

COMPARTMENT REVIEW RECORD OF CHANGES AND DECISIONS



Pigeon River Country Forest Management Unit

2011 Year-of-Entry

Pigeon River Country Headquarters

August 25, 2009

The following documents the changes and decisions made at the compartment review to the Inventory database, reports, and compartment maps presented at open house for the PRC Forest Management Unit compartment review. This document is the official record of changes and decisions. Proposals originally presented were approved unless noted below.

Attendees

Scott Whitcomb, FMFMD; John Pilon, FMFMD; Dayle Garlock, FMFMD; Donald Mittlestat, FMFMD; Richard McDonald, FMFMD; James Bielecki, FMFMD; Brian Mastenbrook, WLD; Penney Melchoir, WLD; Robin Pearson, FMFMD; Matt Storey, PRC Intern; Doug Heym, FMFMD

Members of the public in attendance: Arch Reeves; Joseph Jarecki

Comments from Stakeholders

The Open House was held at the Pigeon River Country Headquarters on July 28, 2009 – 5 visitors came to view maps and data and discuss prescriptions with staff.

Comments were provided by:

- Joseph Jarecki, Vanderbilt, Michigan - Sent documentation for compartments addressed below.
- Chris Engle, Gaylord Herald Times – Submitted comments that he attended open house to gain deeper understanding of the forest management process and to better explain the process to the Herald Times readers.
- Jim Pearson, Haslett, Michigan – Submitted comments stating no more roads should be paved; limit logging along hiking trails; acquire parcels, including conservation easements; supervise campgrounds better to limit noise and not allow outdoor alcohol use.

Comments from stakeholders that were provided at the open house or otherwise during the comment period were announced and discussed. Comments specific to compartments were read and considered as each compartment was discussed. Stakeholder input that resulted in changes to prescriptions for a specific compartment or stand is recorded in the compartment notes below. Copies of all comments are on file at the unit office.

Compartment 9 (Stand examiner – Rick McDonald)

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review:
None.

Compartment 17 (Stand examiner – Rick McDonald)

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: Joe Jarecki's comments:

- Suggested adding a list of acceptable regeneration for stands 52 and 80. Suggestion was accepted.
- Inquired what the residual basal area in stands 52 and 80 noting that if it was less than 10 BA the PRC Advisory Council should be notified. He was informed that the residual was 20 BA.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stands 52, 80 – Add to comment field: Any combination of aspen, northern hardwood, red pine, jack pine and white pine is acceptable for regeneration.
- Stand 79 – Add to comment field: No retention left due to small stand size.
- Stands 28, 29 – Add to comment field: There is significant red pine regeneration.
- Stand 401, 402 – Prescribe mechanical opening maintenance.
- Stand 407 – Prescribe opening maintenance. Add to comment field: Treat invasive exotics.

Compartment 24 (Stand examiner – Rick McDonald)

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: Joe Jarecki's comments:

- Noted what appeared to be an acreage error for stand 12. Acreage was corrected.
- Stand 67 is slated for 44 acres of harvest and wondered if PRC Advisory Council should be consulted. Rick noted that after retention, the acreage would be 40 acres, but it would be brought up to the council.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 12 – Update acreage. Add to comment field: MCCCT is adjacent.
- Stand 67 – Add to comment field: Even though after consideration for four acres of retention, consultation with the council will that acreage exceeds 40 acres.
- Stand 36 – Add to comment field: Protect High Country Pathway.
- Stand 8 - Add to comment field: Mark red and jack pine seed trees.

Compartment 38 (Stand examiner – Don Mittlestat)

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: Joe Jarecki's comments:

- Noted stand 5 is adjacent to stand 9, not stand 7 as was mentioned in comment field of stand 9. Noted and corrected.
- Add comment: Prescribed burn that was prescribed for YOE 2001 was accomplished. Agreed.
- Stand 400 – Recommended opening maintenance method changed to mechanical method. Comment was added to stand record.
- Stands 9, 11, 23, 37 – Inquired regarding residual basal area. Clarified.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 9 – Remove cut code and change treatment period to 1. Change comment field: Defer harvest until stand 10 is harvested. (Not stand 7).
- Stand 33 – Add to comment field: Prescribed burn that was prescribed for YOE 2001 was accomplished.
- Stand 400 – Add to comment: May mechanically treat white pine encroachment.
- Stands 9, 11, 23, 37 - Add to comment field: Leave 40 basal area, scattered distribution, do not re-enter stand until suitable for thinning.
- Stands 9, 37, 400 – Add to comment field: High Country Pathway.

Compartment 44 (Stand examiner – Don Mittlestat)

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: Joe Jarecki's comments:

- Suggested closing a portion of Gornick Trail between the pipeline in stand 15 and the west end of the "cut across" in stand 16 which would leave Gornick Trail on the pipeline until the "cut across" in stand 16. It was noted that this would be considered in the access plan.
- Stands 8, 37 – Inquired regarding residual basal area. Clarified.
- Stand 40 – Noted there may be 4-5 acres of upland in tail of stand. It was stated that being less than 10 acres, it was acceptable to not include it.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stands 8, 37 - Add to comment field: Leave 30-40 basal area, scattered distribution, do not re-enter stand until suitable for thinning.
- Stand 40 – Change limited factors to "insufficient volume" and "too wet."

Compartment 50 (Stand examiner – Don Mittlestat)

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: Joe Jarecki's comments:

- Stand 34 is slated for 43 acres of harvest and wondered if PRC Advisory Council should be consulted or will retention and the buffer strip along the river keep it under 40 acres? Don noted that after retention and the buffer strip consideration, the acreage would be under 40 acres, but it would be brought up to the council.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stands 1, 2 – Change limiting factor to access.
- Map – Stand number needed for stand between 24 and the private forty.

Compartment 56 (Stand examiner – Don Mittlestat)

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: Joe Jarecki's comments:

- Stand 21 – Consider putting in comment field: Bridge over Pickerel Creek is unsafe for anything except pedestrians and should be removed before it becomes unsafe for pedestrian traffic rather than repairing or replacing it. Agreed.
- Stands 9, 13, 19, 26, 30 – Removed from old growth potential and was prescribed for harvest. Was wondering if approval should be at the compartment review or has it been already done by prescription. Recommended at review old growth designation be removed.
- Stands 11, 12, 27, and part of 6 - What is the plan for these stands designated as potential old growth? Since not prescribed, old growth designation will remain. The rest of Joe's concerns were addressed and determined that the review could not address all issues brought up since they included other compartments and may be covered through the BSA process.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 21 – Put in comment field: Bridge over Pickerel Creek is unsafe for anything except pedestrians and should be removed before it becomes unsafe for pedestrian traffic rather than repairing or replacing it.
- Stands 9, 13, 19, 26, 30 – Remove old growth designation.
- Stand 9 – Add to comment field: No retention due to small acreage.

As the Compartment Review facilitator, I certify that the above changes have been agreed upon.

John Pilon, Inventory and Planning Specialist

Signature:



August 25, 2009