

Chambers, Laura M.

2783

RECEIVED

**From:** KENNETH MANNO [pasfi@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 30, 2009 10:12 AM  
**To:** 'Environmental Quality Board'  
**Cc:** 'Paul Lyskava'; jlevavasseur@hnrq.com  
**Subject:** Revisions to Title 25, Chapter 102 Regulations

DEC 7 REC'D

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY  
REVIEW COMMISSION

Ladies and Gentlemen;

On behalf of the PA Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) program, the primary provider of ongoing training programs for loggers and others involved in the harvesting of trees across Pennsylvania, I respectfully request that you exercise fairness in considering what revisions may be necessary to our current Chapter 102 Regulations. The changes presently being considered seem to reflect no allowance for which entities or practices are actually and largely NOT responsible for the problems being experienced. Specifically, forestry and timber harvesting are, according to the 2008 Pennsylvania Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report issued by PA DEP, responsible for less than two-tenths of one percent of the state's total impaired stream miles. Among the broad array of training programs we conduct several times each year is our Environmental Logging Training. In fact, it is one of our core training programs, which means that it, along with Logging Safety and First Aid/CPR, is required for logging crews working on timber harvests on state lands managed by both the Bureau of Forestry and the PA Game Commission. This same requirement extends to several forest products industry companies as well. In the EL training, protecting and preserving water quality is the main focal point. We believe this effort is working effectively and the data concerning the causes of water quality degradation bears this out. We therefore believe that forestry should receive the same exemption from permitting, forested riparian buffers, and PCSM Plan requirements as is afforded to other agricultural activities.

In addition, we believe it is critically important that foresters and loggers remain as principles in the completion of E&S plans. That process establishes a heightened awareness and sense of responsibility for what needs to be done in terms of protective actions and measures. I am convinced that it is a major contributor to the exemplary record of practices that forestry and timber harvesting have established over the years. It seems perfectly logical and practical to me that regulations need to be as simple and minimal as is possible to achieve the desired outcomes. When regulations become overly complex and expansive, it creates the potential for compliance failures. Further, it fosters a greater workload for those limited resources that serve to monitor and enforce compliance. Shouldn't the limited financial and human resources available to monitor and enforce these regulations be concentrated on those activities that are actually responsible for the problems? Forestry and timber harvesting are not among them.

Finally, please consider the ramifications of these proposed changes relative to forestry and timber harvesting and their consequential impacts on forest landowners and forest health. Is it really necessary and beneficial to impose greater restrictions when the current regulations, given the many years of experience they demonstrate with forest landowners, seem to be totally adequate? What about forest health? Are you looking to fix one problem by imposing limits which have the potential to create other, perhaps more serious situations? I urge you to take a more comprehensive look at these areas to more accurately assess whether your proposed changes affecting them are indeed the best way to go.

Kenneth Manno  
 Program Director  
 PA SFI  
 PO Box 276  
 Bellefonte PA 16823  
 814 355 3970  
 pasfi@verizon.net

12/4/2009