

The Forest Futures Visioning Process Technical Steering Committee disseminated Draft Recommendations to the public seeking feedback. The comment period closed on February 22, 2010. One opportunity to comment was through public forums where an overview of the recommendations was given by the TSC followed by questions and facilitated small group discussions. This document compiles the facilitator's notes reflecting comments, suggestions, concerns, etc. from the small group discussions held in **Pittsfield on February 6, 2010.**

Notes from Pittsfield Forum February 6, 2010

General Vision/Process:

- The John Muirs and the Gifford Pinchots on TSC, and its weighted towards the Pinochets. Needed a stronger voice on the TSC.
- What is missing is "centerness". A lot of opinions. What will happen at the end is political. If at the heart of it is the health of the public forests, need to look at any activity that impacts that health, including cutting.
- how are you going to address the next steps going forward over the years?
- how many on the TSC were lumber people or people connected with the lumber industry?
- I'm concerned about the lack of representation of recreational stakeholders on the TCS. There are so many different recreational stakeholders, but few were represented in the presentation. Were the few members represented statewide members of group or local members?
- There is a climate of overregulation in Mass
- DCR is not doing their job and that is why there are problems
- How AGS was formed
- Definition of silviculture
- Representation on the TSC from the "wild Berkshires"; disproportionate amount of forest land in the western part of the state(Quabbin to Berkshires)
- We want more public input from the towns directly affected; we don't want to be informed after the fact; the process in the past has not been transparent.
- DCR has a real credibility problem. Robinson State Park, Chesterfield, Jim DiMeo and DCR staff intimidate people. There is a big gap in what is written here and what DCR has done.
- What is missing in the entire draft is "public education". DCR needs to do more public education to improve its image and to explain why it needs to do management on these lands. It needs to be a two way educational process.
- A good example of "public education" is the MA Department of Agricultural Resource who has educational programs in schools.
- I want to make sure it creates MA jobs. Make money from wood, logging and part of the money should go to DCR. Keep it out of the Governor's General Fund.

Recommendation #1 – Ecosystem Services Model

- Ecosystem based – based on science – if we had done this for the past 30 years – would not have had political heat with bad logging. Now politics wants to set it all aside and take it off the shelf – no management – throwing it away.
- Have to understand that these are the only natural resources we have in the Berkshires (no minerals) northern hardwood forests are valuable. They employ people which allow people to pay taxes. DCR must recognize this fact and take this into account – no one from the timber industry was represented on the TSC.

Recommendation #2 – Elevated Role for MA Forests in Commonwealth Environmental Decision Making Process

- Commissioner of... Good to have one more layer, another set of standards for people who feel trust has been violated.
- Steward – why not a woodland council?

Recommendation #3 – Policies for Privately Owned Forests

- Should not be in report.
- Unless DCR Foresters signing off – instead of hiring private foresters.
- This committee was set up and selected without private landowners.
- Private landowners should not be forced to hire a foresters.
- This licensed forester idea undoubtedly came from Joe Zorzin. This is a problem – DCR already signs off – regulations mandate this.
- This will run into landowner rights
- I am a licensed forester; if not managing private land – then let it go to development – this is their option.
- Problem solved – public value protected in state cutting act.
- Question re: recommendation no. 3: how will supervision encourage better management? Think this is incorrect. Doing okay now.
- The critical issue is the very small acres parcels – they are a burden for the owner. There needs to be more incentives for small parcel owners.
- Chapter 132 regs are fine now and should not be changed at all

Recommendation #4 – Landscape Planning Model

- Put less into reserves.
- We want more in reserves.
- There are major tax implications for towns in which state forests are located. If more land is to be purchased, this will decrease tax base of towns. Especially a problem for small population towns.
- The legislation requires the state to pay towns for the lands they hold, but this is seldom done.
- There must be an iron clad pilot payment system to towns or else there will be major opposition to any expansion of state forests.
- The state needs to inform the towns of its plans for rezoning or additional land purchases, and the implications for town tax base and other potential costs to the town.
- The majority of the state lands are in the Western part of the state, so the burden of undevelopable land and land taken off the tax roles falls disproportionately on the western counties.

