



State of Wisconsin \ DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Jim Doyle, Governor
Scott Hassett, Secretary

101 S. Webster St.
Box 7921
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7921
Telephone 608-266-2621
FAX 608-267-3579
TTY Access via relay - 711

BMP Advisory Committee Meeting Notes

February 14, 2007

Best Western Midway, Wausau, Wisconsin

Committee Members Present:

John DuPlissis, UWSP; Teri Heyer, USFS; Ken Adamovich, Wisconsin Association of Lakes; Larry Meicher, Trout Unlimited; Steve Kariainen, SFI SIC; Mike Gehrke, Wisconsin Woodland Owners Association; Tim Tollefson, Stora Enso North America; Jim Olive, FISTA; Bob Rogers, Society of American Foresters; Matt Dallman, The Nature Conservancy; Lynn Wilson, Lake States Lumber Association; Collette Matthews, Wisconsin County Forest Association; Jack Nedland, Wisconsin County Forest Association; Curt Wester, Great Lakes Timber Professionals Association; Gail Pierce, River Alliance of Wisconsin

DNR Staff Present:

Darrell Zastrow, Carmen Wagner, Kristin Shy, Tom Duke

Additional Guests:

David Mladenoff, UW-Madison; Jordan Muss, UW-Madison; Lee Schauman, FISTA

Presentations:

All presentations from the meeting are available on the DNR's Forestry BMP website at: <http://dnr.wi.gov/org/land/forestry/Usesof/bmp/advisory/>.

Welcome and Introductions: John DuPlissis

John welcomed the group and asked for introductions. John reviewed the agenda and asked for additional items.

Advisory Committee Operational Guidelines and Antitrust Statement: Carmen Wagner

Carmen explained that the Operational Guidelines and Antitrust Statement are now final as approved at the last meeting. She reviewed the changes that were made to finalize the documents and John DuPlissis announced that the Committee was operating under the antitrust guidelines.

2006 Forestry BMP Monitoring Results: Kristin Shy

Kristin reviewed the results from BMP monitoring for federal and industrial timber sales. Results were presented for overall BMP application for each landowner type and for each BMP category. Results were also presented for BMP effectiveness for each landowner type.

Discussions followed about the statistical validity of the data. Several people brought up the issue of variance and that being able to see the raw data will help a person better understand

what the percentages are actually saying. It was clear that a discussion should be placed in the report which explains the variance, how it was calculated, and what it means for the percentages so that the results are presented in most accurate way possible. Paul Rasmussen should attend a future meeting to discuss these concerns, or play a role in writing the portion of the report which discusses the statistical analysis. Lee expressed concern over the number of BMPs that were not applicable to sales. Kristin explained that the BMP monitoring worksheet has 128 BMPs and that for particular sales, only 40 of those BMPs, for example, may get rated. If a sale did not have any wetlands or a stream crossing, then all the wetland or stream crossing BMPs would not be applicable to a sale.

Other discussions about the BMP monitoring results included how the results will be distributed to the public. Carmen explained the traditional distribution of the monitoring report, including sending out press releases. Several committee members expressed the need for distributing this information to a wider audience than just trade organizations so that the success of BMP implementation and protection to water quality from forestry is shared with the general public. Suggestions included: Into the Outdoors or Outdoor Wisconsin television segment, Trees for Tomorrow, and LEAF curriculum for students. Gail and Teri offered to help identify resources for sharing stories and developing curriculum.

The issue of recreational impacts to forest roads came up with a discussion of how best to capture information about those impacts while still accurately rating the BMPs for water quality. For instance, if a road is damaged by ATV traffic, how should it be captured and recorded during BMP monitoring? An update on ATV trail and design standard development in the Department will be provided at a future meeting. Collette also pointed out that ATV regulations should be updated as design standards and maintenance standards are developed.

For future BMP discussions, we may also want to discuss the type of equipment used today. Are the BMPs still reflective of the type of equipment used? John suggested a future field trip that looks at timber sale set-up and equipment.

