

Appendix C-Achievment of Forest Plan Direction

Resource	Monitoring Drivers	FP Objective or FEIS Projection for Decade 1	Achievement of Decade 1	
			Implemented	Approved NEPA Decisions
Air	Desired Condition. D-AQ-1. Air on the forest is of high quality so that: 1) ecosystems are not impaired by pollutants originating in the air, 2) the health of visitors, residents, and employees are not impaired, 3) poor visibility does not impair scenic quality, and 4) other air quality related values are not adversely affected. AND Desired Condition. D-AQ-3. Air emissions from National Forest management actions do not degrade natural resources or uses of the Forest	Annual Stnd: 15 PM25 24hr Stnd: 65 PM25 Fernberg Site: No major changes from that seen over the past 5 years.	NA	NA
Cooperation & Partnerships	Objective. D-CM-1. "The Forest works cooperatively with other landowners and land managers to protect, enhance, and restore physical and biological resources as well as social and economic values. Cooperative management includes tribal, state, county, local governments as well as other federal agencies."	NA	NA	NA
Fire	Desired Condition D-ID-6. The presence of wildland fire on the landscape is appropriate and desirable, but unwanted wildland fire is actively suppressed where necessary to protect life, investments, and natural resources. The full range of appropriate management responses are considered for unwanted wild land fires.	Prescribed Fire activity acres Fire: Ecological Objectives: 6,200 Ac Fire: Hazardous Fuels: 66,100 Ac Site Prep: 6,700 Total: 79,000 Ac	2%	2.6%
	Objective.O-ID-2. Establish, maintain, or improve the condition of vegetation using prescribed fire, mechanical treatments, and other tools AND Objective.O-ID-4. Reduce fuels and control vegetation in the understory of stands that had naturally occurring low intensity surface fires	Avg Annual 7,900 acres treated with fire Avg Annual 13,000 acres treated with timber harvest TOTAL for DECADE 1=200,900	2025 Acres /200,900 = 1%	27,332/200,900 = 14%
	Desired Condition O-ID-3. Treat areas of highest fire risk (based on Fire Regime and Condition Class) to minimize effects of unwanted wildland fire.			
Heritage	Objective. O-HR-1. Identify, evaluate, protect, monitor, & preserve heritage resources.	Maintenance or Improvement of heritage resource conditions.	NA	NA

Resource	Monitoring Drivers	FP Objective or FEIS Projection for Decade 1	Achievement of Decade 1	
			Implemented	Approved NEPA Decisions
Insects & Disease	36 CFR 219.12 (k)(5)(iv). Destructive insects and disease organisms do not increase to potentially damaging levels following management activities	Spruce Budworm pop maintained @ endemic levels(D-ID-3) Gypsy moth infestation at low, non-reproducing level. D-ID-2	Gypsy Moth 100%	Gypsy Moth 100%
	O-ID-1. Increase the amount of forest restored to or maintained in a healthy condition to reduce risk and damage from fires, insects and diseases.	Acres Susceptible to Spruce Budworm; 271,000 Acres Susceptible to Gypsy Moth; 387,000	TBD	TBD
Non Native Invasive Species	Objective. O-WL-37. Terrestrial. Reduce the spread of terrestrial or aquatic non-native invasive species that pose a risk to native ecosystems.	NNIS exist on SNF as minor ecosystem component	NA	NA
	Objective. O-WL-37. Aquatic. Reduce the spread of terrestrial or aquatic non-native invasive species that pose a risk to native ecosystems.	NNIS exist on SNF as minor ecosystem component.	NA	NA
	Objective. O-WL-38. Use Integrated Pest Management to: a. Eradicate any populations of new invaders. b. Contain or eradicate populations of recent invaders. c. Limit spread of widespread, established invaders within the planning area.	Acres of NNIS Managed	NA	NA
Public Health	Objective. O-PH-1. Public & Non public water & wastewater systems are updated, maintained, & managed to standards set forth in federal guidelines & state standards during this plan period AND Objective. O-PH-4. Forest owned facilities and designated recreation sites and/or natural resource amenities are inspected and managed to ensure safe operation.	Management of Forest recreation and administrative sites provides for the health of employees and the public (e.g. D-PH-1, D-PH-2, D-PH-4, O-PH-1, & O-PH-4)	NA	NA
Recreation Motor Vehicles	36 CFR 219.21[g]. Off-road vehicle use shall be planned and implemented to protect land and other....AND Desired Condition. D-RMV-1. The Forest provides RMV road & trail riding opportunities.... AND Desired Condition. D-RMV-2. Allowed, restricted, and prohibited RMV uses are clearly defined to the public.	Road Miles Open To RMV Travel* OML 1 Summer; 565 OML 2..... 867 Subtotal.....1432 Unclassified.....0 TOTAL.....1432	None in 2005	(a) Projected decrease in total miles open to RMVs from ROD (1488) to Decade 1(1432) = 56 Miles. (b) Decrease in miles from ROD resulting from Approved NEPA=76 miles. (c) Achievement of FP direction=76/56= 135%
	Objective. O-RMV-1. A maximum of 90 additional ATV trail miles & 130 snowmobile trail miles with associated trail facilities (trailhead parking, signs, toilets, etc.) may be added to the designated NF Trail System.	Up to 90 addtl. Miles	Decade 1 ATV Miles (90)/New ATV Miles = 5% Achievement	Decade 1 ATV Miles (90)/New ATV Miles = 5% Achievement

