

Summary of Feedback from Forestry Sub-Committee

Prepared by Kate Parsons, October 5, 2011

- 1) Practices/Components – Several comments suggested additional items for which financial assistance would be valuable.
 - a. Pine Regeneration – *(NRCS: this is probably actually covered under 666)*
 - b. Aspen Regeneration- *(NRCS: this is probably actually covered under 666 or 643, if the area is 5 acres or greater)*
 - c. Hickory/butternut/cherry regeneration- receive focus like oak regeneration does. *(NRCS: this is probably actually covered under 666)*
 - d. 666- More specific thinning practices - Additional components found in the Maine (crop tree release, mast tree release under 666; tree shelter/mat under tree planting) and Rhode Island (patch cut) payment schedules.
 - e. Oak Regen - Enrichment planting practice for oak regeneration of 100 to 200 seedlings/acre *(NRCS- our practice now says 700/ac)*; midstory removal with enrichment planting *(NRCS- this is already offered)*
 - f. Invasive species monitoring/control practice to be planned for say year 6 or 8 (?) in invasives control contracts or to be added as a new contract a few years down the road. \$50-\$100/ac.
 - g. Firebreak practice- allow for variability of width (some need to be wider than 25')
 - h. Make EQIP and WHIP rates the same.
 - i. Consider using basal area (sf) as the unit of payment, particularly for crop tree/mast tree release practices (some other states do).
 - j. Assistance for the forester's time in laying out jobs.

- 2) Ranking- Suggestions included:
 - a. Continue focus on impaired waters and nonpoint sources (EQIP), partnerships (EQIP L8) and improvement of protected land (EQIP S8).
 - b. Utilize BioMap 2 Species of Conservation Concern layer and DFW biologist to determine if species are present or potentially present (EQIP N5, S5).
 - c. Consider higher ranking for projects that improve forest health in the BioMap 2 Forest Core, Landscape Block or Forested Priority Natural Community layers.
 - d. Have the EQIP and KFAF WHIP rankings the same.
 - e. EQIP Local Q6 – Change to “within ½ mile of protected land or actively managed land.” Two different comments recommending change from “state land”.
 - f. Rank old growth forest-related practices as heavily as early successional forests. One comment
 - g. Nothing- It looks good.

3) Outreach and Education

- a. More is needed to reach the 85% of forest landowners who do not have a forest management plan.
- b. More is needed to tell people about our practices. There is an indication that a very small percentage of people know about our programs and all of the specific practices that we offer.
- c. Funding for public walks and/or signage to educate about invasives control, forest management, etc...
- d. Funding for more forestry technical assistance on the ground (private, public)

** NRCS comment – Update toolkit systems and guides for forestry practices. Align practices with those that receive credit under PRS.