- I prefer more reserves because I have seen that DCR cannot manage cutting on public lands and enforce its own rules. This leaves the forestlands damaged for all other users.
- How much land are we taking out of productive use anyway?
- I do not like these rigid zones.
- DCR will buy additional lands and not take care of them.
- I want all state lands regardless of how they are zoned to be the “best in class.”
- Large forest reserves – too small – up to 250,000 acres (watershed, DFW, DCR) like Wildlands & Woodlands
- Wildlands and Woodlands said 250,000 acres – this was after ½ of all forests protected.
- Reserves – study how nature happens naturally.
- Having reserves is ecosystem management.
- I am a hiker and a snowmobiler. I have seen clear cuts – logging is not bad. Putting 52% to be untouched – rest only cut to 25% growth – really locking out 90% of the forest from management and in no larger than 5 acre lots.
- Everyone of us is a consumer. We all use wood products. I have been to the Amazon Basin and seen what no regulation looks like – if we don’t do our part and insist on leaving all of our land in reserves – we’re contributing to the decline of other places.
- Need reserves – question whether we need this many – should the targets be set through some type of analysis? In East – need to allow at least cutting for firewood.
- All or nothing? Should look within the land to decide – should be multiple management tools available.
- Management for gross use – not one – all land lumped under one category and managed for specific uses (3 people agreed)
- Allocation – already discussed – most people want the zoning concept thrown out – better to go back to the management plans and do them right.
- 2 million private acres people can timber on, so should not use public lands.
- Why have only good management on only a small portion of the lands (woodlands) and codify others without management (reserves and parks)?
- Office manager TSC Berkshire County and worked for NPS in the Grand Tetons and then in Oregon: the scale of cutting in Oregon is 120 acres. These processes happen often and will continue. This is a positive direction. Not a clean slate and it is an improvement to what we have now: zoning and reserves and adaptive management. Can there be definitive classes of lands when we don’t know the future? The management paradigm is that some of the land is Muir and some is Pinchot. He is comfortable with the balance. Forests are social things nowadays.
- Why place caps on any of the zones? If use adaptive management concept, why not just set a floor? Like the recommendation that land acquisition can go directly into reserve status. Doesn’t think that is possible now for private land to go directly to reserves/CR.
- Don’t know why harvest allowed on public lands here? Understand why in Oregon because needed to for industry, economics.
- How were % reserves etc. determined?
- Common perception of forestry is clearcutting. Do occur with some management goals in mind here in MA. In the 1860s, was all clear cut. Patch reserves and non-harvestable land need to be preserved and not conserved. Then, certain amount should be in reserves and conserved, and after a certain amount of time, flip flop the two to get diversity.
- Like the 50/50 preserve/conserved model.
- What’s the point of all this land for reserves?
- I’m all for reserves and the percentage/range is good – but what happens if there is an infestation, say insects? How are you going to change the management if this were to happen? How much provision to interfere is allowed?
- Expand the forest reserve system in prohibiting clear cutting

- How aggressive is the state going to be in future land acquisition for land forest? What is the process to decide the allocation? It seems heavy toward reserve allocation. Will you have a lot of public input on deciding allocation?
- In the number of acres of reserves – what if all of Graylock became a reserve – would this mean no other areas would need to become a reserve? It seems to be heavily reserved in the Berkshires. I would vote for a more spread out allocation of reserves versus concentrated in one area.
- It should be 80% reserves and 20% managed land
- It should be 20% reserves and 80% managed land
- Reserves are too heavy and too much in this process
- Too small allocation to woodlands
- If land is managed sustainable, it will last
- It should be 20% woodlands and 80% reserves
- It should be 80% woodlands and 20% reserves
- If we have only 20% woodlands throughout the state, Berkshire County may get much less of a percentage
- Don't be so concerned with the %
- Seems to be relegating existing 4 approved management plans for DCR lands mute and must start again. Waste of time and money
- Reserves are being created to avoid previous promises to implement recreation activities.
- Adaptive management vs. land in reserves
- Clarification of reserves vs. watershed lands
- How state/public forest areas will be divided into the three zones (the decision-making process)
- Future acquisitions for zones other than the reserves
- Is there a figure for the amount of private reserves in the state? For woodland and conservation land?
- What is the rationale for dramatically increasing the forest reserves?
- Is there any scientific basis to look at reserves?
- Are we looking at reserves because we can or because it would be a better example for forests in their natural processes?
- I have a 300 acre tree farm and I want to know what is wrong with having 40,000 acres protected from timber harvesting? 40,000 acres for reserves seems high enough.
- The town would say there is not enough revenue from putting lands in reserves.
- There is no impediment to funds coming to the towns. There is already a law that requires it, but the state just doesn't fund or fully fund the towns since Dukakis was governor. Purchasing more land will put the towns and the private landowners at risk because the town's tax budget does not cover this and it puts the burden on the landowner.
- When the state puts lands in reserve, it typically does not consult with the town/community and seek input. Our town is subsidizing these lands for others and the state. Towns can say you cannot buy, but DCR/state never discusses with the town in advance.
- This is a major problem where you are proposing 90,000 to 130,000 acres of reserves. This is not going to be spread out, but will be concentrated around towns already with reserves. There are serious implications for the towns' tax base of this recommendation.
- The state taking land off the town's tax rolls is a huge issue out here. It's different for us out here, different from people who live in urban and suburban areas.
- The only thing that generates revenue for us is woodlands and open space, but that has to be privately owned.

