

Date: August 31, 1989
To: James T. Addis AD/5

File Ref: 2400

From: Michael E. Folgert *M.E.F.*

Subject: Pine-Popple Wild River Master Plan Addendum

I'm requesting your approval of the attached summary which outlines our vegetative management policy for state owned properties along the Pine-Popple Wild River System.

Although not a new policy, this does clarify our management intent for each of the three management areas on all state lands. It will become an addendum to the concept element of the Master Plan which was approved by the Natural Resources board on 1-29-81. This, along with the implementation element, which was approved on 12-2-88, and the Silvicultural and Aesthetics handbook will guide all timber sale activity on department properties. When the Master Plan is re-written in several years, these guidelines will be incorporated into the revision itself rather than as an addendum.

A public meeting was held at Florence on 7-28-89 to review this summary and solicit comments. Recommendations made by various resource agencies or groups were incorporated in this final draft. A summary of this meeting is also attached.

Upon your approval, I will include this Vegetative Management Summary as an appendix to the Master Plan and we will again proceed with timber sale activity as planned.

APPROVALS:

Michael D. Lanquist 9-8-89
District Forestry Supervisor
Mike Lanquist

Charles E. Higgs 9-11-89
District Director
C. E. Higgs

J. M. Frank 9-19-89
Bureau of Forestry
J. M. Frank

James T. Addis 9-19-89
Division Administrator
James Addis

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM

STATE OF WISCONSIN

Date: October 6, 1989

File Ref:

2400

To: Pine-Popple Wild River Master Plan Holders

From: Michael E. Folgert, ~~Area~~ Forestry Supervisor

Subject: Master Plan Addendum

Please include the attached, recently approved vegetative management policy as an addendum to your copy of the Pine-Popple Wild River Master plan. This addendum clarifies our intent for each of the three management areas and will guide our timber management practices on all state-owned lands.

The Master Plan will be subject to the 10 year review process in the near future at which time these guidelines will be further discussed and incorporated into the Plan itself. You will be notified of this review process and are encouraged to participate.

MEF:kss

Comments on Pine-Popple Master Plan

I. Public Information Meeting, Florence, WI - July 29, 1980

Attendees

Ed Wanger	U.S. Forest Service
Terry Eggum	U.S. Forest Service
Walter J. Kurtz	Sheboygan Falls, WI
Horace O. Nixon	Florence County Supervisor
Jack Halada	Lanny Lake, WI

Nixon - How does the existence of the dam on the river conform to NR 302.02?

Ans. - The dam is grandfathered in.

Halada - County zoning prohibiting subdivision of his property has substantially reduced its value.

Nixon - Do we or should we have an active program with specific guidelines for private landowners on the river? Should we be actively pursuing aesthetic management in conformance with wild river program?

Ans. - Our foresters will encourage this within the project area and an aesthetic management handout is to be prepared.

Nixon - The Florence County Board may recommend adoption of the master plan contingent on the fact that it contains a recommendation to seek legislation to simplify the manner in which the state makes payment to local government in lieu of taxes.

Ans. - This is a matter for the Natural Resources Board to decide. We cannot say whether the final version of the plan will contain this recommendation or not.

II. Written Comments Received

A. Office of Endangered and Nongame Species

The entire subject of endangered, threatened and nongame species is not mentioned.....Recommendations should be for a biological inventory of all wild animal and wild plant species. This information is invaluable in both planning and evaluating any fish, wildlife or forestry management efforts.

Ans. - A list of nongame species from a previous survey has been added along with comments regarding endangered species. Since no habitat work is recommended in the plan, any threatened or endangered species of fish or wildlife are automatically protected.

B. Bureau of Wildlife Management

1. A very thorough plan
2. Objective section is poor
3. A fundamental citizen participation program is badly needed.

C. Wild Resources Advisory Council

1. The geological geomorphic impact on the character of the two wild rivers needs to be presented in an appreciable light.

Ans. - This section was changed to be more understandable.

2. The WRAC was shocked by complete void of nongame species.

Ans. - Lists of nongame species were added.

3. The WRAC suggests that education be added following recreation on page 11.

Ans. - Done

D. Bureau of Fish Management

1. Very poor maps.

Ans. - Better maps are now attached.

2. Need figures showing ownership breakdown, current development, cover type, etc.

Ans. - They are in the plan.

E. Bureau of Research

1. I have discussed the vegetation aspects with Germain and we concur that if the preservation of the natural quality of the river system is to be achieved, the approach of "no" manipulation is the way to go.

Ans. - NR 302.03(e) says that outside the 150 ft. protection zone, timber cutting in accord with guidelines established in silvicultural and forest aesthetics handbook shall be practiced.

2. Page 8, item B, deals solely with game species and their response to management and/or impact on system. What about nongame and endangered species.

Ans. - This has been corrected.

3. Don't disagree on decision to leave out habitat improvement.

Ans. - OK

4. Eminent domain reference not clear. Although legislation did not authorize exercise of eminent domain, did it in fact preclude it?

Ans. - No. But its use is not anticipated.

5. It is conceivable that restoration of the channel to original widths through the areas formerly impounded by the logging dams could lower summer water temperatures. This would not improve natural reproduction of trout but it might improve conditions for stocked trout and enhance carry-over.

Ans. - No stream channel work is contemplated.

F. State Historical Society of Wisconsin

1. There may be historic archeological sites and historic structures. A statement pertaining to the identification and management of such resources should be a part of the plan.

2. It would be incorrect to conclude that the archeological sites located within the Pine and Popple Rivers area are both limited in number and importance.

3. The master plan states that the six sites discovered in the Wild Rivers area are "all minor and seemingly without historic significance". This statement is totally unfounded.

Ans. - This section of the plan was rewritten to reflect that there may be significant sites in the project.

G. U.S. Forest Service Regional Office

1. On page 3, fifth paragraph, please change the second sentence to read "some of these lands had become tax delinquent after being cut-over and burned-over".

Ans. - Done

2. Historical and Archeological Features. We question the first sentence and the assumption. An accurate statement would be "Little is known of prehistoric archaeological features".

Ans. - Changes made on this section.

3. There are only two national forest campgrounds adjacent to the rivers - Chipmunk Rapids and Windsor Dam. The Pine River site is no longer a campground.

Ans. - Appropriate changes were made in the plan to reflect this information.