submitted to the Division representing 62 participants from the meetings. The second table is the Division's responses to the inquiries that were raised at the three public meetings. The last table is a list of all individuals and affiliations/organizations from whom the Division received written comments, verbal statements or questions.

There were several themes from the comments that the Division will address in this narrative. For instance, comments were received about how harvesting would remove the forest. Harvesting is not new to the Division of Forestry; in fact, there are records indicating timber harvests on the properties as early as the 1930s. During this time the driving principles behind management of the forests have not changed, even though the amount of board feet removed has increased. This is, in part, due to the increased volume of timber located on the properties as well as the increased number of acres within the system. Under the 2015-2019 Plan harvest levels, the forests will still continue to grow at a rate greater than the harvests. Thus, by the end of the Plan period there will still be a healthy, growing forest.

Another reoccurring statement was that while most commenters were not against harvesting, they were opposed to clearcuts. To clarify, the vast majority of timber harvests conducted on state forest properties are not clearcuts or even regeneration openings, but rather selective harvest in which the forester inspects the tract and identifies trees for harvest based upon individual analysis of each tree: its health, how it is affecting surrounding trees, how it would fall, etc. Openings/clearcuts occur on less than 1% of the forest system. When used, they are done for specific purposes. Some purposes include converting non-native pines to native hardwoods, improvement of a weakened or unhealthy stand, encouraging growth of specific species or habitats, etc.

Several comments stated opposition to developed recreation facilities and cabins scattered across the forests. It is not the intention of the Division to place camping cabins or facilities in undeveloped sections of the properties. Instead, proposed cabins and facility improvements would occur within the previously developed areas, such as campgrounds, where utilities are already present. Although the Division has proposed upgrades to some facilities, the Division of Forestry (DoF) is committed to maintaining primitive recreation opportunities such as non-electric campsites and backpack camping along certain designated hiking trails.

The Division of Forestry thanks everyone who commented on the 2015-2019 Strategic Plan. Your comments, suggestions, and input are important to us, and we appreciate the time you took to review the Plan and give us feedback. As a result changes have been made. A revised 2015-2019 Strategic Plan is on our website.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Below is a summary of the oral comments that were received at the three public meetings and of written comments received during the meetings or submitted before Oct. 31, 2015. The Division’s response to each question is listed in the column on the right.

State Forest Properties

Goal Area: Forest Resource Stewardship

Overview: This broad goal area includes the primary mission of the State Forest system to professionally manage and conserve important forest resources for the use and enjoyment of current and future generations. It includes a full range of multiple-use, multiple-benefit management strategies to meet these obligations. Today’s State Forest system consists of 13 State Forests and 2 State Recreation Areas. Total acreage is approximately 158,300, spread across 25 Indiana counties. The State Forests’ 58.5 million trees contain 1.153 billion board feet. There are 21 State Forest Nature Preserves set aside to conserve more than 2,500 acres noted for their high conservation value.

Comment Summary	Response
Forest Certification (Respondents: 67, 74, 131)	
Supports third party certification of state forests.	The Strategic Plan calls for continuation of certification by recognized certification organizations, which perform annual monitoring of the state forests.
Concerned certification is a burden to the Division with little rewards.	This opinion has been expressed before, but we know there are certain industries that benefit from purchasing certified wood. We continue to believe that having outside auditors review both public and private forest management allows the public an independent assessment of forest management and the impacts.

Harvest Volumes (Respondents: 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 16, 20, 21, 24, 26, 28, 30, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 62, 63, 67, 69, 70, 72, 74, 75, 76, 78, 87, 90, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 108, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 126, 127, 128, 131, 134, 139, 140, 141, 143, 151, 153, 155, 156, 158, 161, 163, 164, 165, 169, 170, 171, 172, 192, 198, 204, 207, 211, 214, 218, 221, 222, 225, 227)

Opposed to Plan’s harvest levels. Supports sustainable harvest levels. Supports Plan’s harvest levels.	Out of an estimated 24 million board feet (mbf) of timber grown each year, proposed levels of harvesting would remove 14 mbf of timber a year and leave 10 mbf of annual timber growth to add to the base. Of greater concern is the lack of habitat diversity with mature timber growing more dominant in the landscape, while the significant decline of early successional species intensifies. From 1967 to 2014, sawtimber (mature) forest stands have increased to 78% of all forest land in Indiana (government and private). Meanwhile, the early successional seedling/sapling /shrub stage has declined from nearly 25% of forest land to 7%. Many wildlife habitat professionals have recommended an early successional level of 10-20% on public forest lands. In the past 15 years, state forests have created about 5,475 acres of early successional forest habitat with openings and clearcuts (and the Henryville tornado). This amounts to less than 4% of the forest area. The 2008 State Forest Environmental Assessment provides more background and information regarding these habitat objectives (www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-StateForests_EA.pdf).
Opposed to state forest harvesting.	Timber management is one of the primary missions of the state forests laid out by the state legislature.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Harvest Volumes Continued	
<p>Recommends increased harvest levels. Recommends reduced harvest levels.</p>	<p>The Division of Forestry has a continual inventory system in place. This regular monitoring provides up to date information about the condition of the forest. Using these data, current science, and professional judgment, we set harvest levels to achieve not only timber management goals but also habitat diversity goals, and attempt to maintain aesthetics both at the tract and forest level.</p>
<p>Hold timber for future generations.</p>	<p>Timber is a sustainable, renewal resource. Continued science-based management can ensure that timber removed from the forest today is replaced by new growth. Harvest levels are set well below growth rates to ensure sustainability and supply for both current and future generations.</p>
<p>Concerned about the validity of the data used to calculate growth and removals.</p>	<p>Over time the current continuous inventory system should show overall changes in inventory and the effect of removals on stocking. Per the Plan, these data will be reviewed periodically to assess growth, forest health and harvest levels to achieve forest goals.</p>
<p>Concerned about Plan's 1000% harvest level increase. Concerned about the increase in logging levels in coming years.</p>	<p>The 2015-2019 Strategic Plan does not propose an increase in harvest levels from the prior Plan. The harvest level proposed in this Plan is the same level outlined in the 2008-2013 Strategic Plan, and is roughly the same level as outlined in the 2005-2007 Strategic Plan. As a comparison, timber sale volumes for the three years before the adoption of the 2005-2007 Strategic Plan, timber sale board foot volume averaged 3.5 million board feet (mbf) per year. For past three years timber sale board foot volume averaged 12.4 mbf per year. The difference between the two harvest levels is 8.9 mbf, which is a 2.5 times (250%) increase from the pre-2005-2007 level. The increase in harvesting is less dramatic when compared to the harvest levels of the mid-1980s — only an increase of a little more than 100%.</p>
<p>Opposes timber harvests in state parks.</p>	<p>This Plan does not propose or cover any timber harvesting in state parks.</p>

Invasive Species (Respondents: 19, 20, 30, 22, 37, 67, 100, 117, 163, 165, 199, 200, 201, 204, 211, 215)	
<p>Supports control of invasive species. Concerned about invasive species. Concerned about emerging threats. Plan to prevent and control invasive species.</p>	<p>The Plan includes implementation of invasive species BMPs and piloting invasive species programs on State Forests. These include preventive and treatment measures. While steps can be taken to slow the movement, as outlined in the Plan, the biggest concerns originate off property and out of our control. Some of the most problematic invasive plants are wind or animal dispersed, and are being sold as landscape plants. Invasive diseases and insects can be moved through nursery stock and plant materials. Quarantines are often used to control them.</p>
<p>Protocols for loggers to reduce invasive species spread.</p>	<p>The Plan includes implementation of invasive species BMPs and piloting invasive species programs on State Forests. These measures include resource management and logging crew considerations. The DoF did provide loggers with quarantine information to control emerald ash borer spread.</p>
<p>Concerned about emerald ash borer.</p>	<p>Unfortunately the time to worry about emerald ash borer is past. Emerald ash borer has virtually spread to the entire State.</p>

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Balance of Forest Age Classes (Respondents: 20, 30, 55, 56, 59, 67, 70, 76, 90, 100, 108, 116, 117, 122, 124, 126, 131, 151, 165, 168, 176, 186, 199, 200, 204, 214)	
Supports promotion of early successional habitat on State Forests; concerned about forest succession/maturation.	We agree it is important to diversify the availability of healthy habitats for all of Indiana's native forest wildlife, regardless of what habitat type they require.
Proportion of State Forest in early successional habitat should be >10%.	We agree with experts in forest wildlife ecology who recommend that due to the ephemeral nature of young forest and the under-represented status of early-successional habitat, goals for its availability within Midwestern forested landscapes should be >10%. For example, biologists from Indiana's Division of Fish & Wildlife have indicated early-successional habitat created through timber harvesting should constitute approximately 18% of state forest. However, because current State Forest early successional forest habitat levels are well below 10%, the goal of 10% in the Strategic Plan is expected to be an attainable first step toward balancing age-classes. If, upon reaching that goal, further increases are warranted, DoF will address that during future strategic planning opportunities.
State Forests should be managed for diverse, multi-aged conditions with an emphasis on oak-hickory regeneration.	We agree. As mentioned in the Strategic Plan, promoting diverse habitats, balanced age-classes, and oak-hickory regeneration would go a long way toward providing a wide range of long-term benefits for all state forest wildlife.
Supports promotion of young forest on privately owned forestland to benefit overall forest health, especially when private landholdings connect or are adjacent to public forestland.	Since the overwhelming majority of Indiana's forestland is privately owned, it is imperative that early-successional habitat is established on privately held property in balance with older forest stands. To maximize the benefit to wildlife statewide, early-successional habitats need to be widely distributed within all healthy forest communities, regardless of ownership status. As mentioned in the Strategic Plan, the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program provides an effective pathway to work with private forest owners toward the goal of maintaining healthy forests.
Supports timber harvest program on state forest and opposes mandates to set aside areas for preservation.	Indiana's forests have always been diverse and dynamic, having been continually shaped by a variety of natural and human-caused disturbance events. Fires, windstorms, insects, floods, and droughts have all played a significant role in how our forests have developed. Plant and animal communities that rely on forest habitats have also been affected by these events and have developed a resiliency to change and disturbance that has allowed their populations to endure over time. On state forests, managers prescribe forest management activities to mimic the effects of natural disturbance events that have historically affected our forests, knowing that native wildlife populations have adapted to, and in many cases benefit from, forest disturbance. Though some believe extensive forest preservation is necessary to reach the goal of 10% older forest in the Strategic Plan, we suggest older forest conditions and periodic disturbance events such as timber harvesting are not necessarily mutually exclusive; both can be achieved in a healthy sustainably managed forest. Current inventory data indicate a general movement toward older forest conditions across the State Forest system.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Balance of Forest Age Classes Continued	
Better define timeline for achieving goals related to habitat and age class objectives.	The Plan proposes working toward the long-term habitat goals without specifying that the goals will be achieved during the timeline of the Plan. Progress toward these goals will be reviewed periodically during the Plan period, as well as at the end of the Strategic Plan period. If programmatic changes are necessary to attain those goals they will be addressed within the next Strategic Plan.
Supports management of diverse, multi-age forest habitats. Supports increased mature forest habitat/old growth. Promote biodiversity. Pointed out benefits of openings. Supports increase of early successional forest. Old growth forest provided on other landholdings.	Out of an estimated 24 million board feet (mbf) of timber grown each year, proposed levels of harvesting would remove 14 mbf of timber a year and leave 10 mbf of annual timber growth to add to the base. Of greater concern is the lack of habitat diversity with mature timber growing more dominant in the landscape, while the significant decline of early successional species. From 1967 to 2014 sawtimber (mature) forest stands have increased to 78% of all forest land in Indiana (government and private). Meanwhile the early successional seedling/sapling /shrub stage has declined from nearly 25% of the forest land to 7%. Many wildlife habitat professionals have recommended an early successional level of 10-20% on public forest lands. In the past 15 years state forests have created about 5,475 acres of early successional forest habitat with openings and clearcuts (and the Henryville tornado). This amounts to less than 4% of the forest area. In other words, both on public and private forest lands throughout the state, the forests are tending to become more mature with more mature trees.
Early successional forest provided on other landholdings.	From 1967 to 2014 sawtimber (mature) forest stands have increased to 78% of all forest land in Indiana (government and private). Meanwhile the early successional seedling/sapling /shrub stage has declined from nearly 25% of the forest land to 7%. Wildlife habitat professionals are recommending an early successional level of 10-20% on public forest lands.
Supports 30% of public lands set aside from logging.	State forests comprise about 30% of DNR land holdings. These are the only DNR lands under a regular forest management program. Lands held in other DNR divisions (70% of DNR lands) will not receive any regular timber management. Small areas may on occasion be salvaged after a storm (Clifty Falls SP a decade ago) or to remove hazard trees from ash borer (McCormick's Creek SP last year). But in general these thousands of acres of forests will continue to mature and age.

Continuous Forest Inventory (Respondents: 118)	
Concerned about inventory process.	The Plan includes continuation of science-based inventory procedures modeled on nationally accepted standards. Trends in stocking and growth should be readily discernible with repeated measurements, which will occur during the Plan period.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Silvicultural Systems (Respondents: 3, 11, 12, 22, 23, 26, 30, 55, 67, 75, 76, 78, 87, 104, 117, 131, 148, 164, 168, 175, 176, 192, 195, 206, 210, 224, 226)	
Opposes use of even-age management. Supports use of even-age management. Pointed out benefits of openings. Areas respond well after clearcuts. Recommends increased use of shelterwood.	The Plan actually proposes a mix of techniques that does include some use of clearcuts, but does not rely on them alone to achieve goals. Having some clearcuts is important because it provides some habitat type in a large enough blocks for use by area-sensitive wildlife and promotes regeneration of shade-intolerant tree species.
Concerned about managing for oak-hickory over beech-maple.	The 2008 State Forest Environmental Assessment (www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-StateForests_EA.pdf) provides some of the detailed explanation of the relevance of promoting an oak-hickory forest type. The Nature Conservancy points out that the oak-hickory forest type supports some of the highest species diversities of any habitat in Indiana.
Consider alternative management goals in certain areas.	State forest management planning provides flexibility for site-specific planning.

Carbon & Climate (Respondents: 8, 22, 30, 44, 48, 55, 56, 59, 73, 76, 104, 116, 126, 151, 189, 203, 213)	
Comments stating the Plan should include a more robust and goal specific component on climate change.	Plan revision will have an expanded section on climate change.
Comments on the importance of older forests, healthy forests and forest soils in climate change and carbon sequestration. Advocates a slow-go approach to state forest management due to the uncertainty of climate change and its impacts on forests.	Maintaining healthy, diverse and vigorous forests are a key component to ensuring forest resiliency in the face of the uncertain impacts of climate change on forests. The revised State Forest Plan will include assessment and management considerations on this topic.

