

# Sand Dunes State Forest Stakeholder Advisory Group – Meeting 2

## Meeting Summary and Notes

Date: July 25, 2016, 6pm-9m

Location: Independence Elementary School – Community Room; 701 Minnesota Ave Big Lake, MN 55309

The meeting agenda can be found in Appendix A.

Attendees included:

- 25 stakeholder advisory group members, which included one DNR staff member assigned to the group and two Minnesota State Representatives
- 14 audience members
- 7 other DNR staff, 1 facilitator from MN Management & Budget

After the meeting schedule was overviewed, John Korzeniowski (project leader) spoke briefly about the role of the Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG). He emphasized that the purpose of the project is not to ‘vote’ on issues, but to provide opportunities for all present to listen and learn from one another, and for stakeholders to provide options and advice to the DNR about SDSF management. Importantly, the group is not a representative sample of all Minnesotans, so the DNR will do its best to seek ways to hear from diverse voices on these issues.

Next, the project planners provided a draft schedule of meeting topics for the remaining scheduled SAG meetings, based on topics that attendees had provided at the previous meeting. Attendees provided oral and written feedback on the proposed schedule (captured below).

The main discussion topic for the meeting was tree management in the Sand Dunes State Forest. John Korzeniowski gave a presentation on key issues behind the DNR’s tree management decisions in SDSF, including information on:

- why the DNR harvests trees – including data on annual wood fiber needs in Minnesota
- shade/sun tolerance of different tree species and the relationship to harvest method
- the role of sustainability in forest management
- historical forest cover in Minnesota compared to today, including clarification about how oak trees are well-adapted to the sandy, fire-prone landscape of the SDSF.
- Examples of specific sites in SDSF where DNR needs to make management decisions, including a buckthorn-infested site where the DNR wants to replant to white pine, and a 70-acre site with 70-year-old red pine on School Trust Land.

Attendees reflected on discussion questions related to tree management individually, then discussed them in small-groups. Small groups then shared key discussion points with the large group (see summary below and detailed feedback in Appendices C and D). The meeting ended with closing remarks from Director of the Division of Forestry, Forrest Boe.

## Summary of Participant Feedback

Individuals and the small groups offered a wide range of ideas in response to the proposed schedule and the discussion questions. Their detailed responses are compiled in Appendices B, C, and D. What follows here is a summary of all the responses:

### Summary of feedback on proposed schedule:

- Mtg 3 (recreation): Discuss the campground plans, hear from the trail user groups present, discuss the impact of recreation activities on natural resource management, what recreation is allowed in the SNA
- Mtg 4 (Wildlife and native ecosystem management): discuss proposed restoration/conversion actions, how existing funds acquired for restoration will be used, impacts of proposed management changes on deer herd, ecological services, native plant management, prescribed fire
- Mtg 5 (roads and trust lands): consider covering economic issues more broadly, such as economic impacts of the proposed restoration, impacts to nearby landowners (real estate value), Div. of Forestry's budget over the last few years, stumpage value.
- Mtg 6 (process check-in and next steps): ongoing communication and education opportunities, and future engagement efforts
- Other meeting topics could include: overview of the legislation and its impacts, comparison with Sherburne Nat'l Wildlife Refuge management plan, DNR's decision-making process for the SDSF, carbon sequestration impacts; herbicide use
- Consider adding additional meetings to cover the bigger topics
- A couple of attendees expressed scheduling difficulties with the Nov. 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### Summary of small group and individual feedback on discussion questions:

- Site-specific concerns that some attendees have about DNR's tree and timber management in SDSF:
  - Pine plantations – very little ecological value, concerns about impact of climate change on pine resilience
  - Campground at Ann Lake
  - Slash left behind after harvest behind home and elsewhere: concern about recreational and ecological impacts of 'scattering' slash
  - Trees along trails – vary their ages for aesthetic experience of users
  - Roads used by logging trucks – post "hauling" signs
  - Clearcut in south Sand Dunes unit – slash left behind, reforestation not yet done, buckthorn/other invasives taking over
  - Where SDSF borders private lands: desire for "urban buffer" strips
  - Sand dunes: concern about loss to clearcutting/management
  - Pine encroachment into SNA
- (Non-site specific):
  - Impact of summer harvest on protected birds/bats
  - Concern about lack of tree diversity – e.g. only red pine or only oak in certain areas.
  - Concern about disease factors for oak

