

AFW-8 Comments
Recommendation 44
Afforestation/reforestation programs -- restocking

Don't farm all the forests.

The economic impacts of any legislation must be determined and be a part of the decision.

This is great, government regulations killed the timber industry in MT and the US.

Can't restock until you remove the burned up stuff

Especially on Federal held public lands

Our forests are also a tourist draw.

How would such activities be funded? State lands has a specific mandate to produce revenue for the education trust. It should focus on this job.

seems like an ambitious restocking program - is it doable?

Finally something I think I can support!! It would help if we folks could harvest burned trees for uses other than firewood. Exchange so much outgoing wood for so many trees planted. My neighbor [who works for MT DNC] and myself would go for it. FYI: 70 of my acres burned in 2005 and I watched the Chippy Creek fire from my front yard in 2007. The policies in place now concerning burned forests do not represent conservation or good stewardship in my opinion.

Perennial crops also capture carbon.

Not realistic.

Critical. Consider citizen volunteers to serve in reforestation, etc. A conservation corps.

too conflicted to answer

This is completely out of scope.

So you want to de-fund the rural counties TLU-5, plant more trees in urban areas AFW-8, Limit the growth of the urban area AFW-5. Where do the people from the rural areas move?

If we remove the subsidies for bad behavior, people will turn toward the existing programs.

Long over due.

A must do.

Fantastic, helps wildlife and oxygen and trees preserve water by shade and capture snow and reduce watering needs. Should promote xeriscaping with native trees and low water consuming natives trees.

Trees also need water. One of the reasons fire has been so prominent is competition for resources in our forests. Healthy trees can fight disease. Diseased, and dying trees are more prone to fire.

ridiculous

Great Idea!!! I fully support this. Encourage local forests and wood products to be FSC certified.

But please, let's be sure not to OVERSTOCK lands impacted by wildfire - or we will be right back in the same boat. Encourage thinning of existing stands to increase resilience to fire - so that after a fire burns through a forest still remains.

Another great idea.

Individuals can only do so much with this issue, we need strong and numerous government action of many forms and formats...

The vast majority of burned over lands in Montana since 2000 have been on federal ownership. Often times regeneration is enhanced through an active fire salvage operation. We have all watched the feds fail miserably at post fire operations. While this goal is applaudible a major shift in forest management strategies needs to occur at the federal level.

Also mandate reforestation for logging damage. Outlaw clearcuts. Penalties for deforestation.

Also encourage urban agriculture.

Yes. And stop letting the timber outfits continue to cherry pick the best old growth left in the name of "stewardship".

I think recent literature finds tree planting is not the best bang for buck carbon offsets? I also worry about the "recycling" effect. People who recycle think they are deep ecologists and their environmental sins are washed away with each soda bottle. It's easy for government to write off more aggressive policies by saying they are planting trees...

But you've got to do it right. Don't replant monoculture forests. Take into account how climate change is going to affect forest communities, and plant for the future, not for the past. Let forest fires regenerate naturally, except where intensity is historically high due to suppression.

Reforestation should not be done without studies that demonstrate the viability of reforestation efforts and funds to ensure any reforestation efforts actually work; this include monitoring and weed treatments.

Plant 42,250 new what's per year? Acres? Trees?

This sounds eerily like a government handout to Plum Creek Timber Company to pay for re-seeding their own lands. I might be in favor of this if it was strictly limited to re-seeding public lands only. Timber companies should be able to make the *investment* to reseed their own lands without taxpayers footing the bill.

I believe forest management is a good thing, unless done in the name of fighting "global warming".

We should be doing this anyway

Read "Why Societies Choose to Succeed or Fail" and you will see the first chapter about the Bitter Root Valley, and deforestation the main cause of soil erosion and failure of the community to support itself.

Why just 20 percent?

Our forests have too many trees because we suppressed the wild fires. I can see reforestation in those areas threatened by runoff damage and in cities and communities.

Don't trees normally regrow after forest fires? The urban reforestation idea is great!

Forests could be doomed under Global Warming. Probably best to stop trying to fend off inevitable extinction, figure out what comes after pine and fir forests (e.g. juniper/scrub/etc.) and encourage that. Are there wood producing trees to replace pine forests? If so plant those. It seems to me that the Western Pine cannot survive GW in all of its present range.