- There needs to be a guarantee of revenue so if any further reserves the town gets funds. Example regarding the Town of Russell and pilot payments. We need a mechanism to ensure payment to the towns.
- Did the TSC designate specific lands for the reserves?
- Did you account for hunting and wildlife in the reserves zone? Did you account for loss of tax revenue and loss of revenue from timber harvesting?
- You can sell this idea (huge locked in reserves) to the urban and suburban people but they don't know what it would mean for the people living here. They think that Quabbin is the wilderness but that is heavily managed forest.
- Woodlands and forests are concentrated outside Rte 128 and mostly west of the Connecticut River. Public attitude may be that DCR should do nothing on reserves but the majority of the land is here. Inside Rte 128 it is environmental issue, but out here it is an economic issue as well.
- I want to think if I walk on state property, I will see the best reserves, the best managed forest, etc.
- I don't like setting concrete lines for different zones. It is all too dynamic. Too many factors to set boundaries and zones. Too complex a set of dynamics to tell DCR foresters to beware of certain zones.
- I would like to see more reserves but we have seen what the state has done. The state has made a mess of its land. Those of us do not want the state messing up our lands.
- We need a distribution of 80% parklands and 20% woodlands.
- I'd like to have it the other way around with 80% woodlands and 20% parklands.
- This group didn't want logging being done by DCR. A tree on a trail fell and killed a woman. We need to actively manage the forests.
- I'm concerned about percentage of woodlands. Its too small. 110,000 acres in watershed is not involved.
- The sentiment that this is an original forest is wrong. Its already been cut twice. We want 80% reserves and 20% woodlands.
- I grew up in the Berkshires. I wouldn't send my son out in the forests now. It's unsafe. Animals are not given proper spacing and invade our spacing. I'm not talking about deer and raccoons. I'm talking about bears in our trash and eating our birdfeed. We used to into the forests in jeeps ever since I was a child. This all depends on how we handle it. Laws are already setup. They are not talking about Berkshire County. It is too number oriented on percentages.
- We spent ages on a planning model for the Berkshires, wetted it and now going back to replacing it.

Recommendation #5 – Management for Reserves

- Need to consider impacts of reserves on wildlife.
- There is a lot of talk about insect and plant species infestations – what about fires in reserves? How would the guidelines be applied in a big fire broke out?
- How do you plan to determine wilderness in reserves?
- Reserves with no trails will adversely impact equestrian clubs who use the DCR lands in Berkshire and Franklin counties, also the snowmobiles and the local businesses that benefit from the trail riders like stores, motels, etc.
- Wants to see the 110,000 acres of watershed lands to be considered for reserves as well
- Wilderness within reserves is incompatible in this state
- Wilderness allows too much fuel for fire and other catastrophic events to leak out on private land

- How is your (TSC's) thinking about reserves based on different geological and climate conditions?
- I've seen forests let go for 50-100 years. I live on the Vermont line. My property has been under active management since the 1970s. Across the line, there is sterile forest – nothing there, no wildlife. Was that taken into account?
- I am concerned about reserves. All these issues are too big of an experiment. To codify this would make it worse. Hemlocks, ash, and oaks are all dying. If you codify, you will have huge blow downs naturally.
- What deep forest species are you expecting in the reserves? Bear? Is there a target species you are seeking to bring back, e.g., wolves?
- Designating various areas as wilderness is restricting forest management. We will not be able to maintain trails, no recreational activities etc. like snowmobiling in October Mountain and Savoy, long distance endurance riding (horse) for 4-5hrs etc. not allowing equestrians will affect our economy, local hotels, restaurants, trail riding clubs. Rollback the restrictions on wilderness. This is an area of economic benefit.
- This has never declared watershed management to be included.
- The idea of a wilderness with a reserve is incompatible in this state given restrictions that wilderness would have. In western USA where they have large areas wilderness is used in reserves. This proposal by TSC is too heavy.
- I believe reserve system is appropriate. It is the law. Emphasis should be on forest management and recreation. Creating natural succession.
- I'm concerned about not having selective cutting like when there are mudslides.

