

**Managed Forest Law Legislative Council Study Committee**

**Discussion Questions - 9/9/10**

**Scope and Purpose**

1. Should the expectation for management objectives be the same on state forests and private forests?
2. Should "sound forestry" or "sustainable forestry" be defined consistently on state lands and MFL lands?
3. Should the program recognize management for forest products such as biomass, or ecosystem services such as clean air, clean water, or carbon?
4. To what degree should the rights and obligations of MFL enrollees at the time of enrollment be protected from later changes?
5. Should the MFL program enrollment periods and/or minimum size of ownerships be changed?
6. Should expectations or oversight of large block enrollees or small enrollees be changed?
7. Other?

**Managed Forest Law Legislative Council Study Committee**

**Discussion Questions - 9/9/10**

**Public Access**

1. Should public access continue to be a primary purpose of the program?
2. Should funds collected for "closed" enrollments be used to secure public recreation access?
3. Should large ownerships that are subsequently subdivided be enrolled as closed land?
4. Could hunting pressure be limited to an acceptable level while still providing public access on open MFL lands?
5. Should leasing for private hunting be allowed on MFL lands?
6. Other?