

At the Public Forums for the Forest Futures Visioning Process participants were asked to hand in index cards noting any additional comments or suggestions they had. These were typed up as presented and then grouped according to the area of the Draft recommendations they addressed.

General Vision/Process Comments

The whole proposal is overreaching. All zones and acreage amounts should be scrapped.

I think that the visioning process needs to be flexible. Forestry was different in 1910, and research will always change it and other ecological sciences. It should be constantly reviewed and changed as needed, nothing carved in stone, including the sizes of parklands, reserves and woodlands.

I think that the TSC draft recommendations have many good elements. – Ben Urquhart

Views of forest industry was not represented in process.

As a planner, I feel your assumptions, which this plan is based on, are incorrect. The stresses on our forests will be more, not less, as we go forward in time. Population will increase leading to many needs, and hence more stresses.

The public doesn't have enough say in the process – let the people vote on it, not just a select few who have their own [can't read] that affect us all.

We need better definitions on a lot of words, for example: forests, forestry, conservation, commercial harvest, preservation, and management.

Clearly define silviculture, successive aged management, reserves.

How are the TSC members experts? By whose standards? Are they Ph. D's in their fields?

There is 570,000 publicly owned land. You are talking about 308,000. What did you leave out?

How were TSC members chosen and specifically why was Joe Zorzin selected for a panel of supposed technical experts?

Insufficient time given to review recommendations and reach the public. Recommendations made public 2/1/10 – meetings held less than 2 weeks later.

Reg 132 is fine as it is. Tom Anders, Licensed Forester MA, CT, SAF; BS Environmental Studies

Believe that dealing with only 308,000 acres when total lands are 575,000 leaves too much un-

dealt with this process. Karen Simon (Wildlife and Trees Facilitate Human Sustainability)

DCR has prevented its foresters from participating in the process – these people know more than anyone else what ought to be done on DCR land – why have they been excluded?

Our state forests should be the BEST forest in the Commonwealth. DCR should have all the tools to reach the goal.

Does this plan have a motive to go statewide or “global”? What is this going through in Massachusetts and the surrounding states clear-cut. How will it affect our forests?

Redefine stewardship as protection of the natural landscape.

To what extent is the effect of what we do – state recommendations – going to affect climate degradation and sustainability of life on planet earth – our only home?

We can not say that the trained, educated, scientists that are our foresters should not have the say over what happens on state forest lands.

This process isn't geared well to soliciting public comment. Dissenting opinions are trying to be controlled rather than listened to. – Carol Gray

Special attention should be given to the public at large rather than those with special interests. – Carol Gray

Concerned that snowmobile users were not represented on either committee. – Randy Tohl

Why weren't forums held in Franklin County – very inconvenient to have to drive an hour or more each way to attend forum?

Why weren't local communities notified of forums?

Why weren't trail groups, towns and sportsmen part of process?

Local community needs to control own destiny – not bunch of environmentalists who don't live there.

Recommendation 1 Comments

I support placing value on forests for carbon sequestration watershed protection, habitat protection. I like recommendation #1.

The ecosystem model is already being practiced now on state and private lands. Reserves are being greatly over weighted. The ecosystem model can be supported by much less reserve land.

It would be great for clarification in description of #1 and #4 to state: ecosystem services are provided on managed forestland.

The recommendations do not address how multiple ecosystem services are provided by the same forest over time.

I support many of the recommendations, particularly #1, #5 forest reserves. Managing our forests on sustainable, multi-purpose basis is vital to human & ecological health.

Cost benefit analysis for forest management program

Recommendation 2 Comments

Why a Commissioner of Forest Stewardship and not a Director?

-Commissioner of Forest Stewardship should be a forest ecologist or biologist.

I don't think we need to hire another high level Bureaucrat, but need more people on the ground in the forests, patrolling the trails/roads, enforcing laws. Recommendation #2 – Donald Mungen

Also adding two more layers of bureaucracy ie. Stewardship Commissioner and also a Science Advisory Board. More talk and no action!

Director of forest stewardship should report to the Director of Forests and Parks.

Recommendation 3 Comments

Delete recommendation #3 entirely. Do not include private forest land. Not part of mission.

Take private lands out altogether not part of process.

Private land should be a concern to the land owner and no one else. Private means not public and should be left that way good or bad.

