

# **MANAGING MARYLAND'S STATE FORESTS: MORE THAN A MATTER FOR DEBATE**

A report commissioned and supported by:  
The Harry R. Hughes Center for Agro-Ecology, Inc.,  
University of Maryland, College Park

Jennifer Dindinger, Agent, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources,  
University of Maryland Extension, Dorchester County

Sarah Taylor-Rogers, PhD, Assistant Director, Harry R. Hughes Center  
for Agro-Ecology, Inc., College of Agriculture and Natural Resources,  
University of Maryland, College Park

## Acknowledgments

This report would not have been written without the participation of many non-governmental organizations, trade associations and state and local agencies specifically:

1000 Friends of Maryland, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay, American Forestry Paper Association, Association of Forest Industries, Audubon Naturalist Society, Audubon Society, Baltimore County Department of Environmental Resource Protection and Resource Management, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Forest Stewardship Council, Forestry and Conservation Associates, Maryland Alliance for Greenways Improvement and Conservation, Maryland Association of Forest Conservancy District Boards, Maryland Conservation Council, Maryland Forests Association, Mary PIRG, The Nature Conservancy, Partnership for Sustainable Forestry, Rural Maryland Council, The Sierra Club-Maryland Chapter, State Foresters and their staffs, as well as, academics who participated represented:

Alabama, Alaska, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia and Wisconsin.

And last but not least, the Department of Natural Resources, Forest Service provided immeasurable assistance and grounding for the project. Thank you Steve Koehn, Don Van Hassant, Jack Perdue, Jeff Horan and John Wilson.

## Purpose

From 2003 to approximately 2005 there was a concerted effort made by several organizations<sup>1</sup> to preserve as many acres of forestland as possible in Maryland. The reason for this effort were based upon threats to forest tracks from development, the opportunity to become part of a multistate effort to create an Appalachian Preserve connecting wildland from Georgia through Pennsylvania and the perception that the Department of Natural Resources Forest Service would continue opening its public lands to timber harvest as the Forest Service's budget depended upon the revenues from timber sales.

The timber cuts were perceived as threats to remaining old growth forests as well as causing fragmentation of habitats and the Department was not reviewed as being one that managed the forest resource for diversity of habitat, ecosystem function, water quality and air quality in addition to programmatic income. Hence this period in time became known as: "To cut or not to cut" the forest resources of Maryland.

This report reviewed the management approaches taken in Maryland and through the use of interviews and surveys provides findings for consideration.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Sierra Club, Maryland League of Conservation Voters, 1000 Friends of Maryland, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Wilderness Society, Trust for Public Lands.

## Table of Contents

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Acknowledgments.....  | ii  |
| Purpose.....  | iii |
| Chapter 1 - Maryland's Practice of Forest Management .....            | 2   |
| Chapter 2 - Methodology .....   | 4   |
| Chapter 3 - Results.....  | 6   |
| I: Group Interview Results.....                                       | 6   |
| II: State Forester Survey Results.....                                | 16  |
| Appendices:   |     |
| Appendix A  |     |
| Interview Questions for Organizations .....                           | 19  |
| Appendix A-1  |     |
| Interview Questions for DNR Forest Service .....                      | 21  |
| Appendix B  |     |
| List of Interviewed Organizations and Content of the Interviews ..... | 23  |
| Appendix C  |     |
| Introduction to the Survey and the Questions for State .....          | 105 |
| Appendix D  |     |
| Data from the Survey .....  | 113 |
| Appendix E  |     |
| Tabular Presentations of State Forester Results.....                  | 141 |

# Chapter 1

## Maryland's Practice of Forest Management

In 1996, the Department of Natural Resources Forest Service came into being. The Service was built upon nine decades of management through a lineage beginning in 1906 under the direction of Frederick W. Besley as the State Forester and even though the managing entity names changed along with the succession of State Foresters to, the present day; actions pursued and laws passed at the Federal and State level have been consistent with the Service Mission for forests in Maryland:

“To conserve and enhance the quality, quantity, productivity and biological diversity of the forest and tree resources of Maryland.”

It should be noted that currently the wording has changed, but still harkens back to the original intent.<sup>2</sup>

In 1943, an underpinning for Management came through the passage of Maryland's Forestry Conservancy District Act of 1943 [Section 5-602 of the Natural Resources Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland] which stated:

“It is the policy of the state to encourage economic management and scientific development of its forests and woodlands to maintain, conserve and improve the soil resources of the state so that an adequate source of forest projects is preserved for the people.”

This legislation brought together private landowners of forest land with the State so that together scientific forest principals could be implemented on these lands and that benefits would be derived therefrom.

Passage was important because heretofore forests had been subject to exploitation in the 1800's with extensive loss of hardwoods and an overabundance of cut timber. It was in the early 1900's that people began to realize that Maryland's forests needed to be conserved. And it was at this time that 2000 acres were offered to the State that is known as Garrett State Forest.

As more and more people began to visit and enjoy the State's forestry resources, the concept of multiple use management emerged. That concept initiated long-range planning for forests in Maryland which in current times has evolved into inventories of the public forests not only for supply and demand but for yielding data to enable the Forest Service to plan for these resources.

Currently, the Forest Service manages the State forest lands with fewer professionals on the staff than used to be. However it continues to manage the forests for sustainability which means for biological diversity, ecological function and forest production with other needs of the citizens considered. Only, 1,790 of the 434,000 acres of Department of Natural Resources managed land is for timber products.

---

<sup>2</sup> “A Brief History of the Forest Service” Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Retrieved 20 November, 2015

In fact, in a letter dated January 17, 2012 to the Honorable Joan Carter Conway, Chair of the Senate Education, Health and Environmental Affairs Committee and to the Honorable Maggie L. McIntosh, Chair of the House Environmental Matters Committee from then Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources, John Griffin it was noted:

“The Department supports the Sustainable Forestry Council’s proposed definition of “no net loss of forests” and also the recommendation that at least 40% of land in the State is covered by forest.”

He further went on to state that forests should be identified and tracked using the State’s land use/land cover classification system from 2007 as a baseline and every three years thereafter assess the forest using statewide satellite imagery.

In the letter the recommendation made by the Ecosystem Services Workgroup, designed to encourage mitigation banking to help offset the loss of forest due to development was also supported. And in conclusion, the “no net loss” policy was believed to address the issues affecting environmental benefit as well as the economic health of forests such as low rates of sustainable private forest management, declining industry infrastructure, pests, pathogens and climate change.

With the transitions that have occurred over time Maryland is poised to take advantage of new environmental services that the market can bring such as carbon sequestration and nutrient trading. In doing so, partnerships will need to continue to be forged between the private and public sectors in order to retain and increase stewardship that will support sustainable healthy forests for the long term. Recommendations made in the report may add further substance to the case.

## Chapter 2

### Methodology

#### Data Collection

Three approaches were taken to gather data for this project.

A personal interview was conducted with representatives from twenty different environmental and conservation groups, industry representatives, citizen groups, and representatives from state and local governments in Maryland (Appendix B). These organizations were solicited because they had offered testimony on state forest management legislation in previous years, or had offered positions or comments on the management of state lands through the media, membership communications, or their websites. Interview questions (Appendices A and A-1) were reviewed and edited by Dr. Valerie Luzadis of the State University of New York, College of Environmental Sciences and Forestry and also submitted for approval to the Institutional Review Board (IRB), per University of Maryland policy. IRB “exempt status” was granted. Each interviewee signed and submitted an Informed Consent Agreement indicating his/her willingness to participate in the interview. The interviews were recorded on audiotape, transcribed, and the transcripts were sent to the interviewees to check for accuracy before including the information in the final report. Data gathered during the interview were analyzed at the organization-name level only; individual names were removed to protect confidentiality. An initial interview was conducted with the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Forest Service to obtain background information on the history of state forest management and on proposed policy and process changes for the state forests. The questions asked during that interview are in Appendix A-1.

A survey (Appendix C) was administered to the state forester for each state in the U.S. The survey instrument was reviewed by Dr. Luzadis and by Anne Heissenbuttel, then of the National Association of State Foresters (NASF). The survey was posted on the website of the NASF and Survey data were analyzed at the state-name level only; individual respondents’ names were removed to protect confidentiality. Thirty-four surveys were returned representing thirty-three states (Appendices D and E). Kansas was removed from the data set because the respondent reported that they have no state forests.

The third approach taken for this project was that of a literature search. Pertinent research reports examining the use of state forests for recreation, biodiversity, timber harvest, ecosystem services, and risk management were reviewed. Maryland-specific data regarding the history of state lands management were also garnered.

To monitor this overall effort, an Advisory Group was formed that included Dr. Bill Bentley, Dr. Peter Black, Dr. Norm Johnson, and Mr. Bob Wolf. The group reviewed the proposed methodology and made suggestions for enhancement.

## Data Analysis

### *Interviews*

The information from the interviews was recorded and organized by group (cut, no cut, or no position) and then further subcategorized by the nature of the questions (position on timber harvest, priorities for management, management recommendations). From these data, investigators identified common points of agreement and opportunities to build consensus between the groups. This information was used to assemble management and process recommendations for the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Forest Service.

### *State Forester Surveys*

The data from the state forester surveys were recorded and compiled into two documents (Appendices D and E). Results from the survey questions were reviewed and summarized. States facing similar issues to Maryland were highlighted and recommendations were made to DNR Forest Service based on the approaches taken by those states.



## Chapter 3

### Results

#### *I: Group Interview Results*

Twenty non-governmental organizations, trade associations, and state and local agencies were interviewed for the project (See Appendix B for the list of organizations and Appendices A and A-1 for the interview questions). The Maryland Department of Natural Resources Forest Service was interviewed to provide the Principal Investigators with background information regarding the Department's management priorities, state forest planning, and the public feedback process (Appendix B).

#### **A. Support for Timber Harvest on State-owned Lands**

In response to Question 1, "We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?" nine of the nineteen participating organizations indicated that they were in favor of or unopposed to timber harvest on state-owned lands. The reasons behind their positions are grouped into eight categories.

##### Water quality

*"The timber industry is a resource-based industry that is good for water quality."*

##### Economics

*"The timber industry provides an income stream from resource lands that helps landowners resist development pressure."*

##### Renewable Resource

*"The state should conserve resources for the use of its citizens, not preserve them and leave them unused. Forests are a renewable resource that should be used."*

##### Good for the Health of the Forest

*"There is no problem with thinning the forest – diverse groups of trees across age groups are good for the nutrient balance of the forest."*

##### Biodiversity

*"State forests:*

- are an important biodiversity conservation opportunity because they represent the last remaining large blocks of contiguous habitat*
- are important for maximizing forest ecosystem viability and ensuring that ecological and economic benefits can be sustained*

- *provide essential ecosystem services*
- *provide unique natural habitats for many rare, threatened, and endangered species*
- *are important open space and recreational lands for Marylanders*
- *can support sustainable timber harvest as one component of multi-use management as long as the harvest is managed to be compatible with the other essential uses and is outside of core set-aside forest reserves”*

#### Supported by Science

*“We support science-based natural resources management, including harvesting forest products to achieve resource and economic objectives.”*

#### State as a Model

*“The state should lead by example in how it manages the state lands.”*

#### Support for Multi-Use Management

*“We support the Governor’s Executive Order [01.01.2004.53, Governor’s Commission for Protecting the Chesapeake Bay through Sustainable Forestry] that calls for enhanced forestry management and dual third party certification.”*

Despite agreement that there is a role for timber harvest on state-owned lands, the nine respondents held differing viewpoints on the emphasis that should be placed on timber harvest. Some felt that the health of the forest and its ability to support biodiversity should be the primary goal, with sustainable timber harvest as a secondary but still necessary practice, while others indicated a concern for the limited amount of harvesting currently allowed and supported increasing the allowable timber harvest as a management tool to create a healthy forest.

### **Rationale for Support**

Question 2 asked, “On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?” The majority of the respondents relied on scientific research and professional experience for their positions.

*“Research shows that the amount of pollution coming from forest land is quite minimal and oftentimes the forest acts as a filter for other pollution sources.”*

*“We rely on the research community, including the scientific studies and reports that have been published.”*

*“Our position is based on years of experience and training of our members, who are landowners, natural resource professionals, and people in the wood products business.”*

### **B. Opposition to Timber Harvest on State-Owned Lands**

In response to Question 1, “We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland’s forest landholdings because we have seen your organization’s name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization’s position on this issue?” three of the nineteen participating organizations indicated that they were opposed to timber harvest on state-owned lands. Interviewees emphasized the need to protect biodiversity and large contiguous

sections of habitat for plant and animal communities. Respondents also supported the protection of land held in the public trust and were opposed to allowing commercial use of those lands.

*“Biodiversity, both of species and habitat, should be preserved on state-owned lands, or at least on the state lands controlled by the Department of Natural Resources. Public land should be saved, and resource extraction limited to private lands. Public lands are supposed to be for everyone; private lands can sustain tree farms or other agricultural enterprises.”*

*“We promote ecosystem protection on a landscape scale, especially as it relates to protecting contiguous wildlife habitat on the Appalachian Mountains.”*

## **Rationale for Opposition**

Question 2 asked, “On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?” As also indicated by the supporters of timber harvest on state-owned lands, the interviewees relied on a combination of scientific research and the experience of the members of their organizations.

*“We have relied upon many individual members throughout the years. These people, among others, have worked in and know the field and understand the situation we’re faced with.”*

*“We have relied on data from nongovernmental organizations, Maryland DNR, and the Southern Appalachian Forest Commission. The scientific literature we’ve uncovered says that protected areas should be about 50,000 acres or larger to sustain the ecosystem.”*

## **C. Top Three Priorities for the Management of State-owned Lands**

Question 3 asked, “What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.”

Table 1 lists the three most important issues from the nine organizations who indicated support for timber harvest on state-owned lands. Table 2 lists the three most important issues from the three organizations who were in opposition to timber harvest on state-owned lands.

Seven organizations and agencies interviewed during the project identified themselves as having no position on the matter of timber harvest on state-owned lands. These organizations did, however, offer observations and suggestions related to the management of state-owned lands, including their top three priorities for the management of forests on state-owned lands (Table 3).

Note that, although positions differ on the role of timber harvest on state-owned lands, nearly all of the respondents indicate some level of support for protecting biodiversity, ecosystem services, wildlife habitat, and economic return in these forests.

| <b>Table 1. Top Three Priorities for Organizations in Support of Timber Harvest on State-Owned Lands</b> |   |  |  |                                   |                       |                                 |                       |                       |                                   |
|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
|  | <b>Organization 1</b>                             | <b>Organization 2</b>  | <b>Organization 3</b>                  | <b>Organization 4</b>             | <b>Organization 5</b> | <b>Organization 6</b>           | <b>Organization 7</b> | <b>Organization 8</b> | <b>Organization 9</b>             |
| <b>1.</b>  | Water quality                                     | One priority should not outweigh another – all options are important to consider | Ecologically functioning core reserves | Recreation                        | All options are equal | Sustainable resource management | Health of the forest  | Habitat/ biodiversity | Economic value of timber          |
| <b>2.</b>  | Maintain viable timber industry to prevent sprawl |  | Biodiversity                           | Economic development for rural MD |                       | Water quality                   |                       | Water quality         | Habitat                           |
| <b>3.</b>  | Habitat value                                     |  | Ecosystem Services                     | Fire/pest/storm damage reduction  |                       | Economic returns                |                       | Recreation            | Minimize fire/insect/disease risk |

| <b>Table 2. Top Three Priorities for Organizations Opposed to Timber Harvest on State-Owned Lands</b> |                       |                       |                                    |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
|   | <b>Organization 1</b> | <b>Organization 2</b> | <b>Organization 3</b>              |
| <b>1.</b>   | Carbon sequestration  | Biodiversity          | Large contiguous blocks of habitat |
| <b>2.</b>   | Ecosystem Services    | Habitat value         | Preserve old growth                |
| <b>3.</b>   | Biodiversity          | Recreation            |                                    |

| <b>Table 3. Top Three Priorities for Organizations With No Position on Timber Harvest on State-Owned Lands</b> |                       |                           |  |                                     |                       |
|--|-----------------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
|  | <b>Organization 1</b> | <b>Organization 2</b>     | <b>Organization 3</b>                  | <b>Organization 4</b>               | <b>Organization 5</b> |
| <b>1.</b>  | Water quality         | All are equally important | Understand terms of ownership          | Protect ecologically valuable lands | Economic value        |
| <b>2.</b>  | Wildlife habitat      |                           | Assess each section of land separately | Biodiversity                        | Water quality         |
| <b>3.</b>  | Biodiversity          |                           | Maintain ecological function           | Water/air quality                   | Recreation            |

## **D. Perspectives on the Management of State-owned Lands**

Participants were asked several questions designed to elicit feedback on the effectiveness of state land management, especially related to the harvest of timber from state-owned lands.

### ***From those who support timber harvest on state-owned lands***

Question 4: “If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?”

All of the interviewees indicated that the management of the forests on state-owned lands should be directed by the trained professional foresters at the Maryland DNR Forest Service. Several suggestions were made for collaborative efforts between the Forest Service and other professionals in related fields:

*“Management should be led by DNR and a team of foresters, ecologists, fisheries biologists, and resource planners.”*

*“The Forest Service should spearhead this effort but there is a need for collaborative efforts with other state agencies such as Maryland Department of Agriculture, Maryland Department of the Environment, and even the Maryland Department of Business and Economic Development.”*

A majority of respondents also indicated that additional staff and funding resources should be directed to the Forest Service, to ensure that the professionals trained to manage the state-owned lands are able to fulfill their responsibilities.

*“Having sufficient agency resources – staff and funding – is a crucial requirement for comprehensive, efficient, and effective management of state forest resources for multiple uses.”*

*“The MD DNR Forest Service is best qualified to achieve this goal, given adequate resources and personnel.”*

Several additional management suggestions were made, including pursuing dual certification through the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and the Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) programs; revisiting the science regularly and making adjustments to management schemes as needed; establishing core reserves of protected habitat with surrounding buffers in which sustainable timber harvest would occur; focusing management on ecosystem value rather than extraction value; and increasing timber harvest on state-owned lands as a tool for creating a healthy forest.

Question 5: “What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?”

Respondents all agreed that the state forests should be managed with multiple uses in mind and should provide an array of services including conservation of biodiversity and wildlife habitat, improvement of water quality, sustainable timber harvest for the resource-based economy, and passive recreation. Several interviewees recommended a full array of age classes and stand types to improve the health and diversity of the forest, and advised DNR to consider management according to the way Maryland's state forests fit into the larger landscape context of the Appalachian region. One interviewee emphasized that management action (i.e. cutting trees) is often necessary to ensure a healthy forest.

*"[State Forests] ought to provide an array of services, certainly water quality should be universal, but I think there should be some active forestry going on in the areas that have been identified as the most appropriate and productive areas."*

*"Timber harvesting used to create more diverse forests will provide revenue and access for greater recreation, capital improvement, and wildlife habitat projects."*

*"These forests provide the benefits of clean water, diverse wildlife habitat, economic returns, and recreational amenities for the people of Maryland."*

Question 6: "Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?"

Respondents did not have consensus on the dependence of the forest and forest products industries on state-owned lands. Some indicated that the state land management should be a model for the way private lands could be managed, while others felt that creating new market opportunities and developing infrastructure would best aid the forest and forest products industries. One interviewee indicated that the state and local governments currently have land that is not being managed to the highest potential so the industry should be allowed to use these lands, and another felt that the state should be developing alternative ways to obtain fiber products rather than cutting trees on state or privately owned lands.

*"...state forests should continue to play that role, but...state forests should be managed differently than private forests that are being managed specifically for timber."*

*"...state lands should be designed and managed to protect Maryland's natural resources and natural heritage for current and future generations. Providing economic opportunities for the local forest industry and jobs in local communities can be done compatibly with these objectives."*

*"Without the available infrastructure, resource management objectives cannot be achieved economically."*

Questions 7-9: "Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? How well do you feel this process

has worked for Maryland forests? What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?”

Only three of the nine respondents had actually participated in the official public comment process related to management plans for state-owned lands. Two felt that the process was effective at incorporating public comment into management plans, but one observed that the process was made longer, more difficult, and less effective because of the polar opposite viewpoints represented at the table. This sentiment was shared by two of the others interviewees, who had not participated directly but had observed that optimal management objectives were not always met due to the many concessions made to disagreeing parties. One interviewee suggested that the process could be improved by forming a management team led by expertise in all the areas of multiple use for which the forests were designed. Another felt that the process could be improved by using public input to inform the debate but that final management decisions should rest with professional forest managers.

*“My observation from outside is that it’s a lengthy, arduous process that makes management changes difficult. As a result, I think the number of acres of state lands currently harvested is very small compared to what the management plan calls for.”*

*“Yes, it is an effective tool in allowing all parties to provide input and in providing for interdisciplinary scientific review of proposed activities.”*

#### **E. From those opposed to timber harvest on state-owned lands**

Question 4: “If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?”

Respondents expressed support for the DNR’s decision to pursue dual certification through the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) and the Sustainable Forest Initiative (SFI) programs, although all three of the interviewed groups preferred the use of the FSC standards.

Several recommendations were made regarding ways to strengthen the management of state-owned lands. These include increasing the staff and resources available to the Forest Service so that accurate maps of forest stands, management history, and prescriptions for timber harvest can be assembled; selecting staff based on “experience and duties that focus on ecological restoration, biodiversity, planning, recreation, etc.” rather than the traditional industrial forestry background; and returning revenue from timber harvest to the affected regions for the purpose of investing in forest restoration. Respondents emphasized the need to incorporate concern for biodiversity into state and local land use planning efforts.

One interviewee felt strongly that Maryland’s state forests should be managed for protecting species and protecting land according to the public’s wishes, rather than maintaining a supply of timber for the industry.

*“It’s probably true that in the first 5-10 years after a clearcut there are a lot of bushes and there are certain species that like that type of habitat. However, we’ve got all sorts of that kind of habitat here in Maryland. It’s the habitat like the 100-year old forests that we don’t have a lot of in Maryland.”* The interviewee recommended that the practice of returning a portion of timber harvest revenue to the department be halted, because this creates a strong financial incentive to keep cutting trees. The interviewee had also experienced some frustration with obtaining information from DNR regarding

the impacts of timber harvests, and ultimately chose to pursue policy change through legislative means.

Question 5: “What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?”

Respondents agreed that management of the state forests should focus primarily on promoting old growth habitat and connecting large contiguous blocks of forests. A stewardship ethic should be encouraged, including fostering a “no footprints left behind” approach to recreation. There was some minor disagreement between the interviewees regarding the use of management to create old growth areas. One respondent felt that “management” should not be perceived as a bad word, since invasive species removal and controlled burns could assist with creating the desired old growth habitat, while another preferred to have large tracts of the forest simply left alone as in pre-Columbian times.

*“...public lands [should be] managed for the goods and services that private lands either cannot or do not provide, which are going to be large contiguous tracts of mature, old growth forest habitat, keeping in mind that there are many reasons to have well managed early successional habitat.”*

Question 6: “Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?”

Respondents agreed that the state-owned lands in Maryland were purchased with public dollars and should therefore be reserved for public use. The private sector could make up the balance, but the harvest should still be done in an environmentally sensitive manner. Two of the three interviewees emphasized that the timber industry should be able to maintain viability on its own and not be dependent on state-owned lands.

*“I would hope to see the private land logging be done with better practices and in a sustainable manner, but we need to leave the public lands for the public. That’s what they were purchased for, and they were purchased using public funds.”*

Questions 7-9: “Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests? What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?”

One of the interviewees participated in the official process of creating the 10-year management plans for the state forests, and all three had experience with offering public comment on a management plan or a particular DNR policy. All three respondents agreed that the system could be better organized and there should be more transparency regarding meeting times and locations. Two of the interviewees commented that the resources and information provided at the meetings were of poor quality and were insufficient to assist citizens with making a properly informed decision. In particular they mentioned the lack of maps that showed protected areas and possible logging areas. The suggestion was made that some revenue from the Forest Reserve Fund be re-directed toward improving data collection in the state forests, including an effective GIS program. The interviewee directly involved in the 10-year management plans did see changes made in the plans as a result of public input:



*“The Forest Service did have a series of regional meetings throughout the state that I thought were very important to do, and they heard overwhelming support for managing the forests not so much for the timber value but for the recreation and ecosystem values. I think that helped change the emphasis a bit.”*

Two of the respondents expressed a feeling of disconnect between public input on the plan and monitoring to ensure that plans are implemented the way they were written. They felt that there was no regulatory means for ensuring implementation or for addressing grievances after the fact when plans were not implemented. This made the plan appear to be a suggested policy direction for the Forest Service and not a binding document. They suggested that greater levels of public participation throughout the process of creating the timber sale plan and workplan and a more diverse representation of interest groups on the Citizen Advisory Committee would strengthen the plan and reduce after-the-fact grievances.

#### ***F. From Those with No Position Regarding Timber Harvest on State-owned Lands***

Seven organizations and agencies interviewed during the project identified themselves as having no position on the matter of timber harvest on state-owned lands. These organizations did, however, offer observations and suggestions related to the management of state-owned lands. These observations are grouped into three categories.

##### Citizen Involvement

A majority of respondents in this group stressed the need for a transparent process to solicit citizen input on management decisions. The suggestion was made several times that it is important for citizens to feel like they were part of a meaningful process in which their concerns were heard and would be addressed:

*“Nothing turns people off more than giving them higher expectations for influence than actually results.”*

One interviewee suggested that listening sessions be held across the state every five years to solicit general comments, after which a plan would be assembled and then taken back to the public for feedback. The use of science-based management to improve water quality was also emphasized.

##### Process

Many respondents weighed in on the overall process of state land management. Two of the interviewees indicated that the task of managing the forests on state-owned lands should fall to the professional foresters at the Maryland DNR Forest Service. Several interviewees mentioned the need for clearer communication regarding the definition and historical use of state-owned lands, state parks, state forests, etc. These designations are seen as confusing and misleading to the public, and can contribute to disagreements over management decisions. Communicating complicated scientific results in a comprehensible manner was also seen as a way to minimize the debate over whether the cutting of trees has a positive or negative impact on the environment.

Three interviewees commented on the perceived profit motive for DNR to harvest timber from state-owned lands. They felt that this created a credibility problem for the Forest Service, as it generated the appearance of approving timber harvest to increase the flow of revenue to the Department.

One interviewee commented on the benefits of third-party certification of state forest management. Certification standards require forest managers to balance multiple priorities when making decisions, and can serve to show the public that state land management is being done in a thoughtful and sustainable way.

### Sustainability

Other interviewees commented on the general need for more state forests and for sustainable and environmentally appropriate rural resource-based economies. Deer predation was seen as a major roadblock to improving regeneration potential, therefore wildlife management should be considered when making management decisions.

The remainder of the interview questions (10-16) were designed to obtain background information for the Principal Investigators and not meant to elicit specific comments related to the interviewees' positions on timber harvest from state-owned lands. If these comments were directly related to the interviewees' positions, they were incorporated into previous sections of this report.

### **G. Points of Agreement**

Focus on biodiversity and habitat management – seems to be points of common interest between groups

Both groups agree that management should be science based and for multiple uses

Both groups agree that DNR needs to create a system for more effective public participation in the management process

Both groups agree that DNR FS needs significant additional resources and staff to carry out all of its responsibilities and that it is the most qualified agency to manage these resources. Suggestions were made about ways to enhance management by including other expertise on the management team.

DNR needs to focus some resources on assisting private landowners with timber harvest – relieve pressure from publicly owned lands and create more sustainable harvesting practices

### **H. Points of Disagreement**

Groups disagree about which of the multiple uses should have priority

Groups disagree about the use of state-owned lands by commercial interests

Groups disagree about whether revenue should be returned to DNR following a timber harvest – suggestions were made for alternative uses of those funds

## ***II: State Forester Survey Results***

Surveys (Appendix C) were sent to the state foresters in all fifty states of the U.S. Thirty-four surveys were returned representing thirty-three states (North Carolina submitted a survey for two separate state forests). The survey returned from Kansas indicated that they have no state forests there, so thirty-two states are represented in the data set (Appendices D and E).

### **Key Findings**

#### ***Multiple Use Management***

Question 1 asked state foresters, “For what uses are the state-owned forests managed?” Respondents were given choices of Ecosystem services, Recreation, Timber Harvesting, Biodiversity, Habitat Protection, Disease and fire control, Production of non-timber goods, Aesthetic value, or Other, and asked to check all that applied.

Out of thirty-three respondents surveyed, thirty indicated that their forests were managed for more than one use and in many cases for almost all of the uses listed. Of those thirty multiple use managers, nine indicated that Timber Harvest was the top priority for the management of their state forests.

Question 4 asked state foresters to characterize the management approach taken in their state. Twenty-four state foresters indicated that their management approach is termed “Multiple Use.” Of the remaining respondents, four indicated their management focus to be termed Timber Harvest/Revenue, three practiced Ecosystem Management, one practiced Wildlife Management, and one practiced Sustainable Forestry.

#### ***Citizen Involvement and Public Comment***

Question 7 asked the state foresters, “How are the needs and views of the “public” addressed and incorporated into the formation of management policies, plans, and decisions for your state-owned forests?” Several states responded with descriptions of innovative or noteworthy programs.

##### Indiana

Annual Open Houses at each state forest are used to solicit public comment and public meetings are held to garner feedback on DNR policies.

##### Michigan

The annual workplan for each forest management unit is presented to the public at an open house prior to the final decision-making. The input is considered, evaluated, and incorporated into the annual workplan if agreed upon. A final decision is made at Compartment Review where stakeholders and representatives of all disciplines within DNR review the plan and approve or recommend changes.

##### Missouri

Feedback is gathered by doing telephone surveys through universities; through meetings between the public and the state land director and staff; and through public meetings between NGOs and staff on specific topics.

### New Hampshire

When activities are scheduled, public input is sought through newspaper ads, letters to adjacent landowners, and notification to the towns where the work will be done. Public meetings are held when the activities are deemed controversial.

### North Carolina

Annual stakeholder meetings are held, per the requirements under the FSC and SFI certification programs. Public comments are documented for consideration. Managers act on public feedback, investigate, and adjust policies or procedures where necessary.

### ***Advice to new foresters***

Question 8 asked state foresters, “Given the issues faced by state foresters today, and considering the future of forestry management, what three points of guidance would you give to a new state forester to help him/her prepare for the task ahead?”

Thirty-two of the thirty-three respondents weighed in with their points of advice to new foresters just entering the field. The complete responses are available in Appendix D (question 8), but below are two recurring points made by the foresters.

The vast majority of respondents indicated that involving the public and building good partnerships with citizens, NGOs, other agencies, and within their own agencies were essential to good forestry management.

Respondents also urged new foresters to be honest, knowledgeable, and transparent when making any management decisions.

### ***Timber Harvest on State-Owned Lands***

In response to the question, “Is timber harvesting permitted on state-owned forests?” all thirty-three respondents replied Yes. All of the respondents have a management plan of some type (unit level, state level, or other), and eighteen of the thirty-three state foresters have experienced conflict over the harvesting of timber on state-owned lands. According to their responses, opposition to the timber harvest in these eighteen states has come from local citizens near the state forests, user groups, and environmental organizations.

Question 10 asked the state foresters if a portion of the revenue earned from timber harvest on state-owned lands was returned to their agencies. Of the thirty-two states that responded, twenty-eight have programs in place that do return revenue to the managing agency. Of those twenty-eight states, ten agencies return a portion of that revenue to the affected local jurisdictions.

Wisconsin has a process in place to avoid the perception of a financial incentive to harvest timber from state-owned lands. The revenue from harvest activities goes into separate accounts (Fish and Wildlife, Parks, Endangered Resources, and Forests) and the spending authority is then authorized by the state legislature during a biennial budget process. According to Wisconsin, this helps ensure a firewall between the management of state property and the budgeting process, since the agency does not know how much will be budgeted for them in the coming cycle.

Question 11 relates to legislation that was introduced in Maryland in the 2004 legislative session. State foresters were asked if they periodically collect and/or report information on the impacts of timber harvest on state owned lands, and if the information from the report has an effect on policy decisions at the managing agency.

