Appendix D. Achievment of Vegetation Objectives

Table 1. COMPOSITION. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION			
Jack Pine-Black Spruce (JPB) Landscape Ecosystem – Composition			
JPB Veg. Composition	Existing Condition (ROD date-July '04)	Decade 1 Objectives % FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Condition in 2006 Includes NEPA Decisions
Forest Types	Percent	Percent	Percent
Jack Pine	24	28	23
Red Pine	10	10	10
White pine	3	3	4
Spruce-fir	13	15	13
Oak	0	0	0
Northern Hardwoods	1	0	1
Aspen	45	40	45
Paper Birch	5	5	5
Total (rounded)	**100**	**100**	**100**

Table 1a. AGE. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION			
Jack Pine-Black Spruce (JPB) Landscape Ecosystem – Age Class			
JPB Age Class	Existing Condition (ROD date-July '04)	Decade 1 Objectives % FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Condition in 2006 Includes NEPA Decisions
Age Classes	Percent	Percent	Percent
0-9	10	14	7
10-49	38	42	40
50-79	24	18	24
80-109	25	22	25
110-179	4	5	4
180+	0	0	0
Totals (rounded)	**100**	**100**	**100**

Table 2 COMPOSITION. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION			
Dry-Mesic Red and White Pine Landscape Ecosystem (DRW) – Composition			
DRW Veg. Composition	Existing Condition (ROD date-July '04)	Decade 1 Objectives % FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Condition in 2006 Includes NEPA Decisions
Forest Types	Percent	Percent	Percent
Jack Pine	9	10	9
Red Pine	13	13	12
White pine	7	9	8
Spruce-fir	8	11	8
Oak	0	0	0
Northern Hardwoods	1	1	1
Aspen	52	47	52
Paper Birch	10	9	9
Total (rounded)	**100**	**100**	**100**

Table 2a. AGE. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION			
Dry-Mesic Red and White Pine Landscape Ecosystem (DRW) – Age Class			
DRW Age Class	Existing Condition (ROD date-July '04)	Decade 1 Objectives % FEIS Projected Condition	Forest-wide Condition in 2006 Includes NEPA Decisions
Age Classes	Percent	Percent	Percent
0-9	10	10	8
10-49	33	44	36
50-99	45	32	44
100-139	12	14	12
140+	0	0	0
Totals (rounded)	**100**	**100**	**100**

Table 3. COMPOSITION. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION			
Mesic Red and White Pine Landscape Ecosystem (MRW) – Composition			
MRW **Veg. Composition**	**Existing Condition** **(ROD date-July '04)**	**Decade 1 Objectives** **% FEIS Projected Condition**	**Forest-wide Condition in 2006** **Includes NEPA Decisions**
Forest Types	**Percent**	**Percent**	**Percent**
Jack Pine	5	6	5
Red Pine	6	7	6
White Pine	3	5	4
Spruce-fir	16	18	16
Oak	0	0	0
Northern Hardwoods	2	2	3
Aspen	51	47	52
Paper Birch	15	15	15
Total (rounded)	**100**	**100**	**100**

Table 3a. AGE. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION			
Mesic Red and White Pine Landscape Ecosystem (MRW) – Age Class			
MRW **Age Class**	**Existing Condition** **(ROD date-July '04)**	**Decade 1 Objectives** **% FEIS Projected Condition**	**Forest-wide Condition in 2006** **Includes NEPA Decisions**
Age Classes	**Percent**	**Percent**	**Percent**
0-9	15	10	10
10-49	30	45	33
50-79	29	16	28
80-99	17	21	20
100-119	6	6	7
120+	2	2	3
Totals (rounded)	**100**	**100**	**100**

Table 4. COMPOSITION. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION			
Mesic Birch/Aspen/Spruce-Fir Landscape Ecosystem (MBA) – Composition			
MBA **Veg. Composition**	**Existing Condition** **(ROD date-July '04)**	**Decade 1 Objectives** **% FEIS Projected Condition**	**Forest-wide Condition in 2006** **Includes NEPA Decisions**
Forest Types	**Percent**	**Percent**	**Percent**
Jack Pine	3	4	4
Red Pine	5	5	5
White Pine	2	3	3
Spruce-fir	25	26	24
Oak	0	0	0
Northern Hardwoods	4	4	5
Aspen	45	43	44
Paper Birch	15	14	15
Total (rounded)	**100**	**100**	**100**

