

**Summary of Advisory Committee Comments and Parks and Public Lands Responses
on the Aroostook Hills Region Management Plan 5-Year Review for 2014
Comment Period Dec. 26, 2014 – January 9, 2015
(Does not include typographical, grammatical, or formatting comments)**

Comment	Response
<i>From: Charles Beck, Sportsman’s Alliance of Maine</i>	
<p><u>Regarding the proposed sugarbush operation at the Scopan Unit:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have reviewed the data provide and do not have any problems with permitting a maple sugaring operation. • I also looked over the rest of actions and non-actions of the five-year plan and have no questions or comments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bureau appreciates the comments.
<i>From: Andy Cutko, Maine Natural Areas Program</i>	
<p><u>Regarding the proposed sugarbush operation at the Scopan Unit:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [During previous discussions on this issue with the Bureau] MNAP commented that a sugarbush on Scopan Ridge could be compatible with a potential future ecological reserve; the compatibility would depend on the intensity of management in the sugarbush. As a result, I’m not convinced that management of a sugarbush would necessitate removing 300 acres from future ER designation, as is currently proposed. • If this concept gets further traction I’d also like to run it by the Ecological Reserves Scientific Advisory Committee for discussion. I anticipate that if the 300 acres is removed from potential ER designation, there may be an interest in seeing some acres added elsewhere to compensate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the inherent incompatibilities of a sugarbush operation with future ecological reserve designation, the Bureau has proposed to remove the 300 acres from the potential reserve area. Ecological reserves are intended to allow natural processes to predominate, while maple sugaring requires active manipulation of the forest. At the same time, maple sugaring can be compatible with the adjacent area that will retain the potential Ecological Reserve designation as it requires large mature trees. • Maple sugaring is an allowed use within the current Wildlife Management dominant resource allocation; therefore, the resource allocation will remain unchanged. However, within the lease area the Bureau will remove the restriction on timber management which the Plan applies to the potential ecological reserve area, since some tree removal may occur. • The terms of the lease will be consistent with the Wildlife allocation and will be designed to minimize impacts on natural community values to the extent reasonably feasible. The lease area will also be defined on the ground to minimize impacts on the larger natural community.

<i>From: Kenny Fergusson, Forester, Huber Resources Corp</i>	
<p><u>Regarding timber harvesting in the Region:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The review information I received lacked details of volumes planned vs. actual as well as reports of the costs and benefits from the activities. Is this information available? <p><u>Regarding Garfield Plantation Lot:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A terse "Timber harvest started in 2009 and completed in 2010" lacks specifics! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Bureau does not provide detailed timber management operational data in 5-Year reviews as this is beyond the scope of the Management Plan and the intended role of the Advisory Committee; however, the information is available at the Northern Region office. See preceding response.
<i>From: William J. Greaves, Maine Forest Service</i>	
<p><u>Regarding the proposed sugarbush operation at the Scopan Unit:</u></p> <p>I support the amendment to the Aroostook Hills Management plan for the maple sugary, as proposed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted.
<i>From: Frank Frost, Fisheries Biologist, Maine DIF&W</i>	
<p><u>Regarding the proposed sugarbush operation at the Scopan Unit:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not object to the "Potential Maple Sugaring Operation on a Portion of Scopan Mountain". I would support any necessary amendments to management plan to allow for this potential use. <p><u>Regarding Scopan Unit Recreation Management:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I support the efforts to connect the three locales [Haystack Mountain, Scopan, Aroostook State Park] with a non-motorized trail. Such a trail would likely intersect some waters with significant fisheries. I would suggest promoting one potential use of the trail as sport fishing for wild brook trout. I support the efforts outlined under #6 for the Scopan Unit [communication with owners of Walker Siding boat launch] to obtain an appropriate boating access facility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. Comment noted. Comment noted.