Thirteen states in the survey indicated that they collect some degree of information related to the impacts of timber harvest on state-owned lands. Of those thirteen, nine states have a formal reporting system and six have changed a policy or management approach based on that information.

Question 12 asked state foresters to comment on the issues they are facing with respect to timber harvest on private lands. The majority of respondents indicated that conversion and fragmentation of the remaining parcels were the primary concerns related to timber harvest on private land. While the focus of this project was on the management of state-owned lands, it seems clear that the activities on private lands do affect the overall statewide supply of timber and as a result can increase the pressure on state land managers to harvest timber from state-owned lands.

## ***Appendix A***

### ***Interview Questions for Organizations***

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?
2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?
3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.
4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?
5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?
6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?
7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)
8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?
9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?
10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?
11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?
13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?
14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?
15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?
16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

## ***Appendix A-1***

### ***Interview Questions for DNR Forest Service***

1. In previous years, the State forests and parks were under the jurisdiction of the Public Lands Administration and the Forest Service was housed in Resources Management. Has a reorganization occurred to change this structure? Has this affected the number of acres under your control? Management changes? Changes in process? Staffing? Changes in philosophy? Changes in policy?
2. To our knowledge, management plans are in place for each of the state forests and parks that address the multiple uses of the lands. Is that still the case? When were those plans last revised?
3. What do you propose to do or are you doing to update those plans? For what purposes will those lands be managed? Any predisposition toward certain purposes over others? (Examples would be air quality, recreation, timber/non-timber goods, ecosystem services, habitat, water quality, disease and fire control, biodiversity, other) Are there certain forests identified for certain purposes? Are there set percentages in each forest set aside for certain purposes?
4. Each day there are many issues that you confront and address concerning the management of state lands. The predominant one that seems to “crop up” in the legislature focuses on timber harvesting on public lands and the idea that this is better directed onto private lands as opposed to public lands. How and in what ways do you propose or are you proposing to address this issue (i.e., to cut or not to cut on state-owned lands)?
5. How many staffers are there to help manage these forests? Are they all professional registered foresters? How are you organized to carry out this responsibility?
6. In addition to relying upon the professional talent, what other information/research, etc., do you rely upon in making management decisions for these lands? Are some of these more recent findings?
7. Is there a mix of uses for the state lands that satisfy the economically, environmentally, and recreationally minded publics? How is their input factored into the allowable uses of the forests?
8. Tell us about the public process to provide input on the management of state forestlands. How is it structured? Are there set time frames for involvement? Has it been effective? What is the representation like from the public; in other words, are all bases covered? What improvements would you make to the process?



9. Even after such a thorough process, why is it still the public's perception that no one is being heard? What are your thoughts on this?
10. Do you think the dual certification process will help reduce the controversy over timber harvesting on state-owned lands? How so?
11. Does the Department issue a report on a regular schedule regarding logging activities on the state lands and the impacts to the state forests?
12. What changes do you think need to be made with respect to how Maryland's forests are managed?
13. What measures are in place to strengthen private property landowner management of their forestlands? Commercial access to forests on privately owned land is a problem; have any measures been put into place to protect access?
14. What are other challenges you face with respect to timber management on privately held and publicly held lands?
15. What groups and/or individuals do you recommend we contact with respect to this study?
16. What states or other governmental/non-governmental entities should we contact with respect to this study, either because they have faced the same issue or have put into place processes that have been beneficial?
17. Can you provide us with copies of the plans or other documents that you think would be beneficial to this effort?
18. Have any of the recommendations of the Forestry Task Force from the Glendening Administration been implemented? Will that report continue to be used or will the Ehrlich Task Force begin anew?

## ***Appendix B***

### ***List of Interviewed Organizations and Content of the Interviews***

1000 Friends of Maryland  
Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay  
American Forest & Paper Association  
Association of Forest Industries  
Audubon Naturalist Society  
Audubon Society  
Baltimore County Department of Environmental Protection and Resource Management  
Chesapeake Bay Foundation  
Forest Stewardship Council  
Forestry and Conservation Associates  
Maryland Alliance for Greenways Improvement and Conservation  
Maryland Association of Forest Conservancy District Boards  
Maryland Conservation Council  
Maryland Department of Natural Resources  
Maryland Forests Association  
MaryPIRG  
The Nature Conservancy  
Partnership for Sustainable Forestry  
Rural Maryland Council  
The Sierra Club – Maryland Chapter

1000 Friends of Maryland  
December 9, 2004

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

We do not have any kind of formal position on this specific issue. We do have a general position on issues like this, which remains constant. It is important to know what the plan is, who got to participate in making that plan, and is the plan going to meet the goals. This is a constant tenet of this organization, namely ensuring meaningful citizen participation across broad groups and understanding the impacts of decision making. We haven't yet addressed, in any meaningful way, the greater forest issues because we've been working on more local issues like revitalization and open space.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

We don't have a specific position on this issue.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

All of these things need to be part of the discussion, including who is involved in that discussion and who helps formulate the plan, but I wouldn't say that any one of these is the most important b/c they are all part of the puzzle.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

There is a confusion between the definition of state owned lands, state parks, state forests, and what each of these designations imply. For instance, if you are buying a house that backs up to "state owned land," you could very easily assume that it's a state forest, which means it's a state park, which means it's protected by someone. Yet none of those designations guarantees any kind of protection. That often gives the state a black eye when they take a development act on one of these properties because of a lack of clarity of their mission and goals. We just need to get more people involved in this in a cooperative, rather than a hostile, loggers versus environmentalists, scenario.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

It just goes back to the point that however the state forests end up looking, we have to be sure that we're meeting the goals that were set. I would tend to believe there would be more forests than not, but we don't have a specific idea for what they should look like.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

Not applicable.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

We focus on the process and making sure everyone is incorporated. There are the usual feelings that voices have not been heard, but across the board the question is whether feedback is accepted, heard, and used effectively. Everybody feels like someone else has the upper hand in this, and that no one is being treated fairly. This is largely because of a lack of communication, but it does take a lot of time and money to communicate effectively and the DNR is definitely short on both right now. The process isn't ideal, and right now DNR doesn't have enough resources to make the process better. That is going to be the key; we can't do anything without the proper knowledge, proper staffing, and proper information. These are all critical factors for getting our agencies up to speed.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

See above.

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

See above.

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

It's important to look at how we can design an effective, meaningful process that people are comfortable with and feel that they've been heard and, even more importantly, feel willing to give the kind of time that is needed. People won't participate if they feel they aren't being taken seriously. People have to know they are going to be listened to and that the process will result in overall meaningful changes and be able to understand how the changes relate back to their concerns.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

Not applicable.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

Not applicable.

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

Not applicable.

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

Not applicable.

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

Not applicable.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

We're really just looking for open and transparent processes and clear goals. The state is not working, on any level, on the basis of sound information. Counties are not able to say what the impact of their development plans are, they don't know the numbers, they don't know the impacts and they can't map the impacts. How can you have sound land use if you don't know the impacts, on any level, such as what will happen with prices, with congestion, with schools, etc. And when you consider transportation, the very models we're using are so flawed that they show by building the Baltimore rail plan that we'll have an increase in congestion. We're not spending our limited resources wisely because the information is so inaccurate.

Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay  
December 8, 2004

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

The Alliance doesn't have an official position. However, we do think that as the state looks at lands, there should be some process to get citizen involvement and a widespread view of the objectives that we want from our forests, i.e., timber, habitat, water, etc. It may not be a uniform set of issues geographically across the state. There may be areas with differences in the way one would manage land. There may be forested areas that regions want left pristine with no management, and there may be other areas that need management plans that have some basis in what the citizenry wants.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

(Documents provided) No official position, but it would be based on the historical perception of the organization that we want a balanced view, we want management to be based on science, and we are interested in what makes sense to increase water quality and environmental needs of the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Overall, we want a sustainable system. The Alliance does have a white paper on riparian buffers in the Bay watershed.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

Water quality and what's going to reduce nutrient flows into the Chesapeake Bay; wildlife habitat and living resources; biodiversity, in tandem with the preservation and promulgation of native species; and sustainability, from the environmental standpoint and also economic viability. There need to be jobs, industry, etc., a way for people to exist and thrive within the watershed while protecting the watershed.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

Maryland needs to identify the forested lands that they own and what the objectives of those lands are. There should be areas managed for timber harvesting that are adjacent to other areas that historically have produced forest products as an ongoing economic activity. In other areas where you are looking for recreation, then you manage for recreation. In areas where you want wildlife, that's what you manage for. Each area may be a little different. You still need to cut trees when managing, even if it isn't for forest products, because it needs to be managed to achieve its ultimate objective. The forest management plan for the City reservoir lands does an excellent job at balancing the needs of the recreational users with water quality issues, through surveying recreational users about what they use the reservoir lands for. There does need to be an overarching goal or objective. The state should use this approach when deciding what the primary objectives are for each Forest. DNR should spearhead this effort. If there are staffing and resource issues, they could contract it out to a well-respected organization with the skills to take this balanced approach. These efforts should be integrated with the management of the parks at the county level because so many of the areas are contiguous to one another.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

We want to see regeneration; and whatever is done it should be done in a sustainable way. Deer predation is a major problem interfering with regeneration in Maryland. The state needs to communicate to the Maryland public through the publications they read, the meetings they attend, rather than printing a state newsletter or publication or convening a group just to come and talk about a forest. They need to go where the people are. Diversity is the main issue. In management, objectives, species types, where they are in the chain of succession. There is no one look that the forests should have. For the uses, it depends on the forest, the management, and what your objectives are in that area. Some areas may have no uses, but we need to remember to think about what is best for water quality.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

It's difficult to answer that question without knowing how much of the raw material that the timber industry uses comes from state lands. If we are going to use wood products, we do want to get the wood products from a sustainable system, rather than taking from a rainforest where it won't be replanted.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

Not familiar with the process, but have never seen a government process that does fully engage the citizenry so citizen involvement could probably be increased. I'm sure there are many citizens that want to be involved, but how does one reach them? How do they become engaged? How does one get an idea of what they're thinking?

With respect to the forest management plan that was developed by the State Forester for the Baltimore City reservoir watershed, it was very in-depth and well-planned as far as scientific information, getting other people and states thinking about costs and benefits to the watershed and getting public input.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

In general, Maryland has an outstanding history of public engagement.

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

Our biggest concern is the follow-through that should occur after people are convened to help make decisions. The time people spend to help with these decisions will be seen as ill spent if no outcomes result. Nothing turns people off more than giving them higher expectations for influence than actually results. A committee that could take the position on commenting on what the science has concluded would be effective, rather than starting from scratch. Participation from the community is key when you get to the implementation phase of any project. What might be helpful is listening sessions across the state every five years or so to get general comments, so that when specific plans are developed for a particular area, the comments from those sessions can be applied at that time. Then go out with the specific plan and get public input. There are so many opportunities for public input that have resulted in zero changes to the plans regardless of what the comments were. Individual meetings are a good part of the process, but there should also be outreach to existing groups or organizations that are already meeting. There should also be mention made in publications that people actually read, like local newspapers.

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

The research should be translated into user-friendly language that can be understood. We haven't effectively communicated what we know about cutting trees on state lands. Is it always environmentally detrimental to cut trees on state land? One of the most important things to do is first answer that question. If people knew the answer to that question, it would be much easier to get public input on an overall plan. I think, right now, the public perception is that all cutting is bad. Points that also need to be covered are what is the contribution to the overall state economy of not cutting on state lands, and if we don't cut there then where do we cut? In the North American region, if we're not cutting here, then where do we get our wood? Are we going to pass our labor to other countries that aren't doing it in an environmentally sound, socially responsible way? Those are the broader, global issues that also need to be examined. Is forestry always going to look like forestry does today? Are we going to meet our needs for wood products by only harvesting mature trees? Short rotation forestry, switch grass, and moving to an agricultural-based way of creating fiber have all been examined for use in some traditional wood products like paper, particle board, etc. This is also another opportunity for retaining working lands.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

Montreal Process and Baltimore County, Harvard Forest, American Forests, The Nature Conservancy, The Conservation Fund, Trust for Public Land, and independent certification organizations.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

Roadless Rule, Healthy Forests Initiative

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

Documents provided.

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

Documents provided.

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

We are a non-lobbying, non-advocacy group. We do not give testimony to the legislature. We can give general information, but can't support specific bills or legislation.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

The state should offer timber rights at market value if they aren't already. Another issue is the follow up after a timber harvest, the state does not follow up with "after care" on a harvest product to make sure the forest recovers in the desired direction. We just leave the land after a harvest and hope for the best.



We'd also like to mention Forests for the Bay. We've been looking to increase thoughtful management of private forestlands and unifying the various certification programs that are out there, SFI, FSC, Tree Farm, etc. so that there would be a certification program at all levels. We realized that at the 10-acre or below level, there aren't any programs currently for landowners to get involved in. This is the size of parcel tending towards fragmentation or non-use or rental. We're working with Maryland Cooperative Extension to put together a self-certification process for small landowners, so they can put together a management plan, looking at contiguousness, wildlife, etc., and basically go down a checklist of things that they've done on their property and send that in. It would then become a Forests for the Bay property. Not all of the details have been worked out yet, but we're working with the state foresters of MD, VA, and PA, Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, and some industry, landowner, and environmental representatives. Our basic theme is that healthy forests make a healthier Bay, and managed forests make healthy forests.

American Forest & Paper Association  
December 1, 2004

Typed answers were provided, in addition to comments below.

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

Fragmentation in Maryland is primarily caused by development, not by timber harvesting only. The key issue is maintaining the forest as forest and not turning it into subdivisions. The way to do this is to generate value from forestland through timber harvesting so that there's less pressure to sell the land for development. Harvesting timber is good for timber diversity. A healthy forest has many age classes, from brush through old growth. The challenge is also one of education. The University of Maryland and the Forest Service should be able to provide more education for the public about the benefits of forest management and timber harvesting. Other states have found opportunities for generating revenue for the state through timber harvesting. There should also be a distinction between state parks (used primarily for recreation) and state forests (managed for multiple uses including timber harvest).

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

Our position has been formulated based on science, professional training, and experience, both in the field and with policy issues.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

We support Active Forest Management, and the following issues are important to AF&PA:

Economic value of timber sales

Wildlife habitat and diversity

Minimization of fire/insect/disease risk

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

See attached.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

See attached.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

The forest and forest products industries should be more dependent on state-owned lands. The harvest can be increased without compromising the health and stability of the forest stands. Forest management is, of course, not appropriate on all stands because some are

environmentally sensitive, but enough acres of wildlands have been set aside already. Parcelization is also occurring, where forests are being subdivided into unmanageable woodlots. There is a strong need for making state forests more available for timber harvest because of the parcelization of the private sector. This is a local government issue that should be addressed.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

Yes.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

See attached.

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

See attached.

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

See attached.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

See attached.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

See attached.

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

See attached.

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

Statements provided, see attached.

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

Statements provided, see attached.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

The Forest District Boards that are active in each county could possibly expand their role to focus on educating the public about timber harvest and forest management. This has been successful in other states like Wisconsin.

Association of Forest Industries  
January 31, 2005

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

The Association of Forest Industries has been in existence for ten years. We advocate the Governor's Executive Order that calls for enhanced forestry management and dual third party certification.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

Our members understand that silviculture needs to be done professionally and by licensed foresters.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

We need a plan formulated with public participation. All of the choices listed here are equal. We should not be trying to preserve every tree.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

The shift of responsibilities for the state forests to the Forest Service was a good first step.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

The Forest Inventory Assessment required by the Federal government (every five years) is showing that tree growth is outpacing tree removal on a national level. This is a good thing and is a tribute to how well management is occurring. The issue for forest retention in the future will be population growth, not industry use.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

The industries should be more dependent on state owned lands, and not just DNR forest lands. The state and local governments in Maryland have lands that are not being managed well and the industry could also use these lands.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

Not as an organization, no.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

DNR has done well in reaching out to the public, but I'm not sure how much of that input has been incorporated.

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

DNR outreach should be enhanced, consistent with its management style.

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

The idea that forests are renewable resources should be emphasized. Expanding population is the real threat to public forests, not industry use.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

Pennsylvania; Virginia Dept. of Agriculture and Forestry. Local governments should also manage their properties the way they want the state to.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

You should look at the Healthy Forests Initiative at the federal level. Also, there may be an opportunity to sell carbon sequestration credits on wildlands and use the money to help DNR. You should also look into the promotion of renewable energy using forest residues.

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

Documents provided

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

n/a

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

Yes, I will provide those documents to you.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

Audubon Naturalist Society  
January 14, 2005

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

The Audubon Naturalist Society does not have an official position on the issue of timber harvest on state-owned lands. We've been dependent on other organizations, especially ones in western Maryland with more experience on this issue, to guide our understanding. In general, we feel that there should be some locations where there is no cutting allowed at all because of natural value, and some places where cutting should be allowed. Over the years, the DNR has not displayed enough ecological focus, and that's why the Wildlands program got started, as an effort to force some legislative action to limit what DNR can do on state lands. We have always supported this program.

Having spent a lot of time working on the issue of cutting on federal lands in the West, I did begin to understand that selective cutting can be an option everywhere. There is a lot of room for compromise on techniques as long as the trust is there between the parties. I think there are methods that allow for ecological approaches to harvesting. It's important to have a good understanding of where we shouldn't cut and then we can work from there on finding the places where we can cut and where it would be an improvement for habitat to do so. It may take a while to get the trust back in the environmental community, but one way of doing that is to do a demonstration site to show everyone how well the techniques work.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

We get a lot of our information from the Sierra Club, Dan Boone, and Beth Hartline, and rely on them to keep us informed about the major issues affecting the state owned lands.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

Protecting ecologically valuable lands, biodiversity, water quality (protecting source water), and air quality are the most important issues from the standpoint of our organization.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

I'm not familiar enough with the management structure to provide comment. Maybe the University of Maryland would be well-poised to spearhead some changes in forest management on state-owned lands, specifically the Frostburg campus and the Center for Environmental Science under Don Boesch. The perception is out there that DNR is allowing timber harvest because the local jurisdictions need a source of revenue.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

Future forests should be places where people go for sanctuary, and also should provide habitat sanctuary for rare, threatened, and endangered species. I would like to see more state forests, if possible. Maintaining the state forests helps with the Chesapeake Bay agenda and also helps with growth management, which has been undersold in the past. Suburban residents who want to experience a different environment don't have to go very far within the state to get this, and marketing the experience of the state forests could get more people involved. State forests should also aid in encouraging Maryland tourism because of their natural beauty.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

Efforts should be made to bring them into the conversation and seek compromise where possible.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

I've testified at public hearings, but none related to forest management. Audubon Naturalist Society has co-signed letters from groups like the Sierra Club and the Maryland Conservation Council related to these issues.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

n/a

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

n/a

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

We need a model approach to the multiple-use management mandate, and a chain of leadership that provides accountability for decisions.

The economics of balancing timber harvest with other uses, including biodiversity, should also be considered.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

n/a

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

n/a

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?



I'm not sure where we are in assessing the biodiversity functions of state forests. It seems to me that having some information to go on for biodiversity and habitat value as well as the economic value of the timber and fire management would be helpful. An economic impact analysis of forest management or timber harvest on state-owned lands including forests would also be useful.

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

n/a

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

Other than testifying on Wildlands proposals over 10 years ago, we haven't provided any testimony on forestry-related issues lately.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

No additional comments.

Audubon Society  
February 23, 2005

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

Audubon has been fairly active in Maryland for about 15 years. In the past 5, we brought in the professional staff to expand our role. We are picking and choosing what issues to get involved in. We want to base what we do on sound science. In addition to our extensive educational program that serves 25,000 kids, one of our focus areas related to forestry is our Important Bird Area [IBA] program. We have to be strategic about what parts of the forest we can concentrate our resources on. The IBA program does this. We have a team of ornithologists who have developed a set of criteria tied in with Birdlife International. Audubon is the U.S. designee to run the program. We have this strict set of criteria based on certain birds for which Maryland has a special responsibility because a threshold percentage of these birds depend on Maryland. There are certain birds that are important and they are associated with certain areas, like special habitat areas. There are rare birds in Maryland that drive birders crazy – they are so excited to see these rare species – but a lot of those birds are just on the edge of their range. Just because these birds come into Maryland doesn't mean we consider them our responsibility, especially if there are millions of them in nearby states or regions. In general we're looking for birds we have true responsibility for. In our community, the criteria have to be particularly strong, because everyone has their favorite birding spot and they all want their spots protected. We need to focus on IBAs, the loss of which would negatively affect these populations for which Maryland is responsible.

So we go through this screening process, where a team of ornithologists look at nominated sites against this criteria and then point to places on the land and determine that Audubon should recognize these places as Important Bird Areas. Next week we'll be announcing our first fourteen IBAs. There will probably be 30-50 sites someday, but we're starting with these 14. There are a number of state parks and state wildlife management areas, and many more have been nominated. With this as my screen for what we get involved in, when last year we were asked to support bills that asked for no more cutting on state forests we chose to take a pass. We didn't think the bills would pass and as of next week my question will be how many of these sites will be IBAs. If there is going to be a bill that says no cutting in state owned forests, I'll ask which ones are IBAs and what I would like is a clause that says maybe we don't want to cut in those that have been designated IBAs. We're not there yet. We're not sure if the cutting would affect these birds but we'd like this extra level of sensitivity. The Chesapeake Forests property has not been nominated for an IBA. It would probably be a fantastic IBA and could co-exist with cutting, but we need a screen and the IBA program does that for us.

Now that we have this set of criteria we're going to distribute it widely, and what we hope is that land managers will look at these criteria and have an additional piece of information on which to base their management decisions. We hope people won't run from this designation in fear of regulation. We have yet to name a private property, and probably wouldn't do that without the owner's permission. What it should mean is that a land manager would be proud to mention that his or her site is an IBA. We hope they would also know that Audubon is

pretty reasonable and we wouldn't prohibit farming or cutting of timber, and maybe they would help us.

After designation, the next steps in the IBA program depend on the site. If you take the example of Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge, you may wonder why it matters that Blackwater is now an IBA since they are so organized, have a dedicated group of volunteers, and have a very active "Friends" group. To me it's all about building partnerships. If I get asked to go the Hill to lobby for something, I have to choose what areas to focus on and I may choose to support Wildlife Refuges or additional research funding for burning schemes in marshes or nutria control programs. If Blackwater is doing a tree planting and needs volunteers, I can send out a message to our mailing list and recruit for them. I might send the director of bird conservation down to help them set up a bird monitoring plan or help them adjust their monitoring plan. We might serve on a panel to review their management plan. We try to do whatever we can to make their jobs easier and to accomplish our goals.

The Fort Smallwood IBA is a very unique site. It's a piece of Baltimore city-owned land at the northern tip of Anne Arundel County. It's an incredibly run-down park that also happens to be one of the top hawk-watching sites in Maryland and on the East coast. The hawks don't land or roost or feed there, but it happens to be located at a perfect point where the winds blow in such a way that millions of hawks stream past that area. More importantly, for 20 years serious researchers who have published their work in respectable journals have collected this incredible body of information and it would be terrible to interrupt that flow of information. So part of what I've been working on is communicating with the City of Baltimore and Anne Arundel County to let them know about this designation and about our desire to see the area remain open for hawk researchers regardless of its future use.

We'll be talking a lot more about Maryland's role in the migration corridor, for waterfowl using the Atlantic Flyway and for the songbirds using places like the Pocomoke Forest on the lower Eastern Shore where bogs are of particular interest. As we talk about that more, our interest in some of the statewide forestry issues will grow.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

n/a

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

n/a

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

We are generally uncomfortable with DNR having a profit motive for cutting trees. The idea that they need to cut trees to continue a revenue source to fund education programs, new uniforms, or new equipment is perplexing, and is something we might be interested in later on.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

n/a

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

n/a

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

We are aware of DNR's public review process; we did send the director of bird conservation down for one of the discussions. Some of our volunteers were very involved in the Chapman Forest discussion as well. We have not taken an active role yet, but with our new IBAs coming online we will be active in the future if any sites in question include an IBA.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

We operate very much in the real world – we have many acres of actively farmed land and we have CREP and CRP lands as well. We haven't harvested any trees off of our sites and probably wouldn't, but that's not because we don't think you should cut trees.

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

n/a

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

n/a

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

n/a

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

n/a

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

n/a

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

n/a

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

We have yet to testify on anything, we talked to some folks about the forestry bills from last session but decided to stay out of the mix for now. We are fairly new to the state

policy world and would like to gain a bit more experience before moving ahead in that arena.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

n/a

Baltimore County DEPRM  
December 21, 2004

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

We do not have an official county policy on the cut/no cut issue for the Maryland state forests because we do not have any state forests in the County. We do have other publicly owned lands, including DNR lands and Baltimore City and Baltimore County forestlands. About 25 percent of our forest base is public land in one form or another. However, these issues have come up as one of the three county pilot programs in the Montreal Process.

Let me provide some background about our involvement in forest management, even though we are not involved in the state harvesting issue. We were invited by the U.S. Forest Service directly to participate in the Montreal Process. That piqued our interest about how we ought to be looking at our forest resources. We felt the Process criteria and indicators were a good framework for forest sustainability and are trying to use them to help solve some of the resource management problems in Baltimore County. We convened this forum in 2003 and invited 65 participants; we hand picked and got recommendations on whom to invite. We were looking for people who were involved in meaningful ways in forest resource management in the county on both public and private lands. They all agreed that the challenge of forest sustainability was real and that the framework of the Montreal Process was an appropriate framework. Everyone examined the seven criteria and identified what the issues were for Baltimore County with respect to the criteria, and looked at goals and data appropriate indicators for the Montreal framework might be appropriate. At the end of the day, we asked who would be interested in helping us achieve these goals and we had a great response, from which we set up a steering committee to continue working on the program. Immediately, the committee identified the need to educate people about the process and to have political buy-in up front. We drafted, for their review, an issues paper called our Forest Sustainability Issues and Indicators paper, which laid out what this is all about, what our problems are, and then introduces the Process that we've started. We also drafted a resolution for our County Council as part of that to adopt forest sustainability under the Montreal framework as policy for the county. In the process of that, the director of DEPRM recommended that we get the administration involved and that's where we are now.

Overall, the first thing to do was to identify the issues and then to develop a game plan for resolving them. We started working in three subcommittees under our steering committee--an economic sustainability subcommittee, one for environmental sustainability, and one for sustainability indicators. We are trying to pull together a Forest Sustainability Strategy for the county. It will provide the context for why managing our forest resources is critical (covering a full range of human and ecological needs); it will identify the issues that came out of the forum, things that were suggested through the Montreal framework; and explain the issue statement and summary; set goals and objectives; and propose potential indicators.

All forests have to be managed for sustainability and that needs to be the policy put in place. We've concluded that across the board our forests have been the victims of benign neglect, in both the public and private sectors. If we're going to assure the ecological benefits and

economic benefits of the forest system, we have to identify what's going on and figure out what to do about it.

The region was initially a forested landscape, and now we're down to about 1/3 of the county under forest cover. At DEPRM, while working on watershed management, we've come to appreciate the functional role of forests in hydrology, stream channel stability, aquatic habitat, terrestrial habitat, biodiversity, conservation, etc., and the forest is the tool we have to work with. When you have 1/3 what you should, and when you consider that half of our county drains to the regional drinking water reservoirs, the ecological functioning of the forest system is absolutely critical for the future. We're also thinking about TMDL implementation. Forest land use policy and management are going to be key components if TMDLs are considered. At the same time, we don't want to preclude reasonable economic use. The hands off approach to forest management risks the health of the forest system. It would be different if our forests hadn't been subjected to tremendous human disturbances and stresses; then you could argue that the natural resiliency was functioning properly, but we've messed with the environment so much that if we want to get the best out of the system using the science available, silvicultural manipulations have to be part of the solution, whether it's for economic concerns or for the sake of forest sustainability.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

Again, we have no position on harvesting of state forests, but I'll explain the basis for our work. The awareness of forest importance stemmed from our stream restoration efforts and forest buffer ordinance in the early 1990s. We try to follow research as well, which is somewhat difficult for local governments, but we do try to bring science-based information to bear on regulations as much as possible. We try to keep up with the major threads of research. Specifically, we're interested in the relationship of the forest canopy to stream structure and the sustainability of the aquatic habitat and water quality. We do a lot with the Department of Natural Resources, specifically the Green Infrastructure program and the GIS components. That is what led us to the Montreal Process.

There's also an equity issue. We are an increasingly consumptive society, and forest products are a big part of what we rely on, and to say that we don't have a responsibility to maintaining that resource is negligent and unreal. It doesn't mean self-sufficiency is what is required; we don't know that that is achievable. In our temperate climate, we have some of the most resilient forest resources in the world. We have an awareness of the impact of forest resources utilization on the environment, and should be more responsible with the use of these resources given our large consumption trends.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

There are three different components to this, one of which is institutional. Through all this debate, we at least want to know for sure what the legal basis is under which the state acquired these lands that are now under debate. That was a long-term process, parcel by parcel, and there may be some reasonable but defensible legal conditions to answer why the state owns 200,000 acres of production forest. It would just be helpful for everyone to have

a clear understanding and documented agreement on what these lands were being held for as well as past management.

The second component is assessment, because every piece of land is different. There is no one-size-fits-all policy that can be effective. Some state lands may be able to be cut with very little ecological consequence, and there may be others that everyone would agree should be avoided. Each forest should be examined for its unique characteristics. These need to be taken into account before any policy decisions are made. We at least have to understand what's at stake before we do any kind of management action, and hopefully the management action would be warranted based on the conditions, and those need to inform policy. The policy ought to have relevance so that we're not just blindly doing one thing or another.

The third component in terms of cutting is that any intervention in the forest system should be careful not to diminish any ecological function. We've tried to pledge that to our citizens as we've started the Montreal Process. We need to be looking at the intensity of the use of the resource, and make sure that it is balanced against the resilience and sensitivity of the region.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

I think changes are being made, from what I can tell. Things are heading in the right direction. We are not directly involved, but the signs we are seeing like the Green Infrastructure Assessment and Strategic Forest Land Assessment indicate that progress is being made. Also, the recent Executive Orders from the Governor, seeking dual third party certification, and getting management plans together for the state forests are all good signs.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

We need more of them, for starters. We need a policy of no net loss, and we need to expand the forest base we have here in Maryland. The forests we have are extremely fragmented, with too much edge and too much human disturbance. We'd like to see these things resolved in the future. We appreciate all the work that's been done but there's still an imbalance. We need to see effective programs against invasive species, and better control of the deer population. The pest problem has been hard to combat, like sudden oak death. We need to see regeneration potential be something that is a high management objective. These are all features we would use when describing a "healthy" system. We need to manage though, regardless of what we decide to do with the forests. We can't just rely on benign neglect anymore. We need to be protective, to the highest degree possible, of water quality. Watershed hydrology, stream channel stability, and biological diversity are the types of ecological functions that really pay off. Future forests ought to have these features as much as possible. At the same time, we need to be aware of the other important uses of the forest such as forest products and recreation.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?



I'm not sure how dependent the forest and forest products industries are currently on timber from the state owned forests. We should be able to know what percentage of the state forests are being harvested before we can decide to increase or decrease dependency on these lands. We need to know what the potential is for sustainable forestry on the state owned forests. Also, revenue generation alone should not be the main driver for harvesting decisions.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

We have not participated. We have seen public notices presented about comment periods for management plans and such, but have not participated directly.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

n/a

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

n/a

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

I'm not sure you'll ever get agreement no matter what you do. At the least, people need to understand the basis for any decisions that are made, which relates to my answer to question 2. I think you would want to have people appreciate that decisions are made based on sound science. We need to have people focused on alternatives if we decide that public lands should not be used for timber generation. The problem occurs when the philosophical arguments come into play, because science is not always the main driver behind those positions. The tough policy question that arises is what percentage of the public gets to dictate their views to everyone else. That is a difficult situation to work with. There will always be people that don't agree with the decisions the agencies have made. DNR has done a great job working with so many diverse needs and concerns. Most citizens just want to know that they are being heard and that their issues are being seriously considered.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

I'm not familiar with any specific states or countries because we're pretty locally focused. We are aware of the model forest program of Canada, but I don't have specifics for you.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

The Montreal Process has been extremely useful because it seeks to deal with the all of the concerns that ought to be there about forest resource management, and dealing with the institutional framework too. It doesn't have all the answers, but work is being done on all aspects of forest management and they are making progress.