As long as restocking involves native species and the locally evolved environment/ecology is thoroughly supported in these efforts.

but who would pay for this?

Please take into consideration the ESSENTIAL nature of mixed-age and mixed-density forests in MT's forest ecosystems!

Now you are talking conservation. Excellent ideas!

If research shows this is economically feasible and effective.

Plan must also include programs to USE wildfire-impacted timber.

will need to keep in step with the wildfire planners and wildland/urban interface issues. I strongly feel that fire protection and fighting costs for folks building in the 'woods' should be shouldered by those individuals impacted by living in that habitat. neighbors helping neighbors, insurance, fire protection kits, etc.

TELL THE FOREST SERVICE TO STOP DOUSING THE FORESTS WITH PESTICIDES - NOT A GOOD IDEA. KILLS BIG GAME ANIMALS, SMALL GAME ANIMALS, NON-GAME ANIMALS AND BIRDS AND OF MOST IMPORTANCE TO GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION, KILLS THE MICRO-ORGANISMS IN THE SOIL. THE FOREST SERVICE'S OWN REPORT SAID THAT THE MICRO-ORGANISMS TAKE 50 YEARS TO RECOVER FROM JUST ONE SPRAYING.

This should include logging as a recognizable way to acquire new growth. Not just fires.

tree planting is a dubious strategy for reducing GHG - as shown in several studies

This is not good science-may be increasing global warming in northern regions-most of the U.S.

Economic Development for Libby and other forest communities; however it would not include federal forests, right? Need federal collaboration here.

Forests are capable of restocking themselves- they are adapted to it. I am concerned about people going in and "planting" a forest after fire. Lots of issues here, including the potential to bring in noxious weeds by accident. I support planting trees in urban areas.

Enhance and expand programs....how much money will that take?

But consider that because of climate change, many places will no longer support the same plant species that burned in forest fires.

Current programs are sufficient.

Education and research efforts are a good means to support the private sector and market system - get off the incentive and bureaucracy creation track please

This would also provide jobs!

The restocking percentages are too low.

How many ways can I say NO to more gov't expansion.

I'm currently working with local government to maintain and improve our urban canopy. It is like hitting my head against a wall repeatedly. People love smooth sidewalks and standard curb and gutter design. If there is one root that interferes with that trained urban design look that tree will come down. Government always cries "we'll get sued" well I'd like to start a lawsuit based on the loss of oxygen from the loss of trees. We need to ask ourselves am I more fearful of tripping on a crack in the sidewalk or skin cancer because all the big shade is disappearing and I'm frying like an ant under a hand lense out here in beautiful Montana?

And harvesting mature forests?

Most of these forest lands will regenerate naturally without the use of state funding or mandates.

NO to first two points! This assumes that forests have to be replanted after a fire. Research does not verify this as an effective program.

And what is the point of planting trees in arid areas? You need to be specific about the kind of trees, so they are appropriate.

We need to cut the pest infested trees and old forest to new and health trees! The fires released more murcery in the air than last year than the new caol fire plant would in greatfalls in 20 yrs

An open forest with managed logging would achieve these goals while also providing needed jobs to the poor. If logging companies were required to replant the acherage they've harvested then the cost to tax-payers would be negligible. If logging companies were allowed to immediately harvest burnt lands with the requirement to, again, replant the acherage they're harvesting (using sound planting policies) then restocking these lands would be free to the tax payer while providing a needed income to many.

Reforestation yes, afforestation no. afforestation is a questionable practice given Montana's water resources

how about logging the deadfall and burned lumber to pay for the reforestation

Take care of the forest as if it was your backyard. It needs TLC and use to keep it heralthy.

Avoid planting trees between roadways that results in impaired visibility.

I am a firm believer that we need to manage our forests and that includes logging and replanting. Forests are a "crop" and should be managed as such. I love having wilderness to look at but we have enough already set aside. Our remaining forest lands need to be used with good stewardship and responsible management practices.

Lets sustainable green cities!

This Action Plan was not a Montana grassroots Plan. It was the same plan written for California and other states.

<http://www.righttalk.com/asx/ggws.aspx>

RIDICULOUS TO WASTE TAX DOLLARS ON REFORESTATION WHEN THIS OCCURS NATURALLY.