Resource	Monitoring Drivers	FP Objective or FEIS Projection for Decade 1	Achievement of Decade 1	
			Implemented	Approved NEPA Decisions
Scenic Resources	<p>Desired Condition. D-SC-1. The scenic environment within the Forest ranges from landscapes with high scenic quality, displaying little or no evidence of mgt. activities, to landscapes with low scenic quality where evidence of mgt activities dominate. High scenic quality is protected or enhanced in landscapes w/ outstanding scenic value and in other highly used recreation areas and corridors AND</p> <p>Objective. O-SC-1. Management activities will maintain the Forest's scenic resource values by meeting as a minimum the Scenic Integrity Objectives in Table O-SC-1 and on Figure O-SC-1. Higher SIOs may be managed for if deemed appropriate. Areas that do not currently meet SIOs will be considered for scenic enhancement & rehabilitation.</p>	Very High: 0 High: 361,391. Moderate: 828,582. Low: 167,121.	Unknown	Unknown
Socio-Economic	<p>36 CFR 219.19.12(k) 1. A Quantitative estimate of performance comparing outputs & services with those projected by the Forest Plans. 36CFR 219.7(f). A program of monitoring and evaluation shall be conducted that includes consideration of the effects of National Forest Management on land, resources, and communities adjacent to or near the National Forest being planned and the effects upon National Forest management from activities on nearby lands managed by other Federal or other government agencies or under the jurisdiction of local governments.</p>	D-SE-1: The Forest provides commodity resources in an environmentally sustainable and acceptable manner to contribute to the social and economic sustainability and diversity of local communities.	NA	NA
	<p>36 CFR 219.12(k) [3]; (CFR 2004) Documentation of costs associated w/ carrying out the planned mgt prescriptions as compared w/ F.Plan estimated costs.</p>		NA	NA
Soils	<p>Desired Condition. FWD. D-WS-12; and 36 CFR 219.12k2. Soils recover from natural disturbance events and absorb the effects of human disturbances without reducing productivity and function. Soils contribute to ecosystem sustainability. Soil-hydrologic function & productivity is protected, preserving the ability to serve as a filter for good water quality & regulation of nutrient cycling. Soil exposure is minimized. There is minimal compaction, displacement, & puddling. Severely burned conditions resulting from mgt-ignited fire occur infrequently.</p>	Treatment units have minimal compaction, rutting, soil displacement, etc	NA	NA
	<p>Desired Condition D-WS-3. Watersheds & soils are maintained or restored to allow the conservation of genetic integrity of native species. Physical properties of soil are maintained & enhanced. Watershed and habitat restoration projects are natural appearing and favor the use of native materials or naturalized species to the extent practical.</p>	Acres of annual improvement projects.	Restored or improved watershed and Soil resources.	10 acres