Recommendation #6 – Management Approaches for Parklands

- What is DCR doing now to manage parklands? Doesn't seem like much.
- DCR is doing nothing on parklands. What is DCR doing actively to manage it effectively? There's no money right? They have some staff.

Recommendation #7 – Management Approaches for Woodlands

- 5 acre limit – maximum size of forest opening – still could have 100 acre logging job? Not clear.
- 25% of growth – need to manage for all values on all acres. Is 25% of whole woodland zone or on each small acreage? This really needs to be clarified.
- This whole recommendation is beyond scope. It is like a management plan – does not make sense from a silvicultural perspective – new inventory impractical (3 land use zones) can't be done – it's inappropriate. It is a hodge-podge. It feels like someone got a box of refrigerator magnets of silvicultural terms and threw them at the fridge.
- Just put all land into forest stewardship.
- Kingdom building for bureaucracy.
- Tying foresters hands – plantations – deserts for wildlife, can't thin, can't do uneven aged management.
- This whole recommendation is not based on science. The Yale forest professor said don't throw out tools – UYSFS bird expert – need ½ acre minimum – took away this habitat. There is a lot more research backing this up ignoring basics – uneven aged management favors beech and hemlock – both diseased. Are we planning to grow a diseased forest?
- Species people want and need open space – we're spending \$ to create open space species people want.
- Good recommendation – great science.

- Bad recommendation – all of it.
- Recommendation for uneven aged management – so much given up by doing this – need to look at values you gain and lose from this.
- Even aged management could be done on private lands and reconnecting agricultural lands. If DCR supervised better – wouldn't be in this process. Large issue making DCR all about stewardship and inventory before cut.
- Bought 1 million board feet for mills – a 20 acre landowner
- Early successional habitat close to suburbia – bringing in declining species to where skunks, etc. create early successional habitat away from people, safer for species that use it – succession is operative word – only in that state for a dozen years, then it grows into an older forest, it isn't irreversible – won't do it with a healthy stand – do it where there is poor quality (high graded, ice damage); new forest will be healthier.
- Plantations – supposed to be thinned, wasn't tended – can't thin. Savoy is great habitat for moose.
- This report is too general.
- This report is weighted heavily toward those who want clear-cutting. Need to sequester – I was on top of October Mtn. – drier because the ground is dry.
- I don't know where wood goes.
- Recommendation no 7: inventory, mapping, silviculture labor is enormous to do what is in the recommendations. No time left over to supervise private land.
- Is there a maximum percentage for clear cutting?
- How are early successional patches chosen and designed (shape, size, location)?
- There should be no clearcutting allowed
- No more than 1400 acres of early successional habitat rotated on a 15 year basis
- Harvest areas should be cleaned up to permit mountain bikes and skiers
- The emphasis on uneven age management takes away tool for sites and trees were even age management would be best
- DCR should not tell the buyer of trees how the trees should be used
- DCR should determine which sites could benefit from having tops left and which sites would not benefit before making a blanket regulation
- DCR timber sales should put ¼ of chips back on the site
- Proper timber harvest makes room and food for new critters
- There should be no clear cutting. There should be a reasonable forest left for the animals. Don't cut at all. Early successional habitat? What is that? There should be more oversight in clearing slash. We can't bike in the forest anymore because of slash.
- Leaving some stuff behind is good for the nutrient cycle. On October mountain 7yrs is just too long to have slash lying around.
- I don't agree to changing Ch. 132 which has been there since 1932. Nothing has changed. 15yrs ago US Forest Service said MA has the best timber. We lost an old saw mill recently which was here since the 17th century. Regulations- over regulations. We have some of the strongest regulations in the Northeast. We don't need more regulations. We just want DCR to do their job. Hurricane comes through the land with uneven management its going to save the forest. State regulates us loggers to do this.
- A number of our trees are spruce plantations. We already have even age management. We will have a bigger mess in cleanup.