Wow! Forest management

Again this is a contradiction in goal. We either have more crop land and less forest land, or visa versa. It is hard to believe that this committee can not see this. Remember we need to increase corn production to 482 million arce that is an increase of 6 times the current planting area Nation wide.

How about logging overstocked stands on Forest Service land? All of the above is useless without the feds doing their part. Which they won't do. Again, ask the enviro's what they will let you do.

Our forest policies need to be overhauled. Clean the fuel OUT of the forests and you will have better containment of fires, and less trees to replant.

Instead of reacting by planting trees after a fire, it would make more sense to prevent the fires in the first place by active management. How was the number 42,250 trees in urban areas reached?? I find the numbers and percentages in most of these recommendations curious at best.

Science has shown that reseedling after fires is not only unnecessary, but can be detrimental to the growth of the forest. While some planting, such as in urban areas, would be wonderful, planting in a wild area after a fire is unnatural and has the potential to severly alter a forest ecosystem. I recommend consulting with some leading scientists on this issue before implementing this measure.

Putting absolute values in place may "shoot the state in the foot" if at the end of a bad fire year there's not enough money to implement or if the economy slows any more in Montana.

We as a state have come a long way with the stewardship of our forests and we still see the envoronmental wacos stopping us from utilizing the renewable resourse that we call timber and now I see an attemp from the same organizations to try to stop us from forest fire fuel reduction. Makes no sense

Would agree as long as this is not a back door attempt to shut down logging in Montana. If it is I disagree

Where viable this is being done.

Would agree as long as this is not a back door attempt to shut down logging in Montana. If it is I disagree

Ok with diverse re-seeding; not for silvi-culture.

This really needs to happen - and soon.

If the forests were thinned out, wouldn't have the devastating fire issues. This alternative costs too much money.

Historically federal mandated reforestation has been too broad causing much waste of time and money. Reforestation is a site specific issue and should not be controlled with blanket legislation. Hire good forest management and let them do their jobs.

DO IT.

Good idea.

Developers should be required to plant and provide drip-water for lots of trees in every new development in treeless land in Montana. Is development to tear the ecosystem up, or to provide homes in a functioning ecosystem?

We should not view our forest and public lands as a way out of an energy crisis.

More trees are fine, but consider varieties appropriate to this semi-arid region.

More and sooner would be better.

First we need to stem the hemorrhage of funds and personnel from the Forest Service budget that is being done by OMB and the current administration.

Pest management: why aren't we harvesting Pine-beetle killed trees? These are now dead standing trees that are just waiting to burn and can be used as an economic resource for our state.

Conservatism -- i.e., caution, prudence -- will be key here, because Montana must be careful not to spend money restocking species that no longer have a future in the state due to anticipated changes of climate. For example, recent papers in peer-reviewed journals cite evidence that the lodgepole pine may no longer be able to survive south of Canada, and that all pines have been committed to "dramatic" change as a consequence of rising global temperatures prompted by consumption of forest and fossil fuels.

raise taxes

Bravo and jobs too

Watch mono-culturing. We need a variety of tree species and ages, and other undergrowth

You cannot go wrong with more trees.

Our local ecosystems are more important than their effect on the atmosphere. Proceed only if weeds will not be propagated, tree densities will not exceed historic levels, and forests will be as healthy as naturally seeded ones. If conducted, promote endangered tree species like limber pine, whitebark pine, larch, red cedar.

We should manage our forest properly to reduce the number of wild fires and we should fight these fires more aggressively. We should stop the green movement from being able to sue to stop fuel reduction logging operations.

More logging and logging jobs are needed. Trees can be re-planted when it's done.

I support restocking forest lands only on those that are already managed for logging. Allow some areas to regenerate naturally, following through a succession of forest types and providing critical habitat for plants and animals. Planting trees in urban areas sounds great.

This could provide biomass for AFW-7 if areas were salvage logged before re-planting.

What about all of the carbon released into our atmosphere when we let these fires rage? What impact does that have on our weather over the next year? More drought? Degradation of quality of life in Montana?

Great!

Helps while also being estheticly pleasing.

Ok, but keep harvesting wood as part of forest stewardship.

I favor natural processes in our forests.

