

# COMPARTMENT REVIEW RECORD OF CHANGES AND DECISIONS

Michigan Department of Natural Resources

Atlanta Management Unit

2017 Year-of-Entry

Atlanta Field Office

August 20, 2015



---

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

## Attendees

Steve Milford, FRD; Cody Stevens, FRD; Shelby Hiestand, WLD; Brian Mastenbrook, WLD; Tim Greco, FRD; Daniel Heckman, FRD; Jason Stephens, FRD; Richard Barber, FRD; Patrick Potter, FRD; Andrew Krugh, FRD; Jacob Ball, FRD; Dale Parris, FRD; Corey Simpson, FRD; Robert Pelton, FRD; Blake Gingrich, PRD; Lee Osterland, FRD; Kerry Fitzpatrick, WLD; Chad Fate, FRD; Darrick Coy, FRD; and John St. Pierre, FRD.

## Comments from Public and Stakeholders

### **Eric Ellis – Ruffed Grouse Society / American Woodcock Society:**

*I am writing to provide my full and enthusiastic support of the proposed Greasy Creek GEMS site in the Atlanta Forest Management Unit on behalf of the Ruffed Grouse Society and American Woodcock Society (RGS and AWS) and our members in Michigan and beyond.*

*In just its first year the GEMS program has attracted considerable support in the upland hunting community, brought new hunters to Michigan, and attracted the attention of other states looking to increase interest in grouse/woodcock hunting and wildlife viewing associated with young forest habitat. The GEMS sites provide unique walk in access that is very conducive to new hunters, people with disabilities, and hunters that want to avoid vehicles for the safety of their dogs and for the solitude it provides. The proposed management at this location will also benefit neotropical songbirds and a variety of game species that appeal to a broader section of the public. The Greasy Creek area has a long history of being*

*managed for young forest habitat and the additional designation should have minimal impact on how the area is currently used.*

*In addition to the habitat benefits, the work associated with GEMS supports many rural businesses including loggers, foresters, and restoration specialists while attracting hunters and birders that seek the species that use young forests. RGS and AWS offer to work together to raise grant funds to help implement habitat projects at this site and may be able to directly provide financial support through our Drummer Fund or volunteer labor.*

*Early in the planning process it was noted that this GEMS is going to be open to vehicle traffic related to the oil and gas activity. I would suggest that this is specifically noted on the kiosk and on all MDNR related publications associated with the program. Many people seek out these sites due to the lack of vehicle use and should be made aware that this GEMS location will not be entirely closed off during the hunting season.*

*Thank you for your time and consideration of my comments.*

*Best Regards,*

*Eric Ellis*

*Regional Wildlife Biologist and Grant Writer*

*Ruffed Grouse Society and American Woodcock Society.*

**Mavis DesRocher:**

*As I am working, and unable to attend the meeting today in Atlanta re forestry of the local timber areas, I wish to go on record as being AGAINST extensive and severe timber harvesting such as was planned for Chippewa Hills last year.*

*Norway Ridge, Chippewa Hills, Pigeon River, Devils Lake, etc., are important to our local economies due to the hunting, fishing, hiking, foraging, fishing, whatever activity outdoor enthusiasts enjoy.*

*The NE side of Michigan is having a tough time right now. Please do not decimate our forests for the sake of some pulp wood and lumber. After what I saw at Chippewa Hills- how it would have been literally scalped for the sake of money- I do not want that done to any of the forests here.*

*Thank you,*

*Mavis DesRocher*

**Jim Johnson:**

*My primary interest is in integrating recreation objectives of designated trails and timber harvest plans. My understanding is that no timber harvest plans to be discussed today will be in immediate proximity of designated trails areas.*

*I have one generic recommendation regarding the intersection of trails and timber management: Would you please consider holding public meetings in the vicinity of trails affected when timber harvest is proposed for a designated trail area? As you know, there is a great deal of public interest in our trails, representing a wider array of users than for timber units lacking designated trails. Asking these people to attend meetings held 40 miles from the communities where the trails are located is asking a lot. For example, if no trails are affected, holding the open house in Atlanta is fine, but when a trail near Alpena is to be affected, a second meeting located near the trail or in Alpena, with the agenda limited to local harvest plans, would help garner more public participation.*

*Similarly, harvest plans adjacent to Black Mountain trails would include a local meeting at or near Rogers City. Parks and Recreation staff would be urged to attend these local meetings where trails were affected. The use of local meetings would be much more convenient for and therefore appreciated by communities affected.*

*Thank you for your consideration of this.*

*Sincerely,  
Jim Johnson*

**John Strugala:**

*I just wanted to share a few thoughts regarding state forest planning in the above counties. I enjoy the forests of northern Michigan. I especially enjoy hunting in northern Michigan – particularly grouse, woodcock and whitetails. My concern is that we do not have enough young aspen forests in northern Michigan. There was a time in which the aspen were regularly timbered and clear-cut because of their use in making paper and wood products. Those practices have been steadily cut back. Grouse and Woodcock both need young aspen stands to thrive and it seems like the population of these birds has steadily gone down in conjunction with the reduced clear-cutting of aspen stands. We need to ensure that clear-cutting aspen is a solid part of state forest planning in general, but specifically these counties. Many of the aspen stands in these counties are under private ownership and control and that has contributed to the reduction of clear-cutting. I own 120 acres in Presque Isle County and hope to initiate some clear-cutting on that soon, but it is merely a drop in the bucket, so to speak. We must be more aggressive with the practice on state lands, as private and federal sectors seem to lag behind. I am especially frustrated with the lack of aspen*