Recommendation #8 – DCR Organizational Structure, Decision Making and Planning

- Issue – DCR management plans containing monitoring – I am not a fan of DCR management plans but they do include this already.
- DCR should partner with bioblitz inventories.
- DFW does a good job.
- I like Rec. 8 – Call it forest management.

- This group is good – 1000% better than in the past.
- You need to involve the towns in your decisions.

Recommendation #9 – Improving Public Process

- DCR needs to provide education to the public about forest management and other aspects of land management so that the public is informed about these issues.
- The public needs to be education on the process of timber.
- we as members of Berkshire County want transparency on how much money it generates where does the money go?

Recommendation #10 – Resources Needed to Implement the TSC Recommendations

- Will there be an increase in additional DCR staff [recommendation #10]?
- Clarification question. Where is the money going or not going? Majority of the people make money out of land owning and logging. I don't understand where money is not going.

FSC Certification

- FSC certification – good for marketing – its about sustainable management of forests – TSC put this on a low level.
- Timber production is an agricultural activity – FSC doesn't mean anything if you don't understand this.

Biomass

- Biomass – no low grade markets
- President is pushing more nuclear power – why would we want that rather than a biomass plant?
- Against biomass plants; leave the trees in the woods for future trees – don't burn when forests sequesters
- I have never seen a clear cut for biomass.
- Need to “unbind” biomass from clearcutting – biomass can work if it is done right.
- Biomass plants have not received a good environmental review – that is what is needed – a good environmental review.
- Nuclear power is a threat but don't throw the baby out with the bath water.
- Good if there was a low grade market.
- Materials are mostly recycled wood.
- Stay away from prohibiting biomass harvesting. If at a landing can process low quality, then leave branches and tips in the forests.
- Opposed to Biomass, wants tops left in the woods after they are ground up and spread around
- Biomass plants will use mostly recycled wood, not new wood
- Biomass – burning and conversion to fuel
- I am against biomass. You can't do everything you do without doing some of what you do meaning biomass is a need.

- I am against biomass energy. I agree with the recommendation which says biomass is a risk.
- Emphasis on uneven management takes away tools for even age management. Even age management should be used. Biomass is a difficult topic. These recommendations are too curtailing.
- A person must not be told to use or how not to use timber products including biomass products. We must be concerned with site productivity which is fine.
- Biomass creates a nutrient cycle. Now they chip up trees for biomass. Instead of bringing in logs they use a chipper. Now even bears can't walk through the slash.
- Most of the biomass does not come out of wood. Biomass doesn't use a lot of that. Current biomass energy isn't significantly going to affect Mother Nature. 80% of the nutrients are in the leaves. That's why foresters are mimicking Mother Nature.
- By chipping back ¼ of the biomass into the forest will have a nice bed of woodchips with nutrients and give back to the forests. The new vegetation will feed animals and slash must be removed. Harvesting is good for animals to feed.

ATV/Recreation

- Off-road vehicles provide recreation and business opportunities.
- Off-road vehicles are needed by some to get into the forest and are important for rescue efforts.
- No one including DCR monitors or enforces off-road vehicle rules, and they cause erosion and other damage to the forests by cutting fences and breaking through gates.
- I do not think that there should be any off-road vehicles on any state lands.
- Want more ORV use.
- Want less or no ORV use.
- DCR too pro-recreation; it should be all about conservation; health forests for future – not just recreation.
- Will existing recreational facilities be shut down if the land becomes part of a reserve?
- The recreational aspect is the least addressed or spelled out – it must be better categorized - keep it simple and just make it motorized and non-motorized. It gives more leeway that way.
- Motorcycle uses need to be involved in recreation uses. Need to determine when and where they can ride and when and where to be excluded.
- What is the scientific basis for exclusion of ATV's from reserves?
- Most OHV riders are out here because they want miles of trails. Will OHV use be allowed in reserves? If so, there is going to be a conflict. Has that been considered? How will OHVs be monitored? They destroyed Chester Blandford Forest. They take down gates, there is no policing. I would not allow OHV use on state lands. They will cause more problems than loggers ever caused.
- State buys land and does not invest in it for monitoring. Snowmobilers are a benefit to trails and they work with the state, repair bridges, etc. Fire departments have to rescue people on state lands.
- I am here to be a sponge to learn. I have learned a lot today from people here. I am concerned about recreation for my family. We are snowmobilers. I have had opportunities to ride and I have seen what a properly managed forest is. Fixing, maintaining, monitoring and enforcing are what is needed. We don't need more rules, we have enough. We just need the rules we have to be enforced. The forests are spectacular and I want to ensure my family can enjoy them.
- I ride motorbikes in the forest. I don't see a difference between that and mountain biking except for a bit of exhaust. But you are talking about snowmobiles. I don't see anything

here about riding motorbikes. Why weren't we involved? I think you should determine where and when we can ride and have it in writing.

