

from [Emily Hague](mailto:emily@monadnockconservancy.org) <emily@monadnockconservancy.org>  
reply-to emily@monadnockconservancy.org  
to kristina.ferrare@unh.edu,  
Karen.bennett@unh.edu  
Rebecca McGuire  
cc <rebecca@monadnockconservancy.org>,  
Anne McBride <anne@monadnockconservancy.org>  
date Tue, Apr 13, 2010 at 12:56 PM  
subject Comments on 'Good Forestry'

Hello Kristina and Karen -

I just looked at several sections of 'Good Forestry' on behalf of the Monadnock Conservancy, and I have a few comments to share. I thought it might be easier to email them so that I could share them with my colleagues, rather than posting them on the website next to each pertinent section, but I'd be happy to do both if that's easier for you guys in compiling comments.

Here goes:

1. "Your Land and the Larger Landscape": What a great section! I think this section is very important and I like the emphasis on collaborative management. We will definitely use this with our easement landowners.
2. State Forester's Message and Steering Committee message: There was a little bit of redundancy between these two sets of remarks, and I think maybe each entity wanted to use their own words, but I did notice it.
3. "Estate Planning and Easements" section: Another great section. I didn't have any suggestions on this one.
4. "Harvesting in High-use Recreation Areas": I thought these recommendations were excellent, but I wondered how realistic they are. Do many landowners and foresters really put up educational signs, temporarily relocate trails and notify their abutters? I'm just curious - if they do, it would be great to hold up examples for some of our easement landowners. I think the points about considering long-term recreational use areas and harvest timing are spot on.
5. "Riparian Areas", buffer matrix: I really like this table, and I would like to reference it with foresters that prepare management plans. However, I was a little bit surprised to find 'no harvest' buffers suggested for 1st-3rd order streams. Though I think it's a good idea, I anticipate getting push-back from foresters on that. Have you found it to be successful? I guess I'll look at Verry and Chase to find some studies that justify that recommendation in case anyone asks. My experience has been that some foresters will flag riparian buffers but still take a few trees from within the buffer lines, within the basal area rule. How strongly do you think we should push for no-harvest buffers? (Tough question, I know).
6. "Stream Crossings & Habitats" section: in the 'recommended practices', it is suggested that permanent crossings be designed for at least a 25-year flood. I know that's the state DOT design standard, but I would strongly suggest pushing that standard up to a 50- or 100-year flood. Though I know there's some distaste in the forestry community (or vocal portions thereof) for Antioch, I must disclose that I was involved in some research at Antioch which determined that what used to be a 25-year storm for us in NH is now more like a 50- or 100-year storm - the frequency and intensity of storms has increased drastically in the last 70 years, but the design standards haven't caught up. So, if we're really trying to protect natural resources here, I think it would be wise to push for a more extreme design standard and have to replace fewer crossings

over time and therefore minimize man-made disturbances in the stream bed.

That's all for now - I thought the document looked great, was well-organized, and covered what I hoped to see it cover as a reference we might be using with our conservation easement landowners and foresters.

Thanks!  
~Emily

--

Emily Hague

Stewardship Manager  
Monadnock Conservancy

P.O. Box 337 Keene NH 03431

603.357.0600

[www.monadnockconservancy.org](http://www.monadnockconservancy.org)