- Concern about potential economic use of oaks
- Clearcutting generally
- No clearcutting near home
- Desire for smaller clearcuts
- Concern that plan falls short of adequately protecting rare species
- Concern about rotation age of red pine
- What is the overall target per tree species for removal/distribution?
- Herbicide use generally, versus manual/grazing removal
- Burning generally
- Replanting plans, generally
- Water quality impacts
- Disagreement with move toward oak savanna, generally
- Site-specific actions DNR could take that might help avoid conflicts or concerns with landowners and other SDSF stakeholders over tree and timber management:
  - Add info display with maps/time-tables in SDSF, signage where harvesting will occur, and alert local media/government of harvests; publish 'calendar' of harvest activities
  - Two-way communication about harvest plans
  - More information about what/where for chemical use, tree disease pockets
  - Provide educational session on rare species
  - Treat slash to allow easier post-harvest recreational access
  - Multi-age management (e.g. with white pine near private landowners)
  - Consider selective cutting – transition red pine slowly to white pine to avoid clearcutting
  - Perform reforestation plantings
  - Use soil data to inform tree species choices
  - Only do rare features management on 60-100 acres that are already open.
  - Use "string of pearls" method to clear cut
  - Consider alternate non-chemical buckthorn treatment (e.g. grazing) – consider well water impact
  - No burning
  - Do site visit with citizens within ¼ mile
  - "Urban buffer" strips near private land and roads – consider aesthetics
  - Leave shelter areas for wildlife
  - Maintain aesthetic of campground
  - Change the title of the "Operational Plan" to something more representative; add a statement about what won't change or is addressed elsewhere (recreation, roads, etc.)
  - Proceed with plan slowly
  - Nothing – state should be able to maintain land as they feel is responsible
  - People are disagreeing on values – that needs to be addressed first
- Site-specific actions landowners and other SDSF stakeholders could take that might help avoid conflicts or concerns over tree and timber management:
  - Plant more trees on own lands, including forming buffer strips on border of State Forest
  - Don't encroach on state forest with lawns, trails, etc.
  - Can private folks do volunteer work on public lands?
  - Follow rules of SNA and rest of SDSF regarding personal belongings, trash

- Restore oak savanna/prairie on their own lands
- Seek assistance from DNR, SWCD, and private foresters for private tree planting
- Seek out tax programs that will assist with management (e.g. prairie tax exemption to preserve habitats on private lands)
- Seek out multiple high-quality sources of information in their research – pass knowledge onto others
- Listen to what others are saying in stakeholder meetings; seek to understand reasoning behind decisions
- Be open to change
- Specific changes concerning tree and timber management that some stakeholders would like to see in the Operational Plan:
  - Move away from non-native planted pine – move toward native oak in areas managed for timber as well
  - Use native species to increase diversity of area
  - Fewer overall acres of oak savanna/rare species management
  - Manage the entire forest for timber management
  - Shift to multi-age management along roads, borders, and rec areas
  - Buffers/higher density of native trees along roads, border, rec areas
  - Preserve trails during/after harvest; clean up slash on trails and near homes
  - Institute weight limit or a repair schedule for roads; confine cutting/chipping to certain times of day; develop logging roads that exit on county roads
  - Education and compromise with nearby landowners, site visits
  - Less large-scale clear-cutting; smaller cuts
  - Thin, but don't clear-cut
  - Use tear-drop thinning method
  - No bare sand dunes
  - Intermingle white pine with oak
  - Intermingle white pine with red pine
  - DNR provide follow-up inspections post-harvest
  - Replant trees after harvest
  - Include in plan more info on invasive insects and disease
  - DNR staff are competent professionals operating with good management principles with very limited resources; plan is generally on track
  - Plan is good – especially as pertains to dunes/savanna/prairie areas
- Other thoughts, perspectives, and advice about tree and timber management in the SDSF:
  - Focus on native tree species
  - Concerns about oak survival due to disease/insect risks
  - Using goats to remove buckthorn
  - County 4 – could clear a strip with scattered remaining trees, replant, wait 10 years before harvest rest so buffer remains.
  - How will DNR maintain right-of-ways?
  - Need statistics for campground and horse camp.
  - Campground needs active management/thinning
  - Participant states that white pine is native to SDSF

*SDSF Public Involvement: Meeting 2, July 25, 2016*

- A field trip would aid understanding
- OP is adequate – need specific, comprehensive plans for management and a site manager to ensure compliance
- No clearcutting, chemicals, or burning
- Delay rare species management 5-10 years
- Implement the OP as-is
- Look at thinning models used by other states (vs. clearcutting)
- Clearcutting is beneficial for certain wildlife (e.g. deer) but not others
- How do the SDSF plan and SNWR plan mesh?
- We should talk about the variety of oaks in SDSF – bur, white, pin

## Appendix A: Meeting Agenda

### **SAND DUNES STATE FOREST – STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY GROUP MEETING AGENDA**

July 25, 2016                      Independence Elementary School – Community Room  
701 Minnesota Avenue Big Lake, MN 55309

5:30    Doors Open

6:00    Welcome and Introductions

6:10    Overview and process for tonight’s meeting

6:15    Stakeholder Advisory Group Membership and Roles

6:25    Re-cap of June 27 Advisory Group meeting; topics and themes for upcoming meetings

6:45    Break

7:00    Main Discussion Topic: Tree Management in the Sand Dunes State Forest

8:40    Re-cap of meeting, closing remarks

9:00    Adjourn

9:30    Doors Close

## Appendix B: Group notes and Individual responses to draft schedule

Attendees were provided with a draft schedule of meeting topics (below) and an opportunity to provide verbal and written feedback on the proposed topics and meeting dates.

### Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting Schedule

	Date	Location	Topic
<b>Meeting 1</b>	M June 27th	Big Lake High School, Big Lake	Introduce process; Overview of SDSF Operational Management Plan, initial reactions
<b>Meeting 2</b>	M July 25	Independence Elementary School, Big Lake	Forest/tree management
<b>Meeting 3</b>	M Aug. 29	TBD	Recreational opportunities and management
<b>Meeting 4</b>	M Sept. 26	TBD	Wildlife and native plant management
<b>Meeting 5</b>	M Oct. 24	TBD	Land management issues – Trust lands and roads
<b>Meeting 6</b>	M Nov. 28	TBD	Public involvement: reflection and feedback on this process; next steps, ongoing public engagement

\*Notes:

- All meetings will be held 6pm-9pm.
- Other area of concern/clarification that will be addressed at relevant opportunities during meetings:
  - Forest management/invasive species management practices of concern – e.g. prescribed burning, chemical use
  - Climate change
  - Erosion concerns

### Group notes taken during oral feedback:

- Requests:
  - Provide 3-ring binders for Advisory Group
  - Microphone
  - Consider 2 meetings for some topics
  - Monitor group's desire/need to move meetings
- Feedback on Topics:
  - On Oct. 24<sup>th</sup> (Mtg 5) invite Aaron VandeLinde, School Trust Lands coordinator, to speak
  - Restoration practices – what proactive steps will be taken?
  - Overview of legislation passed and interpretation – how will it affect process?
  - Campground (under Recreation)
  - Sherburne National Wildlife Refuge: compare and contrast SDSF plan with theirs
  - Economic impact of conversion/restoration efforts
  - Mtg 5: Fiscal impact, real estate and impact to residents

- Div. of Forestry budget/revenue flow for last 3 years
- Process used to make changes: what led up to this decision, and what will happen after this series of advisory meetings to make next decisions about the Plan?
- Wildlife (Mtg 4): There is existing money for restoration – how/what can that money be used for?
- (Mtg 3) Address recreation users: snowmobilers and horse riders
- Timeline may be too aggressive for implementing the Plan
- (Mtg 3) Impact of recreation on natural resources
- Carbon sequestration capability of different ecosystems, present and proposed
- Ask MN Deer Hunters Assn – what will be the impact on the herd of Plan?
- Dollar value on stumpage
- Ecological services – tied back to economic value
- Prescribed fire vs. wildfire impacts, prairie vs. forest fire impacts – what is threat level?
- What you can and can't do in an SNA

### Individual feedback:

Q1: Are there any management topics or aspects of the Operational Management Plan that you would like to discuss that aren't covered in the proposed schedule?

### **Stakeholder Advisory Group**

#### *Comment 1:*

- Timing of logging (maybe fits into tree management)
- Legislation (effects, etc.)
- What management is allowed given legislation – Existing grant monies.

#### *Comment 2:*

- We need to have a membership list and a specific criteria on how decisions will be made – the law requires we work – collaboratively -

#### *Comment 3:*

- I would like to address Horse use in SD. Trails, camping and improvements
- Also Trail Pass and \$ used.

#### *Comment 4:*

- Talk about how ongoing communication can be enhanced with community/public and engagement can be improved in the future.
- Are their ways to create ongoing educational opportunities for the public to learn about what the DNR does so the public is informed? Is there space to talk about this in terms of engagement?

#### *Comment 5:*

- Tree removal plans for campground? (Answer: recreation)

#### *Comment 6:*

- Economic cost of converting half of the forest into open environment.
- Loss of revenue by having 3000 acres without timber sales



*Comment 7:*

- Let's talk about the campground!!!

*Comment 8:*

- I am not sure which of the meetings covers the proposed conversion of the forest?
- Costs of management?
- How will DNR make the final decision on its future management?
- What was the process that came up with the current Ops Plan?

*Comment 9:*

- The 5 W's of logging contracting
  - Details, time tables, sample contracts, dates
- Produce a write up for township records, and future boards

*Comment 10:*

- Ecological services
- Economic changes

*Comment 11:*

- How much of the forest will be replanted after harvesting?