Do not place more laws onto the shoulders of private property owners, but make conservation easements and Chapter 61 statues more desirable for those that do welcome state restrictions.
Michael W. White

There should be no third recommendation – leave private land alone

The big push has to be to take all of #3 out, i.e. no private land section.

Eliminate section 3 – no private lands as subject of the report.

No requirement to have a licensed forester. Removes private rights.

Mission Creep! TSC report should not address private lands issues. It was not intended to.

Requiring a licensed forester to sign off will require a change in licensing process. Ben Urquhart

Licensed foresters should not be required on private lands, but should be encouraged.

On private forest land – don't agree with limiting logging practices by eliminating: 1. “whole tree” logging (line 381); 2. “even aged logging (lines 813-814); and 3. selling logs to utility (lines 1151-1152)

Regarding all forest harvesting plans be reviewed and approved by a licensed forester – if DCR needs private forester to review and be open to comment on plans, then yes.

Land owners should remain able to sign plans.

No forcing private land owners to have a Licensed forest. Already checked by a licensed state forester.

Private land owners loose control of land will encourage development. Tom Anders, Licensed Forester MA, CT, SAF; BS Environmental Studies

Private forest owners already have rules and regulations under Chapter 62 that must be complied with already. Encouraging practices and monetary compensation is fine – otherwise DO NOT try to regulate private LANDS!

You say that DCR has some jurisdiction over privately owned forests. However, would you allow private loggers to profit from clear-cutting these privately owned land? If the answer is “no”, then why would you allow this on what is owned by the community?

What about land owners who have under 50 acres?

Do not support Part 3 recommendations re private woodlands – not enough participation by private landowners – need to separate private woodland owners from DCR by moving those portions to DAR

Recommendation 4 Comments

Recommendation #4: I would suggest:
308,000 acres = 80% woodland; 20% reserve and parklands
110,000 acres Quabbin etc = 80% resrve; 20% woodlands

The splitting up of the averages in this process takes away more than is clearly represented. First, the reserves and parklands are removed. Then patch reserves are excluded, then ate successional habitat is promoted, then the harvesting is limited to 25% of growth. This takes away too much of the land base from active management, and does it in a way that masks how much unmanaged land will really be established. Recommendation #4.

It would be great for clarification in description of #1 and #4 to state: ecosystem services are provided on managed forestland.

Limit woodlands to 10% of DCR lands. Parklands should be 70% and reserves 20%

The focus of dividing land into parklands and forestlands assumes too much that ecosystem services are in conflict and cannot be attained together. Focus more on multiple-use management to provide many services within one area.

Not much was said about future acquisitions – it would seem this is key to really making the 3-tiered approach work. The comments/debates have largely to do with groups with special investments (forest products, environment, recreation, etc). Arguing for a larger share of a limited land area (this is a good problem). By acquiring large, e.g. 1,000,000 acres could see all these interests/efforts bear fruit.

Reserves should be at least 80% of existing state land.

Boundaries for zones (forest reserves, parklands, woodlands) should not be rigidly set. Keep the tools in the tool box. If lines will be fixed, then only after 50 years of trail.

Why not acquire land to build out “woodlands”

Too much land is being put into reserves.

Need some reserves – 20% max though. Reserves are not to be touched, so 20% is plenty for a benchmark. Tom Anders, Licensed Forester MA, CT, SAF; BS Environmental Studies

Designated nature trails in our woodland and reserves to encourage particularly young people to become interested in our state's forestlands - good forestry practices on display and wildlands displayed for their unique inspirations. Robert Rausch

90-120,000 acres reserves – includes 50,000 patch reserves?

80% should be parklands and reserves; 20% should be working woodlands.

Need management plans for each forest and park

Forest reserves, parklands are too restrictive a designation. Proper timber management CAN be done without such restrictions.

I do not feel that the Quabbin and watershed lands be included in the 3 zone system as it is imperative that the forest be properly managed for water quality. If anything, this management should be used as model of proper forest management

What was the basis for developing the proposed amount of forest reserve acreage?