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

Forests for the Bay, Forest Service work, DNR work, Montreal Process websites. DNR also used a study from Virginia in some of their work that might be useful.

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

Website information provided with access code.

We're also starting a Growing Home campaign, incorporating a targeted education piece. We're getting the urban residents to understand the benefits they gain from planting a tree. Coupons will be distributed, hopefully with partnerships from the local tree growers and distributors, for \$10 towards a tree and we refund \$5 after the tree is planted. We're also working on a Rural Residential Stewardship initiative, getting residents who live in fragmented forest areas involved in the management of their own watershed areas by hosting neighbors and doing "walk and talk" sessions. We will do the entire process of planting trees; the owners are only responsible for taking care of them once they're in the ground.

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

n/a

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

Just bear in mind that it is difficult working with broad policies versus site level determinations of what should be done. Policies shouldn't be accepted without demonstrating their impact on the ground. Use science to the degree possible in order to influence the policies.

Chesapeake Bay Foundation  
Interview March 4, 2005

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

CBF has been supportive of the timber industry because it's a resource based industry that is good for water quality. The industry also helps provide an income stream from resource lands that then can help landowners resist development pressure. We see a viable timber industry as a key component to the health of the Bay, from both the water quality of the forest as well as preventing sprawl. That being said, we've also been very strong supporters of training and regulations to insure that forest management is practiced in a way that prevents pollution. This includes harvesting on state owned lands as well. We were involved in the purchase of and development of the management plan for the Chesapeake Forest lands on the lower Eastern Shore and certainly recognize that those lands, in part, were purchased specifically to help the timber industry continue its viability and that was intended to be part of the ongoing management of the forest.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

A combination of factors supports our position. Looking at the research, we see that the amount of pollution coming from forest land is quite minimal and oftentimes the forest acts as a filter for other pollution sources. Also, we've had discussions with the experts from the University side and agency side and we consider many elements such as wildlife, forestry, and water quality. And, in looking at these issues actively we've made observations that support this position.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

Water quality, maintaining a viable timber industry to help reduce sprawl, and certainly habitat value is also important.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

My understanding of the management of state forests is that they take a zoned approach, that they strive for multiple uses, which makes sense, and in certain areas of the forest they focus on certain goals. I think that approach makes a lot of sense; the thing that I see needs to be changed is the ability to get management actions implemented. In the Chesapeake Forest Management Plan we had discussed and recommended the concept of doing some restoration projects that actually help improve water quality draining off of surrounding lands and restoring hydrologic functions to some of those areas. It has been very difficult to get those projects implemented, mostly due to bureaucracy. Funding was not an issue in this instance; it was just very difficult to get consensus on the approach and appropriate siting, etc.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

I think they ought to provide an array of services, certainly water quality should be universal, but I think there should be some active forestry going on in the areas that have been identified as the most appropriate and productive areas. There should also be areas that are focused on wildlife and biodiversity and making sure that we plan those accordingly. We should also be taking a look at the big picture, not just at what is going on in that parcel of state land but how the state land fits into the larger landscape around it. I think forest fragmentation is another major issue with forestry, and state lands have a unique role to play in that issue because they are large contiguous blocks so there are opportunities to provide a lot of that rare habitat and economic benefits at the same time. I refer to the Chesapeake Forests example again, where a lot of that land was managed for pulp wood and our recommendations in that plan were to increase the rotation to much longer time frame, which would change the market and make that stand more viable for a saw timber market, which could be much more profitable to the industry. It would take a transition to get there but it could be done. In this way, we could have realized an economic and ecological benefit, especially for some of the wildlife species we were trying to target. I'd like to see more management schemes out there that supply both of those benefits at the same time. There will be areas where you cannot do that and you'd have to set aside separate areas for both needs.

With regard to the idea of having parts of the forest just left untouched forever, I think this issue gets confused by semantics a little bit. When foresters say "management," it doesn't always mean a timber harvest. So, if there's an area that is critical forest interior habitat for a rare or declining species and a new pest or disease comes in, I think it would be in biodiversity's best interest to take some type of management action. I think that is what the foresters are trying to say, but they are using terms that some environmental groups have a hard time dealing with. Likewise when someone says, "no management," I don't think environmental groups mean that if there was some crisis that you wouldn't go in and do something, it just means you wouldn't do it on a planned basis for revenue. We get tripped up a lot on that. If people could really understand what the other side means by "management" or "no management," that would help to a great extent.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

The forest and forest products industries are dependent on state-owned lands right now, and that was partly by design. The Glatfelter property was purchased with the intent to keep that land in forest but also as an available resource to support the industry. I do think state forests should continue to play that role, but I also think that state forests should be managed differently than private forests that are being managed specifically for timber. The state does have responsibilities beyond timber harvest and they need to take those additional responsibilities into consideration and plan for them.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

We participated in the Chesapeake Forest plan development, but that is not the specific DNR process I think you're asking about. I am aware that there is a public process with a committee to address stakeholder concerns about public lands management and we have not been involved in that process.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

My observation from outside is that it's a lengthy, arduous process that makes management changes difficult. As a result, I think the number of acres of state lands currently harvested is very small compared to what the management plans call for. That planning process and some bureaucratic issues I mentioned before also lead to a certain type of management by default. I am not sure if the plans can be fully implemented because of this, and it may not be the best way to manage. The committees involved in management decisions are usually set up to try to reach consensus, but is that really possible when there are members on the committee from extremely polar opposite viewpoints?

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

It seems like the protracted planning process results in fewer acres being harvested than was originally intended in the management plans. You could improve this process in a number of ways. You could develop a more efficient planning process for management of the state lands. There are certain benefits to bringing the polar viewpoints to the table and working things out there, but it tends to be less efficient that way. There should be a way to actively solicit input from all of the stakeholders and then have just a few people at the table to develop the actual plan. You don't want to limit consideration or involvement, but you do want to make sure the decision-making process isn't paralyzed.

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

We touched on one point, there needs to be education about what each side means when they use terms like "management." The goal is to avoid the unnecessary conflicts. I think it would also be helpful for the state, particularly DNR, to have a very good reading from the public at large as to how they feel about state land management, so that it's not too influenced by industry or by the environmental community. I think the public will be more central in their thinking than either of those sectors.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

I do think that going to a third party certification program, as Maryland is doing, is helpful. The plans will be reviewed from the outside, there is some accountability from an independent party, and that will help with the acceptance of some of the management and timbering practices. I think that is something the industry had a very hard time with for a long time, because they didn't have the credibility to say they were already following some of these practices and have the public believe them. The public will have more confidence in the process.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

n/a

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

#### Forests for the Bay, Chesapeake Forest Management Plan

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

We don't have any formal written policies at this time.

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

Any testimony we've given is filed with the committee and you can access it there. The general position continues to be in support of sustainable forestry and reducing sprawl to help restore the Chesapeake Bay.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

Forest Stewardship Council  
Phone interview, December 3, 2004

The Forest Stewardship Council is an international non-profit organization operating in 70 countries around the world. FSC is designed to make it simple for customers who purchase wood or paper products to identify products that come from “well-managed forests.” We define well-managed forests in a set of voluntary standards; those standards incorporate issues ranging from environmental management and performance to social equity and justice issues to the economic viability of forestry ops. We are trying to develop voluntary commitments on the part of forest management companies to meet these standards and then be rewarded in the market place for those corporate, social, and environmental commitments. We now have about 100 million acres globally certified to FSC standards, and about a quarter of them are in North America. About a year from now it will be more than 1/3 in North America because of a future Canada commitment. A trend developing in recent years is state forests adopting these standards as a way to say to their constituencies that the management they are doing on the public behalf and on public land is being done in an environmentally and socially responsible way. The reason that is valuable is because FSC comes with the credibility that is inherent in a multi-stakeholder program but also with the explicit endorsement of groups like Greenpeace, the Wilderness Society, National Wildlife Federation, World Wildlife Fund, and that is a very powerful mechanism, both in the marketplace and in a public policy discussion. There are other programs in the world, most notably SFI, with which we live in relative peaceful harmony. We view them as mission-consistent with FSC; however we maintain that our system is more rigorous and has greater integrity in how we apply labels to products than any other system in the world. You are seeing increased dual certification in state governments, in part to add to the credibility of the certification but also to satisfy different constituencies because the mainstream industry community resonates far better with the SFI.

Example: WA state forests met SFI standards but would have had to make management changes to achieve FSC certification. This would have required them to set aside more acres for harvest than they had intended to do, and address some discrepancies regarding mapping of endangered habitat. The state government chose not to do those things; they had achieved SFI certification but failed to achieve FSC. This is an important case for why our assessments are different. If you’re FSC certified, you’re very likely to be able to achieve SFI certification. That doesn’t always work if the situation is reversed. SFI is a systems oriented certification program, meaning that they ask for a planning protocol and training program that feeds a certain set of objectives, so it’s largely an administrative tool. FSC is much more oriented around outcomes, what you get versus what you plan to do.

In terms of satisfying the Maryland public with dual certification, it will help but only to a certain extent and will only get you there if the people within the system are able to articulate what it means to have met a certain standard. It doesn’t mean that trees won’t be cut down; it means that certain trees won’t be cut down and where trees are harvested it will be done in a thoughtful and deliberate way, with an eye to what the future forest will look like. Our standards require a manager to incorporate and balance wildlife goals, aesthetic goals, water quality goals, etc. Most forest mgmt is driven by a short-term economic goal. State forestlands play a special role because they aren’t subject to some of the same economic concerns as private lands. Because of that, they should serve as an example in the landscape. People should be able to look at public lands and feel good about what’s happening there. The balanced approach should be demonstrated on public land; it then becomes a strong communication tool to say what a forest looks like when it’s done right. One main difference between FSC and SFI is “conversion.” FSC will not certify the removal of a natural forest to be replaced by a plantation of single species of trees and we do not allow genetically modified organisms, both of which SFI would permit. In the context of protecting biological diversity at the landscape level, FSC standards are far stronger.

Forestry and Conservation Associates  
March 3, 2005

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

I am a conservationist, not a preservationist, so I believe in conserving resources but still using them. If you don't use the resources that have been provided, we would have a hard time living in this world. I think forestry is the nicest of all resources because it's renewable – it always comes back. As long as you leave the area for forests to come back instead of paving it over, they will come back. Disease, gypsy moths, and the natural succession of forests will all impact the forest, and if you just let it go natural all these things will affect the forest, but it will be a lot of resources that just go wasted to the bottom of the forest floor and never be used. As far as I'm concerned, I don't see any problem with thinning. I'm not a keen advocate of clearcutting – I'd like to see a good stand of trees still left. Some harvests we've done on some farmlands left so many trees that you could hardly tell any were gone. The big ones were taken but the smaller ones can now grow and grow faster. Even on a nutrient management basis, you need a diverse group of trees across age groups. If you have even-aged stands, the trees will uptake nutrients when they're young but then they grow old and slow down. So you need young and old trees to balance nutrient uptake.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

My opinion on this is based on observations, science, studies, and reports. I've read most of the EPA reports and talked to many people at the Maryland DNR, and I subscribe to the scientific magazines. I read the science on forestry as well, and it always indicates that good management gives you good forests. That's what I believe in. I don't think you have to cut every tree, but the stands do need to be managed. I consider forestry to be a crop, just like corn or soybeans. It's just a long term crop. If it's managed properly it will be very productive and financially beneficial to the landowner.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

State owned land, to me, is no different than private land. It's owned by the citizens of Maryland and should be managed just as you would private land. Management, including cutting of older trees, would be okay. However, there are some sections of old growth in this country, including some in Maryland, that I don't believe should be cut. There are some small patches in California and elsewhere of magnificent giant trees that I don't want to see cut. I hear there are one or two small areas in Maryland that have old growth – those should be left alone. I view those small sections like the Wye Oak, namely that there should be some parks set aside from harvest and you should be able to go see them and experience their grandeur. That would be a limited number of acres total, only about a few hundred in the whole state.



When I deal with forest mitigation, there are a lot of these factors that are included in our plan. We do not plan for one benefit or another. The Forest Conservation Act requires there to be forest on every development, but it doesn't make financial, biodiversity, or habitat sense to do that. I consolidate all of the pieces from each development and put them together in a block form. Some of my forests might be thirty or forty acres all the way to 150 acres, so that you can provide for the birds that are forest interior dwelling species, the foxes, groundhogs, chipmunks, acorns for deer, etc. These blocks don't become eyesores for the neighborhood or nonfunctioning areas, because I've consolidated them into large functioning pieces. With regard to fire risk, that's not nearly as much of an issue here in the east as it is in the west. In the end, you need to make sure you are managing the forest for whatever outcome you desire, including pest suppression, fire control, lumber use, etc.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

The biggest problem right now is that we're being hampered in our ability to harvest. There is some legislation batted around to prohibit timber harvest on state owned lands...to me that's all wrong. We're letting legislators get in the way of professional management of state lands. Sometimes direction needs to be given but sometimes the bureaucrats need to step back and let professional foresters and state managers manage the way they think is best. They should revisit the science frequently and make adjustments when necessary, but I think state legislators just need to stay out of it. Forests need to be managed and that should sit with DNR and the Forest Service. They've done a good job and are responsible people. They know what needs to be done and they understand when timber can be cut and when it should be left to grow, they can identify insect damage, etc. They are in the trenches and are seeing these forests all the time. They should be left alone to manage as they've been trained to manage.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

State forests should be multipurpose. A State forest is a park in the sense that people will hike through them, enjoy the scenery, etc. There may also be occasions when some areas will be harvested for trees, thinned for trees, reduced because of damaged trees. Things will need to happen. Mining for coal may need to take place because of the mineral resources available. The rights to these shouldn't be given away, but rather sold for their fair market value, at a rate competitive rate to that of resources being sold from private lands. There should be multiple uses of these lands. They've always been tremendous resources for research, for people to get away, etc.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

They should all work together. State forests, private forests should all be working together. They should be merged in the sense that a certain amount of timber should be harvested from certain parts of the state every year. For example, Garrett County should have so many logs or so many board feet harvested each year. Some could be private, some state, even some federal. Everyone should be contributing. If the price of lumber is down, then you could skip a year. Similar to what is done with corn and soybeans...if the price is down you store it and hold it and sell when the price comes back up. The state probably should have some

type of bidding process for timber harvest or timber sales, and if it doesn't meet certain minimums, they should reject all sales and cancel the bid. They should not be obligated to always sell. But there should be a certain level of timber harvest each year, because there are a lot of people who have jobs at lumber mills, there are lumber jacks and equipment operators whose employment is dependent on harvesting trees. If there are no trees to harvest, then something else will have to be done with these people, different jobs may need to be found for them when that happens. To me, if we want to have furniture, if we want to build houses, if we want veneer lumber for paneling, we need to find a way to harvest the trees.

With regard to taking multiple pieces of forested parcels and connecting them, this is purely a private enterprise at this point. The state is not doing work like that. I am one of the few bankers of forestry in Maryland. The private sector has been organizing this "banking" effort. With respect to the Intercounty Connector, I was approached by someone asking if I could mitigate 1000 acres of disturbance from that project. And I can – I have enough farmers and landowners that would be willing to put conservation easements on their farms. Some will be existing forest, some will be planted, but they will always be forest in the future. They will be harvested, but they won't become an agricultural field or a housing development. I'm doing easements on stream valleys and steep slopes on farms, and I've managed to save about 400 acres.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

I don't think I've ever participated in their management assessment. I have participated in the MNCPPC process for managing parks at the county level. We don't have that many state forests in the area where I live; we have more parks, which are not harvested. I will say that a big problem related to management is the deer. It's a huge problem here. I'm not a hunter but this has gotten completely out of whack. They are stripping branches from the bushes in front of our house! There's not enough vegetation out there, in wintertime the ground is frozen and the nuts are all buried in the snow, so there is very little, they're going around scrounging for what they can. The herds are getting bigger and bigger and they are too big for the land they are on. The herds have got to be thinned. The farmers are now at the point where they're going to start giving up field production of corn and soybeans because of crop damage. The forests are being affected too, because all the little stuff that starts to come up from the bottom is getting eaten. Everything that is tender is eaten by a deer. You're losing your replacement trees for the future. If we didn't do anything and the replacements die, there is nothing to come up, nothing new will grow. The hunting season is not adequate for deer management. The deer have gotten ahead of us now. We're killing 2000 deer per year in Montgomery County in traffic accidents. There are probably 2-3 times that many hits that go unreported. The conflicts are just too many. You want to have deer around, but they need to be in proportion to the land. Right now, we have no predators except starvation and that is happening a lot. They don't find enough to eat during the wintertime and they can't eat enough to get them through. Hunting would be the most humane way to reduce the herd and keep them healthy and make sure the strongest and best animals stay alive and the weaker ones are taken. It's unfortunate, but that's the way we're developing. It's the same in the rural areas – if the deer population explodes you're not going to have a forest. DNR really needs to look at more urban deer management as well as regular hunting in the rural areas.

In the rural areas there is sometimes enough hunting, but in the urban areas the deer are completely uncontrolled and they need to set up special permit systems for reducing the herd. We're trying to get crop damage permits in Montgomery County so that we can shoot deer now, in March, and year round, just to keep the pressure on to reduce the deer. The deer are so fertile now that they normally give birth to twins. So every year there are twins coming, and this will happen three or four years in a row. Some of the crop damage is so severe that entire farm fields are going un-harvested and farmers are getting close to selling the farm because they can't make a profit. The fields will turn into housing developments and sprawl, 25-acre lots or even 5-acre lots. So the deer are a part of the big issue on sprawl development. The only thing that will grow in the forest is the stuff the deer don't like to eat. So the forest is going to change completely. If we don't do something to control the deer, we're either not going to have the kind of forest we want or it's going to be a forest that we just won't recognize.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

n/a

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

n/a

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

I think most of the studies have already been done. The Smithsonian has done a number of studies on nutrient reductions, if you're looking at it from that perspective. From a disease and management perspective, the studies have been done for the last 100 years. Everybody knows that you get bigger trees and better trees if you manage, if you take the snags out, if you thin the forest over time, and let the strong survive and the weak be cut away. That's what forest is, the survival of the fittest. The strongest trees grow the fastest, and the younger, smaller ones die off. We plant up to 300 trees per acre, and maybe 100 of them will survive. The rest will die off, through starvation or deer damage, or they just don't get going, or there is disease. You plant more than you need because you lose some of what you planted. It's not a bad idea to go in five or six years later and thin them, to start cutting or dig some out and reuse them somewhere else is not a bad idea. There are a lot of things that can be done. But in the end, some parties will just never compromise or come to an agreement.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

Switzerland has been harvesting trees from the Alps, using helicopters, to minimize the steep slope damage. This would be a good example to research, plus a few of the other European countries around the Alps.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

There may be some information about special burns in the Lake Tahoe area that you could look into. The tree composition is deciduous here, versus pines out there, and we have a

different precipitation pattern, so the fire risk is different. Federal policy on harvesting seems to me to give the trees away, rather than sell the resource for what it's really worth. It's usually a lot less costly to a lumber company to get federal land to harvest than to get private land. To me they should all be comparable; they should all be basically getting the same price. If this could be done, if the state could get a group of private and state landowners together, and put a bid package together, it would be interesting to see private and state lands bid together. I think the private landowner is oftentimes cheated by the lumber companies, from a price perspective, unless they use a professional forester. They do not get as much money as they could; if they consolidate in a cooperative format where you put your resources together and have a larger group of properties being harvested, you could get more money than the smaller pieces would individually. The high costs of mobilization will lower the amount paid for the resource.

Regarding the slash, we need to find landscape contractors that like to sell firewood to come in and clean up the slash. There are a lot of nice firewood logs not being used because the timber companies only want the big logs. Farmers usually try to sell to a landscaper but sometimes it isn't possible. We should make a list of landscapers who are willing to come out to a timber harvest to clean up slash at no cost to anybody. This would help trees get going. You would still leave some behind, but you can take the two- or three-inch branches which would make good firewood. It's a resource that can be used. The lumber companies usually aren't interested. Even the hardwoods, a lot of the larger branches could be cut up and used for firewood. It will take 8-10 years for that stuff to break down on the forest floor. The smaller branches should all be left behind; they are good for erosion control and good for nutrients going back into the soil.

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

The Smithsonian has put out a lot of reports on forestry, they've done the most work on nutrient removal, slopes, soil removal. The Society of American Foresters publishes summaries on recent research projects too.

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

No website

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

Nothing recently. I haven't seen much legislation recently that affected me directly. I've seen stuff I wasn't pleased with, like the preservation and land use pieces that seem to limit uses of the land. I write my easements for conservation and that includes harvesting. That's important. You don't want to lock these lands up so that nothing can happen. You want to be able to manage them. In the end the trees will be healthier with some management.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

I think we've covered most of it along the way. I do have a few handouts for you.

Maryland Alliance for Greenways Improvement and Conservation  
November 22, 2004

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

The purpose of MAGIC is to promote ecosystem protection on a landscape scale, especially as it relates to protecting contiguous wildlife habitat on the Appalachian Mountains. MAGIC is looking for continuous wildlife protected areas, from one green area to another green area, all along the Appalachians. This is the GreenPrint program that Maryland announced. What I'm talking about is exactly the same thing, only it was announced just for Maryland and in actuality we need to look at the whole ecoregion and not just Maryland. The important thing about this region is that it comes up through the two big state forests which almost extend all the way through Maryland, the Savage River State Forest and the Green Ridge State Forest. As we're looking at protection, we've got to be looking at those particular forests and what we need to protect in Maryland to make an Appalachian Preserve. Maryland is just one small portion of this preserve. There are lots of groups working on this preserve to the south and to the north. They all have this idea in mind but it hasn't really gone anywhere because we don't have a large group like the Chesapeake Bay Foundation working in the Appalachians. It will take a lot of money and political desire to do something like this. Most of everything in between the forests is private land, so if you're going to get easements on them it will cost a lot of money that isn't yet allocated for that purpose. Everything that comes out of MAGIC is looking to ecosystem protection.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

All of the above have been used to formulate our position (including copies of documents that were furnished at the interview). MAGIC has also relied upon data from The Nature Conservancy, the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, and the Southern Appalachian Forest Commission. If you look at ecosystems you have to ask how big is big enough. The scientific literature that we've uncovered on that issue says that protected areas should be about 50,000 acres or larger, these would be the hubs. You still need to have connecting corridors between those larger hubs. In the GreenPrint program, the corridors were about 1200 feet minimum. It would be nice to have something larger but that probably won't happen. Wider is better and larger hubs are better. In Maryland, the only two forests with this amount of acreage available are the Savage River and Green Ridge State Forests. This is similar work to what is being done out in the west to connect grizzly bear habitats, the Yellowstone to Yukon proposal. This sort of ecoregion protection is the wave of the future, we hope. We're not protecting just a small forest tract, but rather protecting an entire ecosystem.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

The creation of large contiguous blocks of preserved wildlife habitat is the most important issue for MAGIC. If we're going to be protecting an ecosystem here in Maryland we'd better

be looking at the two large tracts of public lands we have, the Savage River and Green Ridge State Forests. Old growth forests as a part of these blocks is also a top issue, especially since there are relatively few patches of old-growth forest remaining on the state-owned forests.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

When I talk about protecting them, a lot of practices going on out in the state forests have nothing to do with protecting species or protecting land as the public would like it protected. When we first went to DNR, we asked what the public wanted but DNR could never tell us. We asked them to put out a survey and ask but they didn't want to do that. MAGIC conducted its own public opinion survey that showed eight-five percent of Maryland's citizens felt that protection of species was the most important function of the state forests. Some of the forestry management practices occurring in these state forests are not "protection-minded." I believe that DNR policy today benefits only the 5,000 people in the forest industry in Maryland. On the other side there is the rest of the public who says they want to do something else with public lands. That is many more people than the forest industry supports.

DNR does understand the difference between a 200-year old "managed" forest and a 200-year old forest that is left alone to cycle naturally. They don't want people to know they understand this difference because DNR would rather take the management approach. They want to cut down the state forests because they can make money doing that. All the money goes to them, and as long as we reward an agency for doing something we don't want done, we have a problem. We have argued this with DNR; we've brought them their own charts to show them what they created, and the forest industry group, which pretty much runs the public forests, just dissents. I've had them tell me that we're feeding them lies, but it is a constant problem between what the public wants and what DNR wants to do. As long as we keep rewarding them for cutting trees, then cutting trees is what they're going to do. We're to the point where we are going after legislation now as opposed to trying to talk to DNR. I've found, in looking back at historical things, the public has been trying to negotiate this issue with DNR for thirty years. We're still sitting in the same position as we were 30 years ago. I have documentation that shows people were asking the same questions 30 years ago and getting the same answers as we are now, namely that what DNR was doing was right and was the best thing to do.

One of the things we're doing is going to legislators with pictures. Pictures are things everyone can rapidly look at and understand. I have a picture here of a typical 100-year old state forest. These are nice forests; they are productive and provide a lot of nice wildlife habitat. But, when DNR gets through with them, they look like this other picture. They don't call it a clear-cut anymore, they call it a regeneration cut or make up some other name and they leave 10-12 trees per acre, but it's basically a clear-cut with another name. That is generally how the forests in Maryland are managed. They will tell you this is good for forests, that this is how they provide habitat for a lot of species. It's probably true that in the first 5-10 years after a clear-cut there are a lot of bushes and there are certain species that like that type of habitat. However, we've got all sorts of that kind of habitat here in Maryland. It's the habitat like the 100-year old forests that we don't have a lot of in Maryland. If you're looking for edge areas, every farmland that is next to a forest is an edge-type area and provides this

type of habitat. So, we say to DNR, well, we don't have a dearth of clear-cuts or early successional forests in the state, but we do have a dearth of the 350-year old forests. If you look at Maryland, there are almost none of these forests. We're trying desperately to save what we have left of old growth forests, the 350-year old forests, and we haven't even accomplished that. The biggest old growth forest that we have in the state of Maryland is completely unprotected. The Crabtree area near the Savage River was found by DNR, I think, about 20 years ago, and it only has 500-800 acres left of old growth but that's much bigger than anything else we have in Maryland. It's administratively protected in Maryland, they know it's there and they know it ought to be protected, but administrative protection only lasts until the next person comes along to change it. They can easily change that to an area to be logged and we could lose the last of our old growth forests. When we protect this we'd also like to protect buffer areas, so we're looking at protecting about 2000 acres. The piece goes to the top of the ridge, but then they've clear-cut on the other side of the ridge. It's been clear-cut all around it.

DNR says we need to do clearcuts to produce early successional conditions that animals favor, but they don't tell you that for 40 years the canopy will be closed and almost no species will grow. Those trees aren't big enough to be cavity trees, and they're not big enough to produce seed and nuts, and they won't be for a long time until the forest is about 100 years old. From 35 years when the canopy closes, to the next 40-50 years, a forest that has been managed is a terrible forest for wildlife.

With regard to endangered plant species in the Crabtree area, the Endangered Species Act is not enforceable at all with private landowners. You can't enforce it, you have to just hope they know enough not to cut down the trees. Endangered animal species protections can be enforced even at the state level. However, we find that sometimes the enforcement isn't very good, like when they cut down the eagle nest to make National Harbor. No one ever did anything to the developers who did that. The developers knew it was there and they cut the tree down. The will to enforce was not there.

This is a chart from the book I mentioned, Conserving Biodiversity in Our National Forests, and it shows what happens to species in a forest. When you get a major disturbance, you have many species in a climax forest and suddenly there's a tremendous falling off of species. The first ones growing back are the early successional species, which grow in a lot of sunlight. When the canopy closes, they go down to almost nothing and you start to get the late successional species. If you look out over a 200-year period, you have far more species in the forest in an old-growth successional forest than in a new one. Many studies have been done to show this. I found this chart in a DNR report to Baltimore County on the forests around the reservoir. I couldn't figure out why they used this chart to show how important the forests are and then suggested logging them. No matter what the science seems to tell them, the DNR will come out with a recommendation to log. I think this is because of the logging culture going on in the Department.

If we look at our forests, like the Savage River State Forest, there are certain areas that are Wildlands and they've been protected by the legislature. Everything around them is open for logging with the exception of some protected areas along the stream, some 50-foot buffers. There does not seem to be any scheme to have a contiguous protected area. If the legislature had not protected these areas specifically, I am sure they would be under siege with logging right now too. As you look at DNR's plans, there is no plan for a continuous

protected area. As I mentioned, we would like to see one go all the way up through the Savage River State Park and into Pennsylvania. It should be a contiguous protected area going all the way through the state and functioning as the major hub for protection. You might want to log areas around it, but at least have a scheme that gives you a major contiguous protected area. That's the way it is done today. We did get two new Wildlands two years ago.

Last year we supported a bill to push for the Forest Fund money to be spent on restoring forests. We also put in a bill that requested a tally of the damage that has resulted from logging these forests for 30 years. We were looking for a report on what was happening, but DNR fought that because they know there's been a lot of damage done out in those forests. Right now, if you clearcut an area, it immediately becomes filled with exotic invasive species. All the native plants are being pushed out. We're not only getting the damage from all of the roads going in there, now all the native species are being overtaken by invasive species. Thirty-five years later you'll still have those invasive species even if the canopy closes.

Here's what we found on Green Ridge (shows map), we have much better data on Green Ridge because we went out and asked them for all the GIS information that shows what has been cut in the forest. The dark green areas are the wildlands, so they are completely protected. These other areas are the logged areas that have gone on in the past 30 years. If you ask DNR what their scheme for protection is in the forest, you can't find it because they don't have a scheme. These wildlands were done by legislation, so that was out of DNR's control, and we did get some of the better places, but they are all isolated. All of these areas that you see in the Savage River, one wildland is even isolated from another wildland, so there's no continuity at all. Where they've located the water protection areas, these are along the streams and they are nice, but how does anything get from a wildland on one side of the forest to a wildland on another? It has to go through a lot of cut areas that are also interspersed with a lot of logging roads. Eventually we will be able to map the logging roads and what you're going to see is a whole web of roads that they put in for logging. Invasive species run in on those roads, and all-terrain vehicles run on those roads whether they are open or not open. We're getting a lot of damage from vehicles, and from the roads, and from invasive species. And this is also not good productive forest, where they've logged, for the next 50 to 60 years. We also look at the rotational rate for logging this forest. They'll tell you it's 120 years, but when you take the acres they divide each year and you divide them by the acres available for logging, you find that they really have a 60 or 70 year rotation rate. So they intend to log through all the loggable areas in 60 or 70 years. What they do is take all of their acreage and divide that into the numbers that they've clearcut per year and they come up with 120 years, which is fictitious. They say that's their rotational cycle, but it isn't unless you use the areas that they can't log anyway. It's playing with numbers, and what we're saying is that if you log in the 60-70 year rotational cycle, the average age of a tree out there is 30 years old. Nothing can be supported by a tree 30 years old. You're not even getting seeds and nuts out of 30-year old trees. You're certainly not getting cavities that animals can live in from 30-year old trees. So the whole philosophy on 50% of the land is to get revenue off of it, and with no idea of what that's doing to other species. We can't get them to even make a report on what's happening to other species. We have pretty good logging information on the Potomac-Garrett State Forest, but as you see we are missing this information for the Savage River State Forest. As I understand it, DNR may be working with Garrett College in the future to put their records on Savage River State Forest into a GIS system so we can get good information on that. We're finding that the way they determine



what to log next is to visit an area and see if it has nice big trees on it. No rhyme or reason or science seems to be associated with their decision, it's just whatever looks nice is the next area to be cut. The DNR is telling us that they're doing a lot of thinning now but when we look at the actual pictures of what they did it doesn't seem like only a thinning operation. Especially it seems in the Potomac Garrett area, they are telling us that all these areas are thinned and not clearcut. After specifically asking them which areas they thinned, we took them to look at these areas and found out that nearly all of the mature trees were taken out of this area. So there were a few immature trees left but when you get the thinning you have to ask what that meant in each situation. We asked them to tell us what percentage of the basal area was removed by the thinning operation. We think in most cases they took out 70-80% of the basal area, which means that you might call it thinning but it was closer to a clearcut than anything else. When they come back and say they are thinning, you have to ask them how much did they thin and make your own judgment. If we can get numbers on how much basal area is removed in those areas, we will probably say that anything more than 50% was actually a clearcut operation and not a thinning operation. That was also asked in the Public Information Act letter we sent them but we never got a response to that. Incidentally, the information we were requesting was finally provided to us just days before we headed to court to get it. The public is being stonewalled by DNR in trying to get information that describes what is happening on public lands.