Table 4a. AGE. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION			
Mesic Birch/Aspen/Spruce-Fir Landscape Ecosystem (MBA) – Age Class			
MBA **Age Class**	**Existing Condition** **(ROD date-July '04)**	**Decade 1 Objectives** **% FEIS Projected Condition**	**Forest-wide Condition in 2006** **Includes NEPA Decisions**
Age Classes	**Percent**	**Percent**	**Percent**
0-9	13	10	6
10-49	33	45	36
50-79	28	15	29
80-99	19	21	21
100+	8	9	9
Totals (rounded)	**100**	**100**	**100**

Table 5. COMPOSITION. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION			
Sugar Maple Landscape Ecosystem (SMA) – Composition			
SMA Veg. Composition	**Existing Condition (ROD date-July '04)**	**Decade 1 Objectives % FEIS Projected Condition**	**Forest-wide Condition in 2006 Includes NEPA Decisions**
Forest Types	**Percent**	**Percent**	**Percent**
Jack Pine	0	0	0
Red Pine	5	5	5
White Pine	1	2	1
Spruce-fir	15	15	14
Oak	0	0	0
Northern Hardwoods	36	37	38
Aspen	27	25	26
Paper Birch	17	17	16
Total (rounded)	**100**	**100**	**100**

Table 5a. AGE. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION			
Sugar Maple Landscape Ecosystem (SMA) – Age Class			
SMA Age Class	**Existing Condition (ROD date-July '04)**	**Decade 1 Objectives % FEIS Projected Condition**	**Forest-wide Condition in 2006 Includes NEPA Decisions**
Age Classes	**Percent**	**Percent**	**Percent**
0-9	6	4	4
10-49	27	34	28
50-99	45	38	45
100-149	21	23	23
150+	1	2	0
Totals (rounded)	**100**	**100**	**100**

Table 6. AGE. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION			
Lowland Conifer Landscape Ecosystem (LLC) – Age Class			
LLC-A In JPB and DRW	**Existing Condition (ROD date-July '04)**	**Decade 1 Objectives % FEIS Projected Condition**	**Forest-wide Condition in '06 Includes NEPA Decisions**
	Percent	**Percent**	**Percent**
0-9	0	3	0
10-39	7	5	8
40-79	24	18	25
80-159	65	69	65
160+	3	4	2
Total (rounded)	**100**	**100**	**100**
LLC-B In MRW and MBA	**Existing Condition (ROD date-July '04)**	**Decade 1 Objectives % FEIS Projected Condition**	**Forest-wide Condition in '06 Includes NEPA Decisions**
	Percent	**Percent**	**Percent**
0-9	1	2	1
10-39	4	4	5
40-79	25	14	27
80-159	62	70	62
160+	8	10	6
Total (rounded)	**100**	**100**	**100**
LLC-C In SMA	**Existing Condition (ROD date-July '04)**	**Decade 1 Objectives % FEIS Projected Condition**	**Forest-wide Condition in '06 Includes NEPA Decisions**
	Percent	**Percent**	**Percent**
0-9	0	1	0
10-39	2	2	3
40-79	25	19	16
80-159	49	45	58
160+	24	33	22
Total (rounded)	**100**	**100**	**100**

Table 7. PATCH SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION. ACHIEVEMENT OF FOREST PLAN DIRECTION						
Patch Type and Size in Acres	**Specifications identified in Forest Plan Standards and Guidelines**		**Existing Condition (ROD – July 2004)**		**FEIS Projected Condition. Decade 1**	
	Acres	**#**	**Acres**	**#**	**Acres**	**#**
Red/White Pine Mature and Older Forest (Forest-wide)						
100+ ac	**17,300**	**88**	17,300	88	21,000	100
300+ ac	**4,700**	**8**	4,700	8	7,100	12
300+ ac	**44,700**	n/a	51,500	86	36,600	57
1,000+ ac	n/a	**8**	13,200	8	10,500	6
300+ ac	**54,400**	n/a	60,700	35	58,000	36
1,000+ ac	n/a	**14**	50,000	14	48,400	17
(5000-9999) 1/	n/a	n/a				
10,000+ ac	**11,700**	**1**	13,000	1	0	0
Zone 3	**O-VG-24** Strive to minimize decrease in acres & numbers of patches of mature or older upland forest in patches ≥300 acres.					
300+ ac			185,200	177	152,000	155
1,000+ ac			116,500	47	92,900	40
10,000+ ac			10,100	1	0	0
100+ ac	**O-VG-19** Maintain representative array of large patches (≥ 300 ac) of mature or older lowland forest.		72,500	310	79,800	334
300+ ac			30,300	52	35,400	59
1,000+ ac			6,600	4	6,800	4