Resource	Monitoring Drivers	FP Objective or FEIS Projection for Decade 1	Achievement of Decade 1	
			Implemented	Approved NEPA Decisions
Soils Cont'd	O-WS-9. Protect & where appropriate, restore the soil resource. Improve & protect watershed conditions to provide the soil productivity necessary to support ecological functions. Protect & restore areas where soils are adversely impaired & contributing to an overall decline in watershed condition, soil productivity & quality, & soil function. Do this by using mgt practices, inventory & monitoring results, & findings from the inventory of ecological units. During all mgt actions involving soil disturbance, minimize soil displacement, nutrient loss, & severe burning effects.	FP: LANDSCAPE LEVEL: Nutrient sensitive sites Treated. Nutrient sensitive sites Treated. EIS: 4328 ac/yr 7900 ac/yr	NA	NA
	O-WS-10 During all management actions involving soil disturbance: Maintain adequate ground cover and soil organic layers, both during and after treatment, to minimize erosion (including rill and gully formation) and allow water to infiltrate the soil. Minimize soil displacement, nutrient loss, and effects of severe burning. Restore and re-vegetate disturbed areas. Provide for the maintenance of physical, chemical and biological properties of the forest floor (soil organic matter, Surface O layer), that makes soil productive. Protect soil-hydrologic functions by minimizing rutting, puddling, and compaction.	Sensitive nutrient ELT treatment units have minimal loss of organic layer (forest floor), and minimal severe Burning. Treatment units also provide for Long term forest to maintain nutrients on site.	Monitoring results indicate that organic layers following prescribed burning generally in tact.	
Timber	(36 CFR 219.12(k)[5][ii]. Lands identified as not suited for timber production are examined at least every 10 yrs to determine if they have become suited; & that, if determined suited, such lands are returned to timber production.	944,900 Suitable Acres	No change	No change
	(36 CFR 219.12(k)[5][i]. Lands are adequately restocked as specified in the forest plan.	Lands are adequately restocked	TBD. 5 th year stocking surveys under Revised Forest Plan treatments to begin in 2009.	TBD. 5 th year stocking surveys under Revised Forest Plan treatments to begin in 2009.
	Forest Plan TABLE APP-D3 p.D-3 and EIS Table 2-9 p2-31. Allowable Clear cutting Proportion in actual and Proposed Harvest Treatments	Up to 63 % of total acres treated would be clear cut	28%* *a. Difference between ROD EC & Decade 1 is 35% (98-63) b. Diff between ROD EC & '05 accomplish is 10% (98-88) c. 10%/35%=28%.	85%* *a. Difference between ROD EC & Decade 1 is 35% (98-63) b. Diff between ROD EC & '05 accomplish & NEPA is 30% (98-68) c. 30%/35%=85%.
	(36 CFR 219.12(k)[5][iii]. Max size limits for harvest areas are evaluated to determine whether such size limits should be continued & Standard S-TM-2. Harvest using even-age regeneration methods may create a temporary forest opening no larger than 1,000 acres.	No patches > than 1000 acres	100%	100%

Resource	Monitoring Drivers	FP Objective or FEIS Projection for Decade 1	Achievement of Decade 1			
			Implemented		Approved NEPA Decisions	
Timber <i>Cont'd</i>	Objective O-VG-20. Create large (>300 acres) patch temporary openings up to 1000 acres through management activities.	Large Patch temporary openings (harvest units) up to 1000 acres. (1) Area; 6,900 acres. (2) # of patches 300 ac or larger; 17.	Harvested (1) # patches 300 ac or larger: 0% (2) Area; 0%.		Harvested/Sold/Planned (1) Area; 61%. (2) # of patches: 300 ac or larger; 47%	
	Objective O-VG-21 Increase average size of temporary forest openings. Reduce amount of forest edge created through vegetation management activities, while still retaining a range of small patches and edge habitat.	Temporary Forest Opening Size. To increase	Harvested Average Size= 100%		Harvested/Sold/Planned Average Size= 100%	
	O-TM-1. Provides commercial wood for mills in Northern Minnesota. Material is harvested from the NF to supply sawmills, veneer mills, paper mills, & mills constructing engineered wood products. The Forest also provides posts, poles, & logs for log home construction.	Avg Annual Sell Volumes 102 MMBF Area Harvested 131,900 Acres =13,200 ac per yr avg	Avg Annual	Decade 1	Avg Annual	Decade 1
			Volume Harvested		Volume Harvested	
			48%	5%	48%	5%
			Area Harvested		Area Harvested	
32%			3%	325	3%	
				Volume Harvested & Planned		
				TBD	18%	
				Area Harvested & Planned		
				TBD	22%	
Transportation	Objective. O-TS-3. New roads built to access land for resource management will be primarily OML 1 or temporary and not intended for public motorized use. Temporary roads will be decommissioned after their use is completed. All newly constructed OML 1 roads will be effectively closed to motorized road and recreation vehicles following their use unless they are needed for other management objectives..	Roads in Miles OML1 Roads: 1132 OML2 Roads: 867 OML3 Roads: 248 OML4 Roads: 322 OML5Roads: 86 Unclassified:0	None actually Accomplished		Roads in Miles *OML1 Roads: 18% **OML2 Roads: 104% OML3 Roads: 0 OML4 Roads: 0 OML5Roads: 0 Unclassified: +26%	
	Objective O-TS-6 & 8. Decisions will be made on Forest unclassified roads to designate them as a NF system road or trail, or decommission them. The Forest will decommission approx 80 miles of road over the next 10 to 15 years.	84 Miles	3%		80%	
Tribal Rights & Interests	O-TR-3. The FS will work w/appropriate tribal govt's to clarify questions regarding use & protection of miscellaneous forest products w/the objective of planning for and allowing the continued free personal use of these products by band members within the sustainable limits of the resources.	Superior NF facilitates the exercise of the right to hunt, fish and gather as retained by Ojibwe ...Ongoing opportunities for such use ... are determined in consultation ...	NA		NA	