State Forest Habitat Conservation Plan for Indiana bat and Northern long-eared Bat (Respondents: 55, 56, 59, 76, 151, 186)	
No details given on the timeline for the completion of the State Forest Habitat Conservation Plan for Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat.	The spread of white nose-syndrome among cave-dwelling bats in eastern North America has contributed greatly to the delay in the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for Indiana bat on state forests. During the development of the Plan, one species had to be added to the Plan, the Northern long-eared bat, after it became federally listed as threatened in April 2015. Additionally, two other species found on Indiana state forests are currently under review by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for possible listing. The DoF received an extension from USFWS on delivery of the HCP due to delays in the federal listing of the Northern long-eared bat and continued delays in the finalization of a federal 4(d) ruling (still not finalized as of December 2015). Despite uncertainty of the final federal 4(d) ruling applicable to Northern long-eared bat, the Division of Forestry expects to submit a draft of the complete HCP to the USFWS by summer 2016.
Support implementation of State Forest Habitat Conservation Plan for Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat.	Thank you for your support.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

State Forest Wildlife Habitat Management Planning (Respondents: 74, 90, 104, 141, 186)	
Develop best management practices for all listed species on state forests.	The Strategic Plan indicates management planning tools for listed species will be developed for each state forest; this will likely include best management practices for the conservation of listed species. Additionally, DoF completed a comprehensive State Forest Environmental Assessment that addressed potential impacts from all aspects of the forest management program on state forests. That document is available on our website: www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-StateForests_EA.pdf
Property-level wildlife management plans should include all wildlife species, not just T&E species.	Property-level wildlife habitat management plans identify resources on properties related to wildlife and their habitats. While these plans will include sections on the management of species of conservation concern, that will not be their sole focus.
Supports DoF's work on wildlife habitat management.	Thank you for your support.
Recommends a reduction in timber harvest levels and limiting cutting to support hunting and species restoration.	We believe a timber harvesting program limited to addressing the needs of only a single user group contrasts with the State Forests' multiple-use management philosophy. Input from hunters suggests their experience is improved when the early-successional habitat that best supports game species is made widely available. This would be difficult to accomplish if harvesting were reduced below current levels. In regard to species restoration, the Division of Fish & Wildlife is responsible for wildlife repopulation and reintroduction programs; however, we recognize that State Forests could serve a valuable role in providing the suitable habitat necessary for a successful restoration program.
Recommends aligning Strategic Plan with State Wildlife Action Plan.	DoF personnel were directly involved in the both the development and review stages of the State Wildlife Action Plan, including planning efforts involving Indiana's species of greatest conservation need. We find that our programs universally support what has been proposed in the Wildlife Action Plan and, moving forward, will continue to ensure alignment between it and our Strategic Plan.

High Conservation Value Areas (Respondents: 14, 17, 30, 55, 56, 59, 70, 76, 151, 168)	
Concerned about long-term effects of clear-cutting on old-growth forests.	Indiana state forests do not contain old-growth stands. If old-growth occurred on state forest, it would likely be associated with a nature preserve, and timber harvesting does not typically occur on state nature preserves.
Proposes Outbrook Ravine area for consideration as a nature preserve. Increase HCVFs. Supports HCVFs. Concerns DoF has not aside 10% of acreage in HCVFs as required by certification.	High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) areas are determined after areas are evaluated for features warranting inclusion in such an area. The Plan includes a goal to continue to identify and designate exemplary areas of high conservation value. There is no certification requirement for 10% HCVF set aside. The concept of HCVF is to identify and properly manage forest areas with exceptional conservation value and is not tied to a percentage target. The Plan continues to support HCVF designations.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Resource Protection (Respondents: 8, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 33, 43, 44, 46, 48, 53, 55, 75, 76, 104, 117, 140, 143, 156, 208, 213, 225)	
Concerned about impacts to habitat, ecosystems, and wildlife species.	Division of Forestry (DoF) completed a comprehensive State Forest Environmental Assessment that addressed potential impacts from all aspects of the forest management program on state forests. That document is available at www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-StateForests_EA.pdf .
Plan should consider the needs of all life that is dependent on forests.	We agree. The Strategic Plan provides the framework for a forest management program that will help provide a high degree of diversity among habitats available on State Forests. High habitat diversity, in turn, helps support a rich variety of flora and fauna.
State Forests may have more volume today than in the past, but not the same habitat value; forest composition is being altered.	As stated in the Strategic Plan, the forest management program seeks to work toward a long-term balance in stand age-class and structure, and promotion of oak-hickory regeneration where possible. These goals are consistent with the habitat requirements of state forest wildlife and will provide improved habitat conditions for a wide variety of native forest species. Additionally, forest management activities include invasive species control, which also helps improve native wildlife habitat. Even in unmanaged forests, invasive species pose a threat to forest composition and community structure, and in many cases forest management activities provide the most effective remedy available.
Concerned about loss of biodiversity; Plan does not support diversity.	The Strategic Plan includes goals for diversifying forest age-classes, structure, and composition. As stated in the Plan, forest management activities "improve habitat diversity and address imbalances created under past state forest management, which has resulted in a high percentage of forest moving toward mature, closed canopy conditions at the expense of important early successional habitat." Research suggests that the forest management activities conducted on state forests do not result in a loss of species diversity, but rather an increase as previously under-represented habitats become available to the species that depend on them. The Strategic Plan outlines other steps that will further protect biodiversity and rare species on state forests. For instance, measures used to protect rare or ecologically sensitive communities will remain an important part of the management planning process, and the development of plans specific to rare, threatened, or endangered species on state forests is also included in the Strategic Plan.
Plan does not consider the importance of interior forests.	DoF completed a comprehensive State Forest Environmental Assessment that addressed potential impacts from all aspects of the forest management program on state forests. That document is available at www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-StateForests_EA.pdf .
Public lands should not be managed to increase the deer population; concerned about deer overpopulation.	In the absence of natural predators, hunting is the most effective population management tool for deer. While canopy disturbance does increase light-levels in the forest, which in turn increases vegetation growth and food available to deer, populations will not become overabundant under appropriate levels of hunting pressure. The DoF recognizes the importance of hunter access to the health of the state forests and will address this issue in the final version of the Strategic Plan.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Cultural Resource Management (Respondents: 70)	
Supports cultural resource program.	Thank you for your support.
Timber Sale Markets, Methods and Prices (Respondents: 21, 24, 30, 37, 47, 69, 81, 104, 105, 108, 150, 165, 176, 191, 194, 212, 225)	
Recommendation that Strategic Plan compare timber sales between state forests and private forests.	This is beyond the scope of the Strategic Plan. The DoF does not track private timber sales beyond those reported on lands enrolled in the Classified Forest and Wildlands Program.
Concerned about getting fair or market rates for timber. Concerned about competition with private timber sales and prices.	State Forest timber is sold in a sealed bid process in order to capture a market rate. The stricter requirements on harvests in state forests along with the emphasis to harvest the worst trees and grow the best can result in lower prices compared to private land harvests with only a superficial look. The management methods and requirements on state forests are more onerous than those used for most private forest sales. Many buyers avoid state forest sales because of the performance and site protection requirements.
Concerned that harvested timber is going overseas and not to local mills.	Local firms buy all of the timber sold on the state forests. These firms in turn sell wood products on state, national and international markets. This could be veneer from an Indiana veneer mill, or a wood component for furniture. Wood is an internationally traded commodity; however, the hardwood industry remains a leader in Indiana's agriculture economy.
States that small amount of timber coming from state forests would not affect markets. Having a steady supply of state forest timber helps support forest products industry, which helps increase prices to state and private timber owners.	Management of timber resources is a major tool in managing the tree species and habitat diversity to ensure the continued viability of a broad range of forest species. State forest ownership allows for more concentrated, coordinated and larger-scale habitat manipulations needed for many species. For many firms, assurance of a steady source of sustainable, certified, raw material is needed in order to commit to investing in a facility.
Recommends requiring timber sale contractors deaden all marked trees.	Trees in a sale may be marked for a variety of reasons. In some cases trees left behind from a sale may be killed to create snags. In some cases they may be left to grow. And in other cases when enough are left behind they may be sold again.
Funds to Counties and Localities (Respondents: 6, 55, 76, 146)	
Concerned about and increase funds to pay for road maintenance and emergency services. Concerned the State pays no property taxes.	The share of timber sale money that goes to counties and local fire departments is set by legislation. For Fiscal Year 2014-15, State Forests paid over \$440,000 to counties and local fire departments.
Management Practices (Respondents: 33, 162, 165, 196, 200, 207, 210, 211)	
Concerned about emphasis on big trees.	Big trees are aesthetically pleasing to many people and are what they equate with forests. The DoF management of state forests, while trying to create a diversity of habitat ranging from young to older forests, is still fairly conservative. This results in a forest with many mature, big trees.
Recommends use of NGOs for monitoring BMPs	BMP monitoring is an ongoing process using both property foresters and an off-property BMP monitoring team trained for these types of evaluations to ensure consistency and safety on harvest sites.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Management Practices Continued	
Use best management practices (BMPs) to protect water quality. Concerned about erosion from harvesting and clearcutting, planting being done for erosion.	The implementation of BMPs is required by contract on all State Forest timber harvest operations. Managed clearcutting, especially the scale found in Indiana, does not pose a soil erosion concern. The primary source of erosion in any logging is from exposed soil such as along skid trails and access roads. This can be minimized with the use of best management practices such as water diversions and seeding with a grass mixture if necessary. In harvest areas the duff layer, existing root systems and new vegetative growth holds undisturbed soil intact. Tree planting after a timber harvest is generally not needed in Indiana unless the goal is to introduce new species of trees to a site. After harvests, thousands of new trees sprout up from seed stored in the forest leaf layer. This natural regeneration would out-compete almost all planted seedlings.
Concerned about bad loggers.	State Forest timber sales have provisions to encourage satisfactory logging jobs. Additional measures will be considered.
Concerned about tree tops being a fire hazard.	Tree tops/residue from harvesting are one potential fuel component for a wildfire. The type of material, the amount, and its distribution are factors. In general, hardwood debris is less volatile than conifer debris. The debris after a harvest presents minimal fire risk and provides cover and food source for many insects and animals. Areas of extensive windfall or mortality (such as declining and dying stands of non-native pine) present an increased risk. However, the humid climate of Indiana tends to be less supportive of wildfire than the climate in other parts of the country.

Goal Area: Land Ownership and Acquisition	
Overview: The State Forest system is made up of small and large forest blocks and individual parcels of land acquired over many decades, creating a patchwork ownership pattern. This goal area addresses the long term conservation of working forests and ecologically important natural resource lands through strategic ownerships and acquisitions, and addresses the important issue of property line management to secure the long term integrity of these lands. Today there are more than 500 miles of State Forest property line.	
Comment Summary	Response
Land Acquisition (Respondents: 8, 16, 20, 55, 67, 76, 100, 118, 168, 204, 223)	
Supports acquisition to reduce habitat fragmentation and improve connectivity. Recommends changing Strategic Plan goal to purchase 1,500 acres annually. Proposes public input on land purchases. Supports acquisition to acquire old growth, early successional habitats, and threatened wildlife habitat. Supports increased efforts to acquire more state forest lands, use of timber sale funds to purchase lands, partnering with outside sources.	Funding limitations prevent a higher level of land acquisition. DoF annually has to pass on numerous land acquisition projects that would be termed strategic because of the lack of funding. Most funding is available through the Indiana Heritage Trust program on a project by project basis. Most projects require the use of partners for matching funds. Some of our valued partners have included the Nature Conservancy and the National Wild Turkey Federation. Having additional partners come forward would help increase acquisition efforts. These projects are heard at open, quarterly meetings of the Heritage Trust Project Committee.
Opposed to further state land purchases.	The Division of Forestry participates in land acquisition through the Indiana Heritage Trust Program, which was established by the state legislature to purchase land.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Land Sales (Respondents: 16, 38, 41, 44, 46, 50, 51, 52, 55, 62, 76, 87, 103, 117, 118, 120, 121, 123, 126, 150, 209, 218)	
<p>Concerned about or opposed to the sale of "non-essential" lands and real estate speculation.</p> <p>Questions the authority to sell land and ability to retain funds and locate strategic lands to acquire with funds.</p>	<p>The Plan proposes only a continuation of past policy with limited sale of parcels when they are determined to be "non-essential." This happened relatively recently in the mid-1980s and the mid-2000s. In the mid-1980s case, DoF actually purchased more acres than it sold. These land sales in the past have been isolated events involving small acreages and this direction will not change. DoF annually has to pass up on numerous land acquisition projects that would be termed strategic because of the lack of funding.</p>
<p>Proposes public input on land sales.</p>	<p>Sales of land are done by the Indiana Department of Administration. Proposals for land sales will include a public input component.</p>

Land Transfers (Respondents: 55, 76, 209)	
<p>Concerned about definitions or criteria for "non-essential" and "strategic."</p>	<p>Identifying what land is non-essential would involve looking at the size of the parcel, the accessibility of the parcel, resource considerations (biological, cultural, geological), the possibility of connectivity to other holdings, and other possible issues (such as encroachments, property line issues, etc.). Defining what is strategic for determining the acquisition of land would in many ways be the opposite of the above — does it provide connectivity to other holdings, resource considerations, does it improve accessibility, does it resolve possible issues, and parcel size. The definition of a parcel as non-essential or strategic can change with time. For example, an isolated parcel may become non-essential when possible connectivity parcels are subdivided and developed. An isolated parcel may become strategic with the discovery of an important cultural resource.</p>
<p>Concerned about land trades being fair.</p>	<p>The Division of Land Acquisition handles land transfers. It would make the determination on whether a proposed land exchange meets the statutory requirements of the State receiving equal or greater value in the exchange. That Division looks at parcel size, value, and additional aspects (such as access or resolving a line issue).</p>