*Comment 12:*

- Native plant management
- Horses on dunes (SNA)
- Carbon sequestration – plantations vs. savannas/prairies
- Looks good – no doubt SNA issues fit in several meetings esp. illicit horse trails (recreation) that damage the dunes (native plant management and wildlife) and the recreational trails that direct the SNA (roads), woody removal including planted/seeded pine, native woody encroachment (forest/tree management)

*Comment 3:*

- I would like to hear an update from the director of school trust fund land for Oct. 24

**Audience:**

*Comment 1:*

- Under Recreational opportunities would like discussion on improving maintenance of the day use areas and trails to include organized volunteer groups to “adopt” areas.

*Comment 2:*

- Restoration practices – how is “removal”, “burning” etc going to restore anything? What proactive operations are planned to bring back species/habitat?

*Comment 4:*

- Ecological restoration of anoka sand plain – sand dunes subset (compartment).  
Dovetail/integrate with state wildlife action plan and species of greatest conservation need

- Carbon sequestration differences and variables between conifer plantations and savanna/oak brushlands (Marschner)

*Comment 5:*

- Marketing of timber – low value chips?
- Rare species
- Pines – greater wildfire threat
- CO2 sequestration on forest vs. prairie
- Deer numbers on forest vs prairies no difference

*Comment 6:*

- Land value of properties that border
- Effect on tax values (county, township, school)

*Comment 7:*

- Maybe as I learn more.
- Am in favor of your plan generally, but question the idea of 50 year rotation. Old growth pine are scarce in MN. An extended rotation to 100 years and more would alleviate that scarcity of old growth.

Q2: Are there any other changes to the proposed schedule you would like to suggest?

**Stakeholder Advisory Group**

*Comment 1:*

- Nov. 28 meeting – change it??

*Comment 2:*

- Grant money use – ASAP for planning
- Nov. 28<sup>th</sup> works

*Comment 3:*

- Remain consistent for meeting locations.
- Fiscal impact to local residents
- Monday Nov. 28<sup>th</sup> is difficult

*Comment 4:*

- Have refuge talk about comparisons on their management

*Comment 5:*

- Either 11/28 or 12/5 works

*Comment 6:*

- Discuss the cursed conversion plan. (answer: mtg 4 wildlife/land management)
- Don't matter for mtg 6

*Comment 7:*

- Removing pine trees from campground

*SDSF Public Involvement: Meeting 2, July 25, 2016*

- Nov. 28 is fine.

*Comment 8:*

- Where does the campground fall into the next few meetings?
- Nov. 28<sup>th</sup> is fine.

*Comment 9:*

- No conflict for #6

*Comment 10:*

- Possible

*Comment 11:*

- We need the forest replanted.

*Comment 12:*

- None

*Comment 13:*

- How is the DNR funding these meetings? I would appreciate a handout that explains Forestry budget: revenue source and expenditure for 14-15, 15-16, 16-17 projected.

*Comment 14:*

- No conflict on Nov. 28

**Audience:**

*Comment 1:*

- No...might it be better to move the 11/28 meeting by a week or so, due to Thanksgiving weekend? Not a conflict for me.

*Comment 2:*

- Avoid meetings that are adjacent to holidays, i.e. Nov 28<sup>th</sup> adjacent to Thanksgiving weekend – move to Tuesday 11/29?

*Comment 3:*

- Legislation language
- NWR savanna restoration

*Comment 4:*

- Not at this time.

## Appendix C: Compilation of small group answers to discussion questions

In response to Q2a:

- Buffers along properties
- Buffers near private land – “urban buffers”
- Buffers – education for both DNR and landowners
- Adequate notice about management – opportunity for feedback
- Smaller cuts [harvests]
- Slashings on the trails – lots of trails being used that aren’t designated
- Pollinator habitat versus human community – what is this really about?
- Trees have to be replanted after harvesting
- (Their group was ‘a house divided’): Transition to multi-age management
- Buffer – 100 foot buffer
- Plan is adequate
- Pesticides: what is being used?
- Use of burning – in the fall, poison ivy; air quality concerns
- Adding on-ground signage to inform folks about what is going on

In response to 2b:

- Landowners could create their own buffers
- Landowners should be/stay informed that forests will continue after harvest
- Communication options – listservs
- Landowners and others should learn about rare resources – we could have a special session on it
- Planting buffer strips on own property; DNR – provide technical assistance; money with SWCD
- Pass on knowledge – educate other folks; use high-quality sources – multiple insights
- Buffering on private lands – leverage money
- Can private folks do work on public land – make a difference

In response to 3a:

- Smaller cuts
- SNR manage by their whole mandate – not just their environmental mandate; sounds like a narrow focus is dominating
- Less clear cutting – more selective harvest – cut a tree, plant a tree
- DNR develop own logging roads – not use County roads – notify folks about big trucks
- No bare sand dunes
- High percentage of trees especially in recreation areas
- More diverse mix of planted trees
- Cleaner sites – leave it cleaner – limit eco extension/the conversion
- Clarify how invasives and disease will be managed – address it in the Plan

## Appendix D Discussion Questions and Responses - Full Version

DNR asked each individual advisor to respond in writing to discussion questions provided on a handout. What follows is a transcription of all the responses we received. We also gave audience members an opportunity to share their thoughts, and their comments are presented as well.