Resource	Monitoring Drivers	FP Objective or FEIS Projection for Decade 1	Achievement of Decade 1	
			Implemented	Approved NEPA Decisions
Vegetation	SEE VEGETATION TALES BELOW			
Watershed	O-WS-1. Improve and protect watershed conditions to provide water quality and quantity and the soil productivity necessary to support ecological functions and intended beneficial water uses AND Objective O-WS-2(c) Characterize the ecological composition, structure and function and patterns of individual lakes, streams, wetlands....and the watershed and landscapes in which they are nested	LAKES & STREAMS Long Term Lake & Stream Water Quality Monitoring. - Water quality, altered stream flow, & channel stability do not limit aquatic biota or associated recreational uses. Water in lakes, streams, & wetlands meets or exceeds State water quality req.	Established 28 stream reference reaches & 15 lake monitoring sites.	N-A BWCAW Fuels EIS - 10 Lakes (75% Achievement)
	Objective O-WS-2 (b). Restore ecological integrity on all or parts of one or two of the Forest's fifth level watersheds per year by: Improving road and trail crossings of streams and wetlands to assure soil stability, unimpeded flow, sediment transport, and/or passage of fish.	Complete 1-2 road/stream crossing projects each year. This will in result in 10-20 projects completed by the end of the 1 st Decade.	15%-30%	Three road/stream crossing improvement projects were completed in 2005 (15-30%).
	Objective O-WS-6. Reconstruct one-half to three miles of stream channel per year, based on principles of stream geomorphology, to enable the flow of water and sediment to occur without resulting in a change in stream pattern, dimension and profile.	5 TO 30 Miles of improved stream habitat by end of 1 st decade	Restored or improved 1 mile of stream habitat (3-20% Achievement)	Restored or improved 1 mile of stream habitat in the Dark River (3-20 % Achievement)
	Desired Condition. D-AQ-1. Air on the forest is of high quality so that: 1) ecosystems are not impaired by pollutants originating in the air, AND Desired Condition. D-AQ-3. Air emissions from National Forest management actions do not degrade natural resources or uses of the Forest.	Air is of high quality so that: 1) ecosystems are not impaired by pollutants originating in the air, AND Air emissions from National Forest management actions do not degrade natural resources or uses of the Forest	NA	NA
	36 CFR 219.12 (k) [2]. Documentation of the measured prescriptions and effects, including significant changes in productivity of the land.	Compliance w/MFRC site level guidelines, with exceptions where provided for by specific FP direction	NA	NA
WL. Sensitive Species. Aquatic	Objective O-WL-28. Sensitive Fish, Mollusks, Aquatic Insects In all known sites and breeding locations, enhance, or restore high quality habitat for these species primarily by implementing management direction that promotes desired conditions for healthy and functional watersheds, riparian areas, and vegetation AND O-WL-29. Additionally, during evaluation and restoration of one to two 5th level watersheds per year, known locations of the following sensitive aquatic species will provide priority areas for proactive management to improve habitats: Lake sturgeon, Shortjaw cisco, Northern brook lamprey, Creek heelsplitter, and Black sandshell.	FP; Maintain, Protect, or improve habitat for RFSS. Minimize negative effects to RFSS Restore high quality habitat for RFSS Evaluate & restore 1-2 5 th level watersheds per year. Protect known RFSS mussel beds. EIS; Restore 1-2 5 th level watersheds that will benefit RFSS each year.	100%	100% Accomplishment of Approved NEPA Decisions.