This needs to be enhanced at much greater rates as to keep up with the greater loss and the time it takes to re-forest and thus re-oxygenate our atmosphere. Plus, with global warming our forest fire incidents are increasing.

Don't force reforestation on private property.

No.1-reduce the available fuel level in forests by selective logging. This will help stop devastating wildfires.

No.2-If proper forest management is done for the most part the forest will regenerate by the smaller trees filling in for the older removed ones.

No.3-Then reforest, if needed, areas.

I'm in favor if we allow proper logging as a part of this if not then it is not a long term solution.

The US needs an expanded CCC for the homeless. Prison convicts need to be put to work in these areas.

Important but not as much as many other listed above!

What affect will massive reforestation have on the ecosystem after a forest fire?

Don't let them burn. Thin the forest. It must be cheaper and beter for the habitat to thin the forests than to have 750,000 acres of wildlife habiat burn. I can't drive in many of the parts of the forset that burned last year because I might scare a grizly, but there whole habitat can burn and that's OK?

Great idea, but get much better forest management and utilize selective logging in our forests. Also, allow all burned out areas to be harvested within two years while the wood can be used effeciently. The logging industry would benefit tremendously, and the cost of construction should drop also. Also, we should not be addressing "accessible forest lands", it should be all accessible and all road and gate closures removed so fire equipment and personnel can access the areas.

This is dumb. Most states do this now. But it seems that a State cannot do anything without a law. What happened to common sense?

Is the State to take over the National Forests? This is not a function of the State on "Federal" lands.

42,250 seems arbitrary. The report seems to say "by 2020" rather than "per year"

Make sure diversity and indigenious plants take the forefront.

All of these are 'feel good' expensive bulls**t legislation. Global warming is NOT a fact (cold records set last winter in the southern hemisphere) so it might be Northern hemisphere warming, but not global. Secondly, latest studies of the sun spots (that control global temperatures more than humans) indicate that within 20 years we will be back in a 'mini-ice age'. Not politically correct, but MUCH more accurate.

Put the money into managing the forest before the fires.

Evaluation of forest management practices should be evaluated in the context of ecosystems management and principles of disturbance ecology.

Wuit burning it. thin it leaving the right number of trees and it reforests itself naturally,

Trees! We need more trees! Afforestation is an amazing way to create renewable carbon sinks.

Enhance and expand....a perfect definition of government.

Restock more. 50-75%.

Do some selective logging, duh!

Aunt Jemima, what took you so long?

Forest practices in Montana are superceded by Federal claims in many incidents.

Restock asap. There is no excuse to not reforest. All urban areas MUST grow trees and appropriate vegetation.

Extremely important. Loss of forest decreases plant/food chain components needed for decrease in global warming.

we need to require fire burned areas to be harvested

it is extremely important to reforest lands affected by not only fires, but also by logging, and cutting because of diseased trees.

Will need to reverse the effort to make forest service lands off limits and keep and maintain the transportation system.

We would not have near the fire problem if we could just manage the forests through logging and roaded forests. The faster you can get to a fire the faster you can put it out. (stop closing our public access)

Restocking: do you mean plant trees? Pretty ambitious. A healthy forest even when it has burned will usually regenerate. Look at Yellowstone

Restocking? 42,250 what?

HOW ABOUT ALLOWING TIMBER CUTS ON FIRE LANDS?

Let's hope our Congress will recognize this need and increase (instead of decrease) funds toward this goal. Perhaps we need to utilize more volunteers as I have read that the number of Forest Service employees are to be reduced.

Trees require water -- an increasingly rare and valuable resource in MONTANA. I don't know that encouraging a large tree planting program in URBAN areas is a good idea -- especially since those trees may die when residents are required to cut back on water use, either by law or by economic necessity (I'm noticing more and more brown lawns during the summer).

Mother nature seems to be fairly effective at this over the long term.

Hell ya! Plant dem trees! Team up with organizations like "trash for trees" to limit government spending.

It is high time!!! Thank you! What percentage of the forested lands of this country still exist? I believe it's below 5% !! We MUST do something. People need the solace that recreation provides there, and the beauty to restore our weary bodies and souls and sanity.

Why don't you start with cleaning up some of the forests that have been ravaged by forest fires in the recent past? Then start logging, in an environmentally sensitive way, all of the overgrown forest that we now have. That would reduce carbon dioxide emissions by mitigating forest fires in the future. After you've done those things, bring your points back to the table.

allow forests to regenerate naturally.