Q1: What are some site-specific concerns you and others have about DNR's tree and timber management in SDSF? Please be as specific as possible about the places within SDSF where these concerns arise.

Stakeholder Advisory Group + State Representatives:

*Comment 1:*

- Planting and propagation of pines. Very little ecological value, ecologically inappropriate (especially when planted in rows).
- White/red pine are @ southern edge of range in Sherburne County and climate change will likely reduce their productivity in future. Should start phasing out planting/use.
- Timing: Spring/summer harvest may affect federally and state protected birds and bats
  - Should move to winter-only harvest

*Comment 2:*

- Ann Lake area (want to visit it)
- Slash and logs left after marked trees were logged behind our home bordering the Sand Dune State Forest

*Comment 3:*

- Debris left on ground after trees taken out!
- Notice to neighbors of work being done and what it entails
- Better mix of tree varieties

*Comment 4:*

- Oak management issues
  - Oak wilt
  - Gypsy moth
  - Two-line chestnut borer
  - Bur oak blight
- General forest health – varied species and ages as opposed to a monoculture of oak
- Campground – cutting pine

*Comment 5:*

- Cost effectiveness – sales versus paid management
- Varying ages near trail area so users experiences is consistent

*Comment 6:*

- Roads and timing used by logging trucks
- How many trucks and when projections/cords(?) 2017, 2018, 2019

- Post road signs, “Hauling”

*Comment 7:*

- Present clearcutting in the south Sand Dunes was cut, slashing was left where they fell and no reforestation done, now is growing buckthorn and other invasive species.

*Comment 8:*

- Feasibility – will mature oak be economically beneficial in 50 years? What is the cost? Considering the oak diseases so prevalent in the area?

*Comment 9:*

- No one wants clearcutting. Sensible thinning is the way to go.

*Comment 10:*

- Why can't they leave a buffer instead of clearcutting?

*Comment 11:*

- There may not be enough being done to protect rare species
- List more about how planned tree and timber management work supports rare species specifically so the public can be informed about how this work supports those species and name the species to rally support

*Comment 12:*

- Suddenly 60-70 year red pines must be harvested before they deteriorate – why does this just happen to coincide with the mills deciding in 2012 that they needed this size pine – original plan was to harvest at 100 years.

*Comment 13:*

- A complete restructure of forests should not be taken lightly. Natural selection should be an indicator of natural what's to come in the future [sic].

*Comment 14:*

- What would be the final percent of overall removal for the species of trees?
  - What is the target for each species?
- What time of year will the harvests be conducted?
- Who will ensure that contractor follow the prescription for each harvest?
- Slash left behind
- Loss of dunes to clearcutting
- Herbicides
- Trees at campground

*Comment 15:*

- (South Sand Dunes) Current logging practice is to “scatter” debris. This has destroyed several trails in south sand dunes, especially the more remote and less travelled trails. Will future timber management be more conscious of trails and their preservation?
- (South Sand Dunes and Eastern Border) Dune stabilization – most dunes in South Sand Dunes are tree covered. Will forest/timber management properly preserve these fragile dune structures?

*Comment 16:*

- 1) Campground
- 2) Clear cutting 3,000 acres for prairie
- 3) Planting only oak in some areas
- 4) The use of herbicides – instead of goats or hiring people to remove buckthorn.

*Comment 17:*

- [none]

*Comment 18:*

- Clear-cutting
- Chemicals
- Burning

*Comment 19:*

- Pine is coming back into the SNA – needs to be removed – more burns would help keep it out.
- Concerned about change from 100 year harvest v.s. 70 year harvest in 2012 especially in pine plantations

*Comment 20:*

- Lack of management – if there was a plan it didn't get carried out
- If clear-cutting do smaller cuts

*Comment 21:*

- That no more clear cutting be done. (Thinning is ok). We live at 17195 242<sup>nd</sup> ave Big Lake.

*Comment 22:*

- Clearcutting – are there plans now?
- No more clearcutting

*Comment 23:*

- Thin trees rather than clear-cut!