Goal Area: Recreation	
<p>Overview: This goal area deals with current and future recreation-related facilities and offerings on the State Forest system. State Forest recreation facilities currently include: 3 gated properties, 19 family campgrounds (650 electric and non-electric camp sites), 6 equestrian campgrounds (200 electric and non-electric camp sites), 37 camping cabins at 3 locations, 2 family cabins, 300 miles of hiking trails, 41 miles of bike trails, 270 miles of horse trails, 140+ lakes, 150,000 acres of hunting and foraging opportunity, 3 backpacking trails with walk-in trail side camping, 1 shooting range, 2 archery ranges, 2 Education Centers, 3 swimming beaches, 30 picnic shelters and more.</p>	
Comment Summary	Response
System Wide Recreation Plan & Opportunity Analysis (respondents: 55, 67, 76, 150, 153)	
Concern about implementing recreation improvements, upgrades and expansion without first demonstrating need for said facilities.	The Plan calls for a master planning project to help guide recreation development.
Concerned Plan makes unsubstantiated assertions of surveys showing users requests/preference for more developed recreation facilities.	Modernization and improvement of facilities is among the most common improvement requests we receive from our user satisfaction surveys. The Plan calls for additional surveys to be conducted during the development of a State Forest recreation Master Plan.
Infrastructure, Lake and Dam Assessments and Improvements (Respondents: 67, 108, 186, 224)	
Supports upkeep of facilities and increased budget to do so.	We agree this is critical and will continue to seek funds needed as provisioned in the Plan.
Supports sediment removal projects on various State Forest lakes. Suggests timing sediment removal projects with dam repairs while lake levels would need to be lowered. And, undertake other improvements at the same time (e.g., boat launch ramps). Suggests watershed treatment projects to address sedimentation issues long term. Suggests including fisheries and aquatic vegetation management in the Plan.	These are ongoing considerations in both the design and timing of lake improvement projects. DoF will continue to rely on DNR Fish & Wildlife for fisheries and aquatic vegetation management. Watershed level treatments will be explored and incorporated into the Plan.
Shooting and Archery Ranges (Respondents: 20, 67, 100, 117, 148)	
Comments both in support and opposition of assessing and improving existing shooting ranges to meet current standards, or developing new ranges on State Forests.	Our primary concern is where we have shooting ranges that they be compliant with regulations and up to appropriate standards of operation. The initial focus will be on bringing the Clark State Forest gun range in line with standards. This range has more than 6,000 annual users.
Forest Learning (Nature) Centers (Respondents: 22)	
Education should be a primary mission of DNR. Conservation education is greatly needed on the many values of forests.	The Plan includes a commitment to improve materials and forest learning centers during the Plan period.
Marketing and Signage (Respondents: 63, 127)	
Increase marketing and promotion of State Forest recreation opportunities needed.	The Plan includes provisions to review promotion and marketing of State Forest recreation opportunities.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Recreation Trails (Respondents: 1, 4, 5, 17, 24, 32, 33, 42, 53, 55, 56, 59, 76, 83, 151, 190, 191, 196, 200, 211, 216, 228)	
Trails are in need of repairs and overall improvement of trail conditions. Some trails are reportedly in very in bad condition.	DoF has an extensive and valued trail system of about 600 miles, many are in need of maintenance, signage and repair to bring them to desired condition. The trail management program will include an updated inventory, mapping and assessment of all trails on State Forest lands. This will include an assessment of conditions against trail BMPs and sustainability standards.
Concerned that State Forest logging and resource management activities have adverse impacts on recreation trails and the overall trail user experience (trail closures, reroutes, aesthetics, etc.).	DoF recognizes that forest resource management, our primary mission, can affect trails and trail user experience directly or indirectly. We will review trail management protocols with an eye to improving trails and user experiences. In addition to State Forests, more than 700 miles of recreation trails can be found on DNR State Parks and Nature Preserves, and 460 miles on the Hoosier National Forest that may better meet the interests of some users.
Additional trails are needed or suggested at some state forests, including equestrian trails, accessible trails, backpacking trails, and bike trails.	New trail proposals will be evaluated as presented and will also be guided by the recreation Master Plan called for in the DoF Strategic Plan. Any new trails (and future of existing trails) will require resources to construct and maintain. This includes DoF resources and those of partner groups and volunteers.
Concerned that DoF does not have the capacity to manage trails at the level needed. Volunteers not inclined to help maintain trails periodically impacted by logging.	The Plan addresses volunteer opportunities, staffing and organizational concerns under the Communications and Administration Section, Goal #2.
Adoption of national scenic trail standards encouraged (no harvest corridors).	We will review various trail standards and management protocols that may be appropriate for use on the State Forest trail system.
Concerned that trails and recreational development are vectors for the spread of invasive species.	Soil disturbances have the potential to be sites for invasive plant species to get a foothold. The Strategic Plan includes the implementation of an Invasives Species program for the prevention, control and treatment of invasive species of concern.
Concerned that Division is taking over the Knobstone Trail.	The Division of Outdoor Recreation was instrumental in the initial design, funding and development of the Knobstone Trail (KT). They have done a great job getting the trail in place and maintaining it for several years. However, long-term management of the trail would eventually become the responsibility of the land-holding Division. Since the vast majority of the Knobstone Trail is on state forest land, in mid-2015 the Division of Forestry was charged with maintaining that trail as Outdoor Recreation repositions its assets to other projects. Cross-country and backpacking trails are addressed within the Plan, and we will include language specifically identifying our new responsibility to the KT.
Suggest DoF coordinated with DNR Outdoor Recreation on trail planning.	We appreciate the comment.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Camping, Camping Cabins, Family Cabins, et. al. Improvements (Respondents: 4, 6, 17, 22, 24, 30, 32, 33, 37, 55, 56, 59, 61, 67, 72, 76, 81, 101, 117, 122, 124, 125, 131, 141, 148, 150, 151, 153, 163, 164, 176, 193, 198, 211, 217, 224, 228)	
<p>Received comments in both support and opposition of improving or expanding recreation opportunities on State Forests.</p> <p>Suggests campground improvements include adding electric, water, showers, etc. (family and equestrian campgrounds).</p> <p>Suggests Plan should emphasize and DoF should concentrate on primitive, backcountry and low impact recreation vs. developed recreation including upgrading campground facilities.</p> <p>Supports primitive camping.</p> <p>Concerned on DoF shift towards developed vs. primitive recreation.</p> <p>Developed recreation is/and should be provided by State Parks and is not needed on State Forests.</p>	<p>State Forests and Recreation Areas currently offer both primitive and developed camping and recreational facilities (including Deam Lake and Starve Hollow Lake). We recognized that different users prefer different levels of recreation. Under the Plan State Forests and Recreation Areas will continue to offer primitive camping and traditional forest recreation experiences, as well as improved offerings of developed recreation facilities.</p>
<p>Concern that developed recreation (e.g. cabins and RV sites) will unfairly compete with private sector and should be left to the private sector.</p> <p>Concerned proposed cabins will become privatized.</p>	<p>Developed DNR camping and recreation facilities have a long history and generally provide facilities and experiences unique to DNR, its land base and natural resources. While DNR has contracted concessions to private entities in the past, there are currently no private concessions on State Forests and none anticipated at this time, including campgrounds or cabins.</p>
<p>Concern that eminent domain could be used to acquire land for camping cabins.</p>	<p>There is sufficient space within existing State Forest campgrounds, recreation areas and land holdings to place cabins under consideration.</p>
<p>Recommends reopening of Stagesop Campground and the Blue River access.</p>	<p>Stagesop Campground and associated Blue River access, while on State Forest property, is under the management of State Parks. They are reviewing the facilities to see what it would take to bring them up to standards.</p>
<p>Concerned that backcountry areas are not as they were promised.</p>	<p>Backcountry Areas were laid out in the early 1980s as places for backpack camping. Three areas were established and continue to exist today. The management direction has not changed from what was prescribed in the 1980s.</p>

Recreation and Property Security Staffing (Respondents: 4, 32, 131, 199, 228)	
<p>DoF and DNR are not doing enough to monitor collection of camping fees at self-registration campground.</p> <p>Concerned about property damage done by visitors and users.</p> <p>Increased security and supervision needed in State Forest recreation facilities (e.g. campgrounds, vandalism and trash dumping).</p>	<p>The Plan addresses staffing and systems necessary to achieve quality recreational experiences and facility security under Recreation Goal #3. Funding considerations for adequate staffing is considered under Communication and Administration Goal #2. We will also look at increasing the number of reservable campsites, which require payment in advance. This has been very well received where implemented and has increased visitation and reduced issues.</p>
<p>Concern DoF does not have the capacity (staff and budget) to undertake additional recreation, or manage what they have at the level needed (facilities and trails).</p>	<p>The Plan addresses capacity, including volunteer opportunities, staffing and organizational concerns under the Communication and Administration Section, Goal #2.</p>

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Cave and Other Recreation (Respondents: 5, 9, 21, 25, 26, 28, 30, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 44, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 71, 74, 77, 79, 80, 82, 85, 86, 87, 92, 93, 94, 96, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 115, 117, 120, 121, 123, 126, 139, 141, 147, 156, 161, 162, 175, 183, 184, 196, 197, 202, 204, 208, 217, 222)	
<p>Concerned that cave access and management has been overlooked and needs to be included in the Strategic Plan. Several comments supporting the reopening of caves for responsible caving and contend the risk of spreading WNS is very low since most caves have already been impacted by the spread of WNS by the bat population.</p> <p>Most all comments were supporting a pass or permit system rather than unregulated cave access. Examples include the Georgia GORP pass system and an on-line education requirement to obtain a permit.</p> <p>Responsible caving can help control vandalism and teaches/passes on cave conservation to new users.</p> <p>Some support also for protecting important caves (e.g., gating important hibernacula).</p>	<p>Currently almost all caves on state properties have been closed due to the fungal infection within the cave systems called white nose syndrome (WNS), which has had a devastating impact on a variety of bat species. As the risk of new WNS contaminations has diminished, the Division of Forestry (DoF) is considering options to open selected caves. Any course of action to open caves must include provisions to minimize additional risk to bat species, cave features and cave ecosystems. The DoF will consult with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Indiana Department of Natural Resources and others as options are considered to ease cave restrictions. This will be reflected in the Plan.</p>
<p>Concern that the Plan, and timber harvest operations in particular, will impact public recreation use, aesthetics, enjoyment, tourism and marketability.</p>	<p>While forest recreation is an important part of the multiple-use, multiple-benefit management approach on the State Forests system, it is not the primary mission of State Forests. The broader mission is sustainability and conservation of forest resources for the use and enjoyment of current and future generations. The State Forest system provides valued certified forest products to the marketplace in a sustainable manner. The economic impact of bringing certified forest products into the annual market place and Indiana economy is estimated at \$150 million. This management also provides for biodiversity of habitats across the landscape, benefitting and promoting healthy and diverse wildlife populations. We recognize this management has some impact on State Forest recreation use and enjoyment. We will continue to monitor and adjust practices for long-term sustainability and multiple use, including recreation.</p>
<p>Deer overabundance concerns; increase hunter access.</p>	<p>It is well documented that overabundant deer populations can contribute to unhealthy forests. While the Division of Forestry (DoF) does not set deer harvest levels on state forests, we can do more to improve hunter access. This will be addressed in the final version of the Strategic Plan.</p>
<p>Improve hunter access and hunting opportunities. Hunter access more difficult due to timber harvests.</p>	<p>Because most access issues tend to be site-specific, please work with the state forest property manager if access at a particular location is a problem. DoF recognizes the importance of improved hunter access to its properties and will address this in the final version of the Strategic Plan.</p>
<p>General comments and questions on DoF reassuming full property management duties at Salamonie River and Francis Slocum State Forest and the current condition of facilities, trails, firewood cutting options, and dying trees. Equestrian use is of particular interest.</p>	<p>During the severe economic downturn of the 1980s, the DoF closed most of its facilities at these forests, and the recreation and facility management on the properties was temporarily assigned to the Division of State Parks. Beginning in 2016, those responsibilities returned to the DoF. Among our first steps will be to undertake an assessment of recreation facilities and forest resources. Trails in particular have been pointed out as needing attention and improvements.</p>

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Cave and Other Recreation Continued	
General support for the overall recreation components of the Plan.	Thank you for your support.
Plan should have more focus on recreation, including equestrian.	We appreciate the comment.

Goal Area: Communication and Administration	
Overview: This goal area focuses on State Forests' role providing information and educational opportunities to the public and developing an improved process to determine public attitudes, needs and desires. Also, looks at administrative procedures and organizational structure to improve management efficiency and effectiveness.	
Comment Summary	Response
State Forest Funding/User Fee (Respondents: 7, 16, 17, 22, 35, 39, 41, 55, 73, 74, 76, 84, 110, 117, 122, 124, 131, 153, 155, 158, 165, 185, 186, 187, 193, 208, 227)	
Concerned primary use of forest should not be for revenue for the State.	By being good stewards of the forests, one of the benefits is a revenue source. Our approach continues to follow science-based standards to ensure long term forest sustainability and diversity. At the present time, timber revenue from managed harvests is the largest revenue source from the State Forests and helps to subsidize recreation, education and private landowner assistance programs. Tree seedling sales, grants and recreation revenue are other sources. Recreation revenue is steadily increasing.
Request for information on fees at Salamonie.	Salamonie's fees will be the same as those for all state forests.
Implement user fee for State Forests, no tax increase.	We agree. The current Plan moves the Division a step closer to providing services on a user-based fee system.
Concerned about user/gate fee.	Currently three properties have a gate/user fee. The Plan is to implement this process across all Division of Forestry properties. We know that the system is accepted at these three properties and understand there will be resistance to this system when implemented across all properties.
Supports user fee for State Forests.	We agree. The current Plan moves the Division a step closer to providing services on a user-based fee system.
Supports reinstating the lost tax or create new tax to offset lost tax.	Funding levels and requests are the purview of the Indiana State Legislature.
Opposes user fees.	We understand that there will be opposition to user fees, but also know that this system has worked well with the State Parks system. There is a limited tax base, and we feel the user-pay system allows the users to support their outdoor avocation.
Supports alternative options to preserve the park (donation based funding project).	Currently the Division accepts donations directly and through the Natural Resources Foundation.
Concerned about cutting timber to fund Division.	We will continue to seek a diversity of revenue streams to support operations. One benefit of being good stewards of the forests is being able to have them serve as a revenue source. Our approach continues to follow science-based standards to ensure long term sustainability and diversity. At the present time, timber revenue from managed harvests is the largest revenue source from the State Forests and helps subsidize recreation, education and private landowner assistance programs. Tree seedling sales, grants and recreation revenue are other sources. Recreation revenue is steadily increasing.
Supports work to be self-sufficient/State should not be subsidized.	We agree. The current Plan moves the Division a step closer to providing services on a user-based fee system.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

State Forest Funding/User Fee Continued	
Concerned that Plan is focused on funding by selling products (timber) and user fees.	The Plan might be viewed by some as described, but the reality is the Division has always sold timber and had recreational fees. At this point in time, the forest is maturing and we expect more mortality. So, through management, we can harvest the declining trees while thinning the forest to promote healthier and more vigorous growth of the residual trees and improving habitat diversity.
Supports waving or reducing user fees for individuals from the county the property is located.	Although a noble idea, many other visitors from throughout the state would not benefit from such a strategy.
DNR needs to prove they can manage the forests before any new tax is considered.	The Division believes that we have done a good job managing the state's forests. There have been improvement harvests, timber stand improvement and tree planting that has nurtured the forests to the condition they are today.
Concerned that access fees will be a concern for sportsmen.	Yes, we do anticipate some people will not be happy with a state forest user fee. Other user groups already pay a fee to access the state forests and the recreational opportunities. The Division does not receive any federal dollars from federal taxes on hunting and fishing equipment or from hunting and fishing licenses.