Forestry BMP Monitoring Protocol: Carmen Wagner

In December, the Advisory Committee advised to continue using our traditional monitoring method so that we can compare new data to past data, investigate options with using the USFS regional monitoring protocol, and transitioning from a paper-based to an electronic-based monitoring system.

Progress since December: The Forest Service will not let us “hybridize” the regional protocol and that it must be used “as is”. Carmen has written a proposal for transitioning the paper-based system to an electronic-based system and the priorities for the e-based monitoring system will be determined in March 2007.

Bob asked about the March decision and wanted clarification as to whether it would be decided if the project can be done or if it will be based on budget. Darrell clarified that the March decision will be a prioritization, and he knows the major priority at this time will be updating the forest recon system, so it will depend on the decisions about the recon system and the budget because there are only so many resources for all the requests. The BMP project may not be feasible until next year.

For the WI BMP proposal, we would shift to the electronic system with data recorders and standardized databases and analysis programs. This would involve an initial investment in time,

equipment, and program design, but a savings in staff time in the long run. The end result would be consistent data storage and analysis from year to year.

Jack asked what would happen if the BMPs were changed in the future and how that would affect our ability to compare results to past data. Carmen explained that if BMPs change, you will only be able to compare the BMPs that were the same as past years. Teri added that MN is currently in the process of switching to an electronic system, but it is more than just a database system, it will have GIS, picture, etc.

Options for the Forest Service protocol include: integrating into one system with the WI protocol (not feasible at this time); having BMP teams monitoring with both systems; having BMP teams designated for each system (two teams would visit each sale); having BMP staff monitor with the regional protocol when field checking sales.

Curt asked what the reasons are for using the FS protocol. Carmen explained that it would provide a mechanism for the Forest Service to provide information on how the NE area is doing as a whole. Teri added that EPA is asking for data that is quantifiable and easy to compare from state to state.

Consensus was made to move forward with the last option of continuing with tradition monitoring and having BMP staff monitor with the regional protocol during field checking. Bob clarified that this should only be a short-term decision and that for the long-term it would be inefficient to do both methods.

To assist with the decision, Carmen presented the results from the monitoring that was done with the FS regional protocol. 21 different timber sales with 25 different sample units were monitored with the FS protocol. These sites had already been monitored this year with the WI protocol. A report will be developed that will show how the results compare for these 21 sales between the WI and USFS protocol.

One of the discussions that resulted from Carmen's presentation was the issue again of variance and that the results are not calculated with any variance. No variance makes it harder to draw conclusions about overall ownership. Also, the analysis does not remove sample units that were not applicable, so the numbers reflect a different kind of analysis than the WI protocol. Teri voiced that by removing all the not applicable BMPs like the WI protocol does, you are greatly decreasing the sample size.

Gail brought up the idea of the watershed scale of things and seeing issues on a particular timber sale even when the sale was implemented correctly because something harmful was done higher up in the watershed. Things need to be thought of on a broader scale.

Jack explained that the numbers from the regional protocol don't mean much to a land manager because you don't know the initial condition of the stand and what type of harvesting occurred. Lynn agreed and said to draw sound conclusions you need pre- and post-harvest data. All we can draw conclusions about is the point-in-time data that is collected. Gail also agrees and thinks BMP monitoring teams should have some of the pre-harvest and watershed information when going out to monitor a timber sale.

There was also a discussion about the RMZs and shade/basal area reductions. There is a limited capacity for answering the questions from the regional protocol to show that the RMZ

was already below the state BA requirement before the harvest, or if it is a meadow, or there was beaver damage for example.

Steve noted that the percentages don't add up to 100% and there was no explanation known at this time as to why.

Collette clarified; can we add these questions to our protocol? The answer is yes, but then we wouldn't be able to share the data with the Forest Service.