Feel reserves under-represented by acreage division – also think snowmobiling should not be allowed on them (effect on wildlife and air pollution not determined). Karen Simon (Wildlife and Trees Facilitate Human Sustainability)

Identify patch reserves and non-harvestable zones – divide all area (the rest; not patch and non-harvest) into two zones: one (park and reserves) and the other timber land – after three cycles of 30 years each – swap the management one for the other – 50/50 and swap.

Massive increase in reserve system.

Increase forest reserves; limit forest use. No commercial cutting on state land. If we ask Brazil to save 35% of their timber we must first reserve our own.

Truly significant expansion of woodland system.

Where appropriate timber harvest should be allowed in parks. Or parklands should be reduced and more put into woods.

It is critical to solve the problem of uncontrolled development by creating buffers and reducing fragmentation. That's the real problem – the good stuff (visioning) will happen no matter what.

More wildernesses

Old growth forests should be preserved and new forests should be allowed to develop for aesthetic reasons. Massachusetts has few spots with over 160 trees.

Public lands must provide what private lands cannot. Large core areas of remote habitat. No commercial development, no commercial activities.

I support preserving at least 80% being kept in forest reserves. – Carol Gray

Worried about restrictions in any potential wildlands – this is undefined – too open ended and I fear they would be placed in such a way as to interrupt the connectivity of snowmobile trails – we need to be able to get from one place to another. – Randy Tohl

“True” wildlands belong only on much more expansive areas than we have in Massachusetts. I don't think our large state forests were large enough to warrant restrictive wildlands sections. – Randy Tohl

Effect of more state land purchases on town's tax base – raises taxes on private landowners.

Loss of town's share of harvest receipts hurts town finances – can't replace equipment

Concerned loss of timber harvest receipts on DCR ability to maintain infrastructure in state forest – roads washed out, can't reach emergency calls

Do not support expansion of forest reserves and purchase of 90 to 130,000 acres private woodlands – land should be left in working forest, not removed from tax base.

Hawley cannot afford more state land – state doesn't make adequate PILOT payments

Towns need say in whether state purchases land in their community and whether be site of forest reserves

Recommendation 5 Comments

Re: Preserves. Responsible stewardship involves much more than preservation. Used appropriately, logging, hunting, fishing and controlled burns can be very helpful to the ecosystem.

I'm concerned that codifying the forest reserves will not protect these forests against threats from natural disasters, insects (hemlocks, ash, oates), invasive species and the threats of climate change. These forests are too precious a resource to have them destroyed and lost for generations. When disaster strikes, and it will, they will need to be managed.

If natural processes are to dominate in forest reserves, will fires be allowed to burn?

Regarding forest reserves – DCR needs to be able to step in to control or organize adverse impacts on forest health both on the reserves and abutting parcels.

To have specific places designated in our state reserves for educational purposes – as for school children field trips. Robert Rausch

Feel reserves under-represented by acreage division – also think snowmobiling should not be allowed on them (effect on wildlife and air pollution not determined). Karen Simon (Wildlife and Trees Facilitate Human Sustainability)

I support many of the recommendations, particularly #1, #5 forest reserves. Managing our forests on sustainable, multi-purpose basis is vital to human & ecological health.

Ecosystem services are not a zero sum system. Reserves are treated like they are.

Recommendation 6 Comments

No “Commercial Harvesting” on parklands. Why would we require parklands tree work to be a cost? 100 thousand acres of hazard tree removal and trail maintenance could be break even or even for a profit.

Allow more forest management of woodland and parkland. Use of clear cuts where appropriate.

Recommendation 7 Comments

Recommendation #7: Why is the "TSC" so restrictive with respect to silvicultural systems. Foresters learned these in college. It is their tool box. Much like a surgeon's scalpels. Foresters silvicultural options should not be restricted.

While it's commendable to have demonstration areas, it should be stated that actual production of forest products from state lands is a noble endeavor.

Silvicultural techniques should not be limited. No one knows what the future will bring. All Available silvicultural knowledge base should be weighed the same.

Cutting 25% of growth over the long haul is NOT SUSTAINABLE.

Re: Woodland management. While there is a need to regulate certain types of logging/biomass harvest, it is important to not make the regulations so prohibitive that state forests are not cut to prevent proliferation of choked older forest with limited biodiversity.

I am VERY concerned about blanket statements such as "all tops, branches left behind all the time". Please don't limit the tools available to properly manage forestlands.