*management on federal lands – it seems that those folks feel that every tree in the forest must grow old. You certainly must be aware that this is not the case with aspen forests. Clear cutting aspen forests leads to regeneration of the aspen stands and this is beneficial to many game and non-game species of wildlife. Thanks for soliciting the input of the public on this. I hope you come up with a solid plan for the management of the state forests in our area.*

*John Strugala*

## **Compartment Specific changes made during the Compartment Review:**

### **Compartment 11 (Stand examiner – Richard Barber)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stands 78 and 54 – Consider relocating the trail to the boundary between 78 and 50.
- Stands 5,6,30,40,51 and 67 – Change treatment method to thinning and mark stands to a residual basal area of 120. Remove 'shortwood only' comments.

### **Compartment 33 (Stand examiner – Dale Parris)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stands 28,25,56,32 and 60 – Change proposed start date to 10/1/2015.
- Reshape Stand 44 away from stream; talk to Cwalinski.
- Stand 24 in Compartment 32 – Add prescription to clearcut with Stand 37 in this compartment.

### **Compartment 38 (Stand examiner – Richard Barber)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 70 – Remove no-cut buffer along swamp edge.
- Drop prescription on Stand 35 – treat with adjacent stand in the future.

### **Compartment 51 (Stand examiner – Darrick Coy)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 71 – Remove prep treatment, reassess during next entry to clear cut, trench and plant with Stand 74.
- Add recreational trail specifications to these non-forested treatments: 476, 477, 437,430

### **Compartment 59 (Dale Parris)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stands 8 & 10 –Change to clearcut with retention, focus in the narrow strip near Stand 7.

### **Compartment 63 (Stand examiner – Chad Fate)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 81 – Remove management comment in stand comments.
- Mention Director's Order around Tomahawk Lake in the narrative.
- Add campground symbols to the map.
- Add recreation trail specifications to all prescriptions that will have an impact on the trails.
- Stand 81 – Split treatments, delay western most treatments to avoid green-up issues, treat eastern portions early with Stand 72 in Compartment 54062.

### **Compartment 71 (Stand examiner – Darrick Coy)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 29 – Check with Dan Kennedy and Amy Clark –Eagle on Northern long-eared bat regulations from United States Fish & Wildlife Service, specifically related to conversion from hardwood to red pine.
- Stand 48 – Autumn Olive with herbicide along with Stand 29.
- Add Opportunities Field Survey (OFS) for phragmites point in northeast part of compartment.

### **Compartment 75 (Stand examiner – Andrew Krugh)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Add locked OFS comments in the treatment related to the rest in Stand 72. Check the status of the OFS throughout preparation and sale duration.

### **Compartment 87 (Stand examiner – Dale Parris)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 12 – Add comment to leave some red pine along the snowmobile trail.
- Stand 68 – Add comment to focus retention near the north part of the stand.
- Stand 97 – Drop treatment as a commercial harvest, change to non-commercial.
- Stand 85 – Change site condition to “2H”.

### **Compartment 102 (Stand examiner – Andrew Krugh)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- All treatments that have any impact on recreation need to have trail protection specifications.

### **Compartment 106 (Stand examiner – Richard Barber)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 74 – Add a site condition to the stand referring to access.

### **Compartment 120 (Stand examiner – Richard Barber)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Request Michigan Natural Features Inventory survey for the sinkhole area within this compartment to determine the extent of the unavailable site conditions in the area. Also need to re-classify the Potential Old Growth (POG) coded areas to a category that fits.

### **Compartment 137 (Stand examiner – Darrick Coy)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 69 – Remove comment regarding “short wood only”.
- Stands 122 and 113 – Add comment in the acceptable regeneration to the back-up plan of artificial regeneration. Add trail protection specifications to Stand 122 as well.

### **Compartment 139 (Stand examiner – Chad Fate)**

No changes made at compartment review.

### **Compartment 155 (Stand examiner – John St. Pierre)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stand 337 – Change 337 proposed start date to October 1, 2016 (Standard 2017 Year of Entry)
- Add symbology for non-motorized pathway.
- Report 6 – Special Conservation Area (SCA) detail report did not get created correctly for the web posting – needs to be re-posted.

### **Compartment 162 (Stand examiner – Chad Fate)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Add SCA to Stand 149 for the scenic turnout.
- Reshape boundaries of pine stands to reduce straight edges.
- Add recreation trail protection specifications to all stands and prescriptions that will impact the trail.

### **Compartment 164 (Stand examiner – John St. Pierre)**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Stands 10 and 30 – Change minimum stocking levels to low stocking.
- Remove “Shooting Symbols” from map.

### **Grouse Enhanced Management Sites (GEMS), Greasy Creek – 54019**

Changes made at compartment review:

- Road shown on the map will be closed to motorized vehicles (labeled as GEMS TRAIL).