Resource	Monitoring Drivers	FP Objective or FEIS Projection for Decade 1	Achievement of Decade 1	
			Implemented	Approved NEPA Decisions
WL. Sensitive Species. Plants.	O-WL-18 [All 58 SNF RFSS plants]: All sensitive species. Maintain, protect, or improve habitat for sensitive species. Meeting this objective will involve two basic and complimentary strategies...: a. Landscape level (or coarse filter) management strategies: Addressing species' needs through integrated resource management at large landscape scales... b. Site-level (or fine filter) management strategies: Addressing species' needs by managing specifically for high quality potential habitat or known locations of sensitive species.	No threats to viability of RFSS plants	1/20=5%	4/20=20%
WL. Sensitive Species. Terrestrial Species.	All sensitive species. O-WL-18. Maintain, protect, or improve habitat for sensitive species Northern goshawk. O-WL-31. Provide habitat to provide for population goal minimum: 20-30 breeding pairs. Black tern. O-WL-22. In all known breeding locations maintain or restore high quality nesting habitat. Great gray; owl. O-WL-21. In known or potential good breeding habitat, maintain or restore high quality habitat conditions: Mature (>50 years old). Boreal owl. O-WL-20. In known or good potential breeding habitat within the normal expected range of the boreal owl on the NFS land, maintain or restore quality habitat conditions.... Three-toed woodpecker. O-WL-23. Maintain or improve quality nesting and foraging habitat within the woodpecker's range, by managing and O-WL-24 The amount and distribution of dead and dying trees should provide adequate representation of patterns and amounts that would result from natural disturbances. Olive-sided flycatcher. O-WL-25. Maintain, protect, or improve quality nesting & foraging habitat: variety of boreal forests . Wood turtle. O-WL-19. In all known breeding locations maintain or restore high quality breeding habitat and protect nesting areas Sensitive butterflies. O-WL-26. In all known breeding locations, maintain or restore high quality habitat for: <u>Jutta arctic</u> : moderately forested black spruce bogs with sedges, bog forest openings and edges. <u>Freija's grizzled skipper</u> : upland acid meadow. <u>Taiga alpine</u> : semi-open to well forested lowland black spruce-tamarack. Nabokov's northern blue butterfly. O-WL-27. In 8 known breeding locations, maintain/restore high quality habitat....	Variable	It is too early to determine the extent accomplishments have achieved Forest Plan direction. The SNF will do a comprehensive evaluation of Forest Plan achievement during the 5 year evaluation.	
WL. MIH. Aquatic	O-WL-36. MIH 14: Lake and stream habitat	Variable conditions depending on water body. Need to maintain or improve lake and stream habitat to support MIS, RFSS, and other important aquatic species.	Lake and stream monitoring sites established on approximately 10% of Forest.	BW Fuels EIS – 100%

Resource	Monitoring Drivers	FP Objective or FEIS Projection for Decade 1	Achievement of Decade 1	
			Implemented	Approved NEPA Decisions
WL-Terrestrial.. Management Indicator Habitats	SEE MIH TALES BELOW			
WL-T&E Species	Objective. O-WL-16. Bald Eagle. Promote the conservation and recovery of the bald eagle. Population goal minimum: 85 occupied breeding territories.	85 breeding territories.	It is too early to determine the extent accomplishments have achieved Forest Plan direction. The SNF will do a comprehensive evaluation of Forest Plan achievement during the 5 year evaluation.	
	O-WL-17. Wolf. Promote the conservation and recovery of the gray wolf. Population goal minimum: contribution to State-wide goal of 1,250 to 1,400	Pop goal minimum: contribution to State goal of 1,250 to 1,400.		
	O-WL-8. Lynx. Promote the conservation and recovery of the Canada lynx and its habitat.			

VEGETATION MANAGEMENT TABLES

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION				
Jack Pine-Black Spruce Landscape Ecosystem (JPB)-Composition				
JPB Vegetation Composition	Existing Condition (ROD date- July 2004)¹	Mgt Direction (DECADE 1)²: Objectives & FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005³. (EC)	Forest-wide Condition in 2005 plus NEPA Decisions (DN) for vegetation mgt.⁴
Forest Types	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Jack pine	24	28	23.2	23.2
Red pine	10	10	9.5	9.5
White pine	3	3	3.6	3.6
Spruce-fir	13	15	13.2	13.2
Oak	<1	0	0.1	0.1
Northern hardwoods	1	<1	0.7	0.7
Aspen	45	40	44.7	44.7
Paper birch	5	5	5.1	5.1
Totals (rounded up)	101	101	100	100

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION				
Jack Pine-Black Spruce Landscape Ecosystem (JPB)-Age Class				
JPB Age Class	Existing Condition (ROD date- July 2004)¹	Mgt Direction (DECADE 1)²: Objectives & FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005³. (EC)	Forest-wide Condition in 2005 plus NEPA Decisions (DN) for vegetation mgt.⁴
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
0-9	10	14	7.9%	10.1%
10-49	38	42	38.9%	38.6%
50-79	24	18	24.0%	22.7%
80-109	25	22	24.9%	24.3%
110-179	4	5	4.2%	4.2%
180+	0	0	0.2%	0.2%
Totals	101	100	100.0%	100.0%

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION				
Dry-Mesic Red and White Pine Landscape Ecosystem (DRW)-Composition				
DRW Vegetation Composition	Existing Condition (ROD date- July 2004)¹.	Mgt Direction (DECADE 1)²: Objectives & FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005³. (EC)	Forest-wide Condition in 2005 plus NEPA Decisions (DN) for vegetation mgt.⁴
Forest Types	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Jack pine	9	10	8.7	8.9
Red pine	13	13	12.5	12.5
White pine	7	9	8.0	8.3
Spruce-fir	8	11	8.0	8.1
Oak	<1	0	0.2	0.2
Northern hardwoods	1	1	1.0	1.0
Aspen	52	47	52.5	51.9
Paper birch	10	9	9.1	9.1
Totals	100	100	100	100