Audience:

*Comment 1:*

- Remove all or most pine trees adjacent to rare species and allow such species to expand. Any plantation trees represent little diversity and if something more biodiverse can be encouraged then tree removal should be permanent. All trails should be closed.

*Comment 2:*

- Clean up of brush during and after cutting
- Replanting plans
- Effects on water tables and ground water quality

*Comment 3:*

- Require loggers to maintain trails after they are done

*Comment 4:*

- Overall – I respect and agree with thinning and replanting processes. It's the move to oak savanna and no replanting that I disagree with.

*Comment 5:*

- Clear cut. Need to thin out, also clean up. Can't use to walk or ride horses because, so much on ground can't get through. Look at the way SD managed the Back(?) hills.

*Comment 6:*

- At this point I believe the plan is adequate to recondition the proposed sites to their more or less original condition.

*Comment 7:*

- Managing a forest for "rare" species only does not encompass the DNR whole mandate in state forest management. Giving in to environmental groups agenda excludes the rest of the management mandate.

Q2: Here are two questions about finding solutions to address specific concerns related to tree and timber management:

- a. What are some site-specific actions DNR could take that might help avoid conflicts or concerns with landowners and other SDSF stakeholders over tree and timber management?

Stakeholder Advisory Group + State Representatives:

*Comment 1:*

- On-the-ground signage.

*Comment 2:*

- Can they haul out the branches (slash)? We can't even walk out there.

*Comment 3:*

- Send out notices in the newspaper and at town board meetings. On the ground signage.

*Comment 4:*

- The DNR could commit to not removing any trees before their economic rotation. Tax payers do not want to see their investment cut short.
- Transition to white pine and multi-age management on the forest that is adjacent to landowners.
- Do rare feature management (clearing, burning) on a much smaller scale. 8-10 sites that are 5-10 acres in size (60-100ac). These are currently open sites. These sites were delineated by DNR staff 7 years ago.
- Clear cut in small pockets (string of pearls) cord 4(?) stand.



*Comment 5:*

- Continued good two-way communication
- Goats for buckthorn removal vs. chemicals
  - Logistics challenges

*Comment 6:*

- Explore/inform about harvesting, areas of sick trees
- How will chemicals be applied and where?
- Provide wall maps at Township Hall
- Post info display (like what Refuge did)
  - Maps and time-table
- Monthly update to township (las Wed. every month)
- DNR and citizen (1/4 mile) visit site
  - i.e. buckthorn
- But high water table – if chemical gets into water table it will spread. Many wells are shallow sand points
  - Use goats on buckthorn

*Comment 7:*

- Buffer strips
- Selective cutting as done in Federal forests
- Reforest planting
- Match trees to soils not some idea that everything return to something that DNR thinks was there.

*Comment 8:*

- Stop burning
- Stop using pesticides and herbicides

*Comment 9:*

- Careful with herbicide use

*Comment 10:*

- Why aren't they replanting?

*Comment 11:*

- Change the title from "Operational Plan" to something more representative
- Add a statement about what won't change or is addressed elsewhere (recreation, roads, etc.)
- Multi-age management

*Comment 12:*

- Buffer zones near private land.
- Slowly convert red pine plantations into white pine – ending with multi-aged white pine forests that could be selectively harvested on an ongoing basis without need to ever clear cut large areas.

*Comment 13:*

- Urban buffer strip

*Comment 14:*

- Input from stakeholders
- Aesthetics of the campground – maintaining
- Buffers adjacent to homeowners – buffers maintaining trees (agreements)

*Comment 15:*

- 200 foot (NOT 50ft) buffer on borders of private property
- Give warning before activities begin. Publish the “calendar”

*Comment 16:*

- Clear cutting next to homeowners
- Don't convert trees to open prairie

*Comment 17:*

- Let owners know well ahead what the plans are and ask for feedback before plans are implemented and carried out.
- Create wide buffer zones so as to not disturb view landowners have – also, shelter areas for birds and wildlife
- aesthetic

*Comment 18:*

- stop clear-cutting

*Comment 19:*

- Put more thought into visual buffers adjacent boundaries especially adjacent private property.

*Comment 20:*

- Trees need to be planted after harvesting

*Comment 21:*

- Trees need to be replanted after harvesting

*Comment 22:*

- Unless some of the plan is essential, you need to slow down so Mother Nature can take its course to maintain the natural makeup of a sand based soil area.

Audience

*Comment 1:*

- Nothing – the state owns the land and has the authority to maintain it as it see fit and responsibly.
- The homeowner encroaching the SE Uncas Dunes access should be told again to remove belongings from state land and the state remove them in 15 days.

*Comment 2:*

- Small cuts that does not clear large open spaces.

