

# COMPARTMENT REVIEW RECORD OF CHANGES AND DECISIONS



## Gaylord Forest Management Unit

2011 Year-of-Entry

Northland Sportsmen Club, Gaylord

July 23, 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 Gaylord Forest Management Unit compartment review. This document is the official record of changes and decisions. Proposals originally presented were approved unless noted below.

### Attendees

John Pilon, FMFMD; Shannon Harig, FMFMD; Dayle Garlock, FMFMD; James Bielecki, FMFMD; Brian Mastenbrook, WLD; Ken Phillips, FMFMD; Joyce Angel-Ling, FMFMD; Robin Pearson, FMFMD; Charlotte Farner, FMFMD; Dan Heckman, FMFMD; Don Stacks, FMFMD; Kim Lentz, FMFMD; Tim Greco, FMFMD; John Sheele, FMFMD; Mark Monroe, WLD; Keith Kintigh, WLD; Jason Stephens, FMFMD; Darrick Coy, FMFMD; Paul Castle, FMFMD; Zachary Crew, FMFMD; Steve Cross, FMFMD; Maggie Studer, FMFMD; Jeff Major, FMFMD; Ric Barta, FMFMD; Doug Heym, FMFMD

Members of the public in attendance: Randy Keen, Biewer Lumber Co.; Jim Birdsall, Peaine Township, Peg Meyers, Friends of the Jordan; Steve Umlor, Friends of the Jordan; Peter McCutchen, Ruffed Grouse Society

### Comments from Stakeholders

Open House at Gaylord Unit Office July 8, 2009 – 3 visitors came to view maps and data and discuss prescriptions with staff.

Comments were provided by:

- Steve Umlor, Friends of the Jordan – Inquired if the Jordan Valley would be part of the Biodiversity Stewardship plan. It was explained that part of the valley would probably be identified as a biodiversity area, but the process was in progress. He also asked how the DNR monitors or controls timber cutting in the Jordan Valley. It was explained how the inventory process works and subsequent prescriptions included monitoring is done at all stages.
- Peter McCutcheon, Jim Foote Chapter of the Ruffed Grouse Society – Expressed concern for aspen cuts for grouse management.

Open House at Indian River Field Office July 9, 2009 – 4 visitors came to view maps and data and discuss prescriptions with staff.

Comments were provided by:

- Jay Passino, Indian River – Looked at maps and prescriptions for the purpose of identifying possible sources of firewood.
- Randy Keen, Biewer Lumber Co. – The DNR should strive to maintain as much red pine on the landscape as possible and consider markets when making management decisions.

Other comments received:

- Brent Huntman, Mackinaw Forest Council – Sent documentation with recommendation for modifying treatments in parts of compartment 158 and 216 as indicated in his documentation for the purpose of restoring certain habitat and community types. He also submitted Conservation Area Recommendation forms for both compartments as well as a map that indicates age classification.
- 

Snake Island-Mud Lake State Natural Area ERA Management Plan (July 7, 2009) was approved with the following edit:

- Indicate acreage on map.
- 

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 5 (Stand examiner – Ric Barta)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stands 40, 49, 57, 58 – Prescribe final harvest. Cultural treatment: Burn. Add to stand comment field: Retention 3-10%. Burn along with stands 447 and 498. Change management objective to upland brush.
- Stands 447, 498 – Prescribe burn.
- Stand 14 – Change management objective to upland brush.
- Stands 14, 64 – Remove limiting factors. Add to stand comment field: Any combination of aspen, oak, jack pine and red maple is acceptable for regeneration.

**Compartment 27 (Stand examiner – Kim Lentz)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review: None.

**Compartment 31 (Stand examiner – Kim Lentz)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review: None.

**Compartment 32 (Stand examiner – Tim Greco)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review: None.

**Compartment 39 (Stand examiner – Kim Lentz)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 92 – Add cultural treatment for herbiciding. Add to stand comment field: Plant acorns or oak seedlings to produce a mixed pine-oak stand.
- Stand 58 – Remove limiting factor.
- Stand 156 - Limiting factor is just for access.

**Compartment 46 (Stand examiner – Ric Barta)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stands 18 and 21 – Change method of cut to selection.