- I have concerns about restrictions in motorized use. What is the scientific reason? Why? I don't want someone's opinion. I was scientific reasons why.
- DCR has not refined core criteria on ATV use. Over vegetation creates less revenue.

Management/Cutting/Harvesting

- Seen large tracts of land that have not been managed. Land heals over time.
- Asking to have a graveyard for dead trees with climate change coming if don't manage for it.
- It has been proven that harvesting of timber has the same benefits. Prevents blow downs.
- I think the state should manage our forests with all interests in mind and with rotations. Management should be designated and revenue should be given to towns.
- I have not seen good forest management from the state. October Mountain State Forest is outrageous. The state takes no responsibility for forest management or logging. There are cuts a half mile long.

Industry/Economics

- From Peru and a stakeholder: don't think that members of timber industry are or should be stakeholders because they benefit financially. Clarification from another participant: "If you don't own it, you can't control it...".
- Everything is determined by economics. As stewards of the forest, have to have an overall goal of preserving the forests and growth. If clear cut, certain things may follow which may or may not benefit.
- Clear cutting by private companies who take the profits elsewhere is not in the interest. Feel decisions are dictated by private industry whether DCR is doing the work or not.
- People been asking for a long time to do cost benefit analysis – probably will find losing money for the state, particularly when factor in FSC, which he does not like.
- Biggest question: if own private forest can decide to clear cut it, but don't understand why you can on public land? Does the public understand that you can do clearcuts on public land? If only 10% of the forest is public land, the economic interests are dominating decisions.
- Why isn't the state working with private land owners to do the same thing here – to put money into the communities? I don't see anything in the recommendations that seeks to rebuild private forest industry. We private owners carry everyone. We've been left out of this plan and these recommendations.

Other

- We need to consider putting wind turbines for power production on state lands.
- Disproportionate amount of land is being clear-cut in the Berkshires, October Mtn., Savoy, Pittsfield. This is the only place where there is moisture and clean air – doesn't care if they are scrub pine.
- State will have to hire land clearers – state of out money and will then have to close parks. You are taking land out of the public's hands and putting it in the hands of 25 people.

- As a hunter I have seen a steady decline of hunted species because there is not enough logging.
- I am a Biologist – not a forester. DCR does a good job working with logging and recreation. They should partner with biologists so DCR knows what is on its lands – they could do a better job.
- I have been trying to work with DCR to organize a Biodiversity Day in DCR Parks – they're not interested.
- Forests that are cut down re-grow for 200 years.
- If biologists recommend certain things, would want every tool available.
- Haven't seen anything about experimentation. Were able to get examples on 1000 acres public land. No experimentation in Mass that he is aware of. Have to go out of state to do experimentation. There is a lack of biological knowledge.
- We have more forest land now than 100 years ago – back then, it used to be old farm land. The tree is the only resource that replenishes itself.
- Bad logging instances are what started this whole thing. Now all timber harvest has been stopped till this process is done. What's being done about this? What is going to be done so that it doesn't happen again?
- Congratulations for thinking about helping loggers become certified. It's an incentive for youth to get involved in the business.
- If the state continues to eat up the land, it will have a great impact on small towns. Will the state increase the pilot program to help them?
- Towns will parcel owned land – municipalities might get good use of this – It'll be hard to pass in towns.
- Too much danger in the woods these days for kids to play there because of falling branches and large animals like bears
- Woods are like a big garden, why are they not part of agriculture?
- Where is the money going from the woodlands?
- Revenues should come back to DCR.
- DCR is a poor steward of the land
- The money all goes east and very little comes back to Berkshire County
- How can we find out how much money comes back to the Berkshires from DCR income?
- Private harvesting on state lands
- Global climate change – who has insight into climate stability at this time?
- We are really farmers of trees, mushrooms and a gamut of other things the forest produces. It does function in the perspective of a big garden network.
- It should be part of the agricultural commission.
- There would be better management, funding, transparency if we make it part of the agricultural network like DAR. We have changed names.
- DCR and the state of MA are the poor land owners. We are tenants.
- We are landowners, they are the managers (DCR and State). They are taking money and going east.