Joining the management of state parks and state forests into one department has not made a difference in the way the forests have been managed. I don't think anything has changed – even when they were managed separately the plan was to log 50% of the forest.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

We want to connect and protect the old growth areas so that eventually they'll be continuously connected all the way through Maryland. There doesn't seem to be a plan to create protected old growth areas that are connected through the state. Part of the state forest is not forest at all and we would like to get that protected too.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

85% of the forests in Maryland belong to private landowners, so the only thing we can protect is the public land. Private landowners are free to make their own decisions about the uses of their lands. We don't need to dedicate our public lands to this small forest industry and DNR for their purposes. That's not what the public wants. I would hope to see the private land logging be done with better practices and in a sustainable manner, but we need to leave the public lands for the public. That's what they were purchased for, and they were purchased using public funds. Here's the other thing – the forest industry has sold off almost all of their forest lands to the public, yet they were able to negotiate continuous logging plans on many of them. Now, we're in a position of subsidizing the forest industry for evermore with public funds. That is just wrong. That never should have been allowed, but it was. Almost half of the Chesapeake Forest is under a sustainable management plan that probably goes with the easement, so we'll never get rid of them. We shouldn't have public lands supporting the forest industry, that's not what the public wants. The public was not involved in those decisions.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

We put out a press release challenging whether public lands were owned by the public, because DNR and the forest industry seem to act like they own them. DNR will tell you this isn't true because there are Advisory Groups that weigh in on forestry management decisions, but when you look at the Advisory Groups you find that they are loaded with forest industry representatives. There is one environmental person there who usually stays very quiet because he can't really do anything except listen anyway. We once asked DNR to give us the biographies of the people on the Advisory Groups. We knew at the time that one of the people put in as a recreational person was actually the forest industry president at the time. They load these committees with people who are going to go along with what they want to do. They told us we couldn't have the biographies and said that state law allows them to not provide information on employees, which is not true. People on Advisory Groups aren't employees anyway. They would not give us the information. That request was made under the PIA and that was the official answer from the Attorney General assigned to DNR. We didn't pursue that in court because at the time we didn't have the money or expertise to go after that information. It seems that DNR refuses initial requests under the PIA, and only by court action or order do you actually get the information you want.

Under Glendening's administration there was a forestry task force. Early on, I called DNR in that process and asked what environmental groups were represented on the task force. They said The Conservation Fund was represented and that was the only group. We were concerned because we think The Conservation Fund's approach is one of sustainable forestry, which to us is not the only way to manage forests. We asked if we could participate in the task force, and I was told by DNR that the task force wouldn't be discussing public lands. And yet the report that came from that task force was all about public lands. I didn't realize they were doing that much work on public lands until about halfway through the process. I invited myself down to one of their meetings and saw who was sitting around the table and got a list of those names. They were all forestry people. If you're going to have a task force and you have a desired end goal of promoting logging, it makes sense to load the task force with industry people. It was a whole conference room full of industry people. I don't think The Conservation Fund even attended that meeting. Their final report that came out was a plan to put forest management plans on every public forest. That was the recommendation of the task force. This was a group that, as I was told by DNR, would not be dealing with public lands. DNR lied directly to me about the nature of this task force. I asked Gary Allen how he got the people assigned to the task force and he told me DNR supplied the names to him. If you are allowed to run processes where you are allowed to load everything with your forest industry people, obviously they will come out with that result. This is why I say the public is absolutely not involved in this process, even with this token environmentalist we have on these forestry committees, they won't tell us who else is on them or the background of the members. When we do find out who they are, it's mostly people from the forest industry. The public isn't a part of this process, in spite of what they say. We have made the decision to not even try to meet with or contact DNR anymore, because we just got stonewalled whenever we tried. Now we head directly for the legislature and work on getting some of these laws changed.

When MAGIC first got started, I attended several public hearings on the annual workplans for the forests. The state foresters tell you what they plan to do the next year in the forest. It's a review of every place that they plan to log, but they don't provide any maps of the forest to show you the areas that are protected. In fact, DNR has nothing on their website that even shows you the Wildland areas. So if the plan was to log in the middle of the Wildlands, the public wouldn't know anyway because we don't even know where the Wildlands are. At this point, we have a good idea where all of them are because of the work that we've been doing, but before that no one could tell where the water management areas or the Wildlands were. If they show you a map and point to where they plan to log, you can't tell where that is in relation to the protected areas. The DNR says the committee has reviewed the plans and the committee thinks its okay. As it turns out, they don't give you the comments made by the wildlife and heritage division, which may have opposed them logging in certain areas. The public doesn't ever see that. The public has no way of making an intelligent comment on the areas that DNR plans to log if they don't get access to all the reviews of the committee. We stopped attending the public hearings because they were just useless. I wrote letters to each state forest manager and told them what we thought was wrong and the way it could have been run better, but never heard back from anyone. So we started going to headquarters, but got nowhere there as well. The only place we can go as the public to get anything changed is the legislature.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

With regard to changes in the law, the section that we tried to revamp regarding the prioritization of fish and wildlife and plant communities in forest management would be the important first step in changing this process. This is where they discuss the goals of managing the forest. There are currently six goals listed, and there ought to be a section that says we are protecting the resources of Maryland as a primary goal. But there isn't. When a legislature asks about the law DNR sends them the section where wood fiber is included as one of the six priorities. DNR continues to interpret this as an allowance to cut down 50% of the state forest and nobody has challenged them. When I sent letters to legislators and they sent letters to DNR, that was the response I received back. I got tons of these same letters from DNR to the legislators saying that this was the law and it allows them to cut down 50% of the forest. No one questioned them on this until we put in our first bill to change the priorities.

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

There haven't been enough studies on the damage that's been done and DNR doesn't want to do them because that would jeopardize what they're doing. We don't hear from the people who we'd like to hear from.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

We visited the Adirondacks and the Adirondacks State Park, where 3 million acres belong to the public and 3 million acres belong to private individuals. Somehow they have a logging plan that was put together by a committee so that half of the area is logged and the other

half isn't. I was curious about how they achieved such an agreement. What happened was that New York State put into the constitution that "the land of the state now owned and hereafter acquired constituting the forest preserve as now fixed by law shall forever be kept as wild forest lands. They shall not be leased, sold or exchanged, or taken by any corporation, public or private, nor should the timber therein be removed, sold, or destroyed." These are simple words protecting nearly 3 million acres of one of the nicest forests in the U.S. My thought is, why can't we try that here? Instead of taking an area the size of the Adirondack Forest Preserve, take the Savage River State Forest or Green Ridge State Forest and protect it. Make it clear that we don't want it logged anymore. Politically I know that would be a very hard thing to do, but what a wonderful thing to finally take a 30,000 or 50,000 acre piece of land and protect it. I would love to try to do that. You may see something this year where we attempt to do that.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?
13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?
14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?
15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

We have a bill we're probably going to introduce this year to protect the Crabtree old growth area. We also have previous forest protection bills that we worked on and I just gave you an idea of what they were and we also have some of this information on our website. Our very first bill was one that we put in to change the law to prioritize protection for fish and wildlife and plant communities. This was in response to DNR's position that the current law shows multiple priorities for the state forests and wood fiber is one of those six uses. DNR kept using this to justify logging 50% of the forest. I don't know whether it is or isn't – there's nothing that tells you how important logging should be among these six uses – but of the six they are managing 50% of the forest based on one criterion. We said we want the primary goal for the forest management to be protection for fish, wildlife, and plant communities. Also we included water supply and stream protection. DNR fought this and our sponsor wasn't on the Environmental Matters Committee so this bill didn't get very far.

We also have some testimony we've provided in the past. I went back and found some letters we sent to DNR and you can have these as well. We also provided a packet of information to the state legislature that described the forest issues and it is our interpretation of all the things we've discussed here today.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

Regarding DNR's move toward dual certification of the state forests, the SFI standard was derived by a lot of the conservation organizations and the FSC standard was derived by the forest industry people. One of them is much better than the other. I don't understand why we would adhere to two standards when one would suffice, other than making the forest industry happy by adhering to the one they want. If you've decided that logging is what you should be doing with public funds, then it is far better to have a certification program than to

not have one, as long as it's the right program. However, why have we decided that public lands should be continually logged?

State Association of Forest Conservation District Boards  
January 11, 2005

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

The State Association of Forestry Boards' position is that there's nothing wrong with cutting trees. If the state is going to tell people that there's nothing wrong with cutting, then it should be allowed on state-owned lands as well. However, even though we're not opposed to cutting, we are not for indiscriminate harvest. We believe in timber management plans, harvest plans, having a forester come in and mark the timber, and using Best Management Practices. We don't advocate cutting everything, but rather cutting done right.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

We basically rely on the research that's been put out there on this issue, i.e., the scientific studies and reports that have been published.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

The first thing I thought of was the health of the forest, which is not listed, especially given the many insect diseases that are being imported. There needs to be a balance between old growth and newer growth, which should be accomplished through management. If you're going to be managing the forest, you should be managing for the health of the forest, which will bring about the other items you've listed. There is nothing wrong with the state earning revenue from timber harvest. If the state needs funds and the science dictates that a cut in a certain area would be allowed, that should be okay.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

The management of forests on state-owned lands should be combined under the auspices of the Forest Service, if it hasn't been already. The Forest Service should receive more staff and more funding to be able to handle everything they're tasked with. The Forest Service should spearhead the effort, because they're the ones with the training, expertise, and staff, and they are there on the ground and know what to do.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

They do look better now than they did at the turn of the century, because we were able to reclaim some farmland. I think the forests are being well used. A study was done in Baltimore County about the forest lands around the Loch Raven reservoir and it showed that improvements had been made in water quality when the forests are managed specifically for that goal. This should definitely be a factor in any management decisions on state-owned forest lands.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

The state-owned lands should be managed the same way you want the private sector lands to be managed. The management of state lands needs to be the example for what you want people to do on private lands. If harvest plans and management plans and Best Management Practices are required for private lands, then we should be doing the same thing with the state-owned lands. There should be tours and examples of how to "do it right." One of the problems with having the private sector making up the balance is that the parcels are all so small and fragmented, unlike the large tracts available on state property. You can't expect parcels of 10-20 acres to be productive timber areas. It also might be difficult to get a timber company to bring all the equipment out to get a few dozen trees off the property.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

I have not participated in the process of offering public comment.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

In talking to the people who work on the Maryland forests, they are somewhat frustrated by the process because it ends up taking so much of the timber out of operation. There is only a small percentage of available harvest areas that are actually harvested, and then there are areas that are allowed to be harvested if certain conditions occur like fire or natural disasters.

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

People should be able to have a say in what happens on state-owned lands. It would be easier if there weren't so many emotions involved in the process, but it is very difficult to balance that against the science.

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

The main issue is science versus protection, and perception versus reality. How people perceive things is the reality for them, and it takes a lot to change someone's view of reality. The facts just don't work for themselves; there is no magic formula to getting people to understand the science.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

n/a

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

The Forest Legacy program would be good to review. One side effect of that program that we've seen recently is that landowners are given more money to sign an easement that

prohibits timber harvesting, even though the purpose of the Forest Legacy program is to save these lands for productive use. The management plan that a landowner puts together as a requirement of the program can reflect his or her desire to not use the land for timber harvesting. We shouldn't have the state paying for the easements to restrict timber production.

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

Documents provided. Also recommended to review the Partnership for Sustainable Forestry's survey results of Maryland's citizens' views on forestry management.

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

n/a

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

I did testify when the bills were introduced to restrict timber harvesting on state lands and to limit the ability of private landowners to harvest as well, but do not have copies of this testimony.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

Once we decide which areas of the state-owned lands are allowed to be harvested, the Forest Service should be left alone to do their jobs, since they are the ones with the expertise and knowledge.



Maryland Conservation Council  
November 11, 2004

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

The Maryland Conservation Council was founded in 1969 and is a coalition of about thirty organizations, most of whom have taken positions on this issue. Our June 2001 Declaration on Biological Diversity for State owned Lands addresses our main position regarding timber harvesting, namely that biodiversity, both of species and habitat, should be preserved on state-owned lands, or at least on the state lands controlled by the Department of Natural Resources. A main problem with the use of the state owned lands is that of resource extraction, such as oil, coal, timber, or even wind turbines. Public lands should be saved, and resource extraction limited to private lands. The difference is that public lands are supposed to be for everyone and private lands can sustain tree farms or other agricultural enterprises.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

We have relied upon many individuals through the years, including Dan Boone of the Sierra Club, Nick Carter, and George Wilmont. These people, among others, have worked in and know the field and understand the situation we're faced with. Over the last ten years, changes have been made in the acquisition of public lands that make it difficult to distinguish between public and private lands. An example is the Chesapeake and Glatfelter acquisition. This changed the mission of public land acquisition, which should be to preserve land from development.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

Many of the issues listed here are important to MCC. We are most interested in the Carbon sequestration benefits of forests, and the ways in which trees can keep the temperature lower, decrease erosion, and affect air and water quality. Another major issue for MCC is that of biodiversity, as mentioned above. In terms of invasive species, a clear cut is no different from development. Forestry can cause as much damage as real estate development. For example, excrement from horses or residue from tires can bring invasive species into an area and threaten the biodiversity in the same way development can. Public lands are for all citizens to use; corporations should be limited to the use of private lands only. We also need to address the loss of forests through the private sector, because that is where development is occurring most rapidly.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

The management of the forests is moving in the right direction. Obtaining the sustainable forestry certification is the right move. We would prefer that the Forest Stewardship Council be involved along with the Rainforest Alliance because the other option, the Sustainable Forestry Initiative certification program, is based too heavily on manufacturing. We need a balance on both sides of the issue. Public lands need to be preserved for biodiversity, and we need to work on prohibiting disturbance of old growth areas like the Crabtree area. Concern for biodiversity should be incorporated into state and land use planning. The allowable recreation should be low impact, because currently some areas are being "loved to death."

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

There should be less intrusion, and a “no footprints left behind” ethic encouraged. We also need more education about the forests, because once they’re gone, they’re gone. The forests will never be the same and never have the diversity of species as much as nature had put there originally. This also applies to state lands that have forests on them but are not considered State Forests.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

The forest and forest products industries should be less dependent on the state-owned lands, and the private sector should be utilized more. However, the cutting on private lands needs to be done prudently because the environment still suffers when timber harvesting is done irresponsibly. Also, when DNR staff consults with private landowners for their management plans, the private landowners need to be informed that an option to not cut on their lands is available.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

I have not participated, but members of the Maryland Conservation Council have participated on all sides of the issues.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

The biggest complaint from Council members concerns when and where the public input meetings are held. There is an overall lack of access and transparency in the process. Directions to the meetings are difficult to obtain, and the amount and quality of information that one can get to make informed comments are insufficient.

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

The process is getting better. The more people that know about the obstacles, the more DNR tries to improve overall. It has been a struggle though; most recently, a Public Information Act appeal was needed to get mapping data from DNR.

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

I would say that everyone needs to agree on the rules when negotiating. The best way is to keep in mind that everyone is working towards creating a better situation. We need to be looking at portions of the forest that would be beneficial to biodiversity and wildlife and aim towards having large undisturbed tracts of land that are not cut but preserved “as is.” This will allow more mature growth to occur. An example is the Appalachian Preserve. There will be counties that need to understand they have been blessed with forests but that does not mean they have to cut down all the trees.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

Pennsylvania has some good programs, like offering a tax credit for meadows. The Sierra Club has volunteers that help DNR remove invasive species from state lands, which has been effective. The Conservation Law Foundation has also generated some good ideas about forestry and been involved in the collaboration on where to locate 40 wind turbines in Vermont. There just needs to be more of

a process when these types of decisions are being made to make sure we understand the consequences of our actions.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

The federal Roadless Rule is a step in the right direction. Off-road vehicles need to be kept out of public lands, but this is difficult to police.

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

DNR hosted a symposium on biodiversity and published a book with the proceedings that might be useful for you.

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

Declaration on Biological Diversity for State owned Lands June 2001 provided.

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

Members of MCC have testified, like Bob DeGroot of MAGIC and others.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

It will be interesting to see the outcome of the Ehrlich commission on sustainable forestry, especially given that Governor Glendening had convened a task force that was met with some controversy and Governor Schaeffer had also issued an executive order, both on the same issues facing us today.

## INTERVIEW SESSION WITH DNR FOREST SERVICE –

October 25, 2004 9:30am

Steve Koehn  
Jack Perdue  
Jeff Horan  
John Wilson  
Don VanHassent

1. In previous years, the State forests and parks were under the jurisdiction of the Public Lands Administration and the Forest Service was housed in Resources Management. Has a reorganization occurred to change this structure? Has this affected the number of acres under your control? Management changes? Changes in process? Staffing? Changes in philosophy? Changes in policy?

Asst. Secretary Slattery commissioned a panel that examined two alternatives:

- A. To give the MD Forest Service responsibility for all silvicultural practices on all DNR lands.
- B. To give the MD Forest Service responsibility for all silvicultural practices on state-owned lands, and return administrative control of the state forests to the Forest Service from the Park Service

The Secretary has accepted Option B with the responsibility for management of the four State Forests (140,000 acres) effective 7/1/05. In the period from 1992 to 2002, the State Forest and Park Service (now the Park Service) changed their management structure to create land unit complexes that included Parks, Natural Resource Management Areas, State Forests, etc. This meant the larger State Forest Land units were absorbed into the Parks with State Forest Managers reporting to Park Complex Managers. There has been no change in how we manage the roughly 45,000 acres of Wildlands. Since Wildlands came into existence they are managed by the land unit in which they are contained but with very specific limitations by statute on the activities that can occur there.

Beginning 7/1/05, the Forest Service will be responsible for roughly 200,000 acres of State Forest Land, including the 58,000-acre Chesapeake Forest that we have managed since its initial acquisition in 1999.

These proposed management changes have not affected the views and philosophies of the administration, namely that silviculture can be used as a tool to improve all other uses of the land, and that management can support local natural resource economies as well. This administration feels it is good to both plant and cut trees. The administration wants to manage its forest sustainable, which means biological diversity, ecological function, forest products, and the needs of the citizens of Maryland are all considered.

State Forest staff are likely to stay with the State Forest when they come from the park Service to the Forest Service, but the bulk of Maryland State Forest staff will not be working on State Forest land.

In terms of policy changes, we are still operating under a zoning system for the state forests. The Code of Maryland Regulations and Title IV have not changed with regard to management of the forests. Only 17% of the 434,000 acres of DNR managed land is managed for timber products on rotation ranging from more than 120 years to 35 years on some pine plantations on the Chesapeake Forest.

Recreation occurs on the State Forests but it is designed to be much less intensive and less concentrated than that which occurs on State Parks.

Overall, the forests have been and continue to be managed for multiple benefits and that has not changed. The Department of Natural Resources appreciates working landscapes more than development.

2. To our knowledge, management plans are in place for each of the state forests and parks that address the multiple uses of the lands. Is that still the case? When were those plans last revised?

### Forests

Each forest has a 10-year management plan, in which we have “zoned” the forests for multiple uses. The four categories include Water, Travel, General, and Special uses. Our prototype plan is the one for Savage River State Forest. Since the creation of that plan, there has been an administration change and the Chesapeake Forest was added to the state land holdings. We are waiting on a policy direction from the administration to proceed with the rest of the plans. Also, each forest’s manager devises an annual work plan for that forest. These are reviewed by an interdisciplinary team, offered up for public comment, and examined by an Advisory Committee. The forest manager creates the plan based on his best understanding of the forest, and is the best person to create the plan because of this intimate knowledge. A Forest Inventory is also completed every ten years, and includes information such as tree size and species competition for each forest. We are using the Chesapeake Forest as a prototype and increasing the amount of information we collect. This approach should influence the management structure for the remaining four state forests. The management emphasis is on science-based decision-making, and we are moving into Adaptive Management.

We are moving towards a dual certification for the management of the state forests, which is already being done on a 29,000-acre parcel of the Chesapeake Forest under the care of Vision Forestry, LLC. This was part of the transfer agreement when the land was moved to DNR.

On November 18, we held a public meeting to present the revised draft of the Chesapeake Forest Sustainable Management Plan. After this plan is approved, we will be extending the dual certification to the remaining 29,000 acres of the Chesapeake Forest. This process requires a significant amount of documentation. A portion of the proceeds from the state forests are used to acquire data for the certification process.

### Parks

The process for creating a management plan usually begins with the acquisition of the property, after which a plan is developed. Sometimes there is a general sense of what the designation might be beforehand. Parks can be managed for different reasons, some for recreation and some for forestry. Each type of acquisition is managed differently. An advisory committee assembles a plan for natural resources and public recreation or an informational meeting will be held, depending on the size of the property. Because of limited resources, it is hard to keep pace with the requirements for revisions of these plans.

The multiple-use mandate applies to other lands besides forests, and timbering can still be an option on these other lands. The Secretary of the Department makes that decision for those lands managed by the Forest Service and the Park Service. The State Forester is responsible for any and all silvicultural activity on state-owned lands.

3. What do you propose to do or are you doing to update those plans? For what purposes will those lands be managed? Any predisposition toward certain purposes over others? (Examples would be air

quality, recreation, timber/non-timber goods, ecosystem services, habitat, water quality, disease and fire control, biodiversity, other) Are there certain forests identified for certain purposes? Are there set percentages in each forest set aside for certain purposes?

Four of the five state forests have a zoning system, which includes four zones. The General Management Zone, where timbering may occur, can still preclude timber harvest if certain conditions exist. The Department is taking a new look at the management of all DNR managed lands. A plan (Unified Plan for Public Land Management) is being developed that will provide overall guidance to land unit managers based on overarching objectives for the particular land unit type. Eventually land unit plans will be developed for individual land units based on the direction provided in the overarching Unified Plan.

4. Each day there are many issues that you confront and address concerning the management of state lands. The predominant one that seems to “crop up” in the legislature focuses on timber harvesting on public lands and the idea that this is better directed onto private lands as opposed to public lands. How and in what ways do you propose or are you proposing to address this issue (i.e., to cut or not to cut on state-owned lands)?

Timber harvest can be used as a tool to achieve other management objectives without sacrificing those objectives. Examples include cutting trees to protect the forest against gypsy moth infestations or blow downs, or to maintain grouse habitat. Silviculture can be used as a tool, not necessarily as a means to its own end. The management focus of each parcel is determined by its land/zoning designations. We have conducted field tours for the Maryland Senate, and would like to do the same for the House Environmental Matters committee. We do our best to educate the decision makers at the state and county level, but especially at the local level since ordinances at the local level have the greatest impact on private land use. Local jurisdictions have the right to regulate timber harvesting, and often try to regulate in the same way they regulate development. Forest management is often not economically feasible when it is regulated at the same degree as development. It is not a land use change, and therefore does not need the same level of regulation to protect the resources. Depending on the amount of land base designated as a State Forest, counties receive a share of the revenues garnered through timber harvest of these lands. The counties that receive the greatest share are Garrett and Allegany, because of the large percentage of land within those counties that is owned by the state.

We work to dispel the myth that cutting trees is bad, and try to show that the forests can be managed for environmental, social, and economic sustainability. Education is a crucial part of our work. We are currently in the process of obtaining third party certification through an external auditing agency, which will help us achieve this sustainability.

5. How many staffers are there to help manage these forests? Are they all professional registered foresters? How are you organized to carry out this responsibility?

On average, for forest management, there should be one forester and one to two technicians per forest. Right now the Chesapeake Forest has four employees, which is probably not enough given the volume of documentation required for the sustainable management plan. The Forest Service used to have a maintenance staff as well, but they are now under a zone system run by the Park Manager and their availability is dependent on their schedule. Volunteer groups have been somewhat helpful, but it has been difficult to organize and train a constantly changing set of people who still require some oversight. Some of our sister agencies are also available for data and general help, even though they

are not on the forestry staff. State Forests currently have a low level of staffing and that is likely to remain after the move to the Forest Service.

6. In addition to relying upon the professional talent, what other information/research, etc., do you rely upon in making management decisions for these lands? Are some of these more recent findings?

We have excellent forestry staff, and people from other agencies also provide assistance. Everyone keeps up on the current research. Most state foresters belong to professional organizations that also provide guidance and expertise. The United States Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and Environmental Protection Agency provide help where local expertise may be lacking. Some paper companies have good research agencies, and there is also an experimental forest in West Virginia that has provided useful data. We collect our own data too, such as the Forest Inventory Assessment and Habitat Assessment, and have partnered with The Nature Conservancy in the past. To be more proactive, the Department of Natural Resources should determine its research needs and solicit specific research papers based on those needs. Many times studies are conducted without the Department's knowledge.

7. Is there a mix of uses for the state lands that satisfy the economically, environmentally, and recreationally minded publics? How is their input factored into the allowable uses of the forests?

Yes, a balance of uses is sought and achieved in the state forests. An example of this is the different classifications of zoning found within the state forests. Only in the General Management zone is silviculture done to obtain fiber products. The allowable cut could be increased and not affect sustainability.

The annual work plan is vetted by a Citizens Advisory Group to represent the first cross section of Maryland society. Public hearings then follow where all citizens are invited to comment.

8. Tell us about the public process to provide input on the management of state forestlands. How is it structured? Are there set time frames for involvement? Has it been effective? What is the representation like from the public; in other words, are all bases covered? What improvements would you make to the process?

We have noticed in the public process for comment on work plans that attendance and input has decreased. Several ideas have been broached to address this, including advertising the work plans, using a public relations group, and then having a 30-day public comment period after this outreach. We would like to reach the rest of the citizens of Maryland, not just the extreme groups that are always in the forefront.

9. Even after such a thorough process, why is it still the public's perception that no one is being heard? What are your thoughts on this?

Because the ideas expressed are only polar opposites, either "cut" or "no cut." Only the extreme groups are being heard during the process, which is making the argument more polar. When the dual certification is approved, this should help, but will require more broad based public input to be successful.

10. Do you think the dual certification process will help reduce the controversy over timber harvesting on state-owned lands? How so?

It has been the experience of many forest managers that certification makes them manage their forests better because they are forced to have more information before making decisions. Informed decisions are almost always better.

11. Does the Department issue a report on a regular schedule regarding logging activities on the state lands and the impacts to the state forests?

No, we do not issue a report on an ongoing basis. All timber sales are approved by the Board of Public Works. Some items that might fall under “impacts” are covered in the annual work plans. Information on harvests including volumes cut, amount of income, type of cut, successful bidder, location of cut, etc., has been provided to groups upon request.

12. What changes do you think need to be made with respect to how Maryland’s forests are managed?

The primary problem is a resource issue. There is not enough staff for each state forest, the operating budgets are too small, and the dual certification will be difficult with no additional resources. Existing staff will be redirected to doing the certification work and this will cause a shortage. The income gained from each forest needs to be returned to that specific forest. The requirements of Forest certification will help Maryland manage its forests better but it will put a large work load burden on an already overworked staff.

13. What measures are in place to strengthen private property landowner management of their forestlands? Commercial access to forests on privately owned land is a problem; have any measures been put into place to protect access?

Technical assistance is available to the private landowners. Ideally, there should be one forester and two to three rangers per county but the reality is much less. We currently have five counties with no available foresters. The large budget cuts and the hiring freeze have all impacted the Forest Service’s ability to help private landowners. Other helpful measures would be cost sharing, tax abatement programs, and more technical assistance programs. Market considerations are also important, there needs to be a market for landowners who want to sell their timber. Some counties don’t really have a market, and there are also problems with permitting. Overall, the state should lead by example and manage the state forests in a sustainable way to give the private landowners a model to follow.

14. What are other challenges you face with respect to timber management on privately held and publicly held lands?

Maryland is a rapidly urbanizing state that is losing its ability to support rural resource-based industries. I hope counties have in mind what will replace them once they are gone, and not just more houses and roads.

The forest land base is declining due to fragmentation and parcelization. Development is taking its place and forcing the cost of the land to go even higher. Support services are becoming more and more limited with the fragmentation of available timber lands. The incentives are old; we need new ones that focus on things like Carbon credits, forming cooperatives, and real estate ventures.

The Strategic Forest Lands Assessment is a good document that we are showing to the county planning agencies. The county master plans drive land use in the private sector, and the SFLA could help coordinate the growth plans with sensitive lands identified by the



state, including ecological and economic considerations. More specific data is required to make the SFLA applicable to the individual counties.

Other challenges include getting the resources to the operators in the field, lack of funding and personnel, informing the public and the electorate, diffusing the polarity, finding people in the middle of the argument, and acquiring more data. We need more dialogue with the more reasonable elements of the opposition.

15. What groups and/or individuals do you recommend we contact with respect to this study?

Additional names were provided.

16. What states or other governmental/non-governmental entities should we contact with respect to this study, either because they have faced the same issue or have put into place processes that have been beneficial?

Indiana, Oregon, Maine, Mississippi, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts.

17. Can you provide us with copies of the plans or other documents that you think would be beneficial to this effort?

Savage State Forest work plan and various documents were provided.

18. Have any of the recommendations of the Forestry Task Force from the Glendening Administration been implemented? Will that report continue to be used or will the Ehrlich Task Force begin anew?

The Glendening Task Force report will be used as the foundation for further work by the Ehrlich administration.

## Maryland Forests Association

### INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

We support science-based natural resources management, including harvesting forest products to achieve resource and economic objectives.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

Our position is based on years of experience and training of our members, who are landowners, natural resource professionals, and people in the wood products business.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

We are very interested in long-term sustainable resource management, water quality, especially related to the Bay, capturing economic returns where appropriate with forest health and habitat improvement, and wildlife habitat improvement.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

The state forests should be managed for the purposes for which they were created. These forests should be actively managed based on the best professional skills. The MD DNR Forest Service is best qualified to achieve this goal, given adequate resources and personnel. Forest health, sustainability, and habitat improvement objectives will only be achieved by using a full array of resource management tools, including harvesting forest products.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

Forests in the future should be healthy and diverse, representing a full array of age-classes and forest types, commensurate with resource capabilities and sites. These forests provide the benefits of clean water, diverse wildlife habitat, economic returns, and recreational amenities for the people of Maryland.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

It is not a question of dependence, in my opinion. Active resource management, including harvesting wood products to achieve resource and economic objectives requires the infrastructure and markets to do so. Without the available infrastructure, resource management objectives cannot be achieved economically.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

I am somewhat familiar with state land management plan development, but have not participated, personally.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?
9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?
10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

The outcomes and sustainability goals must be addressed before the use of various management tools, including tree cutting, should be discussed. I'm not sure that "agreement" is achievable. These discussions should also look at a larger resource picture, i.e. all of Maryland's forests, and especially public lands as a whole, to determine the appropriate mix of management strategies across the landscape or watershed.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

I think that PA, MN, and WI would be worth a look as to how they approach multiple-use public land management, planning, and certification. MT, ID, WA, and OR have very different approaches to state forest roles. Their forests provide long term economic support for their school systems, and therefore economic returns dominate their management objectives.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

No. The debate at the Federal level is more intense than here in MD.

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

Please review the past three or more reports of Governors' Task Forces in Maryland.

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

The MFA website is the best source for our position statements.

