Woody Biomass Harvesting Guidelines on Forest Lands, Brushlands and Open Lands in Minnesota



2005 MN legislative session

- HF 1026 & SF 69
 - Modified Mn state statute 216B 2424
 Expands the definition of tarm-grown
 - closed-loop biomass' that public utilities seeking to fulfill the state's biomass mandate must meet, to include
 - "Sustainably managed woody blomass"

HF 1026 & SF 69

- "Sustainably Manaced Woody Biomass" includes:
 - Brush and trees removed from rights of way
 - Upland and Lowland brush harvested as part of brushland habitat management.
 - Logging slash or residue created by timber harvest, TSI, fuel management, or insect & disease control or treatments

HF 1026 & SF 69 DNR & MFRC must develop quidelines or best management practices for "sustainably menelegio avviolo je va olio messe DNR for utilizing woody biomass while managing and maintaining brushland and open land habitat on public and private lands MFRC for locging stash, and removal of woody biomass from forest lands with particular attention to soil productivity, biological diversity and wildlife habilal Guidelines must be adopted by July 1 2007



Biomass Guideline Committee (BGC) Membership

- Dick Rossman (DNR Forestry) (chair)
- Dave Grigal (Professor Emeritus, Soil Science Department, Univ. of Minn.)
- Bill Berguson (Program Director, NRRI)
- Steve Merchant (DNR Wildlife)
- Kurl Rusterholtz (DNR Eco-Services)
- John Thompson / Dan McCourtney (St. Louis county)
 - Steve Olson (Fond-Du-Lac forestry)
- Erv Berglund (retired/Hydrologist)
 Tom McCabe (McCabe Forest Products)
 Barb Luelling (Superior National Forest)
 Patrick Orent (Ainsworth Engineered)
 Bill Berg (retired DNR & Sharptail Grouse Society)

Scope of The Guidelines

Guidelines will address the sustainable harvest of woody biomass while protecting the soil, water wildlife habitat and biodiversity that are essential to a healthy and sustainable ecosystem, Guidelines will apply statewide Address the harvest of woody biomass, not traditional neund wood harvest Not address aquostores nv Intended audience includes: equipment operators, contractors, biomass procurement agents, loggers,

natural resource managers and landowners.

Progress

Biomass Guideline Committee (BGC) finalized draft biomass harvesting guidelines in late December 2006 Peer Review completed Feb. 2007 Public Review completed March 2007

 Scheduled for final review by MFRC May 16th

Biomass Harvesting Guidelines Final Draft

Two Documents

Biomass Harvesting on <u>Forest</u> Management Sites in Minnesota

Woody Biomass Harvesting on Brushlands and Open Lands in Minnesota

Existing Voluntary Site-Level Forest Management Guidelines (FMGs)

Sustainable Forest Management

and Recreation



SUSTAINING MINNESOTA FOREST

 Guidelines that address
 Cultural Resources, Forest Soil Productivity, Riparian Areas, Visual Quality, Water Quality, Wetlands, and Wildlife Habitat
 Activity Specific Chapters including
 General Guidelines, Timber Harvesting, Forest Roads, Reforestation, TSI, Mechanical Site Prep,

Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites

Designed as an additional chapter in the current Site-Level Forest Management Guidelines (FMGs)

Includes references to general guidelines timber harvesting guidelines

and TSL chapters



Have you identified your objectives?

Have you conducted a site inventory?

- Considered the suitability of the site for biomass harvest as it relates to presence of endangered or threatened species, sensitive sites.
- For ALL activities review and implement the General Guidelines
- For all biomass harvest on forest sites review and implement the Timber Harvesting guidelines
- If an access road will be constructed / utilized for this biomass harvest review and implement the Forest Roads guidelines
- For TSI activities follow applicable guidelines in this chapter as well as the guidelines found in the TSI chapter.