*Comment 3:*

- To me, it's very simple. We disagree with what is important. Trees vs. other natural flora and species. I don't know how we resolve this until we are clear with the gap in what we value.

*Comment 4:*

- No clear cuts, leave buffer on roads and home owners

*Comment 5:*

- Landowners and others may benefit from a special session to learn about the endangered species involved herein. The fact oak savanna and dry prairie and their species therein are the scarcest ecosystems we have. Sacrificing some timberlands to re-construct these areas are important and much of the public does not realize that.

*Comment 6:*

- See #1.

b. What are some site-specific actions landowners and other SDSF stakeholders could take that might help avoid conflicts or concerns over tree and timber management?

Stakeholder Advisory Group + State Representatives:

*Comment 1:*

- Stop encroaching on forest (trails, lawns, etc.)
- Ensure all users are following directions/rules for use. Trash is a big issue.
- Restore oak savanna/prairie on their lands to add capacity of conservation efforts.

*Comment 2:*

- Can we plant trees where large areas of diseased trees were taken out? If so, we would be willing to do that.

*Comment 3:*

- Be patient and ask a lot of questions and inquire what results should be. Plant more trees on homeowner lands.

*Comment 4:*

- Establish some buffers on their land adjacent to the forest.

*Comment 5:*

- Communication of concerns and alternatives

*Comment 6:*

- Plant buffer strips on their property
- Get DNR to help, money, planning
- Work with SWCD and DNR on site visit with concerned citizens
- Gina Hugo – for planning and implementation

*Comment 7:*

- Use multiple high-quality sources to do research and inform yourself with good factual information.
- Listen carefully to what folks say – listen to understand what is being said.

*Comment 8:*

- Pass on knowledge and education

*Comment 9:*

- No 100% cuts around on homesites – buffer on their land
- Be less resistant to change
- Understand that what they want doesn't need to be in their backyard
- Research the management of the lands – multiple credible sources

*Comment 10:*

- Work with management of forest areas to create buffer zones that allow management needs to be met, but also preserve aesthetics of forest for landowners.
- Investigate participation in programs such as prairie tax exemption to preserve habitats on private lands.

*Comment 11:*

- Same as #2 [clear cutting next to homeowners; don't convert trees to open prairie]

*Comment 12:*

- Create own buffer!
- Get involved.

*Comment 13:*

- Plant trees on their property to screen them from timber harvest activities on SDSF

*Comment 14:*

- Show stakeholders that forest is going to be continued not eliminated
- Plant trees where trees are harvested

*Comment 15:*

- Plant trees where trees where harvested

*Comment 16:*

- Show the stakeholders that the forest is continued and keep in place.

*Comment 17:*

Audience:

*Comment 1:*

- Let their former enjoyment of the forest be forgotten.

*Comment 2:*

- Better understanding of the reasons why

*Comment 3:*

- Manage according to the mandates as a whole and balanced plan and not just one or 2 facets.

Q3: What are some specific changes concerning tree and timber management you would like to see in the Operational Plan? Briefly explain why.

Stakeholder Advisory Group + State Representatives:

*Comment 1:*

- Expand oak woodland/savanna, even in areas to stay primarily focused on timber harvest (move away from planted rows of pine)
- Increase diversity of forest management areas using native species.

*Comment 2:*

- Oak savanna and rare species should be limited to less acres than planned.

*Comment 3:*

- Limit weight on tracks so not to break up roads or set up a repair schedule. Set up certain times of days cutting or chipping.

*Comment 4:*

- Continue managing the whole forest (other than the SNA and 100 acres of scattered sites) for timber management. Continue to shift to multi-age management along trails, rec areas, and adjacent to landowners.
- Why:
  - Better return on tax payer investment
  - Better aesthetics
  - Better regional biodiversity
  - Still would address rare features management.
  - Healthier forest

*Comment 5:*

- Corridors of vegetation along trails/roads? Tiered management of change
- Landowner education and site specific visits and recommendations and compromise
- Less large clear-cutting

*Comment 6:*

- DNR develop roads for logging trucks that exit on county roads

*Comment 7:*

- Bring the plan to the meeting (copies)

*Comment 8:*

- Use the tear-drop thinning method

*Comment 9:*

- I believe the DNR staff are competent professionals operating with good management principles with very limited resources. I think we can add some good items but the plan is on track.

*Comment 10:*

- No bare sand dunes
- Don't go with just oak landscape – intermingle with white pine.

*Comment 11:*

- cost– should take in account for timber management

*Comment 12:*

- Maintain a higher percentage of native tree species at specific high-use sites and recreate openings in less impacted areas.
- Smaller cuts

*Comment 13:*

- Change plan to “thinning” rather than clear-cutting
- Preserve existing trails during harvests.
- Create and honor “buffer zones” along private property where harvesting is limited, or agreed upon with property owners. Make sure buffer is realistic – 50 feet is NOT realistic!