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

Contact our Executive Director, Karin Miller, or VP for Government Affairs, John Colton.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

MaryPIRG

December 10, 2004

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

In general, we have been more involved with national forest issues rather than state forest issues. We are strong supporters of the Roadless Rule and work hard to build support for it. Even here in Maryland, there is a lot of support for protecting national forests across the country. With regard to state forests, our position is that there should be minimal harvesting on any state owned lands. The amount of quality land that is in state hands is small enough that the land that we do have should be protected as much as possible. It's definitely not practical to say there should be no logging ever on state owned lands, but that should be a minority of the holdings. The forests should be managed for the health of the forest and not necessarily for timber harvest. Some timber removal is necessary for a healthy forest, but not widespread harvesting. We are and should be an importer of fiber in Maryland, given the size of the population compared to the area of forestland available. As a society, we can do a much better job at producing pulp from non-wood sources. I don't know the potential for that in Maryland but we should definitely be moving in that direction.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

Mostly research reports. We don't do a lot of direct research ourselves, but we examine the bulk of the research that is out there, including the work of the Forest Service.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

Habitat/biodiversity; water quality; and recreation, although the first two are the most significant for us.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

State forest management should be guided by the principle of making a healthy ecosystem and not guided by the principle of maximizing extraction value.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

Not applicable.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

If we cut less on state owned lands, where should we make up the difference? The answer is not so simple as to say there should be more cutting on private lands, but rather we should look at developing alternative ways to obtain fiber products.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

Not applicable.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

Not applicable.

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

Not applicable.

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

We should also address the value of biodiversity in the forests.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

The National Roadless Rule is an excellent policy on the national level and exemplifies the sort of approach we should be taking, namely to put the best lands off limits.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

See above.

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

Not at this time.

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

Educational materials provided.

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

Not applicable.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

No, thank you.

## The Nature Conservancy

### INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

(Draft answers; last revised 4/12/05)

1. *We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?*

State Forest lands in MD (& other state lands with forests):

are an important and irreplaceable biodiversity conservation opportunity because they encompass the few remaining areas of tens of thousands of acres of contiguous natural forest that provides important core habitat for forest interior species and populations of common and wide-ranging species are critically important for maximizing forest ecosystem viability to ensure that we will have forests in the future to provide all of the ecological & economic services we currently rely on, given the regional onslaught of forest pests & pathogens, invasive plants, nitrogen & acid deposition, habitat fragmentation & conversion, and so on provide important or essential ecosystem services (e.g. maintaining freshwater quality & quantity), at the local, watershed and regional (e.g., Chesapeake Bay) level Harbor significant populations of state & global RTE's, and many occurrences of unique natural habitats are a significant proportion of all DNR natural lands in MD.

Provide important & desirable open space and recreational opportunities for MD citizens

TNC considers sustainable timber harvest to be one component of multi-use management of State forest lands that can be done in a way that is compatible with other essential uses that State forestlands should provide. Careful design and management of harvest locations and activities and core set-aside forest reserves are key to making sure sustainable commercial harvests don't compromise the irreplaceable ecological systems and services provided by these public forests.

2. *On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?*

At the broad scale, TNC forms its positions based on its organizational mission to conserve biodiversity. On the topic of management of state lands, the ecoregional plans we have completed in partnership with DNR staff have identified state forestlands as playing a critical role in protecting Maryland's remaining forested landscapes and their component species, habitats and natural communities, both terrestrial and aquatic. In addition, we recognize that forestlands provide essential ecosystem services, such as protecting water quality in our streams, rivers, and lakes, and in the Chesapeake Bay downstream.

More specifically, we have:

Used comprehensive Ecoregional Planning (with data from BCD, GIS analyses, expert opinion, etc.) to identify viable (= functional), representative and replicate occurrences of

large-scale forested landscapes that are significant across the region. Ecoregional planning also identifies viable occurrences of priority natural terrestrial & aquatic communities, and populations of globally rare species, many of which fall on state forests and other state lands in MD.

Compared our ecoregional planning results with similar assessments done by DNR for MD, especially Green Infrastructure and Strategic Forest Lands Assessment, all of which are remarkably consistent in identifying important forested landscapes. TNC's ecoregional plans were even more selective than Green Infrastructure, and the state forests still emerged as critically important lands for conservation of biodiversity and forest habitats in the state.

Reviewed studies & reports published by MD DNR (e.g., 1990 and 2000 Governor's task force on forests & trees) on state forests, forest health, forest industry economics, etc.

Reviewed studies & reports published by other state agencies (e.g., Univ Maine pub)

Quantified occurrences of state-rare species on public lands in Maryland (using BCD)

Evaluated literature on forest structure & dynamics

Drawn from the collective experience and expertise of hundreds of TNC & professional colleagues at dozens of sites across US

Ecoregional and site planning principles have been adopted by nearly every country in the world under the United Nations Convention on Biodiversity (to which the U.S. is not a party at this time), in its recent 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Parties. In February 2004, the Parties to the Convention committed to establish comprehensive and ecologically representative regional and national systems for biodiversity protection. Maryland has taken an important step towards a similar goal with its Green Infrastructure analysis, and TNC's ecoregional plans complement that with a focus on capturing representative and viable examples of biodiversity across Maryland's ecosystems.

3. *What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.*

- Ecologically functional core forest reserves (for maximizing forest ecosystem integrity, forest interior species, common species & communities) of appropriate size, managed without commercial harvest
- Biodiversity conservation, especially rare species, unique natural communities, in appropriate contexts (ecological processes, landscape)
- Maintenance of ecosystem services provided by public lands (on both reserves and stands managed for timber production), especially with respect to maintaining aquatic communities and water quantity and quality flowing into the Chesapeake Bay downstream

4. *If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?*

TNC suggests that State Forests should be managed based on the following priorities:

- core reserves of sufficient size to be resistant, persistent, and resilient relative to major natural disturbances, and managed to develop characteristics of old growth/mature forest (i.e., diverse age & vertical structure, diverse species composition, abundant biological

legacies, etc.)

- landscape context (i.e., taking into account spatial patterns in topography, soils, etc., the scale, types & frequencies of natural disturbances, ensuring connectivity among protected lands, component watersheds, etc.)
- important ecological processes (both ongoing site-level processes, and periodic major disturbances)
- biodiversity conservation
- protecting sensitive habitats (e.g., wetlands, riparian zones, steep slopes, outcrops, old growth, etc.)
- minimizing habitat fragmentation
- using ecological restoration where appropriate to restore ecosystem functions
- sustainable timber harvest outside core reserves

TNC feels that:

Management should be led by DNR team that includes, foresters (FS), ecologists (NHP), fisheries biologists, resource planners

*Having sufficient agency resources -staff and funding – is a crucial requirement for comprehensive, efficient and effective management of state forest resources for multiple uses*

**Forest certification** (esp., dual certification under both SFI & FSC) can be an important tool for helping implement, achieve, and monitor effective forest management for multiple uses. (It's useful to view certification as one product of good forest management, rather than the other way around.) Forest certification (particularly Forest Stewardship Council certification) can serve to demonstrate better engagement with local communities and could help promote better forest management with local landowners.

5. *What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?*

- Significantly larger holdings that are more ecologically functional in landscape setting (e.g., high connectivity, low fragmentation, etc.)
- Sizable core reserves with no timber harvest, ecological mgmt only, passive rec allowed
- Sustainable timber harvest zones outside core reserves (core-buffer model)
- Functional natural area connections to nearby state forests, parks, private cons. lands
- Ecologically-based deer population mgmt
- Non-destructive recreational use by MD citizens
- SF's can/should remain multiple use as a whole, but primary uses should vary by area, based on core-buffer model

Bigger picture, MD state forests should be viewed in the future as an important component of a regional network of functional, landscape-scale natural areas that help ensure the long-term viability of native species & communities (common & rare) beyond Maryland's boundaries, and that help maintain the health of regionally, nationally and globally significant aquatic systems like the Potomac River and the Chesapeake Bay.

6. *Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?*



TNC supports the idea that state lands should be designed and managed to protect Maryland's natural resources and natural heritage for current and future generations. Providing economic opportunities for the local forest industry and jobs in local communities can be done compatibly with these objectives. The forest industry will be dependent upon those forests (public or private) that can best be managed sustainably over the long-term. Given the patterns & trends of forestland ownership and timber markets, it is difficult to say whether the industry will come to depend more or less on state lands compared with private lands over time.

Background:

- <3% of private forestland in MD held by corporate owners
- 78% of forestland in Maryland is privately owned (130,000+ owners)
- significant parcelization of private forest lands (ave = 17 acres), plus new owners less interested in timber harvest, plus dampening effects of nearby/expanding development
- trend of declining timber harvest from private forest lands in MD and US
- Forest products industry is small fraction of MD's economy, jobs, personal income, etc.
- annual commercial harvest from state lands is *small fraction of total timber harvest statewide*, so current dependency of forest products industry on state-owned lands is low

One Scenario:

- *Significant expansion* of state forest lands, so even with new core reserves, public land acreage available for sustainable timber harvest by forest products industries increases/ does not decline

In addition, DNR and the State could work to significantly improve timber harvest and management for forest products on private lands in MD (as called for in the 2000 Governor's Task Force report) to increase the availability & productivity of these lands to the forest products industry.

Timber contracting would ideally be focused primarily to promote the types of cutting and forestry activity that Maryland wants to support on its public lands and for its local economies. Examples include giving preference to contractors who harvest timber destined for the local value-added products market, that are cutting small diameter trees to promote forest growth, and that relate to local companies. This places the emphasis on cutting what the State wants removed from its lands, and generating forest industry revenues that circulate through the economy according to the State's priorities.

7. *Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)*

Yes; Steve Bunker participated in this process in 1990.

8. *How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?*

Although we think an open public process is appropriate for public lands, there were some significant unintended consequences of the earlier approach:

- Increased competition among those with differing values for state forest resources; this led to designation of multiple management zones, which helped appease different interests, but which chopped up state forests into different patches, an approach that does not provide optimal benefits for all uses

- Polarization of views
- Decreased role of sound science

9. *What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?*

As noted in #4 above, we think the planning process should be led by a DNR team that includes, foresters (FS), ecologists (NHP), fisheries biologists, and resource planners. In addition,

- Include reps from major conservation NGO's in state
- Include reps from major forest industry companies that harvest from state lands
- consider using outside consultant with track record for comprehensive, sustainable, environmentally & ecologically-sensitive forest mgmt planning, and have them facilitate the work group and public-input process

An important question that should be discussed in the planning process is how revenue from commercial timber harvests on State Forests will or will not be used to support management of those forests. There are good arguments for returning revenues to the same unit where the harvests occur. However, systems need to be in place to prevent this incentive from becoming a rationale for increased cutting (to support or expand staff capacity & programs) over time. While nominally an internal 'agency budgeting and resource allocation question, this issue is central to the question of whether or not state forests can be managed effectively to achieve multiple benefits.

10. *What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State- owned lands?*

- acknowledgement that for the most polarized and vocal parties, timber harvest on public lands is an ideological issue, not a scientific or pragmatic (cost/benefits) issue
- accurate and objective evaluation of the contribution that timber harvest on public lands makes to the forest products economy, and its importance in maintaining local and state-wide economies
- financial costs & benefits (direct & indirect) to State and DNR of timber harvest on state lands, particularly relative to the entire DNR & State budgets
- where available, an accurate and objective assessment of other direct & indirect economic benefits provided by non-timber harvest uses of state forests (e.g., hunting, tourism, etc.), as well as assessments of other value-added benefits (e.g., increased private property values for lands bordering state forests)
- Role of SF's in protecting rare & sensitive native species, unique natural communities, especially relative to status of native biodiversity in MD
- Role of SF's in providing ecosystem services
- Degree of understanding of:  
Current mgmt goals & objectives (long-term & annual), and variation among units  
Current mgmt policies & procedures (e.g., rotation lengths, mgmt zones, annual plans, commitment to BMP's, etc.)
- Recent/current levels of harvest on different SF's

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model/approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

State examples & contacts:

- Massachusetts state reserve system – Jim Demarco or Bob O'Connor (TNC contacts: Frank Lowenstein, Loring Schwartz)
- Maine state reserve system – Ralph Knowle (TNC contact: Barbara Vickery) (good example of biodiversity representativeness).
- Pennsylvania's new old growth reserve system - (TNC contacts: Dylan Jenkins, Nels Johnson) (reserves typically in unharvestable areas; size of system good, representativeness poor)
- Michigan -reserves + working forest landscapes; still a work in progress

TNC examples & contacts:

- Clinch Valley (VA) -TNC Contact: Matthew Crum
- St. John (ME) - TNC Contact: Josh Royte
- Atlas Timberlands (VT) -TNC Contact: John Roe
- National Forests in VT & NH – TNC Contacts: Josh Royte, Mark Zankel

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

- Forest Legacy, Ches. Bay Program & 2000 Agreement, others?

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

For core reserves, biodiversity conservation, landscape context, etc.:

- Determining the Size of Eastern Forest Reserves (TNC brochure)
- Science, Biodiversity and Sustainable Forestry (Jan., 2005 report from Nat. Comm. Sci. for Sust. For.)
- TNC's Ecoregional Plans (Central Appalachian Forest, Chesapeake Bay Lowlands)
- Maryland's Green Infrastructure
- Strategic Forest Lands Assessment (MD DNR, 2003)
- Biological Diversity and Maryland Forests (Alliance for the Maryland Forest, 1993)
- United Nations Convention on Biodiversity, Report of the Seventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, VII/28. Protected areas (Articles 8 (a) to (e))

For sustainable forest management:

- Reports by National Commission on Science for Sustainable Forestry ([www.ncssf.org](http://www.ncssf.org))

- Biodiversity in the Forests of Maine: Guidelines for Land Mgmt
- TNC's Forest Operations Manual (Clinch Valley Program; heavy focus on water quality)
- [www.privateforest.org](http://www.privateforest.org) (TNC & US Forest Service website)

For policy:

- Governor's Task Force on Trees & Forest in Maryland (1990)
- Guiding Maryland's Forest Community into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Maryland Forestry Task Force final report, 2000)

Forest industry and forest products economics:

- Sampson Institute papers & reports (among many others out there)

*I 4. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?*

- None on MD/DC website; TNC rarely does position statements

*I 5. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?*

- Frank Lowenstein's testimony on FSC certification on MA state lands
- Other examples?

*I 6. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?*

- TNC will be serving on Governor's Commission of Sustainable Forestry
- TNC can offer expertise on forest reserve design, ecological forest management, working forest easements, etc.
- TNC can offer perspectives on regional, national, global significance of state forest lands for biodiversity conservation
- TNC has considerable acreage of lands in MD adjacent or near state forest lands, so there are opportunities for cooperation on reserve design, certification, management & restoration

Partnership for Sustainable Forestry  
January 13, 2005

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

(Copy of formal position provided)

We believe in the multi-use management of MD's forested lands. We are not hostile to preservation, green infrastructure planning, habitat restoration, or biodiversity; we recognize that timber management is not the highest priority of the majority of Maryland's private landowners and should not be the highest priority for Maryland's public land holdings. We do, however, recognize that there is a role for timber harvest in both cases, and that role should be protected and the state should, if for no other reason, lead by example in how it manages the state lands.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

I would say our position is based on a variety of factors, starting with the perspectives represented by the members of the Partnership for Sustainable Forestry, they bring a lot of experience and knowledge of the forest and a variety of perspectives, including the standpoint of foresters, private landowners, industry perspectives and the science community. These people work the land, study the land, and know the land. We think our position is very well informed because of this variety.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

One of the primary values of forest management is to preserve the quality of the woods for multi purposes on into the future. These include recreation, economic development for rural Maryland, and fire reduction and biological and storm damage reduction. Maryland's forests have been heavily impacted by human habitation and use, and there are virtually no areas within the state that haven't been impacted in this way. The notion of a primeval forest would be alien to most of Maryland's forest lands. We would like to see the forests managed in order to preserve them from the impact of Maryland's growing population. One of our top priorities is to manage the lands in such a way as to protect them from future development; we do not support terminal harvests. Even though we support timber harvest on private and public lands, we do not want to see the forests converted to other uses. We are trying to find ways to provide benefits and values that help preserve them as forested lands. We think these objectives can be achieved through management. Other priorities we have are related to management, like water quality, air quality, carbon sequestration, and of course recreation itself means public access to the public lands. Those haven't been our highest priorities in

the management of the lands but they are incidental to the whole effort and ought to a part of the equation when setting down a particular strategy.

As the chair of the Center for Chesapeake Communities, we are facilitating an ongoing partnership related to carbon sequestration among a number of federal agencies in the Baltimore-Washington corridor, including NASA, Agricultural Research Center, Patuxent Wildlife Refuge Center, and Fort Meade. These cover over 22,000 acres for which to develop a comprehensive forest management plan for the purposes of showing how a number of federal agencies in an important urban corridor could manage their properties for the purposes of providing forestry benefits, wildlife habitat benefits, and air quality benefits. We are also involved in a project in the Baltimore area where we're looking at how trees can be incorporated into the state's air quality planning process. No other state in the nation has undertaken to incorporate green urban vegetative cover in its air quality planning process. We are cooperating with MDE on this process, and working on recommendations covering the science and planning tools to get these objectives accomplished. We'll be doing a conference as an offshoot, where we bring together all of the state agencies that plant trees. We have more legislative tools available than any other state to help encourage the planting of trees. This will be the first time all the program managers involved in planning trees will be brought together to discuss how their work could, over the next ten to fifteen years, can contribute to an air quality plan for Maryland.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

We think there should be some changes; the State Forest service should have greater daily management control over the state forests. With respect to specific management activities, the Forest Service should spearhead this effort but there is a role for other DNR agencies like Planning and science parts, and there is a need for strong collaborative efforts with the MD Department of Agriculture, MD Department of the Environment, and maybe even Business and Economic Development. We think there needs to be new secondary markets and markets to create more value-added to the products that are out there, rather than Maryland becoming a net exporter of our wood. We are trying to be a partner to these marketing efforts.

We are concerned about the way the agency is organized to address the needs of privately owned forest lands. The state is currently not well organized to influence private decisions on lands to provide public benefits and to enhance the stewardship efforts of private citizens. We would like to create the beginnings of a dialogue on how the agency and even the law itself should be changed to reflect the changing demographics of forest land ownership.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

We would like the state forests to have a healthy forest ecosystem. We'd like to see, where possible, the state forests expanded on much the same basis they currently are. We believe in multi-use management. Harvest operations are, over the past five years, a very small part of forest management in Maryland.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

We have never advocated that the industry be more dependent on the state, and they aren't very dependent on the state lands right now anyway. More of the industry is dependent on terminal harvest than on state forest, i.e., the harvest of timber off of newly developed land. The private sector would probably make up the balance if you eliminated state land harvest, and it would be a transition of declining harvest overall. We've seen this in other states like New Jersey, the industry itself becomes a cultural relic with sawmills becoming incorporated into parks. The whole notion of economic value being built through harvest ceases to exist. Right now, the economics of forestry are poor, board values in Maryland are low, and so the whole industry is almost always pretty marginal.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

Yes, we have participated in the processes in Western Maryland.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

Yes, I think it has worked well to incorporate public input into management decisions. We have not formulated a position on how that process could or should be changed. Some changes have been proposed, mostly in terms of timing and scheduling.

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

Public input is a positive benefit for making the management plans.

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

It may be impossible to come to full agreement, given the ideological bent of some of the parties involved. There are issues that can be addressed which would help show all sides of the discussion. One example would be a literature search or specific study on private lands that demonstrates, in similar environments and in similar parts of the state, the advantages of different types of land management strategies on the land. We are convinced that the science is on our side for multiple use management, and so we strongly support any practical plan that would provide for a demonstration of the value of land management on those lands, particularly from the point of preserving their health as an ecosystem and protection against future development.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

We tend to look to Pennsylvania and their SFI program, which pre-dated ours, and the Pennsylvania state certified plan, which also pre-dated ours; we've looked at the harvesting and management practices in Virginia, who's industry is more than 10 times the size of MD's; we've looked to New Jersey and Delaware as examples of what benign neglect and actual institutional inertia will do to the forests if you don't do anything. Those states have also been interested in sharing their own pros and cons of what they've experienced. We've worked with those state agencies and also the U.S. Forest Service offices in Philadelphia and West Virginia.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

Yes, and I'd like to point out that the forests that are most important are not the remote tracts but the urban forests. We have a few position papers dealing with this topic and how it relates to water quality and carbon sequestration. We think how we manage the urban forests, the support for urban forestry, and the visibility and value of forest management in urban areas are important attributes. In growing counties, how forest management activities are implemented is also quite important. We're interested in how county legislators interact with local landowners in a regulatory environment.

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

There's a new carbon sequestration website put out by the Pennsylvania energy group. That is an area that should be examined because state forests are significant carbon sinks. The Forest Service does a Forest Inventory for public lands, but there's also one for urban forestry that does science based computer modeling to quantify urban forest structures.

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

I've provided you with reports and position statements here.

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

I've testified for many years and have provided you with copies of relevant testimony.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

I've mentioned the important factors related to forestry management such as air quality, carbon, urban forestry, and conservation in the process of answering the above questions, but there are two others.

The state needs a comprehensive policy on carbon sequestration; there's a significant gap in our policy framework currently. There is a lack of coordination among the agency partners like MDA, MD Energy Administration, DNR, and MDE.



The agency needs one or a series of publications for private landowners on stewardship measures. We need effective outreach and education and not just good public relations. The state does not have the resources to create stewardship plans for every private landowner that wishes to establish one, so any publications to guide private landowners would be helpful. Georgia and Pennsylvania have good examples of providing helpful information to the landowners.

Rural Maryland Council  
March 21, 2005

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

The Rural Maryland Council is a neutral organization. We support the forest industry from the perspective of creating viable rural economies. We want to see this accomplished in a sustainable and environmentally appropriate manner.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

Our position is supported by the professional experience of members of our committees and subcommittees.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

From our perspective, at the top of the list would be economic value, in addition to water quality and recreation (as it relates to economic value in the region).

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

The professional foresters at DNR should be in charge. It's my understanding from talking with them that they feel constrained currently in being able to maximize, in a sustainable way, the use of the resource and that we have a large oversupply, especially in western Maryland, of good quality hardwood.

I heard a presentation recently from the DNR Forest Service that pointed out Marylanders consume five times more forest products than are actually produced from Maryland timber. So we're importing vastly more than we're actually producing.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

The state forests should continue serving the purposes for which they were established. This includes sustainable harvesting of timber. The forests, I believe, are pretty much open to recreation now, which I think should also continue.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

As you are aware, we have had tremendous fragmentation of private lands in Maryland. At some point, the harvesting of smaller parcels becomes economically unfeasible. There should be appropriate utilization of both public and private resources sufficient to meet the demand in a sustainable way.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

I was involved in a study a few years ago that included some regional listening sessions, but not this process specifically.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

n/a

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

n/a

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

Again, my bias is going to be on economic and community development considerations. Utilization of the resource in the state forest needs to relate to the local and regional economies. Sufficient timber cutting should be permitted to keep the area sawmills producing at an economically viable level.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

I think you are fairly well prepared and have scheduled time to talk to all of the major players.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

You should consider talking to the USFS Utilization Program people. President Bush has proposed to cut a number of economic and community development programs through the USDA and the Forest Service, including the economic utilization program of the USFS. I don't anticipate Congress will support this, but you should be aware of it.

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

n/a

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

n/a

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

We have not weighed in on cutting on state-owned lands. We try very hard to work by consensus of the rural stakeholders. The industry groups are more likely to weigh in on this issue. We also try to avoid duplication; where there is effective advocacy being handled by other groups, we leave it to them.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

The issue of the varying environmental benefit of forest stands at different points in the forest life cycle is also an interesting one for consideration.

Sierra Club  
January 25, 2005

1. We are aware that you are an active player with respect to Maryland's forest landholdings because we have seen your organization's name associated with the issue of timber harvest on these lands. What is your organization's position on this issue?

The Sierra Club Maryland Chapter's position is that it does not support commercial timber sales on state-owned lands. The case is significant in Maryland because we have, proportionally and as a percentage per capita, a much smaller amount of public lands than other states, especially public forest lands. It is the conflict between resource values and looking at long term goals and objectives that increasingly support that position. The Sierra club has no opposition to timber sales on private lands, which is where we hope the timber industry, if it is to survive, will be able to flourish, but realistically, the timber management practices that the industry employs are almost relegated to being an anachronism anymore. It's been misdirected for too many years towards even aged timber production, which is economically beneficial, but as Maryland's private lands are increasingly fragmented into smaller parcels more people are buying pieces of the rural landscape and they are reluctant to buy into the idea of even-aged timber management. The Department [of Natural Resources] has been slow to lead the change in management structure that is needed for the industry to survive. A core problem the Sierra Club has had with the Department is with this desire to see the state forests managed to support the timber industry. The number one volume by use in this region for hardwoods is to make shipping pallets, which are essentially disposable. We aren't encouraging enough production of a high value product on private lands. Even though private lands are increasingly fragmented, access is not as difficult an issue as you might think. Maryland has an incredibly high road density, which should make access to most forest stands easier. There are some amazing technologies, like low pressure vehicles that can be driven through the forest, that can help create niche markets for high value wood products. The other economic problem is with the sawmills, there are virtually none that are able to slice trees into furniture quality wood in this region, so there's no incentive here to produce high quality wood.

2. On what basis have you formulated your position (i.e., observation, scientific studies, reports, etc.)?

I've provided you with some of the scientific rationale for our position in terms of biodiversity. Without any planning, it's hard to assess the impacts of any land management activity. In Maryland, there's a lack of any cumulative timber sales assessment or impact assessment on both public and private lands. Maryland has one of the strongest laws, which may be unconstitutional, called the Seed Tree Law. The law covers anywhere in Maryland where the plurality of the stocking, which is most of the trees that confer an economic benefit, are pine; and if a landowner cuts their woods, they are required by law to replace it in pine. The law was passed to support the pulp mill industry and encourage the operations in Pocomoke City to stay, which was ultimately unsuccessful. When you look at the private land data that's been recorded, you see that the private lands are being logged at an incredibly high rate, almost unsustainable. The timber industry doesn't have any kind of regional data on what the

timber patterns are and DNR doesn't provide that information, so there's no way to determine if the timber industry could flourish or survive, or whether it's doing itself in by moving too much timber at an unsustainable rate. The claim could be made that the landowners need to have some sort of return on their land, and logging actually helps keep land from being subdivided. It's an interesting idea but as far as I know is lacking in any substantiation, mostly because once the land is logged during the landowner's lifetime, no more timber sales can occur and the land would have to be sold to make any more money. Saving rural landscapes through timber management doesn't seem to be a logical idea. There has to be some continuing return on the landowner investment, and that's why we don't like even-aged management. That ends up wiping out the economic incentive for sustainable management. If we're going to be doing forestry, then we should be doing it in a sustainable manner. I don't advocate that we have our public lands serve that purpose, although I think the Sierra Club would be much more amenable to having some pilot examples like demonstration forests. As far as I know, there are very few that are examples of uneven-aged management.

3. What are the three most important issues to your organization with respect to the cutting of trees on state-owned lands? Examples include, but are not limited to: biodiversity, habitat value, economic value of timber and non-wood products, diverse use, fire risk, water quality, air quality, recreation, other.

Our main focus is on biodiversity, which is interlinked with habitat value, but we are also concerned about recreation. We don't have tracts of land that provide a critical recreational resource for remote experiences. Right now people have to trek over to the National Forests of WV and Virginia to get that experience, and I think that works against the economic interest of the rural counties who have recreation and tourism as a major segment of their economies. If we don't provide that attractiveness to those areas then we're going to be exporting people to the other places that do. The other thing is that we need to build attractive enough stands of old growth for these recreational opportunities. The current Wildlands are pretty rugged and steep and not accessible to all those who are interested in the remote recreational experience. This is a big opportunity to create really amazing natural areas for more of our urban centers to enjoy. Our state forests ought to be managed as State Parks, similar to Adirondack State Park in New York. Having that kind of vision and foresight to set that land aside would allow more visitation and economic return to the rural counties.

There was a study done by DBED in relation to the State Forest Management Plans done in the early 1990s that found that the timber value in the State Forests was one-quarter of the economic return of the forest compared to its recreational value. An interesting study to do would be to see how much of Maryland's timber is actually exported. I think you would find that much of it is taken out of state, which forces us to examine why Maryland's forests would be managed for the timber industry when that wood is leaving Maryland and not benefiting Marylanders.

4. If your organization feels that changes should be made in the way Maryland state forests are currently managed, what would you recommend? Who should spearhead this effort?

There need to be groups to partner with the DNR to encourage them to make the changes I've mentioned above. If we could eliminate the overarching economic incentive to cut trees on a county level, through the Forest/Park Reserve Fund, we

might see some progress. We'd like to see the revenue from timber harvest returned to the counties and re-invested in forestry management instead of diverted to other uses within the county. There's no incentive for the foresters to be strategic about timber sales because they reap very little of the benefit in terms of using the resources to better manage the forests. Even in terms of timber production, the state forests are woefully inadequate compared to national forest ranger districts of equivalent size. The DNR doesn't have a mechanism to manage effectively, even for timber production, due to a lack of resources. The state foresters can't even show you a map of where the forests have been logged historically because they don't have that information. The data set that they rely on, the Continuous Forest Resource Inventory, isn't tied to individual stands so they can't even produce a stand map that shows basic information like stand age, management history, and prescriptions for timber cutting. The National Forest Service has maps like this for the national forests but the state does not. It seems like the state foresters just pull out a map and decide where they are going to get their volume by looking at the map. That's not a professional way to manage a timber harvest. It might also be useful to look at what proportion of Garrett County's budget comes from the Forest/Park Reserve Funds. The counties need to be shown that in the long term they will reap many more benefits by maintaining the forests for multiple uses, including tourism, than they are with the revenue from the timber sales. It would be interesting to look at the position descriptions for forest managers. It used to be that staff selections were prioritized for those who have more of a timber management background. Maybe that's changed, but if not it would be an important and needed change to manage these properties more holistically. They ought to be emphasizing experience and duties that focus on ecological restoration, biodiversity planning, recreation, etc. The current managers all have industrial forestry backgrounds.

5. What do you think our state forests should look like in the future? What uses do you see being made of these lands?

The Sierra Club would rather see the public lands be managed for the goods and services that private lands either cannot or do not provide, which are going to be large contiguous tracts of mature, old growth forest habitat, keeping in mind that there are many reasons to have well managed early successional habitat. The Sierra Club doesn't view "management" as dirty word and there's a tremendous amount of work that needs to be done to adequately steward the lands that could be a vision of the future that includes getting more citizens to participate through natural area efforts like controlled burns and invasive plant removals. There should be greater efforts to bring more citizens in to get them involved and to become advocates for increased funding to manage the resource.

6. Should the forest and forest products industries be more dependent or less dependent upon timber from State-owned lands in Maryland? If less, then should the private sector make up the balance?

This situation is not a zero sum game. Public lands shouldn't be there to insure the viability of the timber industry. 10 – 15 years ago it seemed absurd that the public lands should be managed so that the timber industry could survive. Times are changing and now there is greater pressure on private lands. I've heard the claim that public lands are

essential to managing and sustaining the timber industry in the state. It is also true that the public lands can't alone sustain the biodiversity in Maryland. We can't do it alone with the public lands, we have to protect the matrix and the connections (hubs and corridors) that are there for the wildlife to survive or at least persist. But you can't protect biodiversity without public lands either. So we have a tension there that we need to resolve in some way. If MFA wasn't dominated by larger corporations and was instead more influenced by smaller lot owners, then we might have more in common and get more done in a collaborative way. The whole notion that forests are going to be healthier from timber management has to be examined in the light of common sense, because timber management isn't a prescription for making forests healthy. That is a human value that has been imparted on it. If you accept that management is necessary for forest health, you would be arguing that in the thousands of years before Europeans arrived the forests here were unhealthy. And yet they sustained the greatest diversity ever known. There can be conditions that may not yield as high of an economic return, and there may be good justifications for that if you're managing the land for economic return or wood fire production, so there's no reason you shouldn't try to manage it in a way that maximizes that yield. That's not a problem, but just don't try to deceive people into thinking it is good for the forest.