Get the federal government, forest service and green nazis out of my woods! Local control and no federal intrusions and the forest fires would stop happening! There would be enough biodiesel generated in a summer to run all of the western states for endless years.

Put out the fires and clean up the existing forest.

Good goals, but hard to dictate to U.S. Forest Service. Industry & state both doing good job of salvage of burned forests. What can be done to stop some lawsuits?

Now you're talking. And don't forget to remove and use the old stuff. It's renewable just as you suggest. But what's with the number 42,250. Where does that number come from?

Restocking should be much more aggressive.

Finally made a little since on one

Outstanding.

Nature reseeds on its own. Active reforestation programs will use more energy, produce more CO₂ than they will conserve.

How about if we SALVAGE burnt wood, and MANAGE pre-burn stands to ameliorate future fires as well as capture wood value and use THAT money to plant trees?

Key is to manage forests so we do not have large fires.

State forests and private commercial forests are already replanted after fires. Private, non-commercial forests rarely burn and are a very small percentage of the whole forest.

A better goal is to prevent fires in the first place. I don't think anyone has enough money to meet the stated goals.

Great idea!

Vastly more gains in productivity and reduction of GHG could be made by mitigating the extreme fire hazard fuels. The burned areas generally come back with too many trees, except for high elevation and other severe sites that have been damaged so severely, no new trees will grow for a long time including planted trees.

The environmentalists will have a problem with interfering with nature vs. increasing photosynthesis;-) Prevent future fires by allowing reasonable logging and thinning. Use the waste for biomass energy production, and replant after harvest.

I support forest stewardship of our Federally managed public lands. I support burn salvage projects on Federally managed public lands within the first year after the fire, much like the state does on school trust lands. Many small communities are lacking school funding because the forest service has moved from a mission of production to destruction. Again I urge the Forest Service to apply "Best Management Practices" on these lands. Revenue generation from renewable resources should be required from the public land managers.

Pretty safe to do this on the private and state lands that have been salvage logged after the fires. But would be downright dangerous to do it among the widdowmakers and deadfalls on the Federal lands where salvage logging is being prevented.

logging currently plants more trees than than this, and helps the growth of the whole forest, reducing fire hazard overgrowth and providing for economic stimulus in our economy

More important than this is the ability to remove damaged timber, beetle infested, etc. Effective forest management is continually thwarted by environmental lawsuits. This side of the equation needs to be considered.

Can the public get to the dead wood from fires in the first place?

Research on benefits and education is a great investment for future generations

Any replanting should be done with local varieties of native plants. Factor in the fact that fires will be more frequent and larger as the climate warms.

CHECK WITH A COMPANY LIKE PLUMB CREEK HAVING THESE POLICIES FOR SOME 30 YEARS OR SO---

A small step. We need more.

Respondent does not have sufficient information or knowledge to rank this recommendation.

reseeding is a waste of money. Natural post fire reseeding is the best you will ever get. Period.

Need a commitment to restoration that is ecologically sound. Not just re-stocking.

we need to better manage our forest lands - both before and after wildfires

When restocking, consider the mix of species in a natural forest; don't turn wildfire recovery lands into monocultural plantations.

Would these trees then be logged and if so what is the net carbon gain. If this had a net plus on carbon captured and benefited the timber industry I feel it could gain some traction.

Need to study this one carefully. Natural regeneration following fires may be more cost efficient and ecologically desirable and still achieve carbon sequestration.

Natural regeneration following salvage of burned timber should be mandated for state and federal lands.

This should be accompanied with increased logging of old growth and bug infested forests -- to reduce wildfires.

Should also include restoration of marginal cropland to native grass cover. Native grass mixtures should be encouraged as they store substantially more carbon than monocultures.

great thoughts

I am concerned about aerial spraying!

cut more timber, fixing the carbon into homes and furniture, instead of leaving it for bugs and fires.

Will global warming allow you to grow trees? It might be shrubs or grass, depending on the water supply. Plantings that don't survive are not helpful.

Only if we can harvest the dead and dying trees for the benefit of the Montana residents.

Where natural regeneration will not occur or will be significantly delayed we support artificial regeneration in burn areas.