Goal Area: General State Forest	
Overview: This area covers comments on the State Forests in general or comments that were not covered in the previous State Forest sections.	
Comment Summary	Response
General State Forest (Respondents: 2, 16, 22, 24, 26, 28, 33, 37, 38, 51, 55, 56, 59, 63, 72, 76, 78, 87, 88, 104, 115, 116, 128, 139, 143, 148, 151, 163, 164, 165, 171, 186, 190, 195, 196, 213, 228)	
Recommends providing Indiana Code to back up core mission in opening paragraph of Plan.	We agree. The Indiana code is IC 14-23-1.
State Forest mission says to preserve and protect/more focus is needed on preservation.	The Division has a long history of preserving and protecting the forest, including protection of unique resources and managing the forest for long term sustainability and habitat diversity. Additionally, other Divisions within DNR provide lands that are dedicated as preserves and non-commodity uses. The Plan includes goals to continue work to identify and designate exemplary areas of high conservation value.
Requested to know how they can work with the Division for a management program that works.	The Division has always been open to discussions about management options. We believe the current Plan meets the diverse ecological needs of both the flora and fauna that is native of the state forests. The Division has many constituents who all want more or less of something. We are always balancing the needs of citizens, the environment and budgets as we manage the forests.
Opposes privatization in Plan (including extreme resource extraction and fee system).	The Division has been managing the State's forest since its inception. Throughout that history this has included periodic timber harvests. Today's forests have grown considerably under that management and harvest levels have increased correspondingly to achieve forest objectives. The decision whether to harvest is based on the health and renewability of the forest. The user fee system has worked well in the State Parks system, and we expected the same on the State Forests.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

General State Forest Continued	
Supports setting aside Wild Areas/non harvest areas.	The DNR already provides many opportunities on other state lands for aspects proposed by the Wild Areas proposal.
Division should evaluate Wild Area proposal and make available their considerations. Moratorium on all projects within proposed area during consideration.	The Division has reviewed and given due consideration of the Wild Area proposal. The goals of the Wild Area proposal are already being met by various DNR Divisions, as well as lands owned by federal agencies and non-governmental organizations.
Concerned that how we use the forests reflects on how Indiana is viewed.	The state forests were set up at the turn of the century to be models of professional forest management. The multiple-use concept employed is very representative of how most Hoosiers view state forest management. These forests provide opportunities for hiking, biking, walking, bird watching, hunting, etc., as well as serving as a commodity that supports local businesses and Indiana in general. We consider this a win-win situation.
Concerned that Plan omits public purposes and benefits provided by the state forests.	Sustainably managed forests, whether public or privately owned, provide a multitude of public benefits. We believe we have and continue to take input from various user groups and Hoosier citizens. By this process, we are always listening and learning about public issues, concerns and needs. Keep in mind that some or many of these benefits might be provided by other DNR Divisions.
Concerned on the lack of science backing up what Forestry is doing.	There should be little concern about the lack of science. The entire professional forestry staff has extensive science backgrounds, degrees and training. Science drives the management of the forest.
Properties need more labor - utilize Department of Corrections (DoC).	We agree, but also must live within our budget. We have access to a number of DoC offenders and use them for work ranging from property upkeep to building construction. But, we also understand that DoC has standards for the type of person who can work on a crew. This does restrict the number of offenders who can work on a state forest.

Private Forestlands Management

Goal Area: Retain Working Forests at Current Levels	
<p>Overview: This goal area focuses on strengthening the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program (CFW), improving/modernizing the administration of CFW, and working with conservation partners to retain private forests through long term conservation agreements and local planning and zoning.</p>	
Comment Summary	Response
<p>Cost recovery of district forester time/fee proposal (Respondents: 18, 27, 29, 31, 35, 55, 74, 76, 84, 89, 91, 95, 106, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 119, 122, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 142, 144, 145, 149, 152, 154, 157, 159, 160, 166, 167, 168, 170, 173, 174, 175, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 185, 186, 188, 205, 219, 220, 221, 225)</p>	
<p>Provide more information about the fee; provide the cost justification for the new fee. Fee will negatively impact seniors/retired persons. Fee should be included as a tax credit for state income tax. Fees will contribute to "key issues" affecting private forest identified in the Strategic Plan. Fee proposal puts burden on the people providing a public good - providing environmental services, protecting resources for the future. Fee proposal will result in legal action against the state by landowners. Concerned fees would make it too expensive for landowners to work with District Foresters. Allow District Foresters to charge for services when landowner cannot receive service from private forester. Division of Forestry has no option but to increase fee for private forest landowners. Division of Forestry should look into getting a small portion when landowners receive federal grant monies (ex. EQIP). First visits to a landowner should be free and include a handout packet with resources. Visit fees should be charged for additional visits for non-CFW landowners. DoF should not charge for services that are available in the private sector. Government set fees set the market rate and interferes with market development. Support user fees (fee for service) for non-classified landowners provided fees are not below fair market value. Opposes/Concerns about fees for service for non-classified landowners.</p>	<p>The Division of Forestry is considering fees for private forest lands because it is required by law. Indiana Code directs the Division of Forestry to provide assistance to forest owners at the expense of the owner. This requirement has been in the law since 1919.</p> <p>IC 14-23-1-1 Duties of the Department Sec 1. The department shall do the following: ... (12) Examine private forest land: (A) upon the request of; and (B) at the expense of; the owner for the purposes of advising the owner on the proper methods of forest management.</p> <p>In spring 2015, the Natural Resources Commission initially approved a \$10/acre fee for private forest land assistance. The Division of Forestry presented a draft proposal at the Strategic Plan Meetings: Classified Forest & Wildlands Program Fees * Annual Administration fee \$2/acre (county collects and keeps 10%) * All other service free for classified landowners</p> <p>Non-Classified Land Fees * Stewardship Plans \$200; Stewardship Plan revision for non CRP cost share \$100 * Practice Plans for invasive control and tree planting (non-CRP related) \$100</p> <p>The discussion on fees for service on private land is ongoing. The final fee proposal for private lands is not expected until winter 2016. The Division of Forestry will continue discussing options with landowners and interest groups through most of 2016.</p>

Cost recovery of district forester time/fee proposal Continued	
<p>Amiable/may support an administrative fee that is tied directly to a mandated directive from the legislature - ex. Administrative fee to cover cost to enroll and do reinspections for CFW.</p> <p>Opposes Classified Forest & Wildlands administrative fee proposal (\$2/acre year). View administrative fee as a tax.</p> <p>Fees for the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program are contradictory to the Division of Forestry's mission and the intent of the program.</p> <p>Fee proposal will decrease participation in the program: existing landowners leaving the program and potential landowners will not enter.</p> <p>Non-profit groups (conservation groups, land trusts, etc.) will take land out of program and seek tax exempt status.</p> <p>Fee will result in landowners leaving the program and then cutting all their timber or converting it to another use.</p> <p>Fee proposal will result in loss of jobs caused by decreasing acres of managed forest.</p> <p>Fee proposal will have a greater impact on larger ownerships.</p> <p>Don't change the rules for current landowners; grandfather existing tracts so they don't have to pay fees or allow existing landowner to leave the program without penalty.</p> <p>Allow current program owners to stay in the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program but opt out of Division of Forestry services.</p> <p>The biggest draw to the program is that there is no cost.</p> <p>If there is a fee, it should be no more than \$50 per landowner.</p> <p>Fee proposal will open door for additional fees or increased fees in the future.</p> <p>Concerned that counties will take more of the CFW fee; fee should not support counties.</p> <p>Need for district forester services is minimal, landowner uses a consulting forester and/or does work on their own.</p> <p>\$2 fee is too high, \$1 fee or \$1 augmented by fees for service may be acceptable.</p> <p>Classified land does not generate any revenue for the landowner and/or there are costs to the landowner to implement the required management plan activities.</p> <p>Look for efficiencies to reduce cost: reduce reinspections where compliance is obvious; focus on needed/requested services, hire interns to do reinspections (lower cost).</p> <p>Instead of \$2/ acre fee, consider an enrollment/application fee (ex. \$100 + \$1 enrolled).</p>	

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Cost recovery of district forester time/fee proposal Continued	
<p>Supports Classified Forest & Wildlands administrative fee proposal (\$2/acre year). Don't charge for 5 year reinspections or minor management plan revisions. Major plan revisions or additional services may justify a fee. Fee proposal singles out classified landowners. Treat all landowners the same. Fee proposal is inequitable between small and large landowners. Administrative costs are not in proportion. Division of Forestry should not charge fees for services mandated in statute - Classified Forest & Wildlands reinspections. If there is a fee for CFW landowners, make it for CFW inspections and other required services instead of the annual acreage fee. Consider increasing the CFW assessment with a portion of the increase in property tax going to the Division of Forestry. Encourage a cap to be placed on amount charged for a user fee. Supports changing the assessment to a percentage with a portion going to DoF. With tight budgets, the DoF should limit service to CFW and giving advice, direction and referrals.</p>	
<p>Recommends including consideration of charging for landowner assistance in Plan.</p>	<p>Charging for landowner assistance is in the Plan under Goal #1: "Cost recovery of district forester time spent on stewardship/reinspections, cost share and practice plan."</p>
<p>Landowners should not have to pay for funding decisions made by the governor and the legislature.</p>	<p>We understand the concern that citizens might have for paying for others decisions. But IC 14-23-1-1 states that the Division should recover all fees associated with examining private forest lands. This code has been in existence since 1919. One could conclude that this statute was enacted to recover taxpayer dollars for assistance with private lands.</p>
<p>Concerned that revenue from new fees would not result in any additional services.</p>	<p>A valid concern. The Indiana statute requires the Division to collect for services rendered on private forest lands. This revenue will support the private lands section. This section of the Division is supported by a small amount of federal funds and primarily from general fund taxes. The annual cost to support the private lands program exceeds \$2 million.</p>
<p>Indiana Forest & Woodland Owner Association and partners should work with the legislature to modify the IC 14-23-1-1 to remove the requirement for landowners to pay for forest management assistance from the Division of Forestry.</p>	<p>This is beyond the scope of the Division of Forestry.</p>

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

Classified Forest & Wildlands Program (Respondents: 27, 29, 34, 35, 55, 76, 122, 129, 170, 182, 186, 223)	
The Classified Forest & Wildlands Program is appreciated in general and for the tax relief provided. Opposes tax break for CFW.	Tax abatement is one incentive for private lands conservation. It has been the basis for the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program since 1921. The Division of Forestry plans to continue with the property tax break for the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program, but will also look into other opportunities to encourage conservation of forests on privately owned property.
Increase the assessed value from \$1/acre to provide revenue to local units of government. Tracts should pay a minimum fee of \$20 to cover the cost of billing and processing the payment (minimum tax is currently \$5). Assessment has not changed since program began.	The Division of Forestry and other entities have multiple times in the past considered changing the assessed value for the program. This option will likely be considered again during the private lands fee discussion.
Plan omits concern from counties on growing tax loss from Classified Forests.	While not specifically stated, this concern is addressed in the Plan section discussing modernization of the program administration “to reflect the changing land ownership patterns and taxing structures.”
Drop green certification for Classified land.	The Division of Forestry's Green Certification auditing contract goes through 2017. At the end of the contract, we will evaluate whether to continue providing green certification for private landowners enrolled in the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program.
State needs to commit necessary resources to insure landowner compliance to the program.	The Division of Forestry is committed to the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program. We are filling staff positions as the budget allows. The need for additional resources was one of the factors that led to private lands fee proposal discussed above.
Division of Forestry should consider contracting out CFW reinspections and other work.	The Division of Forestry has considered this option briefly in the past but decided against it due to cost and some ethical questions.
Drop re-inspections of CFW lands related to change in ownership unless time for regular reinspections.	We feel that re-inspections at the time of ownership changes are very important. It is at this visit that the new landowner is informed about the program, its requirements and restrictions. The district forester also works with the landowner to develop the required management plan.
Goal should be more focused on management then on enrollment acres (rather than enrolling x number of acres a year could identify a requirement of management of the tracts).	The Division of Forestry has two metrics that we have to achieve and report to DNR director and the governor's office: acres enrolled in the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program and the number of acres we provide assistance to each year. This is the reason the acres target is included in the Strategic Plan.
DoF should direct landowners to the private sector for available services.	The Division of Forestry regularly refers landowners to the private sector for forestry related-services. In the first 11 months of 2015, district foresters made more than 1,200 referrals to private industries through distribution of the Directory of Professional Foresters.
General (Respondents: 70)	
Supports goal of retaining Working Forests	We agree and thank you for your support.
Encourages partnering with local land trusts in the use of conservation easements.	The Division of Forestry will continue working with our conservation partners to protect strategic forest parcels and the use of conservation easements.

Goal Area: Accelerate the Restoration of Indiana's Private Forest to Insure Long Term Forest Health	
Overview: This goal area focuses providing incentives for the restoration and management of private forest land.	
Comment Summary	Response
General (Respondents: 70)	
Supports goal of restoration of Private Forests	We agree restoration of private forests is important.

Goal Area: Protecting Forest Resource Sustainability & Improving Forest Resource Awareness	
Overview: This goal area focuses on improving landowner access to forestry knowledge (including invasive species management), technical information and marketing tools.	
Comment Summary	Response
General (Respondents: 70, 186)	
Supports “Protecting Forest Resource Sustainability & Improving Forest Resource Awareness” goal.	We agree and thank you for your support.
Encourages expansion of demonstration forests and cooperating with Purdue in this accomplishment.	Since the retirement of the staff member who coordinated the Demonstration Forest Program, the program has stagnated. The Division will consider working with Purdue University or other partners to revive the program.
Encourages cooperation with public and private landowners in a statewide invasive species management strategy.	The Division of Forestry agrees with the importance of developing a statewide invasive species management strategy.