7. Have you participated in the process, or are you familiar with the process, that the Maryland Department of Natural Resources conducts which incorporates public comment to help develop and implement a management plan for each state forest? (If yes, continue to next question; if no, skip to question 10)

Yes, I was involved in and was one of the major catalysts for the Department's decision to create 10-year management plans for State Forests. And as we've discussed, they haven't re-done any of the management plans and don't intend to again. I think this is a huge lack of faith in Marylanders and demonstrates the tension between the urban and rural counties where the urban residents view the public land as theirs.

8. How well do you feel this process has worked for Maryland forests?

I think the state forest plans are a good idea, and the Forest Service did have a series of regional meetings throughout the state that I thought were very important to do, and they heard overwhelming support for managing the forests not so much for the timber value but for the recreation and ecosystem values. I think that helped change the emphasis a bit. The state forest planning followed the national forest model of creating zones and we have zones created which we are worried about now especially the water influence zones with steep slopes and streamside sites. We are worried that they might be considered for timber management in the future. And we have the Special Management Area, and that's one of the examples of where the forest planning process almost broke down. There was a tract called Pulsey Run that was supposed to be held out as a model/exemplary area for protection and to be a benchmark to help gauge what the effects of management are. Due to political pressure, the Department was about to sign over the rights to build a road into it. Obviously the forest plans are only a policy, there's no regulatory protection and there's no way for private citizens or groups to bring redress legally against any of the actions of the Department. So we don't have much in the way of a hook to ensure that the forest management planning process is



faithfully carried out. With Pulsey Run, we were left rather shaken because if the plan can be broken for special political pressure, then it begs the question of what is the value of the plan and maybe it can be changed just like when the POS funds are raided. Regarding the lack of public involvement on the state forests, they should solicit comments from all the regions of the state and not just hold sessions in western Maryland and on the lower Shore. They should hold the sessions all over so that there's ample public participation. Because we don't involve more people, we lack a constituency to do the good things we need to do for the forests. The advantage of doing a better planning job is that you can bring in more constituents. The problem with the timber sale project, the annual work plan, is that you can only react to them in the interim. There's no participatory process other than reacting to something from the Department. That's another failure of the 10-year planning process. They'll show the timber sales but there's no other way than through the forest advisory committee for the public to be engaged in any meaningful way besides getting mad at some timber sale. It's not a good way to build alliances. There should be more accountability in terms of the plan. The comments of the interdisciplinary team are not provided to the public and so the public is not benefiting from the internal dialogue that the DNR is having. Sometimes the resources that folks want to see protected get short shrift and because the advocates within the Department are muzzled, that creates that suspicion of the workings of the Department. When we're dealing with resource values and there's disagreement from the agency, the public should know about it. I think it's valuable to see that. The Department will only do something if there's enough pressure and unless there's a way to focus that pressure then it's just a vicious cycle where the same things happen over and over.

9. What recommendations would you make with respect to changing or improving the process?

Getting back on the state forest planning process would be a good step. It's too bad that they can't earmark some of the revenue that comes out of the Forest Park Reserve Fund - and I can't imagine the DNR Secretary would be prevented from doing so - and allocate some of that Fund to purposes that could help improve the information about the forests. I still find it amazing that we can't even get a map of where the timber sales have occurred on state forests. By 2005 we still don't have an effective GIS program in any of the state forests. That's really unfortunate. Putting the resources that are needed to improve the information would be really important. The DNR should be more forthcoming and more inclusive during the planning process to result in actions everyone can agree on.

10. What points do you think need to be addressed by studies like this in order for most of the interested parties in Maryland to come to agreement on the issue of cutting of trees on State-owned lands?

I think rational dialogue is needed. Too much polarization has occurred, and a lot of times the debate isn't over facts but instead is over positions. I wish there were better ways to allow information to drive the process of decision-making. There isn't any forum, institutionally, to bring public policy and public land management to the forefront of the discussion.

11. To your knowledge, are there other states/countries/non-governmental organizations that could offer a model approach to handling the issue of timber harvest on public lands, or that have effective programs or management structures with respect to forest resources and whether to cut on State-owned lands?

Pennsylvania does have a state forest planning process, or at least a state forest plan, and they just went through a revision last year. Maryland is a more suburban state, but there are some good examples from NJ that would be a good to look at. There needs to be a good model to find and that might be the National Forest model.

12. Are there policies or programs at the Federal level that you think would be important to review as we tackle this issue affecting Maryland forests?

Some of the best managed land for biodiversity is actually military lands in the U.S. An example of this is the airbase in Pensacola, Florida. They had someone give them a good education on managing for biodiversity and he convinced them that it's better to manage for bumper crops of endangered species than to just ignore them and have them exist, because they give you more flexibility when it comes to times when you need them. It's exactly what ought to be done. We should be managing to greatly improve the habitat, and increase our options.

The National Forests have mandates for looking at the economic impacts on the surrounding lands. Maybe you should look at the park management plans and the timber management policies of the Jefferson, the Monongahela, and the George Washington National Forests.

13. Are there reports or documents that you recommend we examine as we address this issue?

I brought some with me for you to examine. The forest management plan for the Baltimore watershed is a great example of stewardship. They do uneven age management and they recommend a scientific advisory committee. It wasn't originally developed to be a document; it was going to be more of an interactive software process rather than a report, so it still needs some tinkering. The Baltimore timber sale money goes into their general fund, so there's little incentive to log the county lands. They have to be sensitive to the recreational impacts because of the urban nature of the county, as well as to the contiguous property owners and the amenity values of their properties.

14. In addition to what may be available on your website, would you provide us with a copy of any policies or position statements you have with respect to this issue?

I will find them for you. The Sierra Club chapters establish positions through the vote of the Executive Committee, so I have to locate them for you. The national policies are definitely online.

15. Have you, or has someone from your organization, testified on legislative initiatives pertaining to the cutting of trees on State-owned lands? What was the general position of the testimony and may we obtain a copy?

Yes, we did testify. I gave a verbal testimony. I testified on two bills in 2004 relating to timber cutting in state forests. The general position on the first one was to add some guidance to the law governing the Forest Parks Reserve Fund and what the funds could

be used for. The other bill was looking for a study on the impacts of the forest industry on Maryland's economy.

16. Are there any comments you would like to make about issues we did not address in the above questions?

I think we've covered it all!

## ***Appendix C***

**Maryland Center for Agro-Ecology, Inc.**

### **PART I: INTRODUCTION TO THE SURVEY OF STATE FORESTERS**

#### Why Did You Receive This Survey?

In Maryland, we are facing major debate surrounding the issue of timber harvesting on state-owned lands. For the past three years legislation has been introduced in the General Assembly to place a moratorium on the cutting of trees on state-owned lands and this has had a polarizing effect on the industry, environmental groups, and others who use the State forests. You have been identified as the person who is responsible for the management of state-owned forests in your state and, as such, your perspectives, experiences, and insights with regard to this issue are of great value to us.

#### What Kind of Information Are We Looking For?

We are interested in finding out how your State has approached this issue, to learn what we might be able to incorporate in Maryland to help us address our problem. We are particularly interested in policies, enabling legislation, programs and processes and what has helped you succeed and what pitfalls we should avoid in addressing this issue.

#### What Will We Do With This Information?

We will be providing a decision document for the Maryland General Assembly to use when this issue comes before them again. We will also be providing the document to the Maryland Department of Natural Resources' Forest Service to assist them with their work in developing a strategic plan for the State's forests. We would be happy to provide you with a copy of the finished report upon request.

### **PART II: PARTICULARS OF THE SURVEY**

This survey consists of 10 questions. For our purposes, Section 2 addresses the heart of the matter we're facing here in Maryland and we would appreciate your perspectives as the state forester for that section; the preceding questions are to help us place your state-owned forests in the context of our study and may be answered by another staff member at your discretion.

The first section asks general questions about forest management and for what purposes the state-owned forests are managed. The second section asks about how you have dealt or are dealing with the "no cut" issue in your state, and asks for information such as policies, processes, regulations, incentives, programs, plans, etc. that might help us better address our "no cut" issue. The third section asks a few questions about timber harvesting. Responses to certain questions may be supplemented by program descriptions or management plans, if available.

**Please return the survey by April 1, 2005 to the Maryland Center for Agro-Ecology, Inc., via e-mail to [jdinding@umd.edu](mailto:jdinding@umd.edu); fax at (410) 827-9039; or mail to Jennifer Dindinger, Maryland Center for Agro-Ecology, Inc., PO Box 169, Queenstown, MD 21658.**

**Note:** If another person is involved in answering some or all of the questions, please make a note of that on the survey and provide their contact information. The names and information we obtain will be kept confidential and will not be used for any other purpose.

## STATE FORESTER SURVEY

*NOTE: Questions in italics were not present in actual survey distributed to State Foresters. PI acquired the additional information via web searches and information provided by State Foresters, and included it in survey results.*

State and State Forester: \_\_\_\_\_

Additional Respondents: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Section 1: General Management**

1. a. For what uses are the state-owned forests managed? Please check all that apply.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Ecosystem services<br>(Air quality, water quality, erosion control, etc) | <input type="checkbox"/> Habitat protection             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation   | <input type="checkbox"/> Disease and fire control       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Timber harvesting  | <input type="checkbox"/> Production of non-timber goods |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biodiversity   | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetic value                |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____                    |

b. Are these uses equally important, or are there one or more uses that take priority?  
Please check one.

- ☐ All are equally valued  
☐ Some are valued over others \*

\* If some are valued over others, what are the top three priority uses? Please list them below.

1. \_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

2. In the state-owned forest(s), what percentage of land is set aside for:

Ecosystem services (i.e., air quality, water quality, erosion control) \_\_\_\_\_

Recreation \_\_\_\_\_

Habitat protection \_\_\_\_\_

Timber harvesting \_\_\_\_\_

Disease and fire control \_\_\_\_\_

Biodiversity \_\_\_\_\_

Production of non-timber goods \_\_\_\_\_

Aesthetic value \_\_\_\_\_

Other \_\_\_\_\_

3. a. *Is there an overall strategic plan or management plan for your state-owned forests and are there any plans for individual forests?*

☐

***Yes (please name the individual plans, if applicable)***

☐

***NO***

b. *How often are the plans updated? Every \_\_\_\_\_ years*

4. In Maryland, our mandated management approach is termed “multiple use management.” What would be the appropriate description of your management focus (i.e., ecosystem management, landscape scale management, etc.)?
5. *Are you and the agency for which you work solely responsible for management of the state-owned forests in your state?*

☐ ***YES***

☐ ***NO***

*\*If no, please identify below the other agencies or individuals involved and their respective roles.*

6. As a professional forester, what information sources do you rely upon for policy making besides your expertise and training? Please check all that apply.

- ☐ Federal agencies (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Academic institutions (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ State agencies (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Scientific journals (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Professional Foresters (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Non-governmental organizations (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

7. How are the needs and views of the “public” addressed and incorporated into the formation of management policies, plans and decisions for your state-owned forests? (A program description of the public comment process may be substituted for an answer here.)

8. Given the issues faced by state foresters today, and considering the future of forestry management, what three points of guidance would you give to a new state forester to help him/her prepare for the task ahead?

1. \_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

## **Section 2: The “No Cut” Issue**

9. a. Is timber harvesting permitted on state-owned forests?

☐ YES

☐ NO (if No, please skip to question 10.)

- b. Through what mechanism(s) have you addressed the issue of managing timber harvests on state-owned lands? Check all that apply.

☐ Unit management plans

☐ State level plans

☐ Other (please explain) \_\_\_\_\_

- c. Have you experienced conflicts on the local, regional, or state level with respect to cutting trees on state-owned lands?

☐ YES \*

☐ NO

\* If yes, please specify further:



- d. How were the conflicts resolved? Please check the box next to the approach(es) that was (were) created or utilized to resolve the issue.

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Law        |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Policy     |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Process    |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Program    |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Regulation |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Other      |                       |                  |                    |

\* If any of these approaches are monitored for effectiveness, please explain how below.

### **Section 3: Timber Harvesting**

10. a. Is a portion of the revenue earned from timber harvesting on state-owned lands returned to your agency?

☐ YES \* Percentage \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ NO

\* If yes, please describe below or provide us with some written material describing this arrangement.

- b. Is a portion of the revenue earned from timber harvesting on state-owned lands distributed to affected local governments for specific purposes?

☐ YES \* Percentage \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ NO

\* If yes, please describe below or provide us with some written material describing this arrangement.

11. In the 2004 session, a bill was introduced to the Maryland General Assembly that called for a Logging Impact Report to be generated every three years that would detail the current harvesting activities and their effects on the state-owned forests.

a. Does your agency collect this type of information for your state forests?

☐ YES

☐ NO (If No, please skip to question 10.)

b. Do you report on this information?

☐ YES \*

☐ NO (If No, please skip to question 10.)

\* In what manner? Please specify below. We would appreciate a sample copy of a report if one is available.

c. In what way, if any, does the information from the report influence the manner in which the state-owned forests are managed?

12. a. What are the issues that you are facing with respect to timber harvesting on privately owned forests (e.g., fragmentation, access restriction caused by development, etc.)?

b. How have you been able to address these issues? Please check all that apply.

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>         | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|              | <i>Local provisions</i> |                         |
|              | <i>Ordinances</i>       |                         |

|  |                          |  |
|--|--------------------------|--|
|  | <i>Programs</i>          |  |
|  | <i>State laws</i>        |  |
|  | <i>State regulations</i> |  |
|  | <i>Other</i>             |  |

## **Appendix D**

### **Questions 6, 7, 8, 9c-d, 10a-b, 11b, and 12**

Data from Forester Survey, 2005 MCAE, posted on NASF website (stateforesters.org) JMD

#### **6. As a professional forester, what information sources do you rely upon for policy making besides your expertise and training? Please check all that apply.**

**Alaska** Federal: USFS – State and Private Forestry; Forest Sciences Lab; National Forest System

(Chugach and Tongass NFs); USFWS; BLM Alaska Fire Service

Academic: Univ. of Alaska Fairbanks; Univ. of Alaska Anchorage Environment and Natural Resources Institute

State: DNR, Div. of Parks, Mining, Land, and Water; Office of Habitat Mgmt & Prmtng; Office of Project Mgmt and Prmtng; Dept. of Fish and Game, Divs. Of Sport Fish and Wildlife Conserv'n; DEC, Divs. Of Water Quality and Envmtl Health; Mental Health Land Trust; Univ. of Alaska Mgmt. Office

Journ.: grey lit and many published sources

Prof.: consultants used on timber sale layouts, and on advisory committees for Cooperative Forestry program

NGOs: forest assoc'ns, fisheries assoc'ns, wildlife groups, water quality and envmtl orgs all involved in public review of timber sales, mgmt plan dvlpmnt, and advisory groups for forest practice stds dvlpmnt.

Other: municipalities, borough partnerships for dvlpmnt and mgmt of GIS databases

**CA:** Federal: USFS, BLM, NOAA Fish & Wildlife Forest Svce Expmt Stns, State and Fed. Forest Products Laboratories

Academic: State univ. and colleges, primarily in west

State: Fish and Game, Water Quality, Mines and geology, Forestry and Fire Protexn

Journ: Journ of Forestry et al

Prof.: all practicing foresters in CA must be Licensed Prof. Foresters

NGOs: CA Licensed Forester Assoc'n, Forest Landowners of CA, SAF, Sierra Club, California Native Plant Society, Native American groups and assoc'ns

Other: a/o who wants input as member of public or spec intrst grp

**CT:** Federal: USFS, USFWS

Academic: Yale, Uconn

State: UConn Coop Extens'n; Dept. of Ag.; CT Ag Expmt Stn.

NGOs: CT Forest and Park Assn, TNC

Other: Forest Practices Adv. Brd.

**FL:** Federal: USFS; USFWS; NPS

Academic: Univ. of FL; Univ. of GA; Auburn

State: Dept. of Envmtl Protexn; Water mgmt districts; FL Fish and Wildlife Conserv'n Comm.

NGOs: Tall Timbers, TNC, Florida Forestry Assoc'n, Farm Bureau, Cattlemen's Assoc'n, Florida Fire Chief's Assoc'n

**GA:** Federal: USFWS, USFS, USDA-NRCS

Academic: Univ. of GA, Auburn Univ.

State: GA DNR Wildlife Rscs Div. and Envmtl Protexn Div.

Journ: Journal of Forestry

NGOs: TNC, TCF, GA Conservancy

**HI:** Federal: USFS, USFWS, NRCS

Academic: Univ. of Hawaii

State: Depts of Health, Ag, Land & Ntrl Rscs

NGOs: Community groups, pvte landowners, TNC of HI, TPL, Hawaii Forest Industry Assoc'n

**Idaho:** Federal: USFS and BLM, USFWS & NOAA Fisheries (for thrtnd & endngrd issues)  
 Academic: Univ. of Idaho  
 State: Fish and Game, Water Rscs, Envmtl Quality  
 NGOs: Industry foresters and mngrs  
 Other: other states' agencies

**KY:** Federal: USFS, USFWS  
 Academic: Univ. of Kentucky  
 State: Parks, Fish & Wildlife Rscs, KY State Nature Preserve Commission

**LA:** Federal: USFS, USFWS, NRCS, USACE  
 Academic: La State Univ.  
 State: La. Dept. of Wildlife & Fisheries, La. Dept. of State Parks  
 Prof.: Forest industry, state and federal  
 Other: current scientific info (forums, seminars, symposiums)

**Maine:** Federal: USFS  
 Academic: Univ. of ME  
 State: DOC, DIFW, DAg, SPO  
 Journ: Jo Forestry, Jo Wildlife Mgmt  
 Prof: LPF staff, SilvAdCom  
 NGOs: ME Audubon, TNC, NRCM

**MA:** Federal: USFS  
 Academic: UMass, Harvard Forest  
 State: Ntrl Heritage, Endang species, Wildlife, Envmtl Mgmt  
 Prof: list of 180  
 NGOs: list of 50+  
 Other: Intrstd publics and user groups

**MO:** Federal: USFS, USFWS, NRCS  
 Academic: Univ. of Missouri  
 State: MO Dept of Conservation, MO DNR, MO Dept of Agriculture  
 NGOs: Conservation Federation, Ruffed Grouse Society, Wild Turkey Federation, Equine groups, Industry contacts

**NV:** Federal: USFS, BLM  
 State: Wildlife, Water resources, envmtl protection  
 Prof: NDF staff foresters

**NH:** Federal: USFS Rsch and National Forest info  
 Academic: UNH, Harvard  
 State: Fish and Game Dept., Envmtl Svces  
 Journ: JoF; No. Journal of Applied Forestry; Forest Ecology and Mgmt  
 Prof: Consulting foresters, industrial foresters  
 NGOs: SPNHF, TNC

**NJ:** Federal: Forest Health  
 Academic: Forest pathology, urban ?  
 State: T&E concerns  
 Journ: case studies, research, current trends  
 Prof: pvte lands issues  
 NGOs: public process  
 Other: Dept senior staff

**NY:** Academic: SUNY ESF  
 Other: Public outreach

**NC (DSF)** Federal: USFS publications

Academic: NCSU College of Ntrl Rscs  
 State: NC Wildlife Commission, NC Div of Land Rscs, NC Div of Water Rscs, NC Dept of Ag.  
 Journ: Journal of Forestry  
 Prof: Consulting forester, retired division forester  
 NGOs: Intl Mtn Biking Assoc'n  
 Other: DSF Advisory Committee

**NC (BLSF)** Federal: USFS, USFWS, USACE, EPA  
 Academic: NSCU, VPI, Auburn, Clemson  
 State: NCDA, NCWRC, DWQ, DLR, NCDPR  
 Journ: JOF, Forest Landowner  
 NGOs: LL Alliance, FSC, SFI

**Ohio:** Federal: USDA  
 Academic: OSU – forestry schools  
 State: Ohio DNR  
 Journ: JoF  
 NGOs: TNC

**OR:** Federal: All fed land mgmt and reg agencies  
 Academic: Most NW univ. and some national univ. (UME, Yale)  
 State: OR Dept of Fish and Wildlife; Div of State Lands, Dept of Envmtl Qual; Water Rscs Dept; Watershed Enhancement Brd  
 Journ: SAF Journ of For; Canadian Journ of Frst Rsch; Frst Ecol and Mgmt; Conserv'n Bio; Envmtl Monitoring and Assessmt; Frst Science; Journ of Wildlife Mgmt; NW Science  
 Prof: Extension foresters, Industrial foresters, other State foresters, Fed foresters  
 NGOs: Oregon Forest Industries Council; Portland Audubon Society; Associated Oregon Loggers, Ecotrust; Southern Oregon Timber Ops Assoc'n  
 Other: Western Govs Assoc'n; Forest Trust Lands Advisory Committee; Oregon Forest Rscs Instit.

**PA:** Federal: USFS research  
 Academic: PSU and others  
 State: Dept of Envmtl Protexn; Fish Commission; Game Commission  
 Prof: Advisory Committee/personal contacts  
 NGOs: Advisory Committee/personal contacts

**SC:** Federal: USFS, USFWS, NRCS, EPA  
 Academic: Univ system, including Clemson, NC State, UGA, others  
 State: DNR; Parks, Rec, and Towns; Dept of Education  
 Journ: JoF, Forest Products Journal, Southern Journal of Applied Forestry  
 Prof: SAF, ACF  
 NGOs: TNC, AF&PA, NICASI, Industry assoc'ns, etc.

**SD:** Federal: Rsch Stns  
 Academic: local univ.  
 Journ: JoF  
 NGOs: local assoc'ns

**Texas:** Federal: USFS/NRCS, USFWS, EPA, USCOE  
 Academic: TAMU; SFA  
 State: TDA, TPWD, State Soil and Water Conserv'n Brd  
 Journ: JoF  
 Prof: Assoc of Consulting Foresters; NASF  
 NGOs: Texas Forestry Assoc.; TUFC; TX Wildfire Adv Brd; State Stewardship Coord. Committee

**TN:** Federal: USFS, NRCS, EPA, USGS, DoE, DoI, BLM

Academic: Any but primarily SAF accredited (UT)  
 State: Dept of Envmt and Conserv'n; TN Wildlife Resources Agency; and other state agencies  
 Journ: JoF, SJAF, Forest Service  
 NGOs: TN Forestry Assoc'n, AF&PA, TNC, WWF, NASF, SFI, FSC, etc.  
 Other: public comments, legislators, commissioners

**VT:** Federal: Forest Service Rsch  
 Acad: Univ. of VT  
 State: Fish and Wildlife, Water Quality  
 Prof: other states  
 NGOs: TNC, NWF

**VA:** Prof: Professional Forest Manager  
 Other: Citizens of Commonwealth

**WV:** State: DNR Wildlife Rscs Section and DNR Parks and Rec Section  
 Other: Governor appointed advisory committee, established to dvlp mgmt guidelines, then dissolved. Also Forest Mgmt Review Commission (legislative committee with citizens from industry, tree farmers, county dvlp authorities also holding seats)

**WI:** USFS, Dept of Ag  
 Academic: Univ. of WI – Stevens Point; Univ. of WI; Univ. of Minnesota  
 State: Dept of Ag, Commerce, Tourism  
 Prof: Field Foresters  
 NGOs: all partners, e.g. industry, envmtl orgs, etc.

**7. How are the needs and views of the “public” addressed and incorporated into the formation of management policies, plans and decisions for your state-owned forests? (A program description of the public comment process may be substituted for an answer here.)**

**Alabama:** public input given to St. Forester and staff on all mgmt activities. SF also uses *Stewardship Advisory Committee for discussion, dec'n making, or prioritiz'n processes.*

**Alaska:** see attached briefing paper

**Connecticut:** Formalized public input to state Forest Rsce Plan  
 Local govt and user groups solicited for input on 10 yr forest mgmt plans  
 Local govt and user groups provided notice of harvest ops as per 10 yr mgmt pl.

**Delaware:** Advisory groups appointed by governor

**Florida:** Mgmt plans reviewed in public process every ten years. Dept also reviewed by board of state agencies to ensure mgmt objectives being met. Each forest has liaison committee made of forest users who meet to discuss concerns and get info on forest mgmt ops.

**Georgia:** No specific public comment process. Forest Stewardship Prog guidelines are set by State Stewardship Coordinating Committee, which has reps from public sector.

**Hawaii:** Public hearings, comments, testimony at Brd of Land & Ntrl Rscs hearings, info hearings, news releases

**Idaho:** Seek comments on all timber sales. All sales approved by state board of land commissioners. Yearly meetings held with customers to discuss program and seek input/recommend'ns.

**Indiana:** Strategic Plan with public input; annual open houses to solicit public comment at each state forest; public mtgs on DNR policy.

**Kentucky:** ES mgmt plans were/are avab to public. Press releases announce large-scale mgmt activities. Consider public concerns and needs in mgmt dec'ns, but rely on expertise and expnce to mnge property and then justify axns to public.

**Louisiana:** La. Dept of Wildlife and Fisheries shares public input re wildlife mgmt. Feedback from park patrons in the rec areas is noted. Forest mgmt plan for state forest is dvlpd ev. 10 years. Input from above sources and current science, mkt cond'ns, regs, and rsch are reviewed and considered b/f formul'n of policies that support the mgmt plan.

**Maine:** Public input. Have written prog descrip'n, could send copy of Integrated Resource Policy.

**Mass:** Formal public participation process for rsce mgmt plans and projects

**Michigan:** Natural Resource Commission sets overall policy. Annual work plan of each forest management unit presented to public at open house prior to final decision-making. Input taken at open house, considered, evaluated and incorporated into annual work plan if agreed upon. Final decision is made at Compartment Review where stakeholders and representatives of all disciplines within DNR review plan and approve or recommend changes. Once annual work plan is approved the local unit implements.

**Missouri:** Telephone sampling through universities; public meetings with public/director and staff; public meetings on specific topics with NGOs/staff.

**Nevada:** public hearing process including written and published notifications of any projects on state lands. Public comments considered and factored into land mgmt and ntrl rsce dec'ns.

**NH:** Public input sought through newspaper ads, letters to abutting landowners, and notification of towns where work will be done. Town Road Agents or Public Works Directors are contacted to discuss impacts to public roads in early planning stages of an operation. Citizens often invited to monthly State Lands Management Team mtgs. Some public mtgs held to foster public dialogue in cases where project may be controversial. Working on new Forest Mgmt Plan that will be made avab to public. Drafts will incorporate public input and final plan presented to public on-line and through public mtgs.

**New Jersey:** plans are made avab for public comment and advertised in local newsprint

**New York:** Through public participation process which consists of public review and comment on draft unit mgmt plans, policies, and regulations that relate to state forests.

**NC DSF:** Public meetings to gather input on envmtl assessmt on rec and forest mgmt plan. DSF Advisory Committee has quarterly mtgs and has reps from various intrst grps. Friends of DuPont Forest provides public input on ops of forest, although they are not a policy making group.

**NC BLSF:** Annual stakeholder meetings are held to satisfy the principles and criteria of the FSC certification system under which the forest is certified. Certification under SFI also requires a certain amount of access by the public. Copies of BLSF's management plan are kept available for distribution to the public from the forest headquarters and from the Central Office in Raleigh. Public comments received during stakeholder meetings, and in other ways are documented for consideration. We listen, investigate, correct if necessary, sometimes making adjustments to policies/procedures of the forest.

**Ohio:** Use of legislatively mandated Forestry Advisory Council; numerous meetings with constituencies; direct feedback from public; open houses.



- Oregon:** General public access to dec'ns, public comment period, Board meeting, public meeting, public hearing, or focused technical review. From Oregon Admin Rule 629-035-0080.
- Pennsylvania:** Detailed formal process of public meetings across the state; a series of Advisory Committees which meet 4-5 times per year (Ecosystem mgmt, Recreation, Silviculture, Citizens).
- SC:** Statewide Recreational Advisory Council helps set broad guidance for such uses on state forests. Each local forest has a local group that helps dvlp specific guidelines within the broader state guidelines.
- SD:** Through advisory boards and public meetings
- Tennessee:** No formal process to incorporate public views, but a formal public input/outreach process is under dvlpmt. Additionally, a process to enumerate and define conservation value is also under development.
- Texas:** Public hearings/meetings when needed; County Forest Landowners Assoc'n; State Stewardship Coord. Committee.
- Vermont:** Public involvement as part of the long-range mgmt planning process for each mgmt unit.
- Virginia:** No well-defined plan in place; Dvlp 10-yr mgmt plans for each forest and attempt to incorporate and address needs and views of public through that process.
- West Virginia:** Draft mgmt plan dvlpd for each of the nine state forests. Availability of final draft of each plan will be advertised in statewide newspapers with a large circulation (twice over a two-week period). Included will be advertised times, dates, and locations to review the plan. Copies of the draft plan will be made available for a reasonable and customary fee. A public hearing will be conducted by the Division of Forestry between 30 and 40 days from the date of the second newspaper advertisement. The public hearing will be conducted either on the state forest to be reviewed or within the vicinity of that forest. A response to comments will be made by the Division of Forestry. The record for written comment will remain open for 10 days following the hearing. The DOF Director will prepare and send to the commentators and those requesting such a "Report of Response" on all written comments within 90 days from the public hearing. The written comments and the Director's "Report of Response" will be retained on file at the designated District Forester's office for one year. A final 10-year plan of management for each State Forest will be developed and implemented within 120 days from the date of the public hearing. The State Forest Management Plan will be revised and updated 10 years from the date of approval. □Amendments deemed necessary to meet the mission and goals of the State Forest Management Plan may be recommended by the Director of the Division of Forestry anytime during the 10-year interim subject to consultation from the advisory committee.
- Using the latest forest inventory the Division of Forestry will propose management prescriptions for specific areas of a particular forest. □The Division of Forestry will reinventory the forest resource prior to developing a prescription. An inventory summary and management prescription for the area will be prepared and submitted to the Parks and Recreation Section and the Wildlife Resources Section of the Division of Natural Resources and the Division of Tourism for review and comment. Comments, information, and future concerns received from the cooperating agencies will be considered during preparation of the prescription. When a prescription is prepared for an area of ten acres or greater, it will be advertised twice in a two consecutive-week period in at least one local newspaper and one with a large circulation. A statewide news release will also serve as a notice of the prepared prescription. The time and place for a public tour of the prescription area will also be listed in these advertisements. Within two weeks after the second announcement, a*

*public presentation and public tour of the proposed treatment area will be held. Written comments will be received by the appropriate District Forester for two weeks (14 calendar days) following the tour date. The written comments must be signed and include a return address of the person or persons commenting. □ The District Forester will receive and Division of Forestry personnel will review and consider the written comments. The Director will prepare a response to those who submit serious comments and send them a "Report of Response". The Director will provide final approval based on the review of all input. Upon the Director's approval, the final management prescriptions will be implemented. Prescription for forest areas devastated or with significant damage by injurious agents such as wildfire, storm, insects and/or disease will be exempt from this public input procedure. Emergency salvage measures will prevail in order to expedite the response.*

**Wisconsin:** Wisconsin Admin Code NR-44. Public involvement in the planning process may include meetings, hearings, workshops, open houses, surveys, questionnaires, letters, submitted proposals, personal contacts, study committees, advisory groups and other methods or activities tailored to the needs of the individual master planning effort. Public involvement in the planning process may be for the following purposes: identifying issues related to management and use; submitting suggestions to the department regarding future management and use of a property; identifying and evaluating proposed property goals and objectives; and evaluating management and use alternatives.

*Prior to the initiation of public involvement, except for public surveys or other preliminary issue identification activities, and prior to the formulation of a plan, including management goals and objectives, a plan revision or a plan amendment, the department shall prepare a public involvement plan conforming with this paragraph and make it available to affected or interested parties for comment. The department may revise the public involvement plan at any time with appropriate notice to affected or interested parties. At a minimum, a public involvement plan shall include the following: a description of the process the department intends to use to obtain and assure reasonable public involvement at appropriate points throughout the planning effort; and a description of the process the department intends to use to identify affected or interested parties and notify them about the planning process. Affected or interested parties may include federal, state or local agencies; other government officials and regional planning commissions; Indian tribes; timber, tourism or any other affected business entities; citizen groups, clubs, committees or individuals who have a demonstrated interest; nearby landowners; and users of the property.*

The department shall designate a department employee to be the primary public contact person for each planning process. Concerns or inquiries by any person about the process may be submitted to the contact person who shall have the responsibility to review and respond on behalf of the department.

