

Appendix C

Implementation Monitoring for FY 2000

The following two lists of questions have been used to record the Coos Bay District Implementation Monitoring results for FY 2000. The first list, *2000 Project Specific RMP Implementation Monitoring Questions*, have been used for each of the 18 projects monitored. The summary for the 18 projects monitored in FY 2000 has been included in the previous section on Coos Bay implementation monitoring. The completed forms for individual projects are available for review at the District office.

The second list, *APS Related RMP Implementation Monitoring Questions*, include answers to each of the questions.

In addition to the monitoring reported in this APS, other projects and/or programs are conducting monitoring activities as a part of project implementation.

Coos Bay District

2000 Project Specific RMP Implementation Monitoring Questions

Abbreviation legend:

NFP = Northwest Forest Plan	RMP = Resource Management Plan
RR = Riparian Reserve	LSR = Late Successional Reserve
KW = Key Watershed	AL = All land use allocations
MTX = matrix (