General Private Forestlands Management	
Overview: This area covers comments on the Private Forestlands Management Section in general or comments that were not covered in the Private Forestlands Management sections.	
General (Respondents: 137, 170, 186)	
Comment Summary	Response
Recommends providing Indiana Code under mission in Plan.	References to the Indiana Code have been added.
Recommends listing percentage of landowners who manage their forests.	We are looking for the specific percentage and will add to the Plan when found.
Recommends that the Division stay out of private businesses.	The Division has no intention of branching out in the private sector market. We do sell trees into that market as well as provide recreational opportunities that are mostly unique to forest lands. On the private lands management arena, the Division does not market timber for private landowners but by statute is required to recover costs when we assist private lands. This statute has been in code since 1919.
Recommends providing a source for current timber pricing to help landowners determine if it is time to sell timber.	The Division semi-annually collects delivered saw log prices, which can be found at: www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/3605.htm . Look under the Forest Products Industry tab for the most current report.

Fire

General Fire Program	
<p>Overview: This goal area supports organizational, operational and technical support for wildland and prescribed fire management. The Fire Program provides assistance to rural and volunteer fire departments, to the Department Natural Resources, and supports risk response at the state and national level.</p>	
Comment Summary	Response
General Comments (Respondents: 22, 70, 186)	
Supports fire operational, assistance, training, and prevention programs.	We agree and thank you for your support.
Opposes prescribed burns except in unusual and critical circumstances.	Emerging science is strongly indicating that fire was part of the forest system that we see today. In many cases, it allowed many of the moderately sun-loving species to compete and become part of the forest canopy. Without this tool, we believe the forest will become less species diverse.
Supports training of DNR staff to manage and prescribe fire independent of Fire Headquarters personnel.	The Division has provided continuing education opportunities to the staff. Many also travel to other states to be a part of fire suppression operations throughout the country.
Recommends considering educational program to better understand the importance of fire, why using fire can control fuel loads, prevent wildfires, etc.	The Division has a number of professionals who handle outreach and education on the important values that fire can provide to the forest ecosystem. As with any practice there will be positive and negative impacts.

Community and Urban Forestry

General Community and Urban Forestry	
<p>Overview: This goal area focuses on public awareness and natural resources in urban areas. The Community and Urban Forestry section assists Indiana cities, towns, and non-profits with protecting, expanding, and improving community forests.</p>	
Comment Summary	Response
General Comments (Respondents: 22, 30, 70, 186, 203)	
Supports urban forestry.	We agree and thank you for your support.
Encourages improvement of communications of BMPs to protect existing urban forests.	We agree and thank you for your support.
Encourages filling of open CUF position.	Having adequate staff in any program is important; filling specific staff positions is not part of the Strategic Plan.
Encourages more emphasis on CUF education.	We agree and thank you for the support.
Encourages opportunities for staff from CUF and the urban wildlife program to work together.	We agree and thank you for the support.

Conservation Education

General Conservation Education	
Overview: This goal area facilitates and promotes education on the natural environment and its management. This is accomplished through preparing education with factual information and techniques in order to assist them in reaching their audiences.	
Comment Summary	Response
General Comments (Respondents: 5, 20, 22, 27, 30, 67, 70, 74, 100, 168, 170, 186, 204, 227)	
Supports education of private landowners and the general public.	We agree. This is done with our 20 district foresters as well as through our education section and our foresters who work on the state forests.
Support of the HEE project.	We agree and will continue to fund the research effort.
Supports increase education of landowners to use BMP on private lands.	We agree but have found that BMP implementation and success is best accomplished with the logger. More of our training efforts will be focused on this group.
Supports educational outreach programs.	Educational efforts and outreach are part of the public and private-lands foresters' jobs.
Encourages expansion of the resources Forestry Exchange website.	We agree. The next online service will be the ability to purchase and pay for tree seedlings.
Supports training and technical assistance activities of the Forest Resource Section.	The section leader and typically another FIA forester attend national and sometimes regional training meetings annually. This training is provided by the Forest Service FIA section.
Conservation education should be about more than resource value of the forests.	We agree that forests have many values and will continue to include a broad set of values both in conservation education programming and forest resource planning.
Recommends Division should be an unbiased source of conservation information.	We agree and rely on science as our primary guide for resource management. It is in our best long term interest to be an unbiased source of information for both public and private forests.
More should be spent on education for our citizens.	We agree and are doing what we can with the current resources.
Recommends including conservation education in goal to 'work cooperatively with the Department of Education (DoE) to better integrate forestry education into school curricula and correlate forestry education with state standards.	We agree and will do our best to continue to reach out to DoE, but each school district operates within its own guidelines and needs. The Division does conduct a multiday institute for educators that addresses natural resource management.

Nursery

General Nursery	
Overview: This goal area focuses on growing and distributing high-quality plant material for conservation plantings. The program also manages seed orchards to provide improved seed selections.	
Comment Summary	Response
General Comments (Respondents: 22, 70, 74, 116, 119, 122, 186)	
Supports nursery program.	Thank you for your support.
Supports seed orchard expansion.	We agree and are currently working every year to procure seed from local origins and with improved traits.
Supports public education on tree planting (in relation with the Nursery Program).	We agree and thank you for your support.
Encourages cooperation with the Hardwood Tree Improvement and Regeneration Center in expanding availability of disease-resistant hardwoods.	We agree and currently have seed orchard and propagation research programs ongoing.
Supports charging more for nursery stock.	Current state statute (IC 14-23-1-1) requires the Division of Forestry to sell nursery stock at a rate not to exceed the cost of production, and seedling prices are set accordingly.
Requests to know if the Department of Transportation (DoT) or the Department of Corrections (DoC) is paying for landscaping (distribution of balled stock).	At this time, we are not aware of any Division of Forestry plant materials sold or being given to DoT or DoC.
Supports changing statute to allow seedlings to be sold at a cost-plus basis.	We appreciate the comment. To sell at a cost-plus basis would require a statute change that can only be done by the Indiana legislature.
Supports selling of seedlings out-of-state.	We appreciate the comment. To sell out-of-state would require a statute change that can only be done by the Indiana legislature.
Recommends including mention of pollinators or providing pollinators seeds/plugs.	This is an entirely new endeavor for the nursery section. We are experimenting with cultural treatments and plant materials to see if we are capable of providing the stock.

Division of Forestry

General Division of Forestry	
Overview: This area covers comments on the Division of Forestry in general or comments that were not covered in the previous sections.	
Comment Summary	Response
Strategic Planning Process (Respondents: 2, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 36, 46, 49, 51, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 62, 73, 74, 75, 76, 87, 90, 101, 103, 104, 107, 114, 116, 117, 120, 121, 123, 126, 146, 151, 159, 160, 161, 164, 170, 176, 186)	
Concerned Plan and associated proposals were not widely distributed, notice was insufficient, public comment period should be extended and process should be clearly defined.	Press releases announcing the Strategic Plan were posted on April 16 and Aug. 11. Three public input sessions were hosted by the Division in September. There also was a 30-day extension period for comments in September that ended Oct. 31. Also the Division had 10 meetings with constituent groups over the last 7 months.
Footnote sources in Plan.	Footnoting sources in the Plan is not a typical process for a Strategic Plan.
Increase number of public hearings.	The Division has been accepting comments since the announcement on March 13 and continued through Oct. 31.
Requested to know how concerns will be addressed, timeframe, and where responses will be posted.	The public input process is the same model used in the previous 2008-13 Strategic Plan.
Requested for response in writing of resolution of concerns of the public input process.	The Division is following the same process in responding to constituent concerns as was done in the 2008 Plan as well as the Indiana State Forest Environmental Assessment.
General support of the Plan.	Thank you for your support.
Commends the Division's effort to solicit public input.	Thank you for your support.
Supports IFA's demands in regards to the Plan.	Thank you for your comment. We understand that not every citizen accepts the current management philosophy. That is why other DNR Divisions provide other opportunities for primitive hiking, no-harvest areas and different recreational opportunities. The Division must balance ecological as well as social needs of numerous user groups.
Plan is flawed, makes unsubstantiated assertions that "hardwoods # 1 product".	These data come from various agricultural reports. The unique situation for Indiana hardwoods is that trees are grown, harvested and a significant part is manufactured into secondary and finished products by Indiana companies (2012 Bio-Crossroads Report: Food and Agriculture Innovation 21 st Century Opportunities for Indiana).
Recommends revising and re-noticing Plan with thorough explanation of assertions, management prescriptions, and proposals.	The entire Strategic Plan is based on the best science available while all along adhering to Indiana code and rules that govern the management of both public and private forest lands.
Supports "multiple benefit philosophy" of the Plan.	Thank you for your support.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

DoF Budgets/Funding/Fees (Respondents: 35, 37, 55, 76, 107, 108, 109, 110, 117, 124, 126, 129, 175, 219, 220)	
Better legislative/administration funding.	Funding levels and requests are the purview of the Indiana State Legislature.
Ask for donations from the public for forestry conservation.	The DNR, through the Natural Resources Foundation, accepts both monetary and gifts of land and other assets on behalf of various divisions.
Streamline the Division by concentrating on core responsibilities, which would allow for reductions in personnel and associated costs.	The Division has streamlined a number of its processes as well as consolidated offices and personnel to better serve the public and reduce costs. Leased office space has been eliminated and more technology and office equipment is now shared. We have also concentrated our professional efforts to only those activities that are defined in statute.
Supports forestry yield tax.	A forestry yield tax would take a code modification by the General Assembly. This request is beyond the scope of the Division of Forestry.

DoF Capacity (Respondents: 131)	
Concerned about stress on staff.	The DoF is a lean organization with reduced staffing levels in many areas. The management team is concerned about the level of stress and the workload placed on the employees. We have streamlined our administrative process as well as supplemented where and when we could to use summer help as well as provide full-time office support.

Certification (Respondents: 122, 170)	
Opposes green certification.	We understand that not everyone would support certification but know that there are certain industries that benefit from purchasing certified wood. We continue to believe that having outside auditors review both public and private forest management allows the public an independent assessment of forest management and the impacts. If the land is already in the classification program, almost all of the certification requirements are being met simply by following the program's conditions.
Evaluate Division of Forestry's green certification program to see if FSC and SFI certifications are worth the investment. If worthwhile, consider a fee (annual fee or percent of timber income) to certified landowners to offset the cost.	The Division is always evaluating the cost of all certification programs. It was determined that continuing with Tree Farm certification was not beneficial, so it was not renewed. The current certification program for private lands is also under renewal consideration.

General (Respondents: 6, 22, 47, 61, 67, 70, 74, 81, 90, 97, 116, 122, 132, 134, 146, 203, 207, 208)	
Concerned that Plan sounds like more taxes and regulation.	The Division does not plan to impose any new taxes or regulations. Fees for private lands are already in state law. User fees are also in place on 3 state forest properties at the present time.
Recommends continuation of policies that support local communities and industry.	We agree and continue to work with local commissioners, economic development agencies and users groups to provide service both to local as well as Hoosier taxpayers.
Division should take the lead on a statewide (public and private) forest management strategy.	See the Indiana Forest Action Plan document at www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/5436.htm .
Supports forest stewardship of the Division.	Thank you for your support. The Division's primary mission is the stewardship of forest resources.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

General Continued	
Reduce government footprint.	Although a broad statement, the Division has a relatively small footprint. We do regulate timber buyers and manage the Classified Forest and Wildlands Program, the latter is a voluntary program. We do not anticipate increasing government oversight of the forest resource.
Requests compassion for the living environment.	We agree and also understand that both the flora and fauna have natural cycles, and also are influenced by our management. We are studying those impacts with a number of universities to better understand them through the Hardwood Ecosystem Experiment (HEE) (www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/3603.htm).
Requests responses explaining why DoF does what it does.	The Division provides numerous opportunities to comment on our actions, and we are always open to hosting tours and one-on-one discussions.
Opposed to paving Yellowwood Lake Road.	While we understand there might be some who opposed the improvement of the county road, we are obligated to provide a quality service to all the citizens of Indiana with good access to state facilities. Flooding issues, rough roads and stream crossing will be improved with this activity.
Supports use of conservation easements on private lands in lieu of CFW and on public lands in lieu of acquisition.	No question conservation easements have a place. The decision on an easement has much longer fiscal and management implications than CFW status. Lands can be removed under CFW rules. Conservation easements are typically forever. Lands with a conservation easement could still be enrolled in the CFW program.
Supports FIA and expanding CFI on state and private lands.	The Division feels that having good data leads to good forest management decisions. Although the data will not be good at the parcel level, they will provide county and regional forest trend information.
Recommends tax deduction extension for solar and wind energy.	This is beyond the scope of the Division of Forestry.
Recommends considering payment for Ecosystem Services (carbon storage, water, wildlife, etc.) on private and public lands.	We are not aware of any private/public partnership that currently trades or pays for these services. Forests do provide a number of public services that at this time have no economic value in Indiana. California has a regulated market for carbon.
Recommends that timber value-added products be manufactured in the state.	We agree. There are a large number of secondary manufacturers who source Indiana wood. As a matter of fact, the secondary forest products industry contributes a significant amount to the state's Gross Domestic Product (GDP).
Opposes use of biomass.	Currently, we are not aware of any large-scale industries or energy producers burning woody biomass in Indiana.
Opposes major development that results in loss and fragmentation (I-69).	This is beyond the scope of the Division of Forestry.
Concerned about mitigation plans for forest loss.	The Strategic Plan does allow for possible sale or trading of state forest lands. If the Division would sell or trade lands, we would require like lands for replacement. Our expectation is no net loss of forested lands.
Recommends working with forester groups to grow the private plan sector.	The Division routinely supports the use of private sector foresters. Annually we refer woodland owners who need assistance with various forestry practices to private sector foresters through the distribution of the Directory of Professional Foresters. This might include timber appraisals, timber marketing, tree planting, invasive species control, etc.

Summary of Written Comments and Oral Statements

General Continued	
Reconsider use of offender labor, takes away from small businesses.	The Division has been using offender labor for more than 30 years. In some cases we provide training opportunities through work-release programs that prepare offenders to reenter the private sector. There is also the opportunity to keep costs down by the use of offender labor and help provide opportunities to fulfill community service sentencing. Better to use their skill sets than not to. As a whole, offender labor is a small part of the Division's operation.
Supports research and the quality work the Division is accomplishing.	We appreciate the kind comment and know the employees within the Division are dedicated natural resource managers. The HEE research project is unique among states, and we will continue to support this effort.
Property taxes are an issue.	This is beyond the scope of the Division of Forestry. We understand that certain groups of taxpayers have seen their taxes increase. The Division is not proposing any new taxing authority.
Doing a great job and are underpaid.	We appreciate the kind comment. We are all dedicated to conservation and the proper management of both public and private forest lands.

Summary of Question Cards

Below is a summary of the question cards that were filled out at the three public meetings. The Division’s response to each question is listed in the column on the right.