1995-2006 BMP Monitoring Results & Objectives: Carmen Wagner

Carmen reviewed the objectives for BMP monitoring from the 2003 monitoring report and reminded everyone that at that meeting last February the Committee decided to hold off on beginning the process for updating the BMPs.

Carmen proposed looking at the BMP monitoring data from 1995-2006 now that we have collected statistically valid data for all landowner categories. This will give us an idea of the trends we are seeing so that we know where to focus our efforts if we do decide to move forward with the process for updating the BMPs in the future. Carmen asked the Committee what information they would like to see summarized from the 1995-2006 data set. In past years, we have analyzed the BMPs in terms of landowner categories and BMP categories, but we haven't really taken a broad look at individual BMPs.

The Committee agreed that it makes sense to move forward with this.

Bob asked if EPA happened to have a mandate or something similar if this type of analysis would be able to answer their concerns or questions if they had any. Carmen explained that this analysis would build on being able to find areas that need improvement.

Matt thought that it would be helpful to look at the dataset regionally, for example by landtype association. This would create the ability to identify if there are particular landscapes that cause certain results and that it is not necessarily related to the landowner.

Ken asked if the data could show how many of the sales were repeat contractors. Sometimes one contractor doing things wrong can cause problems all over if not stopped. Carmen explained that the BMP program has always tried to have a certain level of anonymity, but if we do a regional analysis, this type of information might come out since contractors tend to work in a certain area.

Teri thought it would be important to have an analysis that includes whether or not a forester was involved with the sale and see how that impacted the results.

Steve thought after some initial analysis of the 1995-2006 data, and looking at some basic results, the Committee might be able to make a better decision as to how the intensive analysis should be focused.

Larry asked a clarifying question that the BMPs have not changed since 1995 and that is correct.

Matt asked if WI would ever look into developing BMPs for aesthetics, wildlife, etc. like MN does. Carmen responds that this is the only mechanism we've developed for monitoring BMPs

for water quality. Darrell thought it would be helpful to provide the Committee members with copies of MN Forest Management Guidelines to get a better idea of the things they are looking at.

Carmen will move forward with this analysis.

Assessing the Effects of Forest Types on Lake Superior Tributary Streams: David Mladenoff & Jordan Muss, UW-Madison

The hypotheses of the study are:

1. snowmelt derived from stream flows can be predicted by a watershed's forest type, quantity, and spatial arrangement
2. under different stand types variations will be seen in snowpack and timing of snowmelt
3. these variations are the result of canopy structural differences
4. canopy structure can be measured using LiDAR

The end result of the approach is an Event Based Watershed Model.

33 stands represent 9 forest types both deciduous and evergreen across 6 watersheds.

One set of data shows that snow water equivalent is higher in deciduous than field and higher in deciduous than evergreen.

Expected results/applications:

1. detailed models of effects of forest type (and harvesting) and structure on local snowpack,
2. a landscape model that connects stand type to stream hydrology

Faith Fitzpatrick's report can be found at:

<http://wi.water.usgs.gov/pubs/WRIR-99-4083/wrir-99-4083.pdf>

2007 BMP Monitoring Options: Carmen Wagner

Carmen presented the options for completing a BMP monitoring cycle in 2007.

The potential staff workload for 2007 already includes: completing WI BMP protocol transition to e-based system, completing report on comparison of WI & FS monitoring protocols, completing analysis and report of 1995-2006 data, and updating the BMP manual (as approved at the December '06 meeting).

The options for 2007 are: don't complete a monitoring cycle; monitor one landowner category (state, county, federal, or industrial); monitor with the WI protocol, monitor with both the WI and USFS protocols.