**Compartment 58 (Stand examiner – Tim Greco)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stands 21, 37 – Add to stand comment field: Assure adequate protection of hiking trails.

**Compartment 71 (Stand examiners – staff)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: Jim Birdsall, Deputy Peaine Township Supervisor – Asked as contracts are developed, put in requirements for clean-up as the sale is completed. Also since the local fire department has limited capacity, and the state land is not well roaded, can the DNR conduct a fire risk assessment? Steve Cross offered to have a discussion regarding fire risk on the island. He also asked how access will be gained into the areas prescribed for treatment.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 34 – Add limiting factor: Access.

**Compartment 112 (Stand examiner – Don Stacks)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review: None.

**Compartment 119 (Stand examiner – Don Stacks)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review: None.

**Compartment 132 (Stand examiner – Shannon Harig)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review: None.

**Compartment 153 (Stand examiner – Ken Phillips)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 69 – Add to stand comment field: Leave 1-3 oak per acre in addition to the red and white pine.

- Stand 75 – Add to stand comment field: Cut with stand 82, compartment 152, YOE 2008. No retention.

**Compartment 158 (Stand examiner – Ken Phillips)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: Brent Huntman, Mackinaw Forest Council: (A full set of Mackinaw Forest Council comments are on file at the Atlanta FMU office.)

- Stand 1: The stated management objective for this stand is northern hardwood. Comments state “this stand has a good representation of oak...” We propose that the oak regeneration efforts recommended here be put on hold until deer densities fall below levels that threaten oak regeneration due to browse pressure. Oak regeneration is not compatible with maintaining high deer densities. Deer densities should fall over time as interior forest habitat is restored. *It was decided at the compartment review to let the proposed management stand a presented.*
- Stand 9: Logging operations in this stand should maintain soil structure and prevent the introduction of non-native plants into the stand. *DNR staff agreed with this cautionary statement.*
- Stand 18: Retain as a source of large diameter trees for future habitat. Allow natural succession to proceed. *It was decided at the compartment review to let the proposed management stand a presented.*
- Stand 32: Manage to improve quality of northern hardwoods over time and create structure sheltering streams. Maintaining 300 no-clearcut buffer pre Watershed and Fisheries Considerations are of primary consideration. Do not clear cut. *It was decided at the compartment review to let the proposed management stand a presented. It was stated that a good stand of aspen is better than a mediocre stand of hardwoods. The watercourse depicted on the map was in error. There is no stream.*
- Stand 86: Manage to improve quality of northern hardwoods over time. Do not clear cut. *It was decided at the compartment review to let the proposed management stand a presented.*

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 46 – Add to stand comment field: Include with harvest of stand 61 in compartment 156, YOE 2010.
- Map – Add snowmobile trail symbols to map and legend.

**Compartment 166 (Stand examiner – Don Stacks)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review: None.

**Compartment 168 (Stand examiners – Dan Heckman and Shannon Harig)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 105 – Add to comment field: Retain oak for mast production.

**Compartment 179 (Stand examiner – Shannon Harig)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: No comments.

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stands 27, 29, 34 – Add to stand comment field: Extend harvest to stand boundary.

**Compartment 216 (Stand examiner – Shannon Harig)**

Discussion of comments from individual outside parties: Brent Huntman, Mackinaw Forest Council: (A full set of Mackinaw Forest Council comments are on file at the Atlanta FMU office.)

- Stand 19: Maintain regenerating canopy closure and succession process to later succession species. Protect soil structure and prevent the introduction of non-native plants into the stand. *It was decided at the compartment review to let the proposed management stand a presented and that selective harvesting would accomplish this process. The area was heavily grazed and needs regeneration.*
- Stand 25: Maintain regenerating canopy closure and succession process to later succession species. Protect soil structure and prevent the introduction of non-native plants into the stand. *It was decided at the compartment review to let the proposed management stand a presented and that selective harvesting would accomplish this process. The area was heavily grazed and needs regeneration.*
- Stands 10, 22, 23, 28, 29: Natural succession process would be allowed to continue. Openings would close over time, restoring interior forest habitat. *It was decided at the compartment review to let the proposed management stand a presented for the benefit of wildlife.*

Changes made at compartment review: None

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

John Pilon, Inventory and Planning Specialist

Signature:



July 23, 2009