Statement Summary	Response
<p>What is your Strategic Plan to prevent introduction of invasive plants into "openings" of up to 2 acres in size? How are you planning to eradicate such invasive plants if discovered in those "openings"?</p>	<p>The Strategic Plan includes the implementation of an Invasives Species program to locate and treat invasive, exotic species. Control could be done by mechanical, chemical and/or other methods. Prevention measures are also considered.</p>
<p>Can you quantify the long term benefit of forest carbon sequestration on Indiana air quality?</p>	<p>Most of the scientific research indicates that trees and forests do provide a valuable sink for the storage of atmospheric carbon, long term. A recent Purdue University report suggests that forests in general have the potential to sequester 8-10 tons of CO₂ per acre per year.</p>
<p>The states around Indiana that have developed long-distance hiking trails are mostly managing them according to Nat. Scenic Trail Standards of not logging along trail corridors. Will this become your management practice as you seek to satisfy the modern-oriented new visitors you are seeking and upgrade their whole experience!?! Harvesting the chestnut oaks lining the Knobstone would destroy its character and the experience. The value of the thousands of visitors to the trail should outweigh the returns on the timber sold.</p>	<p>The Knobstone Trail traverses a variety of timber types, not just chestnut oak dominated forests. The presence of trails is considered in the development and implementation of management operations and prescriptions are often modified due to trails. In addition to providing hiking experiences, it is the Division’s mission to show and demonstrate management and the diversity of habitats. We look at ways to improve both efforts and not hide management operations.</p>
<p>How many years on average before a forest that has been logged should the same forest be logged again?</p>	<p>This depends on the productivity of the site, the species composition/present condition, and the desired future condition. Many private lands will be reentered on 10-year periods. State Forest lands will generally work on a more conservative approach of 15 to 25 years between select harvest entries.</p>
<p>For the next iteration of a Strategic Plan - in 2019 - will you commit to public "scoping" where you ask the public to help you identify key issues for the Division of Forestry to address?</p>	<p>The Division of Forestry has always been committed to public input, even before the 2005 Strategic Plan. There is no statutory requirement to do so, but we consider the process "good government." That has not changed with the current Plan. We expect the 2019 planning process will also include a public input component.</p>
<p>Does the DoF intend to fill the open position in the Community & Urban Forestry Office? If so, when (it has been open for over 1 year) 52 million trees in urban community land in IN - store 9.9 million metric tons C (value of \$225.7 million) and annually remove 327,000 metric tons C (another \$7.5 million) (Nowak, 2009) NRS -54. Why is this <u>not</u> in DoF Strategic Plan?</p>	<p>Yes, we plan to fill the open Community and Urban Forestry position, but filling positions does require the funding to maintain the position long term. Filling positions is not part of the planning process.</p>

Statement Summary	Response
<p>There are many more species than just the 2 bat species mentioned in the Plan that are Threatened, Endangered or of Special Concern. What about all those species not included that DNR is mandated to conserve?</p>	<p>This is true; all but one of Indiana's bat species are state or federally listed as a species of conservation concern. The Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) the Division of Forestry (DoF) is developing in coordination with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service covers only two federally listed species that occur on state forests, which is typical for an HCP. Other bat species that are given state "endangered" or "special concern" status are considered during forest management activities just as any other listed species on state forests. During the planning stage, foresters consult Indiana's Natural History Database for any observations of listed species, and if they occur within a project area, consideration for the species and/or its habitat is given to minimize potential impacts, if necessary.</p>
<p>1. What role did Gov. Pence play in the goals of the Plan? 2. The term "CUSTOMER" appears in the Plan - that implies ownership of the enterprise. Why is this term being use?</p>	<p>1. The basis of the Plan was laid down a decade ago, in 2005, with the Strategic Plan that was implemented then. This is a continuation, with some revisions, of that Plan. 2. State Forest customers include a wide array of people who visit, use or enjoy our State Forest properties, use Division services, conduct business, and have an interest in the forests of Indiana. We use this term because we have a focus on providing good customer service.</p>
<p>Why are you not supporting the 13 Wild Areas proposal in your Strategic Plan?</p>	<p>The Strategic Plan sets the goal of a balance of forest stands and ages with 10% of the area in older forest conditions. The Department of Natural Resources already has additional programs in place to protect and conserve areas of high importance.</p>
<p>What is your relationship with Department of Corrections? How much are inmates who work on your properties <u>paid</u> for their labor?</p>	<p>The Division of Forestry has had a long working relationship with the Dept. of Corrections. The biggest user of the offender labor is the state nursery. The Division of Forestry does not pay for offender labor. If there is a payment, it is entirely within the Dept. of Corrections.</p>
<p>If the Habitat Conservation Plan for IN bat is not yet approved, why do you continue to log and build roads near maternal roosts, managing the state forests in ways that negatively affect the IN bat?</p>	<p>The Division of Forestry cooperates with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and operates under agreed to guidance to protect the Indiana bat.</p>
<p>"New User Fee For State Forest" will some of this money be used to repair much needed horse trails that need attention? If yes... How Much?</p>	<p>Fees collected will be deposited into the Division of Forestry dedicated fund account and used to support Division of Forestry operation, including management and maintenance of trail systems.</p>
<p>Why has the state been logging more and more in state forests when surveys show citizens, *who own the forests* want less logging and more <u>old</u> forest for recreation? *State forests are owned by Hoosier Citizens.</p>	<p>The most recent scientific research study conducted in 2009 by Purdue University says otherwise. Majority approval was given to: - Removing some trees to protect Indiana woodlands from spread of disease and wildfire (95%), - Harvesting Indiana trees for woodland management if overseen by professional foresters (85%), - Harvesting Indiana trees to improve places for wildlife to live (82%), - Advising Indiana private landowners on how many and what kinds of trees they might harvest and sell (70%), and - Harvesting Indiana trees to make lumber or other wood products that we use (61%).</p>

Statement Summary	Response
<p>What type logging do you conduct? Selective cut? Clearcutting? I prefer selective cut & leave many areas ALONE. - No cut zones.</p>	<p>A variety of management methods are often used in any one operation. Even aged management methods are used only occasionally on the state forests. Clearcuts and shelterwoods are the primary techniques used in even-aged management here. Clearcuts have most commonly been used in areas that were old fields planted to non-native species and the goal is to convert the area to native hardwoods. The vast majority of the harvested acres are done using uneven-aged and intermediate methods, what some people call “select cut.” The primary practices here include thinning, improvement, and selection methods. We also do a small amount of sanitation and/or salvage.</p>
<p>Why are cutting methods designed to grow "straighter" trees? Also, the original (virgin) forest in Indiana (before the early 20th century clear-cutting of Indiana) didn't require this type of management... why is it important now?</p>	<p>Whether to get straight beams for barn construction or to sell trees for lumber to make money, the early owners of Indiana's forestlands targeted the straightest trees for use and harvesting. This left the woods with the more crooked trees. Crooked trees are more susceptible to windthrow and breakage in storms. Whether the problems are caused by the environment or genetics, the process of taking the best and leaving the rest is known as “highgrading.” By using the opposite approach of targeting the worst, it is hoped to return the forest back to a condition of big, tall, straight trees that users also seem to find aesthetically pleasing. The original forest was managed and used by indigenous people. It was managed for game and food production. It was used for building materials. And it was cleared for agriculture.</p>
<p>Why would the State disturb anyone's private property & reroute Brown County roads.</p>	<p>The poor condition of the roads is a major complaint of users at Yellowwood State Forest. Note the popularity of Brown County State Park and its good road system. Unfortunately, as with most road modernization projects, the original road's footprint is too narrow and crooked to meet modern roadway standards for safe travel, so additional land is needed. The same thing happened many years ago when S.R. 46 was upgraded to provide safer travel.</p>
<p>Why is the Forestry Dept. (DNR), in face of strong opposition, not effecting a compromise? Especially in Brown County. Brown County symbolizes "Woods" or Wilderness.</p>	<p>The Strategic Plan has received input from all types of citizenry since we began this process. To say there is strong opposition is a relative concept. We factor in not only comments through the planning process, but also research on public perception of forest management as well as our obligation to manage for environmental and natural resource concerns.</p>
<p>What determines "improved recreational opportunities" - i.e., RV camping replacing primitive camping. AND to get into the forest you should not make everyone PAY!</p>	<p>Recreation improvements will address a variety of recreation pursuits, including camping, hiking, hunting, fishing and more. Campground enhancements will consider needs for both primitive as well as RV experiences. Example: adding electric hookup at some campsites will reduce generator use and noise levels. Fee proposals/systems will be evaluated for all users. No decision has been made at this time on final approaches to implement.</p>
<p>The current Plan for timber harvest doesn't keep up w/growth so it will not create more early successful growth, thus doing very little to solve the problem of increasing forest diversity.</p>	<p>The Division of Forestry is creating more early successional habitat than it was a little more than a decade ago. Only by an active commitment to addressing the ecological need for early successional (young forest) habitat will gains be made on the current imbalance. But the long term trend is for the trees in general to become older and larger.</p>

Statement Summary	Response
Where did you go to school? Your logging plan defies science & reason.	Many of our foresters graduated from Purdue University as it is the accredited forestry program in Indiana. However, many foresters also come from forestry schools around the Central Hardwood region states such as Michigan, Missouri, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Kentucky. A few come from outside the region such as from the northeast or out west. The typical forestry degree includes a heavy dose of science — chemistry, physics, biology, plant physiology, ecology, pathology, soil science, etc., as well as calculus.
What aseptic techniques does the DNR use to prevent the spread of disease while logging? Is there protocol for all the different logging companies?	Exotic diseases such as Thousand Canker Disease are being controlled by quarantines on the movement of wood products. Native diseases are generally present at some level within wooded areas and do not require introduction.
After installing recreation upgrades to infrastructure at taxpayer expense and increasing user fees, how long will DNR operate these forest hotels at a loss before these facilities are privatized?	The Division at this time intends to focus on primitive type recreational upgrades. Most of the upgrades are analyzed from a cost/benefit perspective. To our knowledge there are no forest hotels on the state forest system. At best there have been improvements to septic, water, roads, comfort stations and cabins. Until recently recreation revenue had been declining because the amenities asked for by potential customers were not available on the State Forests. Recent years has seen recreational use increase 10-20%.
When will the "New User" fee State Forest be put into effect?	The process has been vetted with DNR and the Natural Resources Commission. Through various meetings and public input sessions we are still taking input. No final decision has been made on when and how this process will move forward.
Do older forest species return once a forest has regenerated to older forests? Do birds come back that live in deep woods?	Researchers working on state forests have found that bird detections increased after timber harvesting, regardless of whether the species was categorized as one that nests in mature forest or early-successional forest. One reason for this is that many species that nest in mature forest also use early-successional (young) forest habitat and recently disturbed forest to forage and provide food for their young. Research has also found that when regeneration openings temporarily displace mature forest nesting habitat, individuals typically shift activity areas and territories to areas of adjoining intact forest at the periphery of the cut area. Due to the relative frequency of historic disturbance patterns in Midwestern forests, our wildlife species have adapted to the occurrence of canopy-level disturbance. This tolerance for disturbance is even found among species characteristic of mature, high-canopy forest.
1. What is the revenue from timber versus its value? 2. How many ash trees have died in Indiana?	1. Revenue should reflect value as it reflects the products that can be made from the timber. 2. As of two years ago it is estimated that more than 4 million ash trees have died.
1. How many dollars per tree does the State receive for trees logged from state property? 2. Who is buying the lumber and where is the wood going?	1. Looking at last year when 71,106 sawtimber trees were sold on sales bringing in \$4,036,782, it works out to \$56.77 per tree. At an average tree size of 218 board feet per tree that comes to 26 cents per board foot. 2. The timber is sold to local buyers usually within 100 miles of the site. The wood goes to a mill owned by the buyer or to other mills.

Statement Summary	Response
<p>What is <u>recovery</u> for lands after a major logging cut? Or is the logging company mandated to repair land after cut? Thank you</p>	<p>After harvesting recovery would be the reestablishment of vegetative cover on disturbed soil. Logging companies are required to perform practices to minimize sedimentation and speed recovery such as installing water diversions. Natural regeneration is a fairly rapid process and within 3 growing seasons new tree regeneration numbers are in the thousands per acre in forest openings.</p>
<p>Why is the Division of Forestry (DoF) taking over management of Knobstone Trail From Outdoor Recreation? Why isn't Outdoor Recreation managing State Forests if DoF is operating the same type of recreation facilities?</p>	<p>The Division of Outdoor Recreation was instrumental in the initial design, funding and development of the Knobstone Trail. Its staff members have done a great job getting the trail in place and maintaining it for several years. However, long-term management of the trail would eventually become the responsibility of the land holding Division. Because the vast majority of the Knobstone Trail is on state forest land, the Division of Forestry was charged with maintaining that trail as Outdoor Recreation repositions its assets to other projects. The Division of Outdoor Recreation does not have the mission to manage state forests.</p>
<p>What was the dollar amount of revenue from the timber industry contracts on State DoF lands last year, including roads, etc.? (Not just per board foot) or how many board feet per acre. 17,000,000 - 4,000,000</p>	<p>Last year the expected revenue on state forest timber sale contracts totaled \$2,988,047. Net revenue after expenses for these contracts is \$2,827,673.</p>
<p>If I buy 100 bags of food a year, but only eat 60% what happens to the other 40% and the other 40 bags of food!</p>	<p>The other 40 bags sit in your pantry to use another year, or spoils. If you keep putting 40% of your bags of food in the pantry and don't use it you'll find this not sustainable- a bad decision.</p>
<p>How can we improve access to our Indiana caves?</p>	<p>Currently almost all caves on state properties have been closed due to the fungal infection within the cave systems called "white nose syndrome." The Division is considering options to open selected caves.</p>
<p>The US Forest Service considers openings from logging that are larger than 3 acres to be a clearcut. You are calling cuts of up to 9 acres to be group tree selection. Aren't you actually clearcutting when you do group tree selection cuts that large?</p>	<p>There is no common size definition among agencies and experts regarding this because the primary definition of a clearcut is based more on intent and condition than size. There is nothing special that happens that makes a 2.9 acre opening not a clearcut and a 3.1 acre opening a clearcut.</p>
<p>Mr. Seifert says there are no ash trees found yet that are resistant to emerald ash borer. US Forest Service Research data indicate a small percentage of white & green ash are resistant genetically to EAB & research also indicates as much as 49% of blue ash are surviving EAB. Do you deny this?</p>	<p>Studies are being done to determine if "lingering" ash trees that survived the first wave of infestation are truly resistant, tolerant of, or escaped the infestation that occurred. It is true that blue ash are showing substantially more resistance or tolerance to borer infestation than green and white ash.</p>
<p>Selling of public timber (bought by taxpayers) - to whom is it sold and how?</p>	<p>State forest timber is sold to local buyers through a competitive sealed bid process.</p>
<p>How is hardwood the #1 agriculture product?</p>	<p>These data come from various agricultural reports. The unique situation for Indiana hardwoods is that trees are grown, harvested and a significant part is manufactured into secondary products by Indiana companies (2012 Bio-Crossroads Report: Food and Agricultural Innovation. 21st Century Opportunities for Indiana).</p>