Designed to be stand alone
 Incorporates re-worded General Guidelines
 Makes references to Site Level FMGs

Will be inserted (with modifications) as a chapter in the current FMGs

Brushlands





SUSTAINING MINNESOTA FOREST,,,, RESOURCES



Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites

Introduction

- Rationale
 - Wildlife and Biodiversity
 - Water Quality
 - Riparian Management Zones (RMZs)
 - Soil Productivity
- Guidelines
 - Biomass Harvest on Ecologically Sensitive Sites Managing Water Quality and RMZs
 - Managing Seil Productivity
 - Managing/Betaining Wildhie Habitat and Swoofutal Diversity, Biomass Harvest for Fuel Reduction
 - Biomass Harvest for Salvage Following Blowdown on Fire Biomass Harvest Considerations as a Tool for SilvicoItural Management Figures

TABLE OF CONTENES

Tables Appendices Glossary

Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites Primary discussion issues (Rationale)

- Wildlife habitat and blooliversity
- Water Quality
- Riparian Zones
 Soil Productivity



Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites

Wiellie Jamerane Blockersty

ouidance

- Biomass harvest has potential to remove greater amounts of snags, CWD, FWD,
- Science identifies the importance of these components
- Science is unclear as to how much
- Few studies have quantified the amounts needed to maintain populations, especially for FWD
- Emulating natural disturbance may provide best

Existing Forest Management Guidelines (FMGs)

- Leave tree retention 5% of site OR
- Minimum of 6-12 scattered leave trees
- Retain all snags possible
 - Create or retain 2-4 bark on down logs
- Rotten log retention is implied
 Modify management to accommodate
 - ETS species

Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites

Biomass Cuidelines

narvested

- Wildlife habitat and biodiversity
 - Retain all snags & CWD
 - Avoid additional biomass barvest in leave free clumps (except tops & limbs normally removed)
 - Retain approximately 1/3 of FWD on site by Retain and scatter tops and limbs from 20% of trees
 - Retain tops and limbs from incidental breakage (10-20%)
 Goat is approximately 1/3 of FWD
 Examples: OTL Full tree Skidding
- Leave 20% of brush and small trees on site (material can be run over or cut, but left on site as FWD)

Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites BIOMERSCHIEGHES Biomass harvest on ecologically sensitive SIOS Avoid sites identified as High or Outstanding biological diversity significance in the Minnesota County Biological Survey (MCBS) Avoid manye plant communities ranked as critically imperiled or imperiled in Minnesota Avoid sites known to support ETS species - Nest sites, dens, specific plant populations



Minnesota County Biological Survey Areas of Biodiversity Significance

Legend





Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites Water Quality Existing EMGs focus on avoiding direct impacts from equipment, utilizing after strips, and erosion control practices Existing guidelines do not address re-entry into sites for biomass removal or removal of additional stand components within filter strips



Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites

- Riparian Zones
 - Existing FMGs cover RMZs in detail
 - Variable from 50' 200' depending on activity and type of water body.
 - Some timber harvest allowed with minimum Basal area limits depending on management
 - Existing FMGs do not address removal of tops & limbs, brush, or small trees from RMZs

Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites BIOMEESS CITICE INCOM Waterouality and RMZs Avoid removal of CWD and snags from filter strips Allows for harvest of tops and limbs of trees harvested during roundwood harvest Allows for cautious harvest of unmerchantable trees and brush Avoid harvest of additional biomass from RMZs except for tops and limbs of trees harvested under existing timber harvest-guidelines.

Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites Soil Productivity Current FMGs cover physical impacts well Focus is on avoiding impacts through timing of activity, managing infrastructure, avoiding direct impacts such as rutting and compaction Biomass harvesting introduces new potential for impacts due to additional traffic and re-entry onto sites

Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites

- Soil proched why (numeris)
 - Existing FMGs address nutrient concerns through conservation strategies including retaining slash on some sites.
 - Biomass removal has potential to remove more woody material, therefore more nutrients
 - Recent research has modified assumptions on nutrient budgets on several fronts
 - Research suggests refining our definition of sites with nutrient conservation needs (slash retention)
 We propose limiting to deep pears (ombrotrophic), and
 - sites with <8" of mineral soil over bedrock
 Caution on droughty sands and 8-20" soils over rock

Fig 1 Comparison of relative amounts of nutrients removed with increasing biomass removal compared to natural nutrient inputs



Scenarios are for harvest from the aspen-birch cover type, 50 year rotation, 20 cords per acre yield, on an average Minnesota forest soll.

- A = conventional merchantable bole harvest
- B = whole-tree harvest (not including breakage and loss of tops & limbs that stay on site!
- C = whole-tree harvest with an additional 50% of the remaining tops and limbs removed.
- D = whole-tree harvest with removal of all tops and limbs.
- E = D harvest plus removal of all dead logs on forest floor
- F = E harvest plus removal of all standing snags
- G = F harvest plus removal of understory brush

Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites Biomass Guidelmes Soil Productivity Avoid additional biomass harvest on. Deep organic (ombrotrophic) siles. - Aspen or hardwoods on shallow soils (<8') over bedrock Do not remove forest floor (litter) or root systems. No more than 3% of site in infrastructure. Avoid re-entry into general harvest area Re-establish crosion control and rehabilitate intrastructure if re-entering on infrastructure

Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites Biomass Guidelines Fuel reduction

- Retain 20% of understory vegetation in reserve patches
 - Retain large snags and CWD
 - >12" drameter

Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites Bomass Guidelines Salvage following blowdown of fire with no roundwood harvest Retain 25% in reserve patches When present retain at least 10 large snags $(12 \pm cbh)$ Retain of create 2-4 bark on large down logs



Biomass Harvesting on Forest Management Sites

- SivennelExemples
 - Examples of where biomass might or might not work to accomplish silvicultural objectives
 - Swamping
 - Artificial Regeneration
 - Browse Deterrent
 - Natural Regeneration
 - Bark Beetle Management
 Thinning Stands

Brush Prairie

Oak Savanna

Bog

Shrub Swamp



- S

brushland and open land habitats









- P

A change of perspective was required by the BGC to address the guidelines for brushlands and open lands

Structural stand components in forest sites held less significance in brushlands and open lands



Contents reflect existing General Guidelines (GGs) and layout of FMGs
 Many guidelines were pulled forward from the General Guidelines
 Modifications made to GGs to fit brushlands and open tands

Most modifications dealt with the nature of open landscapes

- A

- Primary discussion issues
 Which guidelines to use?
 - Ecologically Sensitive siles
- Visual-quality
 Soil productivity
- Riparian management Zones
 Reserve areas



Which guidelines to use?

A. Is the woody biomass harvest intended to create, testore, or maintain an open landscape'? Yes, Go to B. No. Bo to C.

B. Is the woody blomass harvest intended to reduce future density or cover of woody plants? Yes, Apply Open Land Woody Blomass Harvest Guidelines No. Apply Brushland Woody Blomass Harvest Guidelines.

C Is the site dominated by shrubs, grasses, sedges, or herbs? Yes: Go to D. No. Apply Forest Woody Biomass Harvest Guidelines

D. Has the site recently been harvested for timber? Yes: Apply Forest Woody Blomass Harvest Gludelines No. Apply Brushland Woody Blomass Harvest Guidelines.

Brushland Site Management or Forest Site Management











Drocess

 Avoid sites identified as High or Outstanding biological diversity significance in MCBS

- K

- Avoid native plant communities ranked as critically imperiled or imperiled in Minnesota
- Avoid sites known to support ETS species .
- Nest sites, dens, specific plant populations
 The key is to identify these sites in the planning



Soil productivity indicients)

Brushland guidelines do not identify sites where no biomass harvest is recommended, rather these guidelines focus on letting the sites reflect nutrient status (therefore frequency of harvest) through vegetative regrowth

Sites with highest biomass and associated greatest rates of nument removal associated with harvesting are also sites with highest levels of nutrient capital and highest rates of nutrient replenishment. As a consequence, data indicate that the nutrients lost during harvest are usually replaced in less than 10 years.