*Comment 14:*

- Do not cut all red pine, but also plant white pine, a variety

*Comment 15:*

- DNR inspect site to see if rules, etc. had been followed (i.e slash spread and to not be on paths/trails)

*Comment 16:*

- I likes the Op. Plan especially as pertains to sand dunes and oak savanna/prairie areas.

*Comment 17:*

- Leave site looking better (clean up piling and stacking)
- Limit the eco expansion

*Comment 18:*

- That the forest would look better than it does after harvest

*Comment 19:*

- Trees need to be replanted after harvesting

Audience

*Comment 1:*

- Remove all that were not [illegible] prior to settlement

*Comment 2:*

- Include more about invasive bugs, etc. management; oak wilt.

*Comment 3:*

- Not so big cut areas

*Comment 4:*

- Not at this point.

*Comment 5:*

- The elimination of pines in these areas will cater to a narrow agenda and a narrow cross section of population.

Q4: What other thoughts, perspectives, and advice would you like to share about tree and timber management in the SDSF?

Stakeholder Advisory Group + State Representatives:

*Comment 1:*

- Focus on native (to area) species of trees.
- Avoid planting red/white pines due to range contraction expected under future climate predictions.

*Comment 2:*

- With the issues that oak have (see #1) will not be able to maintain oak as described in the plan.
- Goats to take out buckthorn and prep site in sec. 33

*Comment 3:*

- County 4 clearing; harvest 50-100 foot corridor with scattered trees left. Let planting grow 10 years or existing growth so when harvested, visitor impact is reduced.
- Harvesting should be soon. Trees are degrading rapidly.

*Comment 4:*

- How will DNR maintain their right of ways, paved roads on their land and right of ways, i.e. going into Horse Camp
- Can we get statistics for campground. Horse camp.
- Find funding/help get funding.

*Comment 5:*

- I drove through the campgrounds and went to the beach and there needs to be active management and thinning in those areas.

*Comment 6:*

- White pine is native to SDSF...does that make it endangered now?

*Comment 7:*

- Kill the buckthorn with goats

*Comment 8:*

- Manage buckthorn
- Do not steal from our future generations
- Perhaps a field trip for better understanding

*Comment 9:*

- The OP is adequate for this point in my opinion. The specific plans need to be comprehensive and there must be a site manager to assure the requirements are followed.

*Comment 10:*

- Go slow when contemplating a change to existing programs. It takes a long time for nature to change an ecosystem, we should not be in a hurry to mess with what is there.

*Comment 11:*

- No clearcutting, selective harvest is a better way
- No use of chemicals
- And no burning

*Comment 12:*

- Wait another 5 or 10 years or so to expand the savanna.

*Comment 13:*

- Wait another 5 or 10 years or so to expand the savanna.

Audience

*Comment 1:*

- I prefer the original DNR plan be enacted.

*Comment 2:*

- Other states do a great job thinning not clear cutting.

*Comment 3:*

- Clearcutting which is not beneficial to most wildlife species is never the less beneficial to deer and some others within one or two years.
- How do the Forest plans mesh with the Refuge plans?

*Comment 4:*

- Variety of oaks need to be talked about. Bur oaks, white oak, pin oak.



## Appendix E: Reference Information

### Where to Find Information about the Sand Dunes State Forest:

1. Link to the Anoka Sandplains Subsection Plan and Appendix C - Operational Plan for the Sand Dunes State Forest:  
<http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/forestry/subsection/anoka/plan.html>
2. Instructions on how to subscribe to the DNR GovDelivery service to receive information about recent and upcoming activities in the Sand Dunes State Forest:
  - Go to this address <http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/emailupdates/index.html>
  - Fill in your email address in the white box (scroll down to the yellow area labeled "General Public"), then click on "GO"
  - If you are a new subscriber, you will be asked to confirm your email address first. Fill in the form and click "Submit" at the bottom of the page. You should receive an email confirming that you have signed up.
  - Next, under "destinations" check the box next to Sand Dunes State Forest. Scroll to bottom of page and click on "submit."
  - You will automatically receive any future GovDelivery messages sent to the Sand Dunes list.
3. Link to DNR Website With Information About All Minnesota State Forests:  
[http://dnr.state.mn.us/state\\_forests/index.html](http://dnr.state.mn.us/state_forests/index.html)
4. Link to DNR Website for the Sand Dunes State Forest:  
[http://dnr.state.mn.us/state\\_forests/sft00045/index.html](http://dnr.state.mn.us/state_forests/sft00045/index.html)
5. Lake Maria State Park phone: 763-878-2325
6. Little Falls Area Forestry phone: 320-616-2450