Statement Summary	Response
<p>1. Why are input groups not mentioned by name? Who were the constituent groups invited to make input? And why?</p> <p>2. What are you asking for from State Legislature in your budget now? After mill tax? Caps?</p> <p>3. Why is summer help used on private lands?</p> <p>4. Prison labor - who pays them, transportation, food.</p> <p>5. What is management plan for the Corps of Engineering Land?</p> <p>6. How are you enhancing natural cultural uses?</p> <p>7. What does "60% of Growth" mean if we are growing 24 million BF?</p> <p>8. Will you stop closing the States finest trails to logging?</p> <p>9. How do you deal with counties? Property tax?</p>	<p>1) Input groups are no secret. They will be listed in the formal responses.</p> <p>2) The Division of Forestry does not directly ask for state appropriations (budget) from the General Assembly. It is part of the whole DNR budget as well as the state's budget request to the General Assembly. Mill tax is no longer an option as a funding source.</p> <p>3) The use of forestry interns provide valuable experience to young foresters under the supervision of trained foresters and helps accomplish program goals.</p> <p>4) Offender labor is supported by the Department of Corrections.</p> <p>5) At this time, we are not aware of a forest management plan for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' land.</p> <p>6) Natural cultural resources are managed by the Division's archaeologist. This person reviews, catalogues and helps the Division preserve this resource.</p> <p>7) The State Forests currently contain approximately 1.153 billion board feet of timber, and is adding (growing) an additional 24 million board feet (mbf) annually. Thus, 60% of the annual growth (24 mbf) would be 14.4 mbf, which is the current harvest level.</p> <p>8) Trails are only closed during the active logging period. This is a safety issue. Whenever feasible, a re-route is built into the tract.</p> <p>9) Is the question "How is the Division dealing with county property taxes?" The Division returns to those counties that had a harvest 15% on the net income from all State Forest timber sales that year.</p>
<p>How do we change the arrangement by which the Division's funding is largely dependent on timber sales?</p>	<p>The Division of Forestry's budget comes primarily from two sources: <u>Dedicated revenue</u>, which comes from timber sales, recreation, grants and tree seedling sales. The cumulative amount is about 60% of the annual budget. The remaining 40% comes from <u>general fund</u> money (tax payer dollars) which is appropriated by the legislature. While timber revenues do help support Forestry programs, harvests are conducted as part of the overall program to manage forest resources and ensure long term forest health, sustainability and habitat diversity.</p>
<p>1. Who gets the contracts to cut in Indiana?</p> <p>2. Are the location of Indiana trails such as Knobstone, Tecumseh considered in allowing areas to be cut?</p>	<p>1. Local licensed timber buyers who are the winning bid in a sealed bid process get contracts on Indiana State Forests.</p> <p>2. All trails are considered. Since most trails cover vast areas and traverse much of a state forest, they are difficult. There may be modifications to the methods employed to reduce impacts along trails, though there is not an effort to hide operations. Trails are usually rerouted during operations for safety purposes.</p>
<p>Timber in Salamonie State Forest - is it still considered a fire hazard due to old timber? We receive a letter several years ago that it was, has this improved?</p>	<p>Yes, the continuing decline and death of pine has maintained a high fuel load. Pine tends to be a more volatile fuel for wildfire than hardwoods. This should improve over time as older downed pine decays, and less of it dies because there is less left alive. The humid Indiana climate also helps to mitigate fire concerns.</p>
<p>Why do we cut immature trees from our Parks and Forests? Why does cottonwood not mature?</p>	<p>Immature trees may be cut for a number of reasons. Sometimes it is to improve the growth of nearby trees. It may also be to establish new young trees. Cottonwood does mature.</p>
<p>Has Indiana ever considered planting some of the rare woods being wiped out in other countries that may cease to exist, such as teak, mahogany or rosewood if feasible?</p>	<p>No. Trees such as teak, mahogany and rosewood are tropical. The Midwest's climate is too cold for those trees. We concentrate our efforts on native tree species and may someday see the return of American Chestnut to Indiana's forests.</p>

Statement Summary	Response
<p>How can we find out what the Salamonie State Forest income and expenses have been for the last 5 years - including # of people salaries, outsourced expenses, income sources (in detail). Also, what are plans for future income/expenses for improving the Salamonie fire safety, recreational use, and beautification? Invasive species reduction - when is it planned?</p>	<p>The Division of State Parks (DSP) has taken care of the day to day operations of Salamonie River State Forest for the past two decades. This was due to a staff downsizing that was ordered. DSP would have information regarding income and expenses regarding that time period. Future plans will be determined after the Division of Forestry takes over administration of the property. Invasive species treatment is one of the items to be addressed.</p>
<p>Forestry plans for Salamonie State Forest, timber sales, trail, maintenance, up keep of campgrounds, improvements etc. Plans on cleaning up Salamonie (dead trees, wood, etc.)?</p>	<p>Future plans will be determined after the Division of Forestry takes over the administration of the property. Forest resource management plans will be viewable on the Forestry website.</p>
<p>Why couldn't we allow individuals to cut up all the dead trees in the State Forest for firewood to help clean it up?</p>	<p>Firewood cutting for a fee is allowed and has been allowed for decades.</p>
<p>What budget request DO YOU MAKE TO THE LEGISLATURE? 1. Do you ask for Mill Tax reinstatement 2. Why not TRY asking for 3 million - that is relatively little</p>	<p>The mill tax was removed from statute a number of years ago. It is not the Division's option to request the reinstatement of that tax. The Division's budget is part of the entire DNR's budget request, which is part of the state request. Budget requests do not necessarily result in a final budget. Many factors influence what the final funding level is for every part of state government.</p>
<p>Why adopt a trail when you close it for logging & treat volunteers like chumps? Ditto for horse trails, injurious to horse & rider. E.g. Owen-Putnam</p>	<p>You are correct in that recreation trails are periodically closed and affected by forest management operations. This does present a challenge to trail maintenance and successful trail volunteer programs.</p>
<p>Are you "circling by" on climate change "because our Governor is a climate change denier? Would you lose your job as those Florida DNR employees did?</p>	<p>The issue of climate change and the ability of forests to possibly mitigate those effects are still under consideration. The entire carbon cycle, which includes forests, is a very complex process. Many of the leading universities are still trying to understand this dynamic cycle. We have chosen to keep the door open on forest management and climate change and will expand the climate change component of the Plan.</p>
<p>Why do you have to have so much "balance" in management of State Forests: e.g.: early successional to OLDER. Why cut down "OLDER" to make "early" which is most rest of state already? Managing in vacuum?? With Blinders on.</p>	<p>Balance is to provide for a diversity of habitats to increase diversity for species. Research shows a strong preference for many species of wildlife to use a variety of habitats at different life stages. From 1967 to 2014 sawtimber (mature) forest stands have increased to 78% of all forest land in Indiana (government and private). Meanwhile, the early successional seedling/sapling /shrub stage has declined from nearly 25% of the forest land to 7%. Many wildlife habitat professionals have recommended an early successional level of 10-20% on public forest lands due to the ephemeral nature of young forest and the under-represented status of early-successional habitat. However, since current state forest early-successional forest habitat levels are well below 10%, the goal of 10% in the Strategic Plan is expected to be an attainable first step toward balancing age-classes.</p>
<p>When the harvest of trees is done, who signs off on the logging company? Many horse/multi use trails are unstable after logging.</p>	<p>The administering forester and/or the property manager give(s) the final approval when a harvest is completed. Trails are reviewed and scheduled for repairs where needed.</p>

Statement Summary	Response
Does the Tri County property no longer have a "shooting range?"	This is a Division of Fish and Wildlife property, and the question should be directed to them (317-232-4080).
<p>1. Does our timber go to other countries from the logging done in our state forests?</p> <p>2. Why weren't cabins placed in horse camps?</p> <p>3. Beaver damage GSSF - what's being done?</p>	<p>1. It is very likely that some of the wood harvested ends up in other countries. Wood is a globally traded commodity, just like corn or soybeans. Forest products companies from Indiana do business around the world.</p> <p>2. Cabins are in the horse campground at Deam Lake SRA. Other areas will be evaluated during this Strategic Plan period.</p> <p>3. Beaver presence has increased since the decline of the fur market. Trappers are periodically hired or issued a permit to reduce beaver damage.</p>
What is the driving force behind DoF policy? Whatever political administration is in office, as best practices of forestry, environmental protection?	The driving force for policy is scientific understanding of the forests and the needs of the various components of that system. A secondary factor is meeting the requirements and high standards of the certification organizations.
Has climate change and public health been considered in this Strategic Plan? Explain why/why not/how?	Yes. The Division has been in consultation with the Indiana Dept. of Environmental Management. The issue of climate change was included in the current Plan to allow us in future years to provide possible solutions via the forest base. Currently the Division is providing 2-3 million seedlings per year to Indiana residents for reforestation/afforestation projects as well as converting currently owned and newly purchase non-forested lands back to trees.
How are you ensuring limited impact on Indiana & long eared bat populations with the current summer & fall logging practices?	The Division of Forestry is following agreed-upon operational guidance from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to limit impacts.
Are staff people being replaced when there is a retirement or someone leaving? If good forestry is important to environment why can we not get Lawmakers to help the Division out financially? It makes good sense to work on this.	Yes, but the process can be slow. In most cases, there is a 6 -12 month delay in filling. And there are also some positions that have been placed on temporary hold, meaning that until the budget improves, those positions will be keep vacant.
Will Stagestop campground & Blue River Access in Harrison-Crawford SF reopen and be improved or restored? Same question for Wyandotte Lake. Iron Bridge access site in poor shape too. Need improvements in this area.	Stagestop Campground is managed by O'Bannon Woods State Park. They continue to evaluate the feasibility of improving and reopening the campground. The Division of Forestry has looked at Wyandotte Lake for restoration work, but that may not occur in this planning cycle. The iron bridge public access site on the Blue River will be reviewed for possible improvements.
Please explain how we lost 26% of Forest Division funding after 2008 and when compared to 2015 budget on page 3 of the Plan.	The Division lost the "mill tax" during State property tax reforms, as well as had to take reductions in spending because there was less tax revenue coming into the State, an effect of the "great recession."
What procedures would determine that a tract of land is "non-essential?" Additionally, what guidelines would determine what constitutes an equitable trade of land and who would oversee the exchange?	A parcel of land would be evaluated for what biological or cultural resources it contained. It would also be evaluated for amount of benefit to users. It would be placed on the website for public comment. Determination of equitable trade would be an analysis of the values (appraisal) of parcels considered for a trade. The DNR Division of Land Acquisition would oversee any trade.

Statement Summary	Response
<p>Goal #1: State Forest Recreation. What have you to say to recreational users (hikers, mountain bikers, horsemen, campers) whose trails/rec. areas are being made unusable due to logging?</p>	<p>Our 600 miles of recreation trails are an important part of the multiple-use management on the State Forest system. For safety reasons, recreation trails are periodically closed and affected by forest management operations. We are committed in this planning cycle to improve trail management and provide alternative trails when affected by other activities.</p>
<p>What must we do to ensure that a 60 day public comment period is erected? Three meetings are not enough. What is next step in making this happen?</p>	<p>The Division has and continues to seek public input on all our activities. This Plan was made available beginning in April 2015 and comments accepted through October 2015. If new science or issues relevant to the science of managing forests is brought to our attention, it could possibly affect management actions. The most recent audit by the certification groups noted that the Division of Forestry has an exemplary procedure for public input and found our open houses, Internet accessibility of documents, overview of management plans, public stake holders meetings and the addition of a 30-day comment period meet all certification requirements.</p>
<p>Have environmental impact studies/statements been conducted/filed regarding the impact of the proposed Plan on populations of least shrews and Smokey Shrews? If so, by whom? Both species are listed as "special concern" by IDNR.</p>	<p>All state and federal listed flora and fauna known to occur on state forests up to 2008 were included in the State Forest Environmental Assessment (www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-StateForests_EA.pdf). No least shrew observations occurred on state forests at that time, or since then, so they were not included in the Environmental Assessment. In 2008, there had been no known observations on State Forests of smokey shrews, so they were not included in the EA, either. Since 2008, smokey shrews have been infrequently captured during annual surveys within a state forest research area. An update to the State Forest Environmental Assessment is currently under development, and smokey shrews will be included.</p>
<p>1. Are there plans to dredge the Ferdinand S.F. lake? 2. What is the Division of Forestry (DoF) doing to ensure their staff foresters are of the highest quality? What is DoF doing to retain them?</p>	<p>1. The removal of the sediment buildup in the upper end of Ferdinand Lake is a priority for DoF lake restoration efforts. However, that may not occur in this planning cycle. 2. Foresters hired by the Division of Forestry must possess a forestry degree from an accredited program. We provide regular training opportunities as a means to improve skills and aid in retention.</p>
<p>1. How did you determine the diversity goal (10% older, 10% early) was a best management practice? 2. How do you validate BMP's?</p>	<p>1. IDNR Division of Fish & Wildlife, wildlife biologists have recommended to Forestry "that woodlands on IDNR properties utilize a combination of uncut and overmature areas (approximately 10% of forested area) with the remaining woodlands on an 80- to 100-year cutting rotation using a balance of uneven and even-aged systems." The goal of 10% early successional forest was chosen to provide balance between the amount of older forests and young forest patches (www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/images/Forest_wildlife_StudyTeam.final.pdf) Many wildlife habitat professionals have recommended an early successional level of 10-20% on public forest lands due to the ephemeral nature of young forest and the under-represented status of early-successional habitat. However, since current state forest early-successional forest habitat levels are well below 10%, the goal of 10% in the Strategic Plan is expected to be an attainable step toward balancing age-classes. 2. BMP implementation is evaluated by the property forester in charge of the project. Timber harvests are additionally reviewed by the Division's water-quality expert and outside reviewers for BMP compliance.</p>

