

North Shore Subsections SFRMP Meeting Notes
Two Harbors Area Office
February 4, 2004
10:00 am – 6:00 pm

Present: Doug Rowlett, Craig Sterle, Martha Minchak, Bob Kirsch, Lawson Gerdes, Tim Quincer, Doug Tillma, and Gaylord Paulson.

Meeting dealt with the review of input on issues relating to General Direction Statements (GDS), management recommendations, objectives, and forest management within the higher ranked (O, H, and H') MCBS Sites in the North Shore Subsections SFRMP.

GDS-1F: Revised to read: Management of state lands within Sites of statewide biodiversity significance implements measures to sustain or minimize the loss to the biodiversity significance on which these Sites were ranked.

(Previous statement: Management of state lands within larger areas of statewide biodiversity significance maintains or increases the biodiversity ranking of these areas.)

- It was suggested that biodiversity significance be measured by the criteria (attributes) used originally for ranking a particular Site. (Some team members need more clarification on what this means.) Include criteria table (Guidelines for MCBS Statewide Biodiversity Significance Rank) in the appendix.
- There are still questions on how individual stand-level treatments affect the overall Site ranking.
- Include a statement in the Introduction/Executive Summary regarding the goal of maintaining biodiversity across the three subsections. (**Gaylord**)

Monitoring: Final prescriptions and objectives assigned by the forester (appraiser) in SRM is the method available to monitor the stand treatments applied within the higher ranked MCBS Sites.

Management practices: Discussion will continue when GDS-1F is finalized.

Discussions included:

- It is likely that rock-raking and/or broadcast herbicide application will reduce the biodiversity significance of a stand in a high-ranked Site.
- A short-term loss in biodiversity may result in long-term gain. E.g., a high risk low volume stand consisting of a relatively pure aspen stand with heavy shrub density that is converted to long-lived conifers through use of rock-raking and broadcast herbicide may result in more Site diversity in the long-term.

Examples of management practices to use in high ranked MCBS Sites:

- legacy patches versus scattered reserves in clearcuts
- use least intensive site prep or tsi to accomplish regeneration goals
 - avoid or minimize use of rock-raking, if possible
 - avoid or minimize broadcast herbicide application, if possible
- locations of conifer conversions
- mixed species stands (hardwood/conifers)

Timber productivity: Department direction is needed on the importance of timber productivity in MCBS Sites. Timber management will occur in high-ranked Sites, but is productivity a less important goal in these areas where trust fund lands are located.

- Site level guidelines are to be considered the minimum recommendations for reserve trees (*include statement relating to site-level guidelines in the plan overview*).

Cover Type Conversion Goals: Team needs to review conversion goals after objective coding for high-ranked Sites is completed. Recommended to leave the conversion goals as they are currently stated in the plan, but make a note in the GDS-1B regarding conversion goals that northern hardwoods will probably exceed the increase in acres goal.

St. Louis River Management Plan: Information or reference to the St. Louis River Management Plan (including the Cloquet and White Face Rivers) needs to be included in the plan in the riparian management, GDS-5A.

- Add strategy (Gaylord): f. Follow the recommendations in the St. Louis River Management Plan.
- Tag stands: **Doug T** will ask Paul Olson to identify the management zone affected by the plan on state land stands adjacent to the rivers in the ArcView shapefile. Add a comment in the TeamCom Field: *See St. Louis River Plan*, for each stand affected.

Region Direction needed: The team did not reach agreement (informed consent) on the following two issues and they will be bumped up to the region level for direction.

1. The team will request direction regarding Forestry and Ecological Services coordination on activities in MCBS Sites during implementation of the plan. MCBS information is being incorporated into the plan but there is disagreement on follow-up input and review by Eco staff (and who) prior to final prescriptions.
2. The team will request direction on whether or not to include information to field staff that the team did not reach informed consent that conflicts with information that the team did reach informed consent. This relates to MCBS management recommendation coding assigned to stands by MCBS staff and the follow-up preliminary objective coding assigned to stands by the team.

Gaylord will draft more detailed explanations of the requests for direction and send out to the team for review through e-mail prior to sending to the John, Jeff, and Lee.

Meeting Dates: Tentatively scheduled the following meeting dates: Feb 13, 19, and 26; March 3, 11, 17, and 25; and April 8.

Notes by gp, 2-12-04.
Approved 2-25.