

## Appendix E-Management Recommendations

Resource	Monitoring Drivers	Management Recommendation
<b>Cooperation &amp; Partnerships</b>	<b>Objective. D-CM-1.</b> "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."	Systematically seek partners as part of the Forest Prioritization approach. Involve RO programs to bring regional and national partnerships to the Forest.
<b>Heritage</b>	<b>Objective. O-HR-1.</b> Identify, evaluate, protect, monitor, & preserve heritage resources.	Ensure heritage mitigation measures are effective within heavily used recreation areas across the forest (including the BWCAW). <u>Supporting rationale.</u> Heritage site monitoring over time indicates some heritage sites are being affected by recreation use, especially on campsites subject to extremely heavy visitor use.
<b>Non Native Invasive Species</b>	<b>Objective. O-WL-38.</b> Use Integrated Pest Management to: <b>a.</b> Eradicate any populations of new invaders. <b>b.</b> Contain or eradicate populations of recent invaders. <b>c.</b> Limit the spread of widespread, established invaders within the planning area.	Recommend performing herbicide treatments earlier during growing season, preferably May –early July. <u>Supporting Rationale.</u> Late July –August is too late in growing season to get good kill b/c plants not growing anymore.
<b>Recreation Motor Vehicles</b>	<b>Objective. O-REC-1.</b> Improve the capability of the Forest to provide diverse high quality outdoor recreation opportunities..	When considering management effects on ROS, ensure non fs lands within project area are accounted for. <u>Supporting rationale.</u> Several of our inventoried SPNM ROS areas include non fs lands that we have no control over.
<b>Scenic Resources</b>	<b>Objective. O-SC-1.</b> Mgt 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 Fig O-SC-1.....	Coordinate efforts of monitoring crews so that they can monitor scenery resource mgt while in field monitoring other resources.
<b>Timber</b>	<b>O-TM-1.</b> 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.	Insufficient data collection & data management has resulted in an overestimation of acres available for treatment in vegetation project planning. <u>Supporting rationale.</u> Insufficient data collection & field reconnaissance during the NEPA analysis has resulted in actual treatment acreage 20-25% less than planned. (ie inaccurate crown closures, mistyped stands).  Improve the incorporation of design features and mitigation in vegetation project planning. <u>Supporting rationale.</u> Better incorporating design features and mitigation measures during project NEPA analysis will reduce overestimation of treatment acres.
	<b>(36 CFR 219.12(k)[5][i].</b> Lands are adequately restocked as specified in the forest plan.	Within lowland black spruce treatments re-evaluate regeneration success 7 or 8 years following treatment. <u>Supporting rationale.</u> Monitoring has shown that spruce regeneration within lowland black spruce stands apparent 7 to 8 years following treatment. This regeneration may not be readily apparent during 5th year surveys.