Woodlands – how is DCR going to ensure that loggers leave "tops and branches" in the woods? DCR has failed miserably in controlling logging – Quabbin clear cuts are the worst examples.

There are locations and situations where clear cutting and whole tree harvesting are appropriate. Ben Urquhart

The most efficient way to promote: sustainable production of wood, carbon sequestration, drinking water quantity and quality, and biodiversity is through even-aged management practices.

Set an acreage for woodlands. Let foresters decide how to manage it properly.

No more clear cutting, because oxygen trees produce is lost in bare land. Also require those who have clear cut to replant in bio-diverse way.

More and better timber management without influence by politics.

Clear cuts are a great tool. Tom Anders, Licensed Forester MA, CT, SAF; BS Environmental Studies

Management tools should not be limited ie 5 acres clearing cut 25% of growth 1/3 acres patches

I have personally witnessed the logging practices of Central PA in the Black Moshannon [?] area. Truly multi-use. You would never even know that logging is taking place if you did not hear the saws in the distance. Logged areas are clean, usable, no cut trees, limbs, etc Recommendation #7 Donald Mungen

I feel traditional logging (use of major tree excluding limbs and branches to decompose) is not

working. Trails have disappeared to ten feet tall brown patches, tree trunks and branches. Trails that have been there for decades. Donald Mungen

-No clear cuts on state lands.

-Successional management should be small subsets of land roughly 4,500 acres on continual 15 year rotation (300 acres/year cut every 15 years).

-Have strong oversight on logging so forests are cleaned up after logging so people can hike,bike,ski in forests.

Early succession – excuse for clear-cutting.

Excellent forest management – multi-age forests – hurt by clear-cutting

Bar logging on state lands – there is enough private woodlands for production purposes.

Allow more forest management of woodland and parkland. Use of clear cuts where appropriate.

There should be no clear cutting in woodlands.

No new early successional habitat on DCR lands.

Recommendation 8 Comments

Recommendation #8 should be focused upon and strengthened.

Recommendation 9 Comments

Public comment is the right and responsibility of any citizen. Yet, over the past several years, the DCR, through the forester's Licensing Board, has threatened the license of at least two licensed forestry consultants for opposing DCR's clear-cutting of public forests. Allan Gordon, Peru, MA

The public should only have the ability to provide input at the general planning level for forest management. Specific prescriptions for individual sites should be prepared by licensed foresters and reviewed internally to ensure that the practice meets the overall goals.

Recommendation 10 Comments

Question/suggestion: Use a portion of the revenue from the sale of forestry products, and the benefit from the carbon sequestering value from forest biomass to fund the activities, jobs that these recommendations will generate. Where will the money come from? Incentives for private land owners = green certification and lots more education!

Please be very clear on funding mechanisms. The media often confused what is the real funding

deal.

Where is the funding going to come from for enforcement of logging restrictions?

Massachusetts has too many unfunded mandates already. Let us see what monies and other financial resources there are to back these proposals BEFORE they become law!

Biomass Comments

-No biomass plants in Massachusetts.

-Much more CO₂ is produced from biomass plants than gas or coal plants. Biomass plants in Western Massachusetts will mean many more (hundreds) of trucks on our roads which ruins our rural character.

-NO forest products from state lands should be sold to biomass plants.

Biomass allows us foresters to use low grade wood, leaving good wood to grow. A market for low grade allows this and 132 will regulate it. See State Forest Committee recommendation. Tom Anders, Licensed Forester MA, CT, SAF; BS Environmental Studies

We need numbers for biomass. How many acres consumed? Per plant, per day?

Biomass should be part of the mix of forest product and consider in view of other energy sources.

My main concern is that there should be an explicit statement that NO biomass harvesting be allowed on state lands.

No state contribution to biomass plants, particularly not from state forests. John Cohen, Northampton

Did the TSC study the programs providing funding for biomass incinerators and bio-fuels to project the future demand for wood?

DCR is no match for the billions in federal funding for "biomass" extraction to be used for bio-fuels and biomass incinerators for electricity. You have got to be kidding if you think DCR can ensure "sustainable forestry" when there are billions flowing into biomass plants and bio-fuel production.

I think that to say that "biomass" poses a "significant risk" is NOT a balanced statement. This study should be based on science, not bias.

