

CSP-2018-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Soil Erosion

Sheet and Rill Erosion

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Soil surface organic residue cover greater than 80%; OR, Site is stable and without visible signs of erosion.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

The forest O horizon is covered with leaves, needles, fine woody debris, rocks, and/or herbaceous vegetation that protects the soil on more than 80% of the area.

Yes No

Classic Gully Erosion

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Classic gullies are not present; Or, Classic gully management is adequate to stop the progression of head cutting and widening and offsite impacts are minimized by vegetation and/or structures.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Drainage and erosion control measures are implemented on roads, trails and landings to minimize detrimental effects of concentrated flow, erosion and sedimentation. Stream crossings are restored and stabilized.

Yes No

CSP-2018-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Streambank, Shoreline, Water Conveyance Channels

Planning Criteria

For shorelines and water conveyance channels; banks are stable or commensurate with normal geomorphological processes; AND, If bank erosion is present, it is beyond the client's control or commensurate with normal geomorphological processes; AND, For streambanks, SVAP2 bank condition element score greater than 5. If shorelines or water conveyance channels are not present, set this planning criteria to NA.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Excluding all fundamentally unstable, natural geomorphic streambanks and shorelines, all streambanks and shorelines on the land use show few signs of erosion or bank failure; AND, Each is stable and protected with natural materials. If shorelines and water conveyance channels do not exist on the land management system, set this test statement to NA.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

CSP-2018-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Soil Quality Degradation

Compaction

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Soil compaction is not a problem: AND, Activities do not cause soil compaction problems AND can be documented with prior conservation planning or other on-site evaluation methods.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Soil compaction is limited to roads and landings. Tree root growth is not impeded. No more than 15% of the forested area is devoted to roads, trails, and landings.

Yes No

Trails and landings do not have visible drainage or erosion issues that are a result of soil compaction.

Yes No

CSP-2018-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Water Quality Degradation

Pesticides in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Pesticides are stored, handled, disposed and applied to prevent runoff, spills, leaks and leaching; AND, Conservation practices and techniques are in place to minimize ground water impacts.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Pesticides are not applied or stored on this land management system; Or, Pesticides are applied using a site-specific mixture of prevention, avoidance, monitoring, and suppression (PAMS) strategies. Environmental risk screening tool are used (such as WIN-PST or similar LGU approved tool); AND, application rates and timing are compliant with the label.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Nutrients in Surface water

Planning Criteria

Organic or inorganic nutrients are not applied and the PLU is not grazed; OR, If nutrients are applied, they are based on a soil test, tissue tests or nutrient budget and livestock access to streams is controlled.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

The land adjacent to a stream, river, or other waterbody on the side or sides you control: - has diverse, natural plant cover typical to that along other streams within the drainage basin; - extend from the stream bank/shoreline for a distance of 35 feet; OR, (if applicable) The minimum State buffer-width requirement, whichever is greater; AND, Have few places where concentrated runoff flows through.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

CSP-2018-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Excess Pathogens and Chemicals from Manure, bio-solids or Compost Applications in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Potential sources of pathogens or pharmaceuticals are not applied on the land; OR, Organic materials are applied, stored, and/or handled to mitigate negative impacts to surface water sources.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Livestock access to stream is controlled; OR, Livestock are limited to small watering or crossing areas.

Yes No

Excessive Sediment in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

There are no untreated sources of erosion and streams or shoreline are not on or adjacent to site; OR, Upslope treatment and buffer practices address concentrated flows to water bodies; AND, Heavy use areas are stable; AND, The SVAP2 - bank condition is greater than or equal to 5.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

The land adjacent to a stream, river, or other waterbody on the side or sides you control does: - have diverse, natural plant cover typical to that along streams in your area, - extend from the stream bank/shoreline for a distance of 35 feet or (if applicable) the minimum State buffer-width requirement, whichever is greater; AND, Have few places where concentrated runoff flows through.

Yes No

Drainage and erosion control measures are implemented on roads, trails and landings to minimize detrimental effects of concentrated flow, erosion and sedimentation; AND, Stream crossings are restored and stabilized.

Yes No

CSP-2018-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Air Quality Impacts

Emission of Greenhouse Gases (GHGs)

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Activities that produce GHGs emissions are not present: OR, activities that produce GHGs emissions are managed to reduce those emissions; AND, Carbon sequestration is enhanced through reduced tillage methods or other practices. GHG producing activities that should be considered include: Fertilization (manure/commercial), Tillage methods, grazing management, and forestry practices; AND GHGs are not regulated in this planning area.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

The forest is managed to promote carbon sequestration by selecting species with high growth rates or species with long lifespans that are capable of reaching a large size.

Yes No

CSP-2018-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Degraded Plant Condition

Undesirable Plant Productivity and Health

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Forest species are adapted to site AND, Composition and stand density meet ecological site objectives and production goals.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

The forest or woodlot is fully stocked with tree species adapted to the site, has spacing for good tree growth and air flow between and beneath, does not have excessive tree mortality, has an understory made up of desirable species and is not inhibited by brush or other undesirable vegetation. Monitoring for insects and disease is completed to prevent outbreaks that would be detrimental to forest health.

Yes No

Inadequate Structure and Composition

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Plant communities contain adequate diversity, composition and structure to support desired ecological functions for the ecological site.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

The operation has a sugarbush and 70% or more of the sugarbush canopy trees are sugar maples. Canopy trees are those tall enough that their tops are in direct sunlight.

Yes No

The forest or woodlot is fully stocked with tree species adapted to the site, has spacing for good tree growth and air flow between and beneath, does not have excessive tree mortality, has an understory made up of desirable species and is not inhibited by brush or other undesirable vegetation.

Yes No

CSP-2018-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Excessive Plant Pest Pressure

Planning Criteria

Plant pest damage to plants is below economic or environmental thresholds; AND, plant pests, including noxious and invasive species are managed.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Noxious weeds, and plants that impact forest growth, are controlled or are not present.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

CSP-2018-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Fish and Wildlife - Inadequate Habitat

Inadequate Habitat - Food

Planning Criteria

The WHSI rating is greater than or equal to 0.5; AND, (when surface stream present) The SVAP2 - fish habitat complexity element score is greater than or equal to 7; AND, The SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is greater than or equal to 7; OR, Conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds; OR, Food is available in quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Plant growth and cover is managed to develop and maintain habitat to benefit target wildlife species.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Inadequate Habitat - Cover/Shelter

Planning Criteria

The WHSI rating is greater than or equal to 0.5; AND, (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is greater than or equal to 7; AND, the SVAP2 - fish habitat complexity element score is greater than or equal to 7; AND, the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is greater than or equal to 7; OR conservation practices and management practices are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds; OR, habitat cover is of available quality and extent to support requirements for the species of interest.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Livestock access to stream(s) is controlled; OR, livestock access is limited to small watering or crossing areas

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Plant growth and cover is managed to develop and maintain habitat to help chosen wildlife species. (see State Wildlife Action Plan)

Yes No

CSP-2018-1_IN - NIPF Forest

Inadequate Habitat - Habitat Continuity (Space)

Planning Criteria

The WHSI rating is greater than or equal to 0.5; AND, (when surface stream present) The SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is greater than or equal to 7; AND, The SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is greater than or equal to 7; OR, Conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds; OR, The connectivity of habitat components are adequate to support stable populations of target species.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Connectivity between food resources and cover and shelter is provided for the target wildlife species. (see State Wildlife Action Plan)

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No