When initiating the public involvement process, the department shall distribute a news release, consistent with the requirements of s. NR 150.21 (1), to appropriate news media in the vicinity of the property or statewide if the property has statewide significance. At a minimum, the news release shall include the following information: a notice of intent to develop, revise or amend a master plan and to prepare an environmental analysis document required by s. 1.11, Stats., or ch. NR 150; a brief description of the property and its location; the scope and objectives of the planning effort and its potential significance to affected or interested parties; and the process by which affected or interested parties may receive information about the planning effort and opportunities to participate in the master planning process.

*The department shall maintain a list of persons requesting notification of master plan development, revision, amendment and variance proposals and shall notify them consistent with their request.*

**8. Given the issues faced by state foresters today, and considering the future of forestry management, what three points of guidance would you give to a new state forester to help him/her prepare for the task ahead?**

- Alabama:**
1. Maximize multiple-use options
  2. Manage for sustained use
  3. Budget ops so they are self-sufficient and require no addn'l funds
- Alaska:**
1. Public must be involved in dec'ns on public land. Build good working relationships with wide variety of public orgs so they know you are the best source of info.
- CA:**
1. Be inclusive "up front" with public input but not as a decision maker, rather as advisory only.
  2. Manage for multiple use and demonstration type activities.
  3. Seek forest Certification on state owned and or managed forests.
- CT:**
1. Get a copy of Gifford Pinchot's 11 Maxims for State Foresters
  2. Post them on the wall in your office
  3. Read them every Monday morning
- DE:**
1. Educate/inform the public
  2. Work with other state agencies
  3. Be a good neighbor
- FL:**
1. Understand all issues related to forest health and be able to explain plant succession process to public
  2. Be proud of your profession and provide educational programs that dispel the myths that cutting tress is bad. Ex., teachers tour in FL to show forestry from all aspects
  3. Emphasize the role that good forest mgmt plays in having a healthy forest and the positive water mgmt benefits from well-managed forests
- GA:**
1. Establish "real" (= they contribute to your prog delivery and you use them) partnerships with NGOs, other ntrl rsce agencies, and state forestry assoc'n
  2. Dvlp short term and long term legislative axn plans
- HI:**
1. Trained and educated in ntrl rsces mgmt
  2. Undstnd and rsch history behind your agency
  3. Focus on politics and budget
  3. Engage public stakeholders (landowners, envmtl, riparian, and industry leaders)
- ID:**
1. Have clear mandate and mission
  2. Know your customers
  3. Be honest and credible
- IN:**
1. Information Mgmt
  2. Partnerships/Networks
  3. Defined mgmt objectives
- KY:**
1. Have a vision for your state forest lands
  2. Have a primary objective, even for multi-use lands. Ours is educ'n and demonstration of sound forest mgmt practice. This gives justific'n to actively manage the property when there is growing support for the "do nothing" mgmt approach to public lands
  3. Listen to the public and try to address their need but don't manage based on public opinion

- LA:**
1. Public Trust is a Myth
  2. Rely on your professionalism
  3. Don't let politics "infect" good science
- Maine:**
1. Understand expressed wishes of landowners thru elected reps and get public input
  2. Match allocation and activities to resource, vs. changing character or resource to fit desired activities
  3. Don't be ashamed of managing appropriately for extractive commodities
- MA**
1. Work with public – seek support
  2. Know your forests, resource issue
  3. Be clinically honest
- MI:**
1. Communicate
  2. Plan
  3. Communicate
- MO:**
1. Be honest with all people
  2. Communicate effectively with employees and groups
  3. Know policies, plans, and processes
- NV:**
1. become fully educated on forest conditions, health, issues, threats, and management alternatives
  2. Form partnerships and seek cooperators from all sectors
  3. Communicate and educate public and interest groups
- NH:**
1. Develop a very broad base of support
  2. Direct management activities to address a broad array of issues and benefits
  3. Educate the public in cooperation with other agencies and NGOs with a unified resource message as much as possible
- NJ:**
1. Involve the public for input
  2. Use the experience of staff
  3. Be conservative on cost estimates
- NY:**
1. Get to know field staff, core program elements, and land
  2. Become an active and aggressive player in budgeting
  3. Develop relationships with NGOs
  4. Develop relationships with local governments
- NC DSF:**
1. Keep all operations open to public review and comment
  2. Develop partnerships with other agencies and groups
  3. Know that you can't please all the people all the time
- NC BLSF:**
1. Solicit public input
  2. Develop a plan in cooperation with partnering agencies
  3. Be flexible and adaptable
- Ohio:**
1. Be honest and do what you say you are doing to do
  2. Do not compromise mission, but be willing to compromise elsewhere
  3. Engage public and constituencies and promote value of forestry
- Oregon:**
1. Be principled about following legal and statutory mandates
  2. Maintain good communications with and commitment to the stakeholders and beneficiaries of state forests
  3. Understand that policy decisions are value driven. Use scientific and other available info and stakeholder involvement to help inform decisions
- PA:**
1. Build trust
  2. Listen and meet with constituencies
  3. Keep in mind ecological and economic concerns
- SC:**
1. State forest employees should be people-oriented, not technical
  2. Good information system is essential
  3. Maintain emphasis on multiple use

- SD:**
1. Understand your budget thoroughly
  2. Understand your programs
  3. Understand your people
- Texas:**
1. Listen to constituent issues
  2. Assess constantly; evaluate everything
  3. Lead – don't wait for others to
- Vermont:**
1. Be aware of user conflicts – i.e. recreation
  2. Don't go the way of Forest Service with formal appeal process
  3. Embrace technology
- Virginia:**
1. Listen to citizens and diff groups within State
  2. Dvlp well-designed mgmt plans
  3. Keep all technical dec'ns "science-based"
- WV:**
1. Involve the public
  2. Do not expect consensus
- WI:**
1. Collaborative and trustworthy rel'nshp with policy makers and forest stakeholders
  2. Statutory authority and current readable mgmt plan focusing on sustainability
  3. Adequate rscs to implement sustainable forestry

9.

- c. Have you experienced conflicts on the local, regional, or state level with respect to cutting trees on state-owned lands? If yes, please specify further:
- d. How were the conflicts resolved? Please check the box next to the approach(es) that was (were) created or utilized to resolve the issue.

**Alaska:** Conflicts have been local to regional, specifically with respect to developing new access into unroaded areas. Also at issue – recreation conflicts, aesthetics/tourism, subsistence hunting.

**Alaska:**

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Law        | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
| X     | Policy     | Y                     | Y                |                    |
| X     | Process    | Y                     | Y                | Periodic updates   |
|       | Program    |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Regulation | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
|       | Other      |                       |                  |                    |

**CA:** Redwood forest (50,000 acres) has been managed since 1947 and is well stocked. Harvesting has occurred for over 40 years. Now some of the public wants to preserve this stand from cutting, which has been created by our mgmt strategies.

**CA**

| Check | Approach  | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|-----------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive |                       |                  |                    |

|   |            |   |   |   |
|---|------------|---|---|---|
| X | Law        | Y | Y | Y |
| X | Policy     | Y | Y | Y |
| X | Process    | Y | Y | Y |
| X | Program    | Y | Y | Y |
| X | Regulation | Y | Y | Y |
|   | Other      |   |   |   |

**Hawaii:** Concern re native tree harvest or trees in recreation areas; differing perceptions and priorities on role of public forests

**HI**

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Law        |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Policy     | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
|       | Process    |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Program    |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Regulation |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Other      |                       |                  |                    |

**Idaho:** Lawsuits from envmtl groups are main objxn. Our mandate is clear in the state constitution and the lawsuits have failed from lack of standing and/or lack of better science.

**Indiana:** Limited local opposition from special interest groups

**IN**

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Law        |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Policy     | Y                     | N                |                    |
| X     | Process    | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
|       | Program    |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Regulation |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Other      |                       |                  |                    |

ME

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Law        |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Policy     | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
| X     | Process    | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
| X     | Program    | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
|       | Regulation |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Other      |                       |                  |                    |

MA

| Check | Approach                 | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|--------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive                |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Law                      | Y                     | Somewhat         | Y                  |
| X     | Policy                   | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
| X     | Process                  | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
| X     | Program                  | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
|       | Regulation               |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Other (demo area set up) | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |

Missouri: Envo NGO attacked prog thru photo report to newspapers

MO

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Law        | Y                     | Somewhat         | Y                  |
| X     | Policy     | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
| X     | Process    | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
| X     | Program    | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
|       | Regulation |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Other      | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |

NH: Conflicts occur mostly on a local level. In most cases they are resolved through education, cooperation, and compromise.

NH:

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Law        | Y                     | Y                | N/a                |
| X     | Policy     | Y                     | Y                | N/a                |
| X     | Process    | Y                     | Y                | N/a                |
|       | Program    |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Regulation |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Other      |                       |                  |                    |

**New Jersey:** Threatened and endangered issues.

**NJ**

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Law        |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Policy     | Y                     | Y                |                    |
| X     | Process    | Y                     | Y                |                    |
| X     | Program    | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
|       | Regulation | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
|       | Other      |                       |                  |                    |

**New York:** Nimham Mtn Multiple Use Area – strong local opposition to a proposal to develop a demonstration forest on the area. Zoar Valley Multiple Use Area – strong local and state opposition to timber harvesting on area expressed at onset of unit mgmt plan dvlpmnt. Neither situation has been resolved, but public concerns have been heard and are being incorporated in revised plans.

**NC DSF:** To date there have been no commercial timber sales. Tree harvesting confined to mrktng trees cleared for pkg lots and salvaging insect infested and storm damaged trees by DSF staff.

**Ohio:** Periodic appeals from citizens or groups over specific plans or cutting in general. Two occasions of legislation proposed to halt harvesting but did not pass. Legislature has consistently supported state forest harvesting.

**OH**

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Law        |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Policy     |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Process    | Y                     | N                | Y                  |
|       | Program    |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Regulation |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Other      |                       |                  |                    |

**Oregon:** Protests at timber sale auctions and one timber sale operation; many comments at public meetings for reviews of forest mgmt plans and during public comment periods for these and district annual ops plans; ballot measures intro'ed to voters to restrict cutting trees on state lands; pressure asserted by timber industry, county taxing districts, and the legislature to increase harvests.

**OR**

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Law        | Y                     | Y                | N                  |
| X     | Policy     | Y                     | Y                | N                  |
| X     | Process    | Y                     | Y                | N                  |
| X     | Program    | Y                     | Y                | N                  |
| X     | Regulation | Y                     | Y                | N                  |
|       | Other      |                       |                  |                    |



**Tennessee:** Occasional concerns raised by indiv citizens living nearby or user groups.  
Seems to come and go but increased levels of harvesting seem to generate more inquiries and comment.

**TN**

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Law        | Rules Y               |                  |                    |
| X     | Policy     |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Process    |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Program    | Y                     |                  |                    |
|       | Regulation |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Other      |                       |                  |                    |

**Vermont:** Need long-range mgmt plan prepared prior to harvesting.

**VT**

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Law        |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Policy     |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Process    | Y                     | Y                | Y                  |
|       | Program    |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Regulation |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Other      |                       |                  |                    |

**West Virginia:**Went to State Supreme Court – WVDof won, case was brought in an attempt to include another state agency (layer) in process, not specifically to stop timber cutting, but stopping timber cutting was an underlying reason for the case.

**WV**

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place? (Y/N) | Effective? (Y/N) | Monitored? * (Y/N) |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Law        |                       |                  |                    |
| X     | Policy     | Y                     | see below        |                    |
| X     | Process    | Y                     | see below        |                    |
|       | Program    |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Regulation |                       |                  |                    |
|       | Other      |                       |                  |                    |

**Wisconsin:** Aesthetic concerns; values associated with harvesting vs. rec issues; wood supply issues.

WI

| Check | Approach   | Still in Place?<br>(Y/N) | Effective?<br>(Y/N) | Monitored? *<br>(Y/N) |
|-------|------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|       | Incentive  |                          |                     |                       |
| X     | Law        | Y                        | Y                   | Y                     |
| X     | Policy     | Y                        | Y                   | Y                     |
| X     | Process    | Y                        | Y                   | Y                     |
| X     | Program    | Y                        | Y                   | Y                     |
|       | Regulation |                          |                     |                       |
|       | Other      |                          |                     |                       |

\* If any of these approaches are monitored for effectiveness, please explain how below.

**Alaska:** Alaska Forest Rscs & Practices Act establishes interagency review processes, riparian mgmt stds, reforest'n stds, and enforcement authority. The regs that accompany the act establish mandatory BMPs. Public confidence in the effectiveness of the act and regs is a factor in resolving forest mgmt issues. Act and regs monitored through routine inspections and rsch projects. State forest planning process is established through statute.

**Indiana:** A process has been established for implementing signif. Mgmt activities on state forests, and is monitored for consistent implement'n.

**Maine:** Program monitored thru SilvAdCom, certific'n, and unit plan process

**Missouri:** Adjusted BMP applications and no more photo attacks occurred.

**New Jersey:** Monitored through compliance to regulations by program area.

**West Virginia:** Guidelines were est. after the court case. So far the process has not drawn addn'l conflict, but the forests that would likely draw conflict have not had tim hvst prescribed for them yet. One is waiting for a new St Forest Mgmt Plan. The other is awaiting completion of a Safe Harbor Agrmt (w/ USFWS, habitat enhancemt project and agrmt).

10a. If a portion of the revenue earned from timber harvesting on state-owned lands is returned to your agency, please describe below or provide us with some written material describing this arrangement.

**Alabama:** Alabama State Law

**Alaska:** Annual legislative appropriat'n of ~ \$700K/yr of revenue spent by Div. of Forestry. Amnt usu. capped; s/ti cap higher than revenue, s/ti lower. Excess revenue carried over. Above \$700K rtrnd to Gen. Fund.

**CA:** Revenue rtrnd to special fund used for St. forest ops, other rsce mgmt progs and cost share funding to pvte landowners for stand imprvmt and restor'n.

**CT:** Funds over \$875K deposited in the Dept's Envmtl Conserv'n Fund

**DE:** Referenced "attached text" missing from survey

**FL:** All revenue generated on state forest comes to Div. of Forestry and is budgeted for prog. mgmt. 10% of timber sales from other agencies' state lands is rtrnd to Div. of For. for admin. fees.

**HI:** §183-16  
(a) Any moneys accrued from:  
(1) The harvest of non-native forest products from forest reserves;  
(2) The harvest of native forest products from degraded forests as defined in section 186-5.5, within forest reserves;

(3) The sale of forest products found dead and lying on the ground; or

(4) The sale of tree seedlings from state nurseries

shall be deposited into the Forest Stewardship Fund.

(b) Any other moneys accrued from any forest reserve or the products thereof shall be deposited into the general fund.

**MI:** 80% revenue deposited into Forest Dvlpmt Fund and used for mgmt of state forests lands that are predominantly tax reverted lands. 20% deposited into accts used to purchase state forestlands and is used for mgmt as well.

**NH:** \$150,000 returned to state's general fund from sale of saw timber and softwood pulp and the balance is deposited in a non-lapsing account used to manage state lands. All revenues from sale of hardwood fuel wood are deposited into non-lapsing account used to fund sale of addnl fuelwood to the public.

**NJ:** Revenue account established; however, most sales are barter.

**Ohio:** total revenue = costs (DoF) + 25% net rev (DoF) + 10% (gen fund) + 32.5% (schools) + 16.25% (counties) + 16.25% (townships)

**OR:** 36.25% of revenue generated by Board of Forestry lands (land acquired from counties) is returned to St. Forester for supervision and mgmt of State forest lands; revenue from Common School Forest lands goes into Common School Fund, part of which reimburses the Common School Forest Revolving Fund, which pays for admin expenses incurred by State Forester from mgmt and sale of the forests and forest products.

**Pennsylvania:** Revenue is placed in a restricted account and then re-appropriated by the Governor and the Legislature through the budget process.

**Vermont:** 100% of revenue from timber sale receipts is returned to Vermont Land & Facilities Trust Fund. Brochure attached.

**Wisconsin:** Timber sale revenues go into separate accounts in the Conservation Fund depending on the property designation (e.g. principally this involves the Fish & Wildlife account for Fisheries or Wildlife lands, Parks account for State Parks, Endangered Resources account for Natural Areas, and Forestry account for State Forests). It is not directly available in the management of the properties however. The spending authority must be approved by the legislature in a biennial budget process. This works well since it maintains a disconnect between the management of the property and budgeting (i.e. public can't claim we are harvesting aggressively in order to keep our budgets flush).

10b. If a portion of the revenue earned from timber harvesting on state-owned lands is distributed to affected local governments for specific purposes, please describe below or provide us with some written material describing this arrangement.

**GA:** An annual payment is made in the county of our largest state forest as an offset to the loss of possible county tax revenue from that land

**LA:** No portion of revenue, but a severance tax is pd by purchaser and local govt receives 75% of the tax

**NH:** NH does not tax standing timber. Hvstd timber, even on state lands, is taxed at 10% of stumpage value with all tax revenues going to the local municipality. The tax from state owned timber is paid by the logger, resulting in a net reduction in stumpage.

**OR:** 63.75% of BoF returned to counties, 25% of which goes into county school fund, remainder of which prorated and appropriated by county to taxing districts in which land is located using tax levy formula; for Common School Forest lands, see answer to 10a above.

**SD:** Some agencies make payments in lieu of taxes to local governments

**Wisconsin:** Not directly, but the State does compensate local governments with aids in lieu of taxes and some of that money comes out of the “pot” of money that timber sale revenues contribute to.

11. b. LIR reports for the state: In what manner do you report on this information? Please specify below. We would appreciate a sample copy of a report if one is avab.

**Oregon:** Regional forest mgmt plans cover 20+ years; Implementation plans cover 10 years; Annual ops plans cover each harvesting op (timber sale) for the coming year; annual reports also given to beneficiaries, Div of State Lands for Common School Forest Lands and the counties. Adaptive mgmt used to assess effects on state forest lands, through research and monitoring.

Ex: Seven C's Pre-Op Report. Headings include Physical Description of Op Area, Current Stand Cond'n, Desired Stand Cond'n, Proposed Mgmt Prescrip'n, Estimated Timber and Revenue Info, Hvstng and Access Consider'ns, Aquatic Rscs and Water Qual, T&E Species Consider'ns, Slope Stability and Geotechnical Issues, Recreation Rscs, Cx-al Rscs, Scenic Rscs, Other Rscs Consider'ns, Land Mgmt Classific'n Summary.

**Pennsylvania:** Impact information is not reported specifically: we report the number of timber sales and acreage, volume removed, etc. The impact information is covered in the Resource Management Plan and Certification reviews.

**Tennessee:** Only to the extent that harvest data is collected but not related to impacts. Reports given to State forester and fiscal officer.

**Wisconsin:** Internal accomplishment reports and work planning, annual stakeholder meetings, annual forest certification audits, annual insect & disease reports, monitoring of best management practices on timber sales.

12. a. What are the issues that you are facing with respect to timber harvesting on privately owned forests (e.g., fragmentation, access restriction caused by development, etc.)?

b. How have you been able to address these issues? Please check all that apply.

**Alaska:** On Native Corporation land (large landownerships mngd for commercial use), main issues are herbicide use; stds for culvert installation; silvix exempt'n for roads under CWA §404; riparian stds for forest ops in south-central AK; market pressures and loss.

On small private ownerships, issues are beetle infestations; wildland/urban interface fire mgmt; loss of cost-share for forest mgmt activities (FIP, SIP, FLEP).

**CA:** fragment'n; access restrixn b/c of dvlpmt; high cost of Tim Hvst Plan prep. Neither side is happy. Some want no trees cut, some want freedom to do what they please on their land. The laws and ordinances will never satisfy the “no cut” group as long as there are provisions to cut trees.

CA

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>  | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|------------------|-------------------------|
| X            | Local provisions | Y/N                     |
| X            | Ordinances       |                         |
| X            | Programs         | Y                       |

|          |                          |            |
|----------|--------------------------|------------|
| <i>X</i> | <i>State laws</i>        | <i>Y/N</i> |
| <i>X</i> | <i>State regulations</i> | <i>Y/N</i> |
|          | <i>Other</i>             |            |

**CT:** Local regulation via either Inland wetlands or P&Z ordinances (169 towns with potentially 169 diff ways of regulating).

## CT

| <b><i>Check</i></b>                       | <b><i>Approach</i></b>   | <b><i>Effective? (Y/N)</i></b> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
|   | <i>Local provisions</i>  |                                |
|   | <i>Ordinances</i>        |                                |
| <i>X – educ’n of st. foresters</i>        | <i>Programs</i>          | <i>Somewhat</i>                |
| <i>X</i>                                  | <i>State laws</i>        | <i>Not yet</i>                 |
| <i>X – certific’n of loggers + frstrs</i> | <i>State regulations</i> | <i>somewhat</i>                |
|   | <i>Other</i>             |                                |

**DE:** Fragment’n, lack of mkts in some areas for low-quality wood, concerns with nearby dvlpmt, Delmarva Fox Squirrel

## DE

| <b><i>Check</i></b> | <b><i>Approach</i></b>   | <b><i>Effective? (Y/N)</i></b> |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>X</i>            | <i>Local provisions</i>  | <i>Y – are none</i>            |
| <i>X</i>            | <i>Ordinances</i>        | <i>Y – are none</i>            |
|                     | <i>Programs</i>          |                                |
| <i>X</i>            | <i>State laws</i>        | <i>Y – E and S regulations</i> |
| <i>X</i>            | <i>State regulations</i> | <i>Y – E and S regulations</i> |

|  |              |  |
|--|--------------|--|
|  | <i>Other</i> |  |
|--|--------------|--|

**FL:** Non-forestry landowners forcing their desires on landowners who have practiced forestry for generations.

**FL**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Local provisions</i>  | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Ordinances</i>        | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Programs</i>          | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>State laws</i>        | <i>So far</i>           |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>State regulations</i> | <i>So far</i>           |
|              | <i>Other</i>             |                         |

**GA:** Fragmentation, public demand for log truck safety, and safety and road damage concerns at woods road entry pts on state and county rds.

**GA**

| <i>Check</i>                | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|                             | <i>Local provisions</i>  |                         |
| <i>X – road access</i>      | <i>Ordinances</i>        | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X – log truck safety</i> | <i>Programs</i>          | <i>Y</i>                |
|                             | <i>State laws</i>        |                         |
| <i>X – log trucks</i>       | <i>State regulations</i> | <i>Y</i>                |
|                             | <i>Other</i>             |                         |

**HI:** Thrtnd & endngrd species, habitat conservation plans, safe harbor agreements, land use zoning (conservation district), private landowners avoiding public grant programs to concurrently avoid regulatory restrictions.

**HI**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i> | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------|

|  |                          |          |
|--|--------------------------|----------|
|  | <i>Local provisions</i>  |          |
|  | <i>Ordinances</i>        |          |
|  | <i>Programs</i>          | <i>Y</i> |
|  | <i>State laws</i>        |          |
|  | <i>State regulations</i> |          |
|  | <i>Other</i>             |          |

**Idaho:** Development pressure and access across federal lands for private and Idaho Endowment Lands

**Idaho**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i>  |
|--------------|--------------------------|--|
|              | <i>Local provisions</i>  |  |
|              | <i>Ordinances</i>        |  |
|              | <i>Programs</i>          |  |
|              | <i>State laws</i>        |  |
|              | <i>State regulations</i> |  |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Other</i>             | <i>Forest Legacy Prog; haven't resolved access prob across fed lands</i> |

**Indiana**

- Lack of professional forestry assistance in marking and layout of NIPF harvests. (programs addressing with some success)
- Poor harvesting practices and less than desired implementation rate of voluntary BMPs (programs addressing with some success)(ordinances in one county also address this with significant success- but it also discourages any harvest practice.)
- Discriminatory road bonding for logging trucks. And inconsistent requirements between counties. (not being addressed)
- Timber theft and wrongful cutting. (state law addresses and does a pretty good job)
- Nuisance law suits- not a real problem but 2005 state legislation may address this issue.

- f. Local land use ordinances are a problem in only a couple counties. 2005 State legislation is being proposed to limit county/local ordinances that infringe on owner's right to undertake generally accepted forestry practices.
- g. Land parcelization is reducing forest access and sustainability. This is being addressed by programs with some success in rural areas. Conservation programs have limited success in developing areas.
- h. Lack of investment in timber stand improvement work to insure forest sustainability and growth. (not much success in addressing this)

**IN**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Local provisions</i>  | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Ordinances</i>        | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Programs</i>          | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>State laws</i>        | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>State regulations</i> | <i>Same as above</i>    |
|              | <i>Other</i>             |                         |

**KS:** fragmentation; perception that cutting is bad

**KY:** Water quality; law enforcement issues; landowner pre & post harvest education; taxes; lack of involvement of rsce professionals; logger educ'n; public educ'n; timber theft

**KY:**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|              | <i>Local provisions</i>  |                         |
|              | <i>Ordinances</i>        |                         |
|              | <i>Programs</i>          | <i>Y</i>                |
|              | <i>State laws</i>        | <i>Y</i>                |
|              | <i>State regulations</i> | <i>Y</i>                |
|              | <i>Other</i>             |                         |



**LA:** Endangered species issues; local govts policies on county road use; USACE interpret'n of wetland regs; isolated incidents of homeowners' assoc'ns petitioning local govts to interfere w/ timber hvsts in the area.

**LA**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|              | <i>Local provisions</i>  |                         |
|              | <i>Ordinances</i>        |                         |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Programs</i>          | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>State laws</i>        | <i>Y</i>                |
|              | <i>State regulations</i> |                         |
|              | <i>Other</i>             |                         |

**Maine:** Water quality BMP and statewide stds; maintaining forest based economy infrastx; trained workforce; endang species (salmon); timber theft and trespass; fragment'n; sprawl

**Mass:** silviculture systems (too much high grading); fragment'n (rapid dvlpmnt and parceliz'n); Endgrd Species Act; timber theft; Wetland Protexn Act violations

**MA**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|              | <i>Local provisions</i>  |                         |
|              | <i>Ordinances</i>        |                         |
|              | <i>Programs</i>          |                         |
|              | <i>State laws</i>        | <i>Y</i>                |
|              | <i>State regulations</i> | <i>Y</i>                |
|              | <i>Other</i>             |                         |

**MI:** Fragment'n; Right to Forest Act has alleviated some problems.

**MO:** No BMPs used – or at least not monitored; diameter limit harvests – take the best and leave the rest.

**MO**

| <i>Check</i>         | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i>        |
|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>Pvte land BMP</i> | <i>Local provisions</i>  | <i>Logger training - ?able</i> |
|                      | <i>Ordinances</i>        |                                |
|                      | <i>Programs</i>          |                                |
|                      | <i>State laws</i>        |                                |
|                      | <i>State regulations</i> |                                |
|                      | <i>Other</i>             |                                |

**Nevada:** Rapid urban dvlpmnt and the conversion of timberlands to other land uses; lack of timber harvesters and mills; insect and disease infestations induced by drought. These issues have not been mitigated, to date.

**NH:** A few large private landowners are managing their large land holdings in a short-term manner by clear-cutting large contiguous blocks (1000s of acres). Another issue of concern is fragmentation caused by residential development.

**New Jersey:** Local and state regulations related to Threatened and Endangered protection.

**NJ**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|              | <i>Local provisions</i>  |                         |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Ordinances</i>        | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Programs</i>          | <b><i>Y</i></b>         |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>State laws</i>        | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>State regulations</i> | <i>Y</i>                |
|              | <i>Other</i>             |                         |

**New York:** Local timber harvesting ordinances; fragmentation; unsustainable silviculture ("high grading"); lack of mkts for lower quality material; declining numbers of logging contractors; road access issues (old roads, abandoned roads, access

rights, etc.); timber theft; lack of technical assistance for landowners (only about 20% of harvests ever have a professional forester involved [state or private sector]). Addressed through state Right to Practice Forestry legislation passed in 2004; high grading being discussed within forestry community and with forest landowners to raise awareness and concern; penalties for timber theft increased in 2004 as part of RtPF legislation.

**NC DSF:** Clear-cutting is opposed by some, and some municipalities have enacted ordinances to regulate tree removal. Legitimate forestry ops under a timber mgmt plan are generally exempt from these ordinances.

**NC BLSF:** Continuing longleaf pine acreage losses; fragmentation; development.

**NC**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|              | <i>Local provisions</i>  |                         |
|              | <i>Ordinances</i>        |                         |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Programs</i>          | <i>Unknown</i>          |
|              | <i>State laws</i>        |                         |
|              | <i>State regulations</i> |                         |
|              | <i>Other</i>             |                         |

**Ohio:** Parcelization; proper use of BMPs; lack of prof assistance to landowners; lack of landowner incentives for sound mgmt; lack of low grade markets.

**OH**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|              | <i>Local provisions</i>  |                         |
|              | <i>Ordinances</i>        |                         |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Programs</i>          | <i>Y</i>                |
|              | <i>State laws</i>        |                         |
|              | <i>State regulations</i> |                         |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Other</i>             | <i>Y</i>                |

**Oregon:** Promoting sustainable forest mgmt practices; controlling conversion to non-forest uses; public safety regarding landslides from harvested lands that may affect

precariously located residences and highly traveled roads; adequate protection of water quality for streams, wetlands, and lakes; protection of threatened and endangered species.

**OR**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>           | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
|              | <i>Local provisions</i>   |                         |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Ordinances</i>         | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Programs</i>           | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>State laws</i>         | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>State regulations</i>  | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Other - Incentives</i> | <i>Y</i>                |

**Pennsylvania:** Regeneration problems; high grading; parcelization and fragmentation; timber theft.

**PA**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|              | <i>Local provisions</i>  |                         |
|              | <i>Ordinances</i>        |                         |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Programs</i>          | <i>Poor</i>             |
|              | <i>State laws</i>        |                         |
|              | <i>State regulations</i> |                         |
|              | <i>Other</i>             |                         |

**SC:** Declining market for small diameter trees; aging logging force, training of loggers. Working with Dept of Commerce to get new industry, develop markets for biomass, etc, and working with local industry groups to train loggers in BMP program.

**SD:** Fragmentation; Over harvesting – liquidation of timber; subdividing lands

**Tennessee:** Loss of forested acreage to non-forest uses; parcelization in general and from corporate divestitures; water quality – BMP implementation rates; maintaining diverse readily available competitive markets; public objection to clear cutting and

associated aesthetic issues. BMPs are non-regulatory and this approach is working to get implement'n rates above 80%. Legislative bills have been intro'ed each year for past 7 years to limit or regulate clear cutting – none have been passed to date.

**Texas:** Fragmentation – decrease in ownership sizes; loss of mkts – industry selling land and closing mills; family forest owners increasing – values shifting; rapid urbanization. Approaches for dealing with these issues: created “urban districts” to meet the new family forest owners technical assistance needs; created new “Sustainable Forestry” program that includes Ecological Services and Econ Dvlpmnt; re-tooled state agency professionals to meet new clientele needs; and strengthened tax, GIS, econ analyst, conserv'n educ'n and wood technologist staffs.

**TX**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|              | <i>Local provisions</i>  |                         |
|              | <i>Ordinances</i>        |                         |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Programs</i>          | <i>Y</i>                |
|              | <i>State laws</i>        |                         |
|              | <i>State regulations</i> |                         |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Other (Education)</i> | <i>Y</i>                |

**Vermont:** Local zoning ordinances impacting “right to practice” forestry; parcelization; reduction in number of market opportunities.

**VT**

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
|              | <i>Local provisions</i>  |                         |
|              | <i>Ordinances</i>        |                         |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Programs</i>          | <i>Y</i>                |
|              | <i>State laws</i>        |                         |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>State regulations</i> | <i>Y</i>                |
|              | <i>Other</i>             |                         |

**Virginia:** Issues depend on location. For the three largest state forests in Piedmont area, the issues are primarily mgmt ones like age and species diversity. Occasionally there are public issues with conflict with recreation or other activities. Layout of sales areas takes into account aesthetics, water quality, wildlife needs plus many other concerns that help with public opinion.