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION				
Dry-Mesic Red and White Pine Landscape Ecosystem (DRW)-Age Class				
DRW Age Class	Existing Condition (ROD date- July 2004)¹.	Mgt Direction (DECADE 1)²: Objectives & FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005³. (EC)	Forest-wide Condition in 2005 plus NEPA Decisions (DN) for vegetation mgt.⁴
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
0-9	10	10	8.3	10.2
10-49	33	44	34.8	34.6
50-99	45	32	44.9	43.4
100-139	12	14	11.7	11.5
140+	0	0	0.3	0.3
Totals	101	100	100.0%	100.0%

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION				
Mesic Red and White Pine Landscape Ecosystem (MRW)-Composition				
MRW Vegetation Composition	Existing Condition (ROD date- July 2004)^{1.}	Mgt Direction (DECADE 1)^{2.}: Objectives & FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005^{3.} (EC)	Forest-wide Condition in 2005 plus NEPA Decisions (DN) for vegetation mgt.^{4.}
Forest Types	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Jack pine	5	6	4.9	4.9
Red pine	6	7	6.2	6.2
White pine	3	5	3.6	3.9
Spruce-fir	16	18	15.9	15.9
Oak	<1	0	0.1	0.1
Northern hardwoods	2	2	2.6	2.6
Aspen	51	47	51.8	51.5
Paper birch	15	15	14.9	14.9
Totals	98	100	100	100

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION				
Mesic Red and White Pine Landscape Ecosystem (MRW)-Age Class				
MRW Age Class	Existing Condition (ROD date- July 2004)^{1.}	Mgt Direction (DECADE 1)^{2.}: Objectives & FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005^{3.} (EC)	Forest-wide Condition in 2005 plus NEPA Decisions (DN) for vegetation mgt.^{4.}
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
0-9	15	10	10.8	11.7
10-49	30	45	30.9	30.7
50-79	29	16	29.9	29.3
80-99	17	21	18.9	18.8
100-119	6	6	7.0	7.0
120+	2	2	2.5	2.5
Totals	99	100	100	100

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION				
Mesic Birch/Aspen/Spruce-Fir Landscape Ecosystem (MBA)-Composition				
MBA Vegetation Composition	Existing Condition (ROD date- July 2004)^{1.}	Mgt Direction (DECADE 1)^{2.}: Objectives & FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005^{3.} (EC)	Forest-wide Condition in 2005 plus NEPA Decisions (DN) for vegetation mgt.^{4.}
Forest Types	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Jack pine	3	4	3.5	3.5
Red pine	5	5	5	5.1
White pine	2	3	2.5	2.6
Spruce-fir	25	26	25.2	25.2
Oak	<1	0	0.1	0.1
Northern hardwoods	4	4	4.4	4.4
Aspen	45	43	44.3	44.2
Paper birch	15	14	15	15
Totals	99	99	100	100

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION				
Mesic Birch/Aspen/Spruce-Fir Landscape Ecosystem (MBA)-Age Class				
MBA Age Class	Existing Condition (ROD date- July 2004)^{1.}	Mgt Direction (DECADE 1)^{2.}: Objectives & FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005^{3.} (EC)	Forest-wide Condition in 2005 plus NEPA Decisions (DN) for vegetation mgt.^{4.}
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
0-9	13	10	7.1	7.6
10-49	33	45	34.6	34.5
50-79	28	15	29.8	29.6
80-99	19	21	20.1	20.0
100+	8	9	8.3	8.3
Totals	101	100	100	100

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION				
Sugar Maple Landscape Ecosystem (SMA)-Composition				
SMA Vegetation Composition	Existing Condition (ROD date- July 2004)¹.	Mgt Direction (DECADE 1)²: Objectives & FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005³. (EC)	Forest-wide Condition in 2005 plus NEPA Decisions (DN) for vegetation mgt.⁴
Forest Types	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Jack pine	<1	0	0	0
Red pine	5	5	4.7	4.7
White pine	1	2	1.1	1.1
Spruce-fir	15	15	13.7	13.7
Oak	0	0	0.1	0.1
Northern hardwoods	36	37	37.5	37.6
Aspen	27	25	26.5	26.2
Paper birch	17	17	16.5	16.6
Totals	101	101	100	100