Re: Biomass harvesting. Clearly there is a need to regulate clear cutting, but there is a valid and important role for the harvest and use of timber. We need to remember we use natural resources, so let us try to do so responsibly in our backyard.

Biomass forestry guidelines will take care of the problem.

Biomass should be allowed. A more reasonable approach would be to establish guidelines to safely remove biomass, such as limiting the amount. Leave a percentage in the woods.

Biomass would be beneficial for us to at least try because we have sustainable and renewable forests and can start to take our dependence away from other fuels.

The concerns about biomass are ill-founded. We are a long way from having the price of biomass dictate management decisions. Ben Urquhart

No state lands lumbar to biomass

Excluding “biomass” as a harvesting option is a big mistake – it needs to be modeled and demonstrated in practice so the public can see the results, see and judge the reality, not just by “fear”

Biomass or other economic interests should not be governing policy. The state agencies should be protecting our forests. I thought state lands were about conservation. – Carol Gray

When they sell a timber sale, they can not control what the “buyer” does with what he removes from the forest. So: they think the way to restrict material going to biomass is to say, “you must leave the tops and branches” from harvested trees in the forest. You can’t take out the whole tree. (whole tree harvests take away the tops and chip up the branches for biomass).

FSC Certification Comments

End FSC certification program – it does not protect our forests.

Woodland management tree farm certification - yes; FSC – no!

Tree farm certification is okay. Not FSC

Green certification inappropriate for public lands. Enormous waste of taxpayer money

ATV/Recreation/Hunting Comments

Would like to improve ATV access to state lands – need to drive across state to access.

I support ATV use on public trails &/or private land that the land owners have given permission. Our daughters ride ATV’s with us and enjoy spending time with us on the trails. We need improved access to trails in Sutton, Oxford, Northbridge, and Webster.

I support ATV riding on public trails. (P.S. I’m a 17 y.o. senior in high school.)

Increase hunting access to state lands

Public hunting of all areas allowed by state regulations. Opening up new areas for hunting as they become available. DO NOT ALLOW home building or development within 500 ft. of state parks, forest or lands (Public)

If a state property contains snowmobile or ATV trails currently. Those trails are already maintained by a snowmobile or ATV club and should remain so.

ATV riders have destroyed 75% of the trails in Oct. Mtn forest. Donald Mungen

Keep public lands open to responsible use for recreation. Michael W. White

I'm from Freetown and ride bicycles and motorcycles and hike in Freetown state forest. I belong to the Friends of Freetown and Pilgrim Sands Trail Riders (PSTR). The forest has thousands of dead oak trees that need to be removed but the clear cutting being done is very poorly managed with no regard to replanting. I hope we will not outlaw motorized use (dirt bikes) because they don't cause any real environmental damage, especially compared to poor timber harvesting practices. The PSTR group devotes hundreds of man hours cleaning the trash people dump on the forest every year. Trail riders indirectly enforce littering laws by their presence in the Freetown State Forest. Christian Wilson, Assonet MA Christionwilson@comcast.net

We need to lessen off-road vehicle impact by opening up more forest for trail riding for motorcycles

Re: Hunting and fishing. Please do not choke off access to hunting and fishing on state lands. There are already severe limitations.

Content that the 4" snow pack would remain as the condition for snowmobile use. – Randy Tohl

If previous recreation is still going to be permitted under these new designations, that should be more clearly stated in the document. I didn't hear anything that sounded like a red flag, but if there will be more restrictions I need reassurance. – Randy Tohl

Snowmobilers, mountain bikers and horseback riders very important to keeping roads in forest open – after ice storm, they got roads cleared out when DCR couldn't get it done.

DCR owns more than 8,000 acres of land in Hawley, including part of Hawley Bog. Forest intensively used for mountain bikers, hikers, hunters, snowmobiles, horseback riding, showshoeing, cross country skiing

Economic Concern Comments

What will the lack of harvesting do to our local economies? Loggers will lose jobs, etc.

Forest management on state lands supports our rural economy.

The economic fallout of a decision to stop logging on state land, will be felt for years to come. Some towns, and certainly the state, will suffer from the lack of the business which will be affected.

Economics cannot be the primary concern in the management of the state forests – good science without industrial pressure should be what makes decisions. Under no circumstances should the forests be turned over to the Department of State Energy.

