“I think, in this business, with limited resources, and with, frankly, an overabundance of [important issues], we inescapably, have to make choices. We have to make hard judgments about what investments will yield the biggest returns for conservation. And that means we make choices about what strategies make the most difference.”
2010 Forest Planning Effort

• Will produce
  – Statewide Assessment of Forest Resources
  – Statewide Forest Resource Strategy

• To provide
  – A basis for management and policy
  – Opportunity to engage partnerships
  – Expand forestry understanding
Goals

• Assessment
  – Conditions of forest lands
  – Threats
  – Areas that are a priority

• Strategy
  – To develop "long-term strategies to address threats to forest resources in the state"
Scope

• Statewide all ownerships
  – Private
  – Public
  – Urban
    • Forests
    • Street trees
Assessment
9 layers

Soil erodibility

% impaired stream length in 10-digit watersheds

Wells and surface water intake

% forest cover by 10-digit watershed

% forest cover in riparian corridors

Slope

% impervious surfaces in 10-digit watersheds

Karst region

Riparian corridors
The layers used in the analysis are all converted into layers of ones (represents that layer) and zeroes. Then they are multiplied by the weight assigned from the on-line voting and added together, resulting in values ranging from 0 (lowest importance) to 1 (highest importance).

Maximum score = 1
Soil & Water

*Conservation and maintenance of soil and water resources*

- retaining or adding forests to protect from soil erosion
- retaining or adding forests to increase water quality
**Fragmentation**

*Fragmentation and/or conversion of forests to another land use*

- breaking forests into smaller, unconnected patches
- converting forests to paved surface, residence, agriculture, water
Contiguous Forest Patches
Roadless tracts

This map shows forest derived from 2009 NASA satellite imagery, minus a 15 meter per side buffer around all roads in the state. Forest patches smaller than 10 acres in size were removed since they are too small for inclusion in forestry programs.
Projected Development Patterns to 2030

This map shows lands that were greater than 10 acres in size in 2000 and are projected to be subdivided into parcels smaller than 10 acres by 2030, based on U.S. Census block data. Derived from Dr. Darre Thedelton's work on population densities across the conterminous U.S.
Percent Forest Cover in a 1KM Radius
Percent Forest Cover in a 10KM Radius
Invasives

*The spread and control of invasive species*

- managing the impact of invasive plants
- controlling the spread of invasive plants
Known statewide invasives occurrence
This map shows corridors (roads, railroads, powerline and pipeline easements, and trails) that through forests in Indiana. An inset in the Brown County Hills area is included to better show detail.
High home density and high forest cover
Biodiversity

Conservation of biodiversity (including plant and wildlife habitat)

- Retention of viable plant and animal communities
- Keeping common species common
Larger than average contiguous forests by eco region

This map shows forest patches that are bigger than the average size for their natural region, only including forest patches 10 acres or greater in size.
Wetlands with buffers

Buffered Wetlands

- Non-woody Wetlands
- Woody Wetlands

This map shows woody wetlands buffered by 1 km, and non-woody wetlands buffered by 350 meters.
Imperiled natural community types
Large forest patches within low forested areas

This map shows forest patches 100 acres in size and greater in areas of the state where there is less than 20% forest cover.
### Assessment Stakeholder Survey Results
May 15 - June 1, 2009

**Survey Monkey: ~1,200 Resource Professionals, Landowners**

Indiana forest issue

| **Fragmentation** and/or conversion of forests to another land use | 189 | 507 |
| Conservation and maintenance of **soil and water** resources | 199 | 425 |
| The spread and control of **invasive species** | 127 | 421 |
| Conservation of **biodiversity** | 150 | 364 |
| Counterproductive government forest conservation related policies | 75 | 249 |
| Availability of land for public recreation | 142 | 234 |
| High cost of forest ownership and low incentives to retain | 49 | 226 |
| Conservation of forests that protect drinking water supplies | 51 | 206 |
| Overpopulation of white-tailed deer | 47 | 194 |
| Inadequate public education about forests | 38 | 166 |
| Sustaining Indiana's forest product industry | 49 | 160 |
| Lack of active management on forests | 38 | 146 |
| Sustainable regeneration of oak woodlands | 29 | 138 |
| Inadequate youth education about forests | 18 | 94 |
| Lack of healthy woodlands and trees in urban areas, including city parks, street and yard trees | 16 | 90 |
| The control of forest fires | 36 | 73 |
| The loss of fire dependent plant communities and habitats | 13 | 67 |
| Other | 24 | 61 |
| Forests not managed for carbon storage | 6 | 45 |
Identifying what we don’t know

- All county parcel data (have 65/92)
- Tax rates on forestland
- Statewide zoning restrictions
- Forestland sale prices by parcel or at least township
- Perennial vs. annual agricultural vegetative cover
- Comprehensive state-level surveys for invasive species
- Stand age and forest type
- Understory and midstory survey – oak distribution
- Forest biodiversity connectivity and dispersal corridors
- Productive capacity (site index)
- Active management of forests, timber harvests
- Forest ownership demographics
- Estate tax income from properties >10 acres
- Ecological impact of deer herbivory
After the Forum

• Submit input, comments, guidance
  – stateassessment@dnr.in.gov
  – http://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/5436.htm

• When it is released
  – Review the Draft Statewide Forest Strategy
  – Provide written comment, feedback

• Be aware of partnership opportunities
  – Federal grants
Questions?

Chris Gonso
Ecosystem Services Specialist
Indiana Division of Forestry
cgonso@dnr.in.gov
Satellite image analysis tells us...

Acres of land that were forest in 1992 but weren't in 2009:

924,680
Satellite image analysis tells us…

Acres of land that weren’t forest in 1992 but were in 2009:

1,272,820