Proposal for future 4-year monitoring cycle:

- year 1 - NIPF
- year 2 - state and county
- year 3 - federal and industrial
- year 4 - complete a summary report of the previous three years of data

A discussion occurred about the workload related to monitor NIPF and the difficulties in finding NIPF timber sales to monitor. Jack suggested that we identify other ways for finding NIPF sales other than county cutting notices because some counties don't file them. It was also explained that once the sales are found, getting permission to monitor those sales on NIPF lands is difficult. Lynn agreed that the DNR should support an online method for submitting cutting notices and MFL notices. Carmen added that it is important when monitoring NIPF that the sample size needs to be at about 60 and it needs to include both MFL and non-MFL. Teri asked if NIPF timber sales could be identified with satellite imagery and the answer was no because of the scale and because it is hard to determine if it was a timber sale, storm damage, cut for development, etc.

Teri asked for a clarification of what would get done this year if we didn't monitor. Carmen explained that if we get the green light to move forward with developing the electronic system for BMP monitoring, we can spend this year developing that and then monitor using it in 2008. If we aren't able to develop the electronic system this year, we could still monitor one landowner category in 2007.

The consensus of the Committee was to work toward developing the electronic based system and if it does not get priority, to monitor state and/or county timber sales. The Committee also came to consensus about the proposed 4-year monitoring cycle.

Other Forestry-Related Items: Carmen Wagner and Kristin Shy

Wisconsin Act 79:

On January 8, the rule was referred to the Senate's Committee on the Environment and Natural Resources. On January 18, the rule was referred to the Assembly's Committee on Forestry. Committees have 30 days from when the rule was referred to them to decide if they are going to hold a hearing or not.

Ch. NR 320 – Wis. Admin. Code – General Permits for Temporary Stream Crossings for Forest Management Activities:

On February 1, 2007, changes to NR320 went into effect. General permit applications for culverts without an engineered design and clear-span bridges have been updated to reflect the changes. A new general permit application is now available for temporary in-stream crossings. The permit fee is \$50. Previously, an individual permit was required at a cost of \$500.

Riparian Management Zone Study:

We are still looking for timber sales to participate in the RMZ study. We need at least twenty sales for the study. We did not receive Coastal Management Program funding for the study and are looking for alternative funding sources. Carmen will send out the letter with the proposal asking for timber sales for the study out to the Committee again.

Coastal Management Program Grant:

The following training sessions have been scheduled as a part of this grant project:

- April 25: Forest Management Along Lake Michigan's Trout Streams (Crivitz)
- May 23: Forest Management in Lake Superior's Red Clay Region (Ashland)
- March 30: Forest Management Along Lake Superior Trout Streams (Cable Loggers Conference)

- April 13: Forest Management along Lake Michigan's Trout Streams (Iron Mountain Loggers Conference)
- April 20: Forest Management along Lake Michigan's Trout Streams (Wausau Loggers Conference)

FISTA BMP Training Schedule announced:

The following BMP training sessions will be available for 2007:

- May 11 Black River Falls
- June 12 Wausaukee
- August 22 Hayward
- September 21 Tomahawk

Great Lakes Commission Grant:

We will be submitting an application for a Great Lakes Commission grant for funds to update the BMP field manuals. Updates to the manual will include such items as: recommendations for protecting red clay slopes during forest management, recommendations for protecting trout streams during forest management, additional options for erosion control, background information to better explain BMP issues, practices to avoid, clarification of definitions, update permit and statutory/regulatory information, color photos/diagrams, etc. BMPs themselves will not be altered.

SAF Conference Focuses on Soil Compaction and Productivity:

On March 6-8 in Wausau, SAF is hosting a conference on soil compaction and productivity. Speakers will include Mike Phillips from MN Forest Resources Council, David Hoppe from US Forest Service, and Dan Duckert from Ontario's Center for Northern Forest Ecosystems Research.

Training Scheduled on Road and Stream Crossings:

A workshop is being offered on April 24-26 in Carter on the design and installation of culverts. The course is being offered by the Nature Conservancy, US Forest Service, WDOT, WDNR, and UW-Madison Engineering Department. A grant from WE Energies is helping to fund that training. Registration is limited to 40 people and focuses on town roads.

NEXT MEETING:

June 27, 2007

Meeting will be held in northern Wisconsin and include a field exercise.