 On less productive sites, rates of nutrient replenishment are lower. However, biomass and hence nutrient removal are also lower, and the consequence is that the nutrients lost during harvest are replaced in less than 10 years.

 In other words, a site s inherent productivity influences the rate of nutrient removal and helps maintain the site s appropriate nutrient balance.



Soil Productivity (physical impacts). Focused on reducing impacts through

timing of activity, fimiting direct impacts and

managing infrastructure (same as PMGs)

In a clitten new guidelines includer

 Avoid activity on water tracks and lagg areas
 When shearing brush ensure that soils are well frozen to avoid uprooting vegetation
 Avoid shearing off hummocks

Riparian Management Zones

- Provide for a RMZ width of 50 feet from the stream course edge for all designated trout waters and Public Water Inventory water courses
- Retain canopy or shrub cover of 35% within the RMZ (50 feet from the waters edge) to protect water temperatures and hydrological functions during re-growth of vegetation.
- Avoid operation of heavy equipment within the RMZ of streams or shorelines of waterbodies.
- Utilize hand felling or equipment with the ability to reach into this zone (boom cutting heads) as a means of managing vegetation.



Reserve areas

- Retain 5-10% of the area in reserve areas (habitats in reserve patches can be dominated by grasses, sedges, or brush, but should be typical of
- the plant community). A minimum patch area of one acre is recommended.
- Use Table 2 to determine the recommended composition of reserve areas. Table 2 describes recommended composition of
- reserves areas — For example, see <u>Wet Meadow/Catr</u>

Table 2. Structural Habitat Components of Reserve Areas and RMZs in Woody Biomass Harvest Siles.

Habitat Class	Ecological System ¹	Open Land Habirat	Brushland Habitat
Lowland Shrub	See definitions of below table.		
	Open Peatlands ²	Primarily herbaceous; no live trees, shrubs and snags over 2 meters or 6.6 feet tall.	Herbaceous with widely scattered stunted trees and snags (<10 meters or 33 feet) and sparse tall shrubs.
	Forested Rich Peatland	Tall shrub dominated (>50% cover); no live trees and snags >2 meters or 6.6 feet tall (Note: applies primarily to Northern Alder Swamp.).	Apply Forest Woody Biomass Guidelines
	Wet Meadow/Carr	Primarily herbaceous with sparse (<25% cover) tall shrubs. No live trees, tree regeneration, and snags	Variable tall shrub cover; tall (>10 meters or 33 feet) trees occasionally present. Leave all snags and downed CWD.
	Wetland Prairie ²	Primarily herbaceous; No trees, tall shrubs, and snags.	Same as Open Land Habitat
Upland Shrub			
	Upland Prairie ²	Primarily herbaceous with sparce low shrubs. No trees, snags, tall shrubs and CWD.	Same as Open Land Habitat
	Rock Outcrop ³	Primarily herbaceous with variable shrub density. No live trees and snags.	Primarily herbaceous with variable shrub density with widely scattered tall trees and snags. Retain all downed CWD.
	Fire Dependent Forest/Woodland (cut-over)	Primarily herbaceous; no live trees, shrubs and snags over 2 meters or 6.6 feet tall.	Apply Forest Woody Biomass Guidelines
Old Fields ⁴	None	Primarily herbaceous; sparse tall shrubs acceptable. no live trees and snags.	Dependent upon management objectives

Questions?

Copies of guidelines available at www.mfrc.state.mn.us

Dick Rossman 218-755-4062

dick rossman@dnt.state.mn.us