**West Virginia:** Due to pressure put on National Forest Land in WV (1 million acres) to not cut timber and the lengthy time period it takes to even put up a sale, the forest industry has had to look at private land. Unlike public land, the private land sale is not often cut from a sustained yield concept. Private land is often put into another land use following a sale (housing) particularly if the harvest is exceedingly heavy. Due primarily to second homes and vacation housing, fragmentation is the result. Other issues on private lands are rights-of-way problems, boundary problems and subdevelopment "covenants" to prevent/restrict cutting.

#### WV

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i>                      |
|--------------|--------------------------|--|
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Local provisions</i>  | <i>Only restrictive, often not effective</i> |
|              | <i>Ordinances</i>        |  |
|              | <i>Programs</i>          |  |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>State laws</i>        | <i>Some what</i>                             |
|              | <i>State regulations</i> |  |
|              | <i>Other</i>             |  |

**Wisconsin:** Fragmentation, values for owning land, high property taxes, parcelization, lack of private forestry assistance, shortage of logging contractors willing to work on small acreages.

#### WI

| <i>Check</i> | <i>Approach</i>          | <i>Effective? (Y/N)</i> |
|--------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Local provisions</i>  | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Ordinances</i>        | <i>Y and N*</i>         |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>Programs</i>          | <i>Y</i>                |
| <i>X</i>     | <i>State laws</i>        | <i>Y</i>                |
|              | <i>State regulations</i> |                         |

|  |              |  |
|--|--------------|--|
|  | <i>Other</i> |  |
|--|--------------|--|

\* Some local ordinances occasionally conflict with overall direction of plans and mgmt.

## Appendix E

### Question 1

| State                | Date      | Uses<br>ES | Rec | Tim | BDV | HabPro | Dis/Fire | NTG | AesVal | oth  | Value<br>Equal | Prior. | 1<br>Rec.          | 2<br>TimHvst<br>other uses       | 3<br>n/a                             |
|----------------------|-----------|------------|-----|-----|-----|--------|----------|-----|--------|--|----------------|--------|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Alabama              | 3/15/2005 | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        |     | X      |  |                | X      |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Alaska               | 3/7/2005  |            |     |     |     |        |          |     |        | n/a  |                | X      | TimHvst            |                                  |                                      |
| Arizona              |           |            |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |  |                |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Arkansas             |           |            |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |  |                |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| California           | 4/4/2005  | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      |  | X              |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Colorado             |           |            |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |  |                |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Connecticut          | 2/28/2005 | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      |  | X              |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Delaware             | 3/3/2005  | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        |     | X      | demo/educ'n  | X              |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| District of Columbia |           |            |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |  |                |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Florida              | 2/28/2005 | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      |          | X   | X      | hydrologic<br>restor'n; endang<br>sp mgmt;<br>educ'n | X              |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Georgia              | 3/7/2005  | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        |     | X      | wildlife/hunting                                     |                | X      | Water qual.        | TimHvst                          | Wildlife/hunting                     |
| Hawaii               | 3/31/2005 | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      |  |                | X      | ES                 | Habitat<br>protexn               | NTG &<br>gathering                   |
| Idaho                | 3/7/2005  |            |     | X   |     |        |          | X   |        | revenue  |                | X      | Revenue<br>gener'n |                                  |                                      |
| Illinois             |           |            |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |  |                |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Indiana              | 3/28/2005 | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      |  |                | X      | TimHvst            | Ecosystem<br>srvcs               | Recreation                           |
| Iowa                 |           |            |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |  |                |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Kansas - no st for   | 2/28/2005 |            |     |     |     |        |          |     |        | no state forests                                     |                |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Kentucky             | 3/11/2005 | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      |  |                | X      | TimHvst            | Recreation                       | ES, biodiv,<br>habitat               |
| Louisiana            | 3/29/2005 | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        |     | X      | wildlife mgmt  |                | X      | TimHvst            | Endgrd sp.<br>Habitat<br>protexn | 3. wildlife<br>mgmt 4.<br>Aesthetics |
| Maine                | 3/18/2005 | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      |  |                | X      | species<br>protexn | backcountry<br>rec               | wildlife                             |
| Maryland             | n/a       |            |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |  |                |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Massachusetts        | 3/7/2005  | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      |  |                | X      | biodiv             | water qual                       | "the rest"                           |
| Michigan             | 3/28/2005 | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      |  | X              |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Minnesota            |           |            |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |  |                |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Mississippi          |           |            |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |  |                |        |                    |                                  |                                      |
| Missouri             | 4/1/2005  | X          | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      |  |                | X      | Habitat<br>protexn | forest<br>health/tim<br>mgmt     | biodiversity                         |
| Montana              |           |            |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |  |                |        |                    |                                  |                                      |



## Nebraska

| State                          | Date      | Uses |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |                                     | Value |        |  |                          |   |  |
|--------------------------------|-----------|------|-----|-----|-----|--------|----------|-----|--------|-------------------------------------|-------|--------|--|--------------------------|---|--|
|                                |           | ES   | Rec | Tim | BDV | HabPro | Dis/Fire | NTG | AesVal | oth                                 | Equal | Prior. | 1  | 2                        | 3   |  |
| New Hampshire                  | 5/16/2005 | X    | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        |     | X      |                                     | X*    |        | Tim/recreatn   |                          |   |  |
| New Jersey                     | 5/9/2005  | X    | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      | forest health                       |       | X      | biodiv   | forest health            | ES  |  |
| New Mexico                     |           |      |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |                                     |       |        |  |                          |   |  |
| New York                       | 3/31/2005 | X    | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        |     | X      | oil and gas                         | X *   |        | * ntrl rscs<br>protexn<br>paramount  |                          |   |  |
| North Carolina DuPont SF       | 3/31/2005 | X    | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      |                                     |       | X      | soil/H2O qual  | unique plant communities | Recreation (all plus timhvt)  |  |
| North Carolina Bladen Lakes SF | 3/31/2005 | X    | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      | rsch/demo                           |       | X      | TimHvst  | NTG<br>produxn           | rsch/demo   |  |
| North Dakota                   |           |      |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |                                     |       |        |  |                          |   |  |
| Ohio                           | 3/7/2005  | X    | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      |                                     | X*    |        | *timHvst<br>prescribed by<br>law   |                          |   |  |
| Oklahoma                       |           |      |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |                                     |       |        |  |                          |   |  |
| Oregon                         | 4/1/2005  | X    | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      | X                                   |       | X      | Econ/envmt<br>value  | social values            |   |  |
| Pennsylvania                   | 5/16/2005 | X    | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      |                                     |       | X      | tim supply   | recreation               | wtrshd prtzn  |  |
| Rhode Island                   |           |      |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |                                     |       |        |  |                          |   |  |
| South Carolina                 | 3/5/2005  | X    | X   | X   | X   | X      |          | X   | X      |                                     |       | X      | TimHvst  | NTG                      | Recreation  |  |
| South Dakota                   | 3/29/2005 | n/a  | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a    | n/a      | n/a | n/a    | State Parks                         |       | X      | Recreation   | Scenic<br>Beauty         |   |  |
| Tennessee                      | 5/10/2005 | X    | X   | X   |     | X      | X        | X   | X      |                                     | X     |        |  |                          |   |  |
| Texas                          | 4/1/2005  | n/a  | X   | X   | n/a | X      | X        |     |        | endg<br>species/demo                |       | X      | Endg species   | demo<br>frst/educn       | timber  |  |
| Utah                           |           |      |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |                                     |       |        |  |                          |   |  |
| Vermont                        | 4/11/2005 | X    | X   | X   | X   | X      |          | X   |        |                                     |       | X      | Biodiv   | recreation               | timber  |  |
| Virginia                       | 3/21/2005 |      | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        |     | X      | rsch/demo                           |       | X      | Rsch/demo  | educ/rec                 | timHvst   |  |
| Washington                     |           |      |     |     |     |        |          |     |        |                                     |       |        |  |                          |   |  |
| West Virginia                  | 4/12/2005 |      | X   | X   |     | X      |          |     | X      | demo                                |       | X      | spec values<br>(T&E species<br>habitat/wtrshd;<br>SMZ; trail and<br>road buffers;<br>imprvd rec<br>areas | timber<br>management     | Hvst roads now<br>used as trails are<br>still considered<br>roads for future<br>use |  |
| Wisconsin                      | 3/31/2005 | X    | X   | X   | X   | X      | X        | X   | X      | local and st<br>economy;<br>hunting | X     |        |  |                          |   |  |

Wyoming

## Questions 2, 3, 4, and 5

| State                | % set for: |      |     |     |        |          |     |        |                 | Mgmt Plan?  | updated?                                  | Mgmt focus                              | Mgmt Agencies  |
|----------------------|------------|------|-----|-----|--------|----------|-----|--------|-----------------|---|---|---|--|
|                      | ES         | Rec  | Tim | BDV | HabPro | Dis/Fire | NTG | AesVal | oth             |   |   |   |  |
| Alabama              | n/a        | n/a  | n/a | n/a | n/a    | n/a      | n/a | n/a    |                 | Y - Alabama Stewardship Plan (2002)                         | n/a                                       | multi-use                               | Alabama Forestry Commission; AL Forest Stewardship Adv Committee |
| Alaska               | some       | most | 9%  | <1% | most   | n/a      | <1% | n/a    |                 | Y - Inventory and Mgmt Plans, sep for each of 2 st. forests | 5 yrs                                     | m-u/sustained yield                     | DNR Div of For; overseen by Bd of Forestry                       |
| Arizona              |            |      |     |     |        |          |     |        |                 |   |   |   |  |
| Arkansas             |            |      |     |     |        |          |     |        |                 |   |   |   |  |
| California           | n/a        | 10%  | 40% | n/a | n/a    | n/a      | n/a | 20%    |                 | Y - Mgmt plan/EIR and site specific Timber hvst plans       | tim hvst plans updated prior to new hvsts | m-u/ecosystm health+restor'n/ rsch+demo | CA Dept of For and Fire Protexn; State For Adv Committee;        |
| Colorado             |            |      |     |     |        |          |     |        |                 |   |   |   |  |
| Connecticut          | n/a        | n/a  | n/a | n/a | n/a    | n/a      | n/a | n/a    | ntrl areas 7.6% | Y - CT Statewide For Rsce Plan ('04-'13)                    | 5-yr review in '08; 10-yr in '13          | sustainable m-u                         | CT Bureau of Ntrl Rsces, Div of For; CT Forestlands Committee    |
| Delaware             | n/a        | 100% | 67% | n/a | n/a    | n/a      | n/a | n/a    |                 | Y - each forest has own Unit Mgmt Plan                      | 10 years                                  | multi-use                               | DE Forest Service  |
| District of Columbia |            |      |     |     |        |          |     |        |                 |   |   |   |  |
| Florida              | n/a        | n/a  | n/a | n/a | n/a    | n/a      | n/a | n/a    |                 | Y - review by public and board of st agencies               | 10 yrs                                    | multi-use                               | FL Div of For; multiple st agencies also do review               |

|                    |           |            |             |            |               |                 |            |               |   |   |                                       |   |  |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|---------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Georgia            | 100%      | 75%        | 75%         | 25%        | n/a           | 100%            | n/a        | 100%          | 75% (wldlf/hntg)  | Y - Forest Stewardship Plans                        | n/a                                   | guidelines from Fst Stwrdsip Prog used; timber main object. | GA For Commission  |
| <b>State</b>       | <b>%</b>  | <b>set</b> | <b>for:</b> |            |               |                 |            |               |   | <b>Mgmt Plan?</b>                                   | <b>updated?</b>                       | <b>Mgmt focus</b>   | <b>Mgmt Agencies</b>                                       |
|                    | <b>ES</b> | <b>Rec</b> | <b>Tim</b>  | <b>BDV</b> | <b>HabPro</b> | <b>Dis/Fire</b> | <b>NTG</b> | <b>AesVal</b> | <b>oth</b>  |   |                                       |   |  |
| Idaho              | n/a       | n/a        | 40%         | n/a        | n/a           | n/a             | 60%        | n/a           | cropland,grzng,comm. cottage sites, minerals                        | Y - Bur of For Mgmt Plan; Timber Sale Plan          | both yearly: CY; FY                   | maximize revenue, esp for public schools                    | ID Dept of Lands, For Mgmt Bureau                          |
| Illinois           |           |            |             |            |               |                 |            |               |   |   |                                       |   |  |
| Indiana            | n/a       | n/a        | n/a         | n/a        | n/a           | n/a             | n/a        | n/a           | 60% can be hvstd  | Y - specific plans for tracts within each st forest | 20 years                              | multi-use   | IN DNR, Div of For   |
| Iowa               |           |            |             |            |               |                 |            |               |   |   |                                       |   |  |
| Kansas - no st for |           |            |             |            |               |                 |            |               |   |   |                                       |   |  |
| Kentucky           | n/a       | n/a        | n/a         | n/a        | n/a           | n/a             | n/a        | n/a           | no set %; all considered in mgmt dec'ns                             | Y - ecosys mgmt plan and hvst plans                 | hvst - b/f any hvst; mgmt - as needed | Ecosystem mgmt  | KY Div of Forestry   |
| Louisiana          | n/a       | 80%        | 50%         | 10%        | 20%           | 100%            | n/a        | 100%          | wildlife mgmt 100%  | Y - For Mgmt Plan                                   | 10 yrs                                | multiple use  | LA Dept of Ag and For, Office of For                       |
| Maine              | n/a       | n/a        | n/a         | n/a        | n/a           | n/a             | n/a        | n/a           |   |   | IRP - 10 yrs                          | m-u/sustained yield   | ME Dept of Conserv'n, ME For Svce; Bureau of Pks and Lands |
| Maryland           |           |            |             |            |               |                 |            |               |   |   |                                       |   |  |
| Massachusetts      | n/a       | 100%       | 80%         | 100%       | 100%          | 100%            | 20%        | 100%          |   | Y - land mgmt plans by '09 (in process)             | 15yr implemntn sched                  | multiple use - want to meet FSC stds by '09                 | MA Dept of Conservn and Rec, Bur of For                    |
| Michigan           | n/a       | n/a        | n/a         | n/a        | n/a           | n/a             | n/a        | n/a           | timhvst can occur in any area as long as dominant use is maintained | Y - annual workplans                                | each year; comment begins 2yr prior   | ecosystem mgmt (seeking dual certification FSC and SFI)     | MI DNR,  |
| Minnesota          |           |            |             |            |               |                 |            |               |   |   |                                       |   |  |

Mississippi

| State               | %    | set            | for: |      |        |          |      |        |   | Mgmt Plan?   | updated?  | Mgmt focus                            | Mgmt Agencies  |
|---------------------|------|----------------|------|------|--------|----------|------|--------|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|
|                     | ES   | Rec            | Tim  | BDV  | HabPro | Dis/Fire | NTG  | AesVal | oth   |  |   |                                       |  |
| Montana             |      |                |      |      |        |          |      |        |   |  |   |                                       |  |
| Nebraska            |      |                |      |      |        |          |      |        |   |  |   |                                       |  |
| Nevada              | n/a  | n/a            | n/a  | n/a  | n/a    | n/a      | n/a  | n/a    | no set asides; mngd as single unit  | Y - NV Natural Resources Plan  | once since 1985 (ongoing)   | multiple use                          | NV Dept of Conserv'n and Ntrl Rscs                                 |
| New Hampshire       | 100% | 100% (passive) | 60%  | 100% | 100%   | 100%     | 100% | 100%   | 100%  | Y - NH Forest Resources Plan   | 10 yrs  | multiple use                          | NH Div of Forests and lands  |
| New Jersey          | n/a  | n/a            | n/a  | n/a  | n/a    | n/a      | n/a  | n/a    | besides rec, land mngd for F&W, ntrl areas, pks and forests, and hx sites | 11 Unit mgmt plans; new process being dvlpd for multi-discp input into forest mgmt               | unit mgmt plans not updated regularly; new process underway - no time frame | multiple use, focused on biodiversity | NJ Dept of Envmntl Protection, Div of Parks and Forestry           |
| New Mexico          |      |                |      |      |        |          |      |        |   |  |   |                                       |  |
| New York            | ~7%  | n/a            | n/a  | n/a  | n/a    | n/a      | n/a  | n/a    |   | Y - unit mgmt plans (contain forests and parks and other areas) in conjunxn w/ State Master Plan | review/ revisions in 10 yrs   | multiple use                          | NYDEC Div of Lands and For; Div of Fish, Wildlife and Marine Rscs; |
| North Carolina DSF  | 100% | 100%           | 75%  | 25%  | 100%   | 100%     | 75%  | 100%   |   | Y - unit mgmt plan being written   | probably 5-10 yrs   | multiple use/rec                      | NC Div of For Resources  |
| North Carolina BLSF | 100% | 100%           | 66%  | 100% | 100%   | 100%     | 33%  | 100%   | rsch/demo = 100%  | Y - Forest Mgmt Plan Guidelines  | last updated '98, starting next update '05                                  | m-u/landscape scale                   | NC Div of For Resources  |
| North Dakota        |      |                |      |      |        |          |      |        |   |  |   |                                       |  |

| State          | %     | set  | for:     |      |                                   |          |      |        |                            | Mgmt Plan?   | updated?  | Mgmt focus   | Mgmt Agencies                                  |
|----------------|-------|------|----------|------|-----------------------------------|----------|------|--------|----------------------------|--|---|--|--|
|                | ES    | Rec  | Tim      | BDV  | HabPro                            | Dis/Fire | NTG  | AesVal | oth                        |  |   |  |  |
| Oregon         | 4.60% | <1%  | the rest | 0%   | 18% until unocc by indctr species | 0%       | 0%   | <1%    | <1% pwr lines/quarries     | Y - Forest Mgmt Plan & Habitat Conserv'n Plan; Implement'n Plan; Annual Ops Plan | FMP/HCP - 10 yrs Imp Plan - 10 yrs Annual Ops Plan - 1 yr | maximize revenue for Common School Fund; secure grtst permnt value |  |
| Pennsylvania   | n/a   | 100% | 53%      | 100% | 100%                              | ?        | 100% | 100%   |                            | Y - State For Rsce Mgmt Plan   | 15 yrs  | ecosystem mgmt (FSC certified)                                     | PA Dept of Conserv'n and Ntrl Rscs, Bur of For |
| Rhode Island   |       |      |          |      |                                   |          |      |        |                            |  |   |  |  |
| South Carolina | 10%   | 10%  | 80%      | 0%   | 20%                               | 0%       | 30%  | 5%     | no sites for single use    | Y - State For Long Range Plan; specific mgmt plans derived from it               | complete inventory in 5 yrs; re-invent 20% annually       | multiple use (mgmt for diverse uses)                               | SC Forestry Commission                         |
| South Dakota   | n/a   | 75%  | 5%       | n/a  | 20%                               | n/a      | n/a  | n/a    |                            | No State Forests; st forester reviews timber sales on state lands                | n/a   | Rec mgmt - St pks Revenue mgmt - st trust lands                    | SD Dept of Ag, Rsce Conserv'n and Forestry     |
| Tennessee      | 100%  | 100% | 75%      | 100% | 100%                              | 100%     | <5%  | 50%    | 15% - smz/row/strms        | Y - 1000ac stand/cmptrmt plans; forest plan; state systems plan                  | stand/cmptrmt plan revised ev. 10 yrs                     | multi-use (FSC certified)  | TN Dept of Ag, Div of For                      |
| Texas          | n/a   | 2%   | 70%      | n/a  | 90%                               | 5%       | n/a  | n/a    | endg spc - 60% demo - 100% |  |   | demo forests for multip assets; emphasis on EndSp where present    | TX Forest Service                              |
| Utah           |       |      |          |      |                                   |          |      |        |                            |  |   |  |  |

| State         | %    | set  | for: |      |        |          |     |        |  | Mgmt Plan?  | updated?                                   | Mgmt focus  | Mgmt Agencies        |
|---------------|------|------|------|------|--------|----------|-----|--------|--|---|--|---|----------------------|
|               | ES   | Rec  | Tim  | BDV  | HabPro | Dis/Fire | NTG | AesVal | oth  |   |  |   |                      |
| Virginia      | n/a  | 5%   | 80%  | 5%   | n/a    | n/a      | 5%  | 5%     |  | Y - mgmt plans for each of 3 lgst st forests, use sustained yield prog for timhvt | 10 yr plan for each forest                 | total mult use; system supported from sale of forest products (SFI certified) | VA Dept of Forestry  |
| Washington    |      |      |      |      |        |          |     |        |  |   |  |   |                      |
| West Virginia | 0%   | 5%   | 0%   | 0%   | <5%    | 0%       | 0%  | <5%    | zoning only used for T&E habitat and rec areas | Y - state level guidelines; Mgmt Plan for ea of 8 st forests                      | guidelines - no sched; Mgmt Plans - 10 yrs | multiple use and demo of forest mgmt  | WV Div of Ntrl Rscs, |
| Wisconsin     | 100% | 100% | 80%  | 100% | 100%   | 95%      | 80% | 100%   | % is "avab for" not "set aside"                | Y - State Forest Master Plans for each forest                                     | 15 yr review                               | sustainable forestry  | WI DNR, Div of For   |
| Wyoming       |      |      |      |      |        |          |     |        |  |   |  |   |                      |

## Questions 6, 9a-c, 10 and 11

| State                   | InfoSrce |      |    |       |         |      |      | TimHvst? | How mngd?  | Conflicts?                                 | TimHvst<br>Rev<br>rtrnd?<br>(%)             | Local %?                       | LIR         |                             |   |
|-------------------------|----------|------|----|-------|---------|------|------|----------|--|--|---|--------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---|
|                         | Fed      | Acad | St | Journ | Pr.For. | NGOs | oth  |          |  |  |   |                                | Info coll.? | Reprtd?                     | Infl. Policy?                                       |
| Alabama                 | X        | X    | X  | X     | n/a     | n/a  |      | Y        | unit plan  | N  | Y(100%)                                     | N                              | N           | N                           | n/a   |
| Alaska                  | X        | X    | X  | X     | X       | X    | text | Y        | area/mgmt<br>plan  | Y  | Y,capped<br>700K                            | N                              | N           | Y,current<br>hvst<br>activ. | identify rsch<br>priorities;<br>training<br>needs   |
| Arizona                 |          |      |    |       |         |      |      |          |  |  |   |                                |             |                             |   |
| Arkansas                |          |      |    |       |         |      |      |          |  |  |   |                                |             |                             |   |
| California              | X        | X    | X  | X     | X       | X    | X    | Y        | envmtl impact<br>rpts + hvst<br>plans                      | Y  | Y (100%)                                    | Y(portion<br>of yield<br>tax)  | Y           | Y                           | info used for<br>annual rpts                        |
| Colorado                |          |      |    |       |         |      |      |          |  |  |   |                                |             |                             |   |
| Connecticut             | X        | X    | X  | n/a   | n/a     | X    | text | Y        | unit plan  | N  | Y, up to<br>875K                            | N                              | N           | n/a                         | n/a   |
| Delaware                | n/a      | n/a  | X  | n/a   | X       | X    |      | Y        | unit plan  | N  | Y(100%)                                     | N                              | N           | n/a                         | n/a   |
| District of<br>Columbia |          |      |    |       |         |      |      |          |  |  |   |                                |             |                             |   |
| Florida                 | X        | X    | X  | n/a   | n/a     | X    | text | Y        | unit plan  | N  | Y (85%)                                     | Y(15%)                         | Y           | N                           | only to<br>ensure<br>growth>hvst                    |
| Georgia                 | X        | X    | X  | X     | n/a     | X    | text | Y        | unit/stand level<br>salvage                                | N  | Y(100%)                                     | Y (~10%)                       | Y           | N                           | n/a   |
| Hawaii                  | X        | X    | X  | n/a   | n/a     | X    | text | Y        | unit plan  | Y  | Y (70%)                                     | N                              | N           | n/a                         | n/a   |
| Idaho                   | X        | X    | X  | n/a   | n/a     | X    | X    | Y        | 5yr invntry rpt  | Y  | Y (varies)                                  | N                              | N           | n/a                         | n/a   |
| Illinois                |          |      |    |       |         |      |      |          |  |  |   |                                |             |                             |   |
| Indiana                 | X        | X    | X  | X     | X       | X    |      | Y        | unit plan  | Y  | Y (85%)                                     | Y(15%)                         | N           | n/a                         | n/a   |
| Iowa                    |          |      |    |       |         |      |      |          |  |  |   |                                |             |                             |   |
| Kansas - no st<br>for   |          |      |    |       |         |      |      |          |  |  |   |                                |             |                             |   |
| Kentucky                | X        | X    | X  | n/a   | n/a     | n/a  |      | Y        | unit plan  | N  | Y(100%)                                     | N                              | Y           | Y, when<br>requestd         | N; negative<br>impacts of<br>hvst mitigt<br>b/fhand |
| Louisiana               | X        | X    | X  | n/a   | X       | n/a  | text | Y        | unit plan  | N  | Y(100%)                                     | N (txt)                        | N           | N                           | n/a   |
| Maine                   | X        | X    | X  | X     | X       | X    | text | Y        | unit, state, &<br>compartmt<br>examination +<br>prescrip'n | Y, minor<br>(T16R10<br>deeryard<br>scrape) | Y (100%,<br>less local<br>revenue<br>share) | Y(25% of<br>gross<br>stumpage) | Y           | Y                           | N   |
| Maryland                |          |      |    |       |         |      |      |          |  |  |   |                                |             |                             |   |

| State                     | InfoSrce |      |     |       |         |      |      | TimHvst? | How mngd?  | Conflicts?                            | TimHvst  | LIR                |  |  |   |
|---------------------------|----------|------|-----|-------|---------|------|------|----------|--|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|--|---|
|                           | Fed      | Acad | St  | Journ | Pr.For. | NGOs | oth  |          |  |                                       | Rev<br>rtrnd?<br>(%)                               | Local %?           | Info coll.?  | Reprtd?                                  | Infl. Policy?   |
| Michigan                  | n/a      | n/a  | n/a | n/a   | n/a     | n/a  | all  | Y        | unit/state<br>level/legisl'n                     | Y<br>addressed<br>at Cmptmt<br>Review | Y(100%)  | N                  | Y  | Y (1st<br>year; not<br>submitted<br>yet) | prob will be<br>reflected in<br>appropriat'ns                         |
| Minnesota<br>Mississippi  |          |      |     |       |         |      |      |          |  |                                       |  |                    |  |  |   |
| Missouri                  | X        | X    | X   | X     | X       | X    | text | Y        | unit/state/area<br>and forest<br>inventory plans | Y                                     | Y (100%;<br>used for<br>all aspects<br>of oper'ns) | N, not<br>directly | Y  | Y (acres,<br>income,<br>volume,<br>BMPs) | Y (affects<br>hvst acres &<br>BMP<br>monitoring)                      |
| Montana<br>Nebraska       |          |      |     |       |         |      |      |          |  |                                       |  |                    |  |  |   |
| Nevada                    | X        | n/a  | X   | n/a   | X       | n/a  |      | Y        | unit;watershed                                   | N                                     | N (usu<br>pay to<br>have<br>timber<br>removed)     | N                  | N  | n/a                                      | n/a   |
| New<br>Hampshire          | X        | X    | X   | X     | X       | X    |      | Y        | unit; state                                      | Y                                     | Y (80%+/-<br>)                                     | Y (10%)            | Y (#acres,<br>tim vols<br>hvstd,types<br>of trtmnts) | Y  | Info rprtd in<br>Qtrtrly<br>Update;<br>used as<br>public educ<br>tool |
| New Jersey<br>New Mexico  | X        | X    | X   | X     | X       | X    | text | Y        | unit   | Y                                     | Y (100%)   | N                  | N  | n/a                                      | n/a   |
| New York                  | n/a      | X    | n/a | n/a   | n/a     | n/a  | text | Y        | unit; state                                      | Y                                     | Y (100%)   | N                  | N  | n/a                                      | n/a   |
| North<br>Carolina DSF     | X        | X    | X   | X     | X       | X    | X    | Y        | unit mgmt plan                                   | N                                     | Y (100%)   | N                  | N  | n/a                                      | n/a   |
| North<br>Carolina<br>BLSF | X        | X    | X   | X     | X       | X    |      | Y        | unit mgmt plan                                   | N                                     | Y (100%)   | N                  | N  | N  | n/a   |
| North Dakota              |          |      |     |       |         |      |      |          |  |                                       |  |                    |  |  |   |
| Ohio                      | X        | X    | X   | X     | X       | X    |      | Y        | unit; state                                      | Y                                     | Y<br>(cost+25%<br>of net)                          | Y (see<br>formula) | N  | N  | n/a   |
| Oklahoma                  |          |      |     |       |         |      |      |          |  |                                       |  |                    |  |  |   |



| State          | InfoSrce |      |     |       |         |      |     | TimHvst? | How mngd?  | Conflicts?              | TimHvst   | LIR   |                |   |   |
|----------------|----------|------|-----|-------|---------|------|-----|----------|--|-------------------------|---|---|----------------|---|---|
|                | Fed      | Acad | St  | Journ | Pr.For. | NGOs | oth |          |  |                         |   | Rev<br>rtrnd?<br>(%)                                | Local %?       | Info coll.?                                   | Reprtd?<br><br>Infl. Policy?                                  |
| Pennsylvania   | X        | X    | X   | X     | X       | X    |     | Y        | unit;state   | N                       | Y (100%<br>see txt)   | N   | Y/N see<br>txt | N   | n/a   |
| Rhode Island   |          |      |     |       |         |      |     |          |  |                         |   |   |                |   |   |
| South Carolina | X        | X    | X   | X     | X       | X    |     | Y        | unit;state;<br>sustained yield<br>based on<br>growth/econ<br>needs | N not in<br>past 5 yrs. | Y (75%;<br>per<br>statute,<br>can retain<br>funds for<br>educnl<br>purposes)<br>N | Y (25%;<br>goes to<br>Co.<br>schools )              | N              | N   | n/a   |
| South Dakota   | X        | X    | X   | X     | n/a     | X    |     | Y        | state;st forester  | not really              | N   | Y see text  | N              | N   | n/a   |
| Tennessee      | X        | X    | X   | X     | n/a     | X    | X   | Y        | unit/state/forest  | Y                       | N   | N   | Y              | Y (hvst,<br>not<br>impacts)                   | only hvst<br>sched and<br>timing                              |
| Texas          | X        | X    | X   | X     | X       | X    |     | Y        | state/ESA<br>reqmts  | N                       | Y (100% -<br>dtls<br>mailed<br>later)   | N   | N              | n/a   | n/a   |
| Utah           |          |      |     |       |         |      |     |          |  |                         |   |   |                |   |   |
| Vermont        | X        | X    | X   | n/a   | X       | X    |     | Y        | unit mgmt  | Y                       | Y (100%)  | N   | Y              | Y (only<br>acres,<br>MBF,<br>cords,<br>bid\$) | may be<br>mechanism<br>for<br>enhanced<br>funding             |
| Virginia       | n/a      | n/a  | n/a | n/a   | X       | n/a  | X   | Y        | unit - 10 yr<br>mgmt plans   | N                       | Y (100%)  | Y (25%<br>rtrnd in<br>lieu of<br>taxes)             | Y              | N   | n/a   |
| Washington     |          |      |     |       |         |      |     |          |  |                         |   |   |                |   |   |
| West Virginia  | n/a      | n/a  | X   | n/a   | n/a     | n/a  | X   | Y        | unit; state;<br>prescrip'ns<br>vetted with<br>public               | Y                       | Y (100%)  | N (25%<br>rtrnd to<br>State<br>Forest<br>facilities | N              | n/a   | n/a   |
| Wisconsin      | X        | X    | X   | X     | X       | X    |     | Y        | unit (indiv<br>forest plans)                                       | Y                       | Y (100%)  | N   | N              | Y see txt                                     | Y (justify<br>wkload and<br>priorities;<br>tracks<br>implmntn |
| Wyoming        |          |      |     |       |         |      |     |          |  |                         |   |   |                |   |   |