Statement Summary	Response
<p>With proposed logging what replanting is done? What? How much? How is this determined?</p>	<p>Most logging does not require replanting. Usually after logging a fully stocked stand of trees is left. In cases of an opening, natural regeneration in the form of established seedlings or dormant natural seed will quickly revegetate the site with thousands of trees/acre within 3 years.</p>
<p>Why is no timber sale data available on the DoF website for 2013? Are timber sales revenue reported and totaled for the fiscal year (7/1 -6/30) (I believe) or for the calendar year (1/1 -12/31)?</p>	<p>This omission occurred during a website changeover. We will look at having this material posted to the website in 2016. Timber sale revenues are reported in fiscal year and calendar year basis depending on the need for the information.</p>
<p>Did you give Indiana Forest Alliance permission to video tape the meeting? I did not sign a release for my image to be used & do not want it used in one of their videos.</p>	<p>No. All meetings held by state agencies are open to various recording media.</p>
<p>The \$2/acre (or what whatever) is a terrible idea for promoting enrollment, retaining, and management of private timber. Surely there is a better way to recover \$1.3 million/year.</p> <p>CFM Fee: How about "forgiving" back taxes owed if a person takes his/her land out of the CF&W program?</p> <p>The public value open space, forest, clean air. We are doing them a service. Why charge us for the fees? They need to be shared by all that benefit. We are already facing property taxes hikes on our farmland every year. The so called cap has only meant increases for us. It's not our fault the state cannot manage its resources. Our roads are shot.</p> <p>1. For people in CFW program, is there a grace period when they can drop out without penalty? 2. What would the revenue from private lands fees be used for? Additional staffing or programs?</p> <p>Will CFW landowners have a grace period to get out of the program without penalty?</p> <p>How will fees be collected from landowners who pay no property taxes now?</p> <p>If District Foresters do not step foot on my property in a given year will there still be assessed a fee?</p>	<p>The Division of Forestry is considering fees for private forest lands because it is required by law. Indiana Code directs the Division of Forestry to provide assistance to forest owners at the expense of the owner. This requirement has been in the law since 1919.</p> <p>IC 14-23-1-1 Duties of the Department Sec 1. The department shall do the following:...</p> <p>(12) Examine private forest land: (A) upon the request of; and (B) at the expense of; the owner for the purposes of advising the owner on the proper methods of forest management.</p> <p>In spring 2015, the Natural Resources Commission initially approved a \$10/acre fee for private forest land assistance. The Division of Forestry presented a draft proposal at the Strategic Plan Meetings: Classified Forest & Wildland Program Fees * Annual Administration fee \$2/acre (county collects and keeps 10%) * All other service free for classified landowners</p> <p>Non-Classified Land Fees * Stewardship Plans \$200; Stewardship Plan revision for non-CRP cost share \$100 * Practice Plans for invasive control and tree planting (non-CRP related) \$100</p> <p>The discussion on fees for service on private land is ongoing. The final fee proposal for private lands is not expected until Winter 2016. The Division of Forestry will continue discussing options with landowners and interest groups through most of 2016.</p>

Statement Summary	Response
<p>Are you aware of the recently published global study (Nature, 2014) regarding the impact of mature trees vs. immature trees on Carbon sequestration? (1 mature tree can fix as much carbon in a year as is contained in a medium-sized tree!)</p>	<p>Yes. The carbon issue can be influenced by tree age, density of trees per acre, soil, moisture, soil quality, etc. So, one study does not necessary close the science on the issue. The work done by IU on the Ameri-flux tower at Morgan-Monroe State is a great example. One of the summary observations was that without adequate moisture, longer growing seasons may not result in more carbon sequestered. Also, harvesting and sequestering carbon on long-lived forest products can provide as much if not more carbon storage than just in live trees.</p>
<p>What is being done concerning tree of heaven on private land?</p>	<p>The Division of Forestry works with landowners to help identify tree of heaven (ailanthus) and gives management recommendations to control this invasive species. The Natural Resources Conservation Service's Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) provides federal cost share to treat invasive species, including tree of heaven. Verticillium wilt, caused by a soil borne fungus, will kill tree of heaven. Research is being done to look at the verticillium fungus as a biocontrol for ailanthus.</p>
<p>What % of the private land in CFM is harvested for timber, and do you look for land to connect State lands.</p>	<p>Based on Annual Reports submitted by Classified Forest & Wildlands landowner 3-5% of classified forest are harvested in any given year.</p> <p>The Division of Forestry does not consider connectivity to State Forest, when enrolling land in the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program. Connectivity to State-owned land is considered when the DNR is acquiring land.</p>
<p>By statute what is the Division of Forestry (DoF) required to provide for classified forest owners?</p>	<p>Indiana law requires DoF to provide the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Forms and Approvals (applications, withdraw paperwork, special permits, etc.). 2) Four Classified Forest and Wildlands signs. 3) On the ground property visit once every seven years. Visit is to provide recommendations and a written report of the visit. <p>The Indiana statutes dealing with the Classified Forest & Wildlands Program are IC 6-1.1-6 and 312 IAC 15. Links to the laws are available on the Division of Forestry's Classified Forest & Wildlands webpage: www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/4801.htm</p>
<p>Allow cutting fire wood for a fee.</p>	<p>Firewood cutting for a fee is allowed and has been allowed for decades. The permit fee is \$10/rick.</p>

Commenter Names and Affiliation

Below is a table listing all individuals, organizations and stated affiliations who submitted a written or verbal comment about the Strategic Plan or its process. A total of 228 respondents were logged during this public input period.

Respondent #	First Name	Last Name	Stated Affiliation/Organization
1	Martha	Burton	
2	Paula	Albers	
3	Vera	Grubbs	
4	Marsha	Bedwell	Horse Club
5	Rock	Emmert	Forest Park High School
6	Charlie	Cole	Yellowwood Lake Watershed Group
7	Rhonda	Carr	
8	Doug	Berky	Heart of the River Coalition
9	Robert & Leslie	Patterson	
10	Sarah	Grain	
11	Mary	Jones	
12	Marc	Milne	
13	Kurt J.	Meier	
14	Stephen	Trippel	
15	Jeff	Marks	
16	Susan	Hollis Bassett	
17	Brian	Hoover	
18	Tim	Weaver	
19	Paul F.	Sackman	
20	Steve	Gage	National Wild Turkey Federation, Indiana Chapter
21	Janet	Hollis Selby	
22	Thomas	Tokarski	
23	Correta	York	
24	Mary K.	Rothert	
25	Pam	Raider	
26	David E.	Lawler	
27			Indiana Association of Consulting Foresters
28	James & Andrea	Ferguson	
29	Anonymous 1		
30	Jeanne	Melchior	
31	Bryon W.	Steele	
32	Timothy	Calahan	
33	Catherine	Greene	
34	David A.	Bottorff	Association of Indiana Counties

Commenter Names and Affiliation

Respondent #	First Name	Last Name	Stated Affiliation
35	James	Steen	Pike Lumber Company, Inc.
36	Brittany	Harcourt	
37	P. David	Simcox	
38	Lewis	Brown	
39	Abby	Stayer	
40	Toria	Braun	
41	Clemencia	Tello-Rojas	
42	Shelby	Springer	
43	Brandon	Scruggs	
44	Mohammad		
45	Kelsey	Baker	
46	Matt	Thomas	
47	Gage	Seaborn	
48	Emma	Myers	
49	Rachel	Hawkins	
50	Ciana	Sorentino	
51	Emily	Cart	
52	Riley	Steimel	
53	Emily	Slayer	
54	Hunter		
55	Jason	Flicker	Indiana Forest Alliance
56	Bowden	Quinn	Hoosier Chapter Sierra Club
57	Roger	Reese	Knob and Valley Audubon Society
58	John	Blair	Valley Watch
59	Tim	Maloney	Hoosier Environmental Council
60	B.J.	Gray	Save the Valley
61	Elizabeth	Mangum	
62	Peter	Scott	
63	Sidarth	Dasari	
64	Brian	Cross	
65	Richard	Vernier	Indiana Karst Conservancy, National Speleological Society, Evansville Metro Grotto
66	Donnie	Byers	Evansville Metro Grotto
67	Eric	Ellis	Ruffed Grouse Society/ American Woodcock Society
68	Richard L.	Powell	
69	Keith J.	Hampton	
70	Bill	Minter	Indiana Society of American Foresters
71	Ty	Spatta	Indiana Cave Survey Notebook
72	Marcella	Larch	
73	Silvia	Schneirov	

Commenter Names and Affiliation

Respondent #	First Name	Last Name	Stated Affiliation
74	Ray	Moistner	Indiana Hardwood Lumbermen's Association
75	Susan	Clearwater	
76	Jeff	Stant	Indiana Forest Alliance
77	Richard	Newton	
78	Charlene	Marsh	
79	Ronald	Adams	Central Indiana Grotto, Indiana Karst Conservancy, Indiana Cave Survey, National Speleological Society
80	Brian	Walker	Indiana Karst Conservancy
81	Gene S.	Elias	
82	Laura	Demarest	Bloomington Indiana Grotto, Indiana Karst Conservancy, Indiana Speleological Survey, Indiana Cave Survey, National Speleological Society
83	Kevin	Manley	Dubois County Visitor Center
84	Dean	Farr	
85	George P.	Cesnik	
86	John	Benton	National Speleological Society
87	Barry	Banks	Red-Tail Land Conservancy
88	Andrew	Eddleman	
89	Jim	Wichman	
90	Barbara	Simpson	Indiana Wildlife Federation
91	Richard M.	McFall	
92	Dave	Everton	Indiana Karst Conservancy, National Speleological Society, Indiana Cave Survey, Indiana Speleological Survey
93	Franklin R.	Meadows	
94	Joseph B.	Kinder	Central Indiana Grotto, Indiana Karst Conservancy, Indiana Cave Survey, National Speleological Society
95	Keith	Dunlap	Indiana Karst Conservancy
96	Zack	Snyder	Central Indiana Grotto
97	Lisa	Hays	
98	Joy	Baiz	
99	Horace	Tucker	
100	Andrew	Niedermeyer	
101	Steve	Schwoeppe	
102	Willie	Wireman	
103	Joan	Middendorf	
104	Ann	Deutch	
105	Pamela J.	Davidson	
106	Brian	Wolka	
107	Darlene	Messenger	
108	Philip	Gramelspacher	
109	Colton	Cooley	

Commenter Names and Affiliation

Respondent #	First Name	Last Name	Stated Affiliation
110	Gary A.	Walters	
111	Greg	Spurgeon	
112	Neil	Collignon	
113	Curt	Kovener	
114	N	Muccillo	
115	Tom	Zeller	
116	Mary	Bookwalter	Indiana Forest Alliance
117	Catherine	Rountree	
118	Wayne	Werne	
119	Mark	Dunn	
120	Maura	Buckley	
121	Christine	Linnemeier	
122	Liz	Jackson	Indiana Forest and Woodland Owners Association
123	Dana	Ericson	
124	Doug	Allman	
125	J.	Wackowski	
126	Sara	Waters	
127	Victoria	Osika	
128	Donald L.	Jordon	
129	Garry	Weybright	
130	Tom	Hougham	
131	Doug	Brown	
132	Robert	McClary	
133	Dean	Baker	
134	Regina	Allman	
135	Sam	Durham	
136	Glenn	Durham	
137	Lois	Clark	
138	Don	Durham	
139	Robert	Mills	
140	K.	Allanson	
141	James I.	Jean	
142	Thomas	Cooley	
143	David H.	Seastrom	
144	Danny	Pearson	
145	Gary	Mundy	
146	Linda	Baden	
147	Goniela	Iskali	
148	Paul	Bryan	

Commenter Names and Affiliation

Respondent #	First Name	Last Name	Stated Affiliation
149	Michele	Wedel	
150	Curt	Mayfield	
151	Ernie	Reed	Heartwood
152	Anna	Batz	
153	Scott	Hampton	
154	Micah	Keith	
155	Michael	Keith	
156	Ian	Morrall	
157	Joe	Schuerman	
158	Luke	Sowa	
159	Rhett	Steele	
160	Anonymous 2		
161	Franklin	Lograsso	
162	Anonymous 3		
163	Karen	Smith	
164	Angelo J.	Dattilo	
165	Shari R.	Frank	
166	Michael	McDonald	
167	Linda	Booher	
168	Allen	Pursell	The Nature Conservancy
169	Steven	Levine	
170	Jeff	Page	
171	Andrew	Fritz	
172	Mark	Helmond	
173	Lisa	Phillips	
174	Ron	Wolka	
175	Thomas E.	Waters	
176	Samuel E.	Flenner III	
177	Allan	Holle	
178	Michael	Holle	
179	V. G. (Trudy)	Hammond	
180	Lynn	Morningstar	
181	Tim	Steltenpohl	
182	Mendy	Lassaline	Perry County Assessor Office
183	Shelly	Wolf	Indiana Karst Conservancy, National Speleological Society, Indiana Cave Survey, Central Indiana Grotto, LG
184	Danyele	Green	Bloomington Indiana Grotto, Indiana Karst Conservancy, Indiana Cave Survey, Indiana University Caving Club, Rockcastle Karst Conservancy - Kentucky, Kentucky Karst Conservancy
185	Paul	Eads	

Commenter Names and Affiliation

Respondent #	First Name	Last Name	Stated Affiliation
186			IN DNR Fish and Wildlife
187	James	Beard	
188	Mike	Diener	Wally's Woods, Inc.
189	Audrey	Moore	
190	Chris	Barth	
191	Chuck	Turner	Indianapolis Hiking Club
192	Greg	Koontz	
193	Mark	Cagle	
194	Jack	Brubaker	
195	Robert	Marr	
196	Betty	Wagoner	
197	Ray	Long	Indiana Cave Survey, Indiana Karst Conservancy, Central Indiana Grotto, Louisville Grotto, Kentucky Karst Conservancy
198	Clyde	Irvine	
199	Thomas	Beauchamp	
200	Kenneth	Olin	
201	Bill	Herring	
202	Gretchen	Laymon	
203	Holly	Jones	Indiana Urban Forest Council
204	Ryan	Boyer	
205	Chris	Egolf	
206	Randy	Showalter	
207	Rich	Solano	
208	Dee	Moore	
209	Judy	Colby	
210	Robert	Sloman	
211	Michael	Fulton	
212	Samuel	Klawitter	
213	Myke	Lurtsema	Heartwood
214	Jack	Corpuz	Ruffed Grouse Society
215	Paulette	Justice	
216	Suzanne	Mittenthal	Knobstone Hiking Trail Association
217	Bob	Graves	Hoosier Back Country Horseman
218	Michael	Ryan	
219	Mary	Huber	
220	Kendrick	Putran	
221	Brent	Clary	
222	Evonne & James	Schmitt	
223	Chris	Feirebach	

Commenter Names and Affiliation

Respondent #	First Name	Last Name	Stated Affiliation
224	Brian	Biery	
225	Kathy	Klawitter	
226	Laurie	Becker	
227	Stephen	Liebering	
228	Martha	Jackson	