

## Appendix E. Vegetation Composition And Age

<b>Table 1. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION - COMPOSITION</b>					
<b>Jack Pine-Black Spruce (JPB) Landscape Ecosystem</b>					
<b>Forest Types</b>	<b>Mgt Direction – Decade 1</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2004)</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2005)</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2006)</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2007)</b>
Jack Pine	28	24	23	23	23
Red Pine	10	10	10	10	10
White Pine	3	3	4	4	4
Spruce-fir	15	13	13	13	12
Oak	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Hardwoods	0	1	1	1	1
Aspen	40	45	45	45	46
Paper Birch	5	5	5	5	5

<b>Table 1.a ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION – AGE CLASS</b>					
<b>Jack Pine-Black Spruce (JPB) Landscape Ecosystem</b>					
<b>Age Classes</b>	<b>Mgt Direction – Decade 1</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2004)</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2005)</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2006)</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2007)</b>
0-9	14	10	10	7	7
10-49	42	38	39	40	39
50-79	18	24	23	24	23
80-109	22	25	24	25	25
110-179	5	4	4	4	5
180+	0	0	0	0	0

<b>Table 2. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION - COMPOSITION</b>					
<b>Dry-Mesic Red and White Pine (DRW) Landscape Ecosystem</b>					
<b>Forest Types</b>	<b>Mgt Direction – Decade 1</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2004)</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2005)</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2006)</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2007)</b>
Jack Pine	10	9	9	9	9
Red Pine	13	13	13	12	13
White Pine	9	7	8	8	9
Spruce-fir	11	8	8	8	8
Oak	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Hardwoods	1	1	1	1	1
Aspen	47	52	52	52	51
Paper Birch	9	10	9	9	9

<b>Table 2.a ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION – AGE CLASS</b>					
<b>Dry-Mesic Red and White Pine (DRW) Landscape Ecosystem</b>					
<b>Age Class</b>	<b>Mgt Direction – Decade 1</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2004)</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2005)</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2006)</b>	<b>Existing Condition Percent (2007)</b>
0-9	10	10	10	8	8
10-49	44	33	35	36	35
50-99	32	45	43	44	45
100-139	14	12	12	12	12
140+	0	0	0	0	0

Table 3. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION - COMPOSITION					
Mesic Red and White Pine (MRW) Landscape Ecosystem					
Forest Types	Mgt Direction – Decade 1	Existing Condition Percent (2004)	Existing Condition Percent (2005)	Existing Condition Percent (2006)	Existing Condition Percent (2007)
Jack Pine	6	5	5	5	5
Red Pine	7	6	6	6	7
White Pine	5	3	4	4	4
Spruce-fir	18	16	16	16	16
Oak	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Hardwoods	2	2	3	3	3
Aspen	47	51	52	52	51
Paper Birch	15	15	15	15	14

Table 3.a ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION – AGE CLASS					
Mesic Red and White Pine (MRW) Landscape Ecosystem					
Age Classes	Mgt Direction – Decade 1	Existing Condition Percent (2004)	Existing Condition Percent (2005)	Existing Condition Percent (2006)	Existing Condition Percent (2007)
0-9	10	15	12	10	9
10-49	45	30	31	33	35
50-79	16	29	29	28	26
80-99	21	17	19	20	20
100-119	6	6	7	7	7
120+	2	2	3	3	2

Table 4. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION - COMPOSITION					
Mesic Birch/Aspen/Spruce-Fir (MBA) Landscape Ecosystem					
Forest Types	Mgt Direction – Decade 1	Existing Condition Percent (2004)	Existing Condition Percent (2005)	Existing Condition Percent (2006)	Existing Condition Percent (2007)
Jack Pine	4	3	4	4	4
Red Pine	5	5	5	5	5
White Pine	3	2	3	3	3
Spruce-fir	26	25	25	24	25
Oak	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Hardwoods	4	4	4	5	5
Aspen	43	45	44	44	44
Paper Birch	14	15	15	15	15

Table 4.a ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION – AGE CLASS					
Mesic Birch/Aspen/Spruce-Fir (MBA) Landscape Ecosystem					
Age Class	Mgt Direction – Decade 1	Existing Condition Percent (2004)	Existing Condition Percent (2005)	Existing Condition Percent (2006)	Existing Condition Percent (2007)
0-9	10	13	8	6	5
10-49	45	33	35	36	36
50-79	15	28	30	29	28
80-99	21	19	20	21	22
100+	9	8	8	9	9

Table 5. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION - COMPOSITION					
Sugar Maple (SMA) Landscape Ecosystem					
Forest Types	Mgt Direction – Decade 1	Existing Condition Percent (2004)	Existing Condition Percent (2005)	Existing Condition Percent (2006)	Existing Condition Percent (2007)
Jack Pine	0	1	0	0	0
Red Pine	5	5	5	5	5
White Pine	2	1	1	1	2
Spruce-fir	15	15	14	14	14
Oak	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Hardwoods	37	36	38	38	37
Aspen	25	27	26	26	26
Paper Birch	17	17	17	16	16

Table 5.a ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION – AGE CLASS					
Sugar Maple (SMA) Landscape Ecosystem					
Age Class	Mgt Direction – Decade 1	Existing Condition Percent (2004)	Existing Condition Percent (2005)	Existing Condition Percent (2006)	Existing Condition Percent (2007)
0-9	4	6	3	4	4
10-49	34	27	27	28	27
50-99	38	45	46	45	45
100-149	23	21	23	23	23
150+	2	1	1	0	0

Table 6. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION – AGE CLASSES					
Lowland Conifer Landscape Ecosystem (LLC)					
LLC-A (JPB/DRW) Age Classes	Mgt Direction – Percent Decade 1	Existing Condition Percent (2004)	Existing Condition Percent (2005)	Existing Condition Percent (2006)	Existing Condition Percent (2007)
0-9	3	0	1	0	0
10-39	5	7	7	8	7
40-79	18	24	25	25	24
80-159	69	65	65	65	66
160+	4	3	2	2	2
LLC-B (MRW/MBA) Age Classes	Mgt Direction – Percent Decade 1	Existing Condition Percent (2004)	Existing Condition Percent (2005)	Existing Condition Percent (2006)	Existing Condition Percent (2007)
0-9	2	1	1	1	0
10-39	4	4	5	5	5
40-79	14	25	28	27	26
80-159	70	62	61	62	63
160+	10	8	6	6	6
LLC-C (SMA) Age Classes	Mgt Direction – Percent Decade 1	Existing Condition Percent (2004)	Existing Condition Percent (2005)	Existing Condition Percent (2006)	Existing Condition Percent (2007)
0-9	1	0	0	0	0
10-39	2	2	3	3	3
40-79	19	25	18	16	16
80-159	45	49	56	58	58
160+	33	24	24	22	22