Lack of timber harvesting on DCR land will hurt rural economies.

No harvest should be directed to income. Harvest should be target to improve-regenerate the BEST forest.

We need more of the money received from tree harvesting returned to the community where the trees were logged. Donald Mungen

Logging important business in town – 2-3 percent of town's population work in logging or related businesses

Management Comments (Misc.)

Management for fire control should also be considered. Some people went to school for forestry/natural resources and these decisions should be left up to them. Forests under DCR should all continue to be managed with the current management goals.

Re: Forest management. There is an important place for harvesting timber on public lands, in selective ways. Currently, much of the state forest approaches monoculture forests.

I manage a number of DR properties (seven). We have done cutting for both firewood and lumber, both by contracted and staff. I know cutting is a good thing. Also, in the late 1980s, we did a GOALS plan which zoned the forest for various uses. It did work very well and still does.
Ron Clough

DCR and other agencies should be utilizing volunteers to help manage properties. Recreational users, namely motorized users, have so much to offer. We really care about the preservation of our forests and we appreciate "unimproved" roads and trails. We also strongly support environmental protection to trails that maintains a rustic, unimproved aesthetic. Michael W. White.

I get much more spiritual value from walking through managed forestlands than through preserved land.

Massachusetts should take responsibility for their forest products needs by continuing active forest management on all lands, with good, educated forestry in mind.

Rigid zones and management approaches do not lead to adaptive management of forestlands.

No logging at all on state and federal lands

No more clearcutting!

We have to increase MA forest area resources. These trees should never be cut for money.

Public lands should be off limits to commercial timber cutting! How can we expect third world countries to protect their forests if we won't protect ours?

Cost/benefit analysis of forest management program.

Our forests have already and still are impacted by non-natural processes. We can not then leave this land to natural processes because we can not know what this will lead to, and there is too much acres under this consideration.

Re "resource management plans" - please detail in your report examples from this process that lead you to believe it is the BEST approach to generating plans. Include, for example:

- types of area in RMP (park, forest, etc)
- time from start to finish
- cost (state and consultant) and cost/acre
- staff and budget available now and in next ten years to fuel this process.

Forest management is key to wildlife management – water quality, recreation. Forest cutting is not an all or nothing deal; it needs to happen and be managed.

Timber management is also a diversification of farming/agriculture. Department of Agriculture would better serve the forestry component.

Default management to do nothing is not and has never been a good solution for good forest management. This is such a bureaucratic solution! Harvesting operations overseen by a forester is much more productive than doing nothing.

Other Misc. Comments

Does DCR have a mailing list of private forest owners and abutters? A list used to get letters and surveys and holiday cards to.

MODR needs to invest in laptops for its scribes in the small group session. Good job Courtney!

Mass. Has some of the strictest forestry regs. in the world. If we don't get our forest products from Mass they're going to come from some place less regulated.

How would these recommendations effect the present status of motorized recreation in the new parks and forests where it is currently allowed? Gordon Cayle (or Cayles?)

How many acres are currently owned by conservation organizations such as Audubon, TNC, Tor, etc that are unlikely to ever be harvested and are these considered in figuring amount of forest reserves?

People see open areas where trees have been cut.

Education!

What are the buying patterns for privately owned Berkshire forest land now? The past ten years – next ten years?

I live in Windsor, MA and have had the opportunity to observe first hand the clear cutting of Windsor state forest. Thousands of trees were cut down and left where they lay. It was a decimation of the forest; enormous amounts of branches/logs/debris were washed down into the low-lying rivers and streams in clear violation of the wetlands act. Julie G. Allan, Esq. Environmental Attorney

What provisions/oversight will be provided to protect archeologically sensitive sites such as Native American mounds, rock structures, colonial stone walls and foundations? Paul Ziobro, Assonet, MA

Why should private organizations profit from publicly owned property.

What can the state do to promote visitation in our parks> how can people experience the outdoors more? I support encouraging public access to natural environments.

Promote more public education so that people understand and are not so concerned and combative about biomass and timber harvesting.

People are much more aware than ever of organic foods and the environment. Ow can we do the same P.R. Job for open space/forests, etc (we buy "rain forest chocolate" - our local agriculture includes forest maple syrup, etc. but the public is not aware of this association.