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION				
Sugar Maple Landscape Ecosystem (SMA)-Age Class				
SMA Age Class	Existing Condition (ROD date- July 2004)¹.	Mgt Direction (DECADE 1)²: Objectives & FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005³. (EC)	Forest-wide Condition in 2005 plus NEPA Decisions (DN) for vegetation mgt.⁴
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
0-9	6	4	3.7	3.3
10-49	27	34	27.3	27.4
50-99	45	38	45.6	45.8
100-149	21	23	22.9	23.0
150+	1	2	0.6	0.6
total	100	101	100	100.0

MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION				
Lowland Conifer Landscape Ecosystem (LLC)-Age Class				
LLC-A In JPB and DRW Vegetation Age Class	Existing Condition (ROD date- July 2004)^{1.}	Mgt Direction (DECADE 1)^{2.}: Objectives & FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005^{3.} (EC)	Forest-wide Condition in 2005 plus NEPA Decisions (DN) for vegetation mgt.⁴
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
0-9	<1	3	0.2	1.1
10-39	7	5	7.3	7.2
40-79	24	18	25.1	24.9
80-159	65	69	65.1	64.5
160+	3	4	2.3	2.3
Total	99	99	100	100
LLC-B In MRW and MBA Vegetation Age Class	Existing Condition (ROD date- July 2004)^{1.}	Mgt Direction (DECADE 1)^{2.}: Objectives & FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005^{3.} (EC)	Forest-wide Condition in 2005 plus NEPA Decisions (DN) for vegetation mgt.⁴
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
0-9	1	2	0.6	0.7
10-39	4	4	4.8	4.8
40-79	25	14	27.7	27.6
80-159	62	70	61.0	61.0
160+	8	10	5.8	5.9
Total	100	100	100	100
LLC-C In SMA Vegetation Age Class	Existing Condition (ROD date- July 2004)^{1.}	Mgt Direction (DECADE 1)^{2.}: Objectives & FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005^{3.} (EC)	Forest-wide Condition in 2005 plus NEPA Decisions (DN) for vegetation mgt.⁴
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
0-9	0	1	0.0	0.0
10-39	2	2	2.7	2.7
40-79	25	19	18.0	18.0
80-159	49	45	55.6	55.6
160+	24	33	23.6	23.6
Total	100	100	100.0	100.0

MANAGEMENT INDICATOR HABITAT (MIH) TABLES

Jack Pine-Black Spruce Landscape Ecosystem (JPB)							
MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION							
JPB MIHs	FEIS Existing Condition 2004¹	FP Objectives: Change from 2004 Condition (+) = increase (-) = decrease			DECADE 1²: FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005³.	2005 Forest-wide Condition + Vegetation Mgt NEPA Decisions (DN).⁴
MIH YOUNG/SEEDLING (0-9 yrs old)	% of total MIH⁵ (276,600 ac)	Decade Objective			% of total MIH⁵ (284,500 ac)	% of total MIH⁵ (284,500 ac)	% of total MIH⁵ (276,600 ac)
		1	2	10			
1. Upland Forest	10.9%	+	+	+	13.5%	7.2%	10.1%
2. Upland Deciduous Forest	4.6%	+	+	+	5.0%	3.6%	4.6%
3. Northern Hardwood Forest	0.0%	-	-	-	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
4. Aspen-Birch Forest	4.6%	+	+	+	5.0%	3.6%	4.6%
5. Upland conifer Forest	6.3%	+	+	-	8.5%	3.6%	5.5%
6. Spruce-fir Forest	2.1%	-	-	-	0.0%	0.8%	1.4%
7. Red & White Pine Forest	1.6%	-	-	+	0.1%	1.4%	1.7%
8. Jack Pine Forest	2.5%	+	+	+	8.4%	1.4%	2.5%

Dry-mesic Red and White Pine Landscape Ecosystem (DRW)							
MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION							
DRW MIHs	FEIS Existing Condition 2004¹	FP Objectives: Change from 2004 Condition (+) = increase (-) = decrease			DECADE 1²: FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005³.	2005 Forest-wide Condition + Vegetation Mgt NEPA Decisions (DN).⁴
MIH YOUNG/SEEDLING (0-9 yrs old)	% of total MIH⁵ (183,500 ac)	Decade Objective			% of total MIH⁵ (183,500 ac)	% of total MIH⁵ (188,900 ac)	% of total MIH⁵ (188,900 ac)
		1	2	10			
1. Upland Forest	11.7%	-	-	-	10.0%	7.6%	10.2%
2. Upland Deciduous Forest	6.5%	-	+	+	4.9%	4.6%	5.8%
3. Northern Hardwood Forest	0.0%	+	+	+	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
4. Aspen-Birch Forest	6.5%	-	+	+	4.8%	4.6%	5.8%
5. Upland conifer Forest	5.2%	-	-	-	5.1%	3.0%	4.4%
6. Spruce-fir Forest	1.7%	-	-	-	0.0%	0.3%	0.6%
7. Red & White Pine Forest	2.9%	-	-	-	1.8%	2.4%	3.1%
8. Jack Pine Forest	0.6%	+	+	+	3.3%	0.3%	0.7%

Mesic Red and White Pine Landscape Ecosystem (MRW)							
MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION							
MRW MIHs	FEIS Existing Condition 2004¹.	FP Objectives: Change from 2004 Condition (+) = increase (-) = decrease (m) = maintain			DECADE 1²: FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005³.	2005 Forest-wide Condition + Vegetation Mgt NEPA Decisions.⁴
MIH YOUNG/SEEDLING (0-9 yrs old)	% of total MIH⁵ (127,800 ac)	Decade Objective			% of total MIH⁵ (133,700 ac)	% of total MIH⁵ (133,700 ac)	% of total MIH⁵ (183,500 ac)
		1	2	10			
1. Upland Forest	17.3%	-	-	-	10.1%	9.1%	11.7%
2. Upland Deciduous Forest	9.0%	-	-	-	6.4%	6.3%	8.2%
3. Northern Hardwood Forest	0.0%	m	m	m	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
4. Aspen-Birch Forest	9.0%	-	-	-	6.3%	6.2%	8.1%
5. Upland conifer Forest	8.3%	-	-	-	3.8%	2.9%	3.6%
6. Spruce-fir Forest	5.9%	-	-	-	0.0%	0.4%	0.6%
7. Red & White Pine Forest	1.7%	-	-	-	1.9%	1.8%	2.3%
8. Jack Pine Forest	0.8%	m	m	-	1.9%	0.6%	0.7%

Mesic Birch/Aspen/Spruce-Fir Landscape Ecosystem (MBA)							
MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION							
MRW MIHs	FEIS Existing Condition 2004¹.	FP Objectives: Change from 2004 Condition (+) = increase (-) = decrease			DECADE 1²: FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005³.	2005 Forest-wide Condition + Vegetation Mgt NEPA Decisions.⁴
MIH YOUNG/SEEDLING (0-9 yrs old)	% of total MIH⁵ (281,300 ac)	Decade Objective			% of total MIH⁵ (281,300 ac)	% of total MIH⁵ (291,700 ac)	% of total MIH⁵ (291,700 ac)
		1	2	10			
1. Upland Forest	14.8%	-	-	-	10.1%	5.7%	7.6%
2. Upland Deciduous Forest	7.2%	+	+	-	7.9%	3.8%	5.2%
3. Northern Hardwood Forest	0.1%	+	+	+	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
4. Aspen-Birch Forest	7.1%	+	+	-	7.7%	3.7%	5.1%
5. Upland conifer Forest	7.7%	-	-	-	2.2%	1.9%	2.3%
6. Spruce-fir Forest	6.5%	-	-	-	0.2%	0.4%	0.6%
7. Red & White Pine Forest	1.0%	-	-	+	0.9%	1.4%	1.6%
8. Jack Pine Forest	0.2%	+	+	+	1.1%	0.1%	0.1%

Sugar Maple Landscape Ecosystem (SMA)							
MANAGEMENT DIRECTION & ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION							
MRW MIHs	FEIS Existing Condition 2004¹.	FP Objectives: Change from 2004 Condition (+) = increase (-) = decrease (m) = maintain			DECADE 1²: FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Existing Condition in 2005³.	2005 Forest-wide Condition + Vegetation Mgt NEPA Decisions.⁴
MIH YOUNG/SEEDLING (0-9 yrs old)	% of total MIH⁵ (51,000 ac)	Decade Objective			% of total MIH⁵ (51,000 ac)	% of total MIH⁵ (52,300 ac)	% of total MIH⁵ (52,300 ac)
		1	2	10			
1. Upland Forest	7.7%	-	-	-	4.1%	3.3%	3.3%
2. Upland Deciduous Forest	3.9%	-	-	-	2.9%	1.9%	2.0%
3. Northern Hardwood Forest	0.2%	-	-	-	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
4. Aspen-Birch Forest	3.7%	-	-	-	2.9%	1.9%	1.9%
5. Upland conifer Forest	3.9%	-	-	-	1.2%	1.3%	1.3%
6. Spruce-fir Forest	3.3%	-	-	-	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%
7. Red & White Pine Forest	0.5%	+	-	-	1.1%	1.0%	1.0%
8. Jack Pine Forest	0.0%	m	m	m	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%