Resource	Monitoring Drivers	Management Recommendation
<b>Transportation</b>	<b>Objective O-TS-6 &amp; 8.</b> Decisions will be made on Forest unclassified roads to designate them as a NF system road or trail, or to decommission them. The Forest will decommission approximately 80 miles of road over the next 10 to 15 years.	<p>During project planning, consider analyzing &amp; making transportation decisions within entire project planning area including roads not associated w/ veg mgt projects. <u>Supporting rationale.</u> Recent NEPA decisions have focused on veg treatments &amp; associated access roads.</p> <p>Avoid designating RMV use on roads that terminate in sensitive areas that may result in or encourage resource impacts (ie wetlands). <u>Supporting rationale</u> Monitoring has shown that several, short roads designated &amp; signed open to ATV's terminated within sensitive habitats. Such designations could encourage unauthorized travel and resource damage.</p> <p>Ensure that thorough accurate road inventories are completed and entered into the roads data base before printing next atv map. <u>Supporting rationale.</u> Within a sampled area , several roads (OML 1 &amp; 2 Roads &amp; non system roads) not shown on the forest atv travel map were being used by atv's during the 2005 hunting season. Some of these unmapped roads resulted from incomplete inventories.</p>
<b>Tribal Rights &amp; Interests</b>	<b>O-TR-3.</b> The Forest Service will work with the appropriate tribal governments to clarify questions regarding the use and protection of miscellaneous forest products with 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.	The Forest Plan desired condition (D-TR-3) notes that the Superior National Forest facilitates the exercise of the right to hunt, fish and gather as retained by Ojibwe whose homelands were subject to treaty in 1854 and 1866. The Forest is accomplishing consultation efforts with the bands, yet the opportunity exists for more proactive government-to-government interaction and collaboration to actively facilitate rights of band members for hunting, fishing and gathering.
<b>Vegetation</b>	O-VG-1 to -3 O-VG-9 O-VG-13-14 O-VG-16	<p>Correct error in Table JPB-2 for age class groupings: Forest Plan Supporting rationale. Implementation has used correct groupings in all NEPA projects, but the correction should be published. Forest Plan <u>Supporting rationale.</u> Implementation has used correct groupings in all NEPA projects, but the correction should be published.</p> <p>Clarify Lowland Conifer Landscape Ecosystem: Changes between the Forest Plan FEIS Landscape Ecosystem map and the implementation layer Landscape Ecosystem map in either an errata or an amendment. <u>Supporting rationale.</u> Current implementation of Lowland Conifer LE (LLC-A, LLC-B, LLC-C) age objectives address lowland black spruce &amp; tamarack, not white cedar (WC) and black ash(BA) (no measurable objectives were developed for the latter two forest types). One possible resolution is to add sections similar to LLC for WC and BA to provide a framework for monitoring general objectives in the Plan that address these types.</p>
	O-VG-1 VG-17 to -21 Spatial S&Gs	<p>Forest Vegetation spatial distribution: Conditions and trends that address spatial management are mostly consistent with Plan direction with two exceptions:</p> <p>New projects in Zone 1 should maintain remaining 5 patches greater than 1000 acres and seek opportunities to replace a minimum of three additional patches of that size by the end of the first decade. <u>Supporting rationale.</u> Zone 1 G-VG-5 for maintaining a minimum of 8 &gt;1,000-acre patches of mature and older upland forest: current condition shows only 5 patches,</p>

Resource	Monitoring Drivers	Management Recommendation
<b>Vegetation</b> <i>Cont'd</i>		though total acres in these patches are close to what was expected at the end of the decade. In Zone 2 seek opportunities to reestablish a 10,000-acre patch. <u>Supporting rationale.</u> Zone 2 G-VG-4 for maintaining one patch >10,000 acres in mature and older upland forest: Current condition shows this patch has been fragmented to less than 10,000 acres. Some of the acres that were in the 11,700-acre patch that existed when the FEIS was conducted (April 2004) are now likely encompassed in one or more of the current five patches in the 5000-10,000-acre class.
<b>WL. MIH. Aquatic</b>	<b>O-WL-36. MIH 14: Lake and stream habitat.</b> Improve lake and stream habitat quality. Objectives, standards, and guidelines are found primarily under Watershed and Riparian Management direction.	A lake habitat monitoring protocol should be developed for the Forest that includes lake habitat, fish population and water quality parameters.
<b>WL. Sensitive Species. Terrestrial WL</b>	<b>O-WL-1 and -2</b> Objectives for Management Indicator Habitat 9 Lowland Black Spruce/Tamarack	Evaluate the feasibility of establishing permanent bird monitoring sites in lowland conifer MIH 9. <u>Supporting rationale.</u> Bird surveys associated with MIH 9 are currently inadequate since long-term song-bird monitoring plots on the Superior include very few plots in this MIH. Because of overall Forest Plan objectives for increasing vegetation management to create young and retain old growth MIH 9, Monitoring songbirds is an efficient and cost-effective way to track species associated with MIH 9.
<b>WL. Threatened and Endangered Species.</b>	<b>G-WL-8</b>	Update inventory areas of regular cross-country over-the-snow travel. <u>Supporting rationale.</u> This action is needed to address <i>Conservation Recommendations</i> for lynx in the Fish and Wildlife Service's programmatic Biological Opinion for the Forest Plan. Updated inventory would allow more accurate assessment and appropriate management related to risk factors associated with compacted snow routes (competition with bobcat, human access to lynx habitat).