Please do not prohibit something as important as wind energy on tax payer land. It is the future of our children, environment and the land you say you are here to protect.

DCR needs to be proactive in explaining forestry and land management, i.e. Mass department of Agriculture has agriculture in the classroom. DCR should have "class in the woods" - No child left inside!

At a DAR Ag Commissions meeting in April 2009, a climatologist stated that Massachusetts would have a GA style

Wood is going to Canada! How to get more of our wood to stay in Massachusetts? How to make timber industry more local? Feeling you can't do it.

Let us get young people excited in forestry management

We, in Massachusetts, only harvest 2,300,000 acres across the whole state per year, but based on our consumption – we would need 15,000,000 acres managed sustainably. In other words, how is this decrease in acres of public lands growing forest products like timber going to be balanced? Answer: greatly increasing harvesting on private lands.

Fire all the “foresters” who are mis-named because they are really “de-foresters” and replace them with conservation biologists and ecologists/educators.

Before deciding that forest land should not be harvested, the TSC has to determine the losses from biodiversity, revenue from harvests, and the fact that it will be worse for the global environment if we start to depend on other states and countries for our wood products because of ‘poor’ management in those areas and the fuel it takes to get it here and the parasites and illnesses those trees will bring with them.

DCR should not allow any commercial logging on state lands unless there is guaranteed adequate funding for enforcement of cutting plans!

I’m concerned about the role and involvement of N.H.E.S.P. People can get in trouble with them without even knowing it.

Monetary gain is not the driving force in patch-cuts or clear-cuts but is the exact opposite. They are generally put in areas with very low value forest products.

I would like to get DCR to actually focus on conserving environmental and aesthetic and recreational use and not logging it all down. DCR has become the logging fox guarding the forest chicken coop; this enrages me.

How can silviculture be accomplished with the giant equipment that foresters use?

Our lives are better in living spaces with wood products. Our planet is better with locally produced wood products.

Need to connect forestry with air and water quality issues.

No more clear-cutting

Use citizen science groups to monitor lands – animal counts, plant inventory invasive plant and insect invasion.

DCR should allow an “Adopt a Forest Stand” Program to allow experiments and differing stand treatments by selected outside DCR people.

Observation: The protection of place is obsolete! Climate change will affect all forest, no matter

the designation. Without serious and immediate carbon negation energy systems our forests will be dead as temperatures change

What checks and balances have been put in place or considered to prevent land owners from being strong armed, through taxes, etc into turning their property over to state control? For instance, it would be a shame for someone to say "I don't want to give my property to the state for control but I can't afford not to"

"Sustainable" is the key word. Forest management is similar to vegetable gardening. Properly done, it can provide for everyone – humans, wildlife, and the forest itself. 5% or less of the aboriginal forest remains. Let us continue to use, sustainably, the forest that remains to the benefit of all.

How about having funds from timber harvests go to hiring more state foresters to properly oversee the proper Chapter 132 laws? Our trees are our best source of funding. "It's a big garden" Just longer harvest cycles than peas, corn and beets.

The DCR's Charter calls for the use of the "highest level" of silviculture on public forests. Clear cutting/high grading being the "lowest" form. Then how can the DCR justify the policy of continued "high grading" of public forest lands in Massachusetts? Allan Gordon, Peru, MA

Do cost-benefit analysis of forest management program – is harvesting losing money for public.

No more clear-cutting in state lands.

Thus far, the DCR has NOT demonstrated to the concerned public that they are capable of managing this extremely important impact upon our precious state forest.

As a parent and a grand parent, I believe that the 10% of the state of Massachusetts which belongs to us and our future generations MUST be protected.

I'm very troubled by the clear cutting in the Quabbin and heard no explanation as to how those lands are being protected. Why not selective forestry no clear cutting? – Carol Gray

Global warming cannot afford 1/5 of our forests cut. – Carol Gray

Town provides emergency services for state forest without reimbursement from state – means town cannot pay firefighters or EMTs

Traumas most common injury in state forest – half of calls require lifeflight due to life-threatening nature

Roads are so bad that cause 5 to 10 mile detours on emergency responses – at some time it will cost a life.

Only road improvements done in forest were done as part of logging operations – town has repeatedly tried to get DCR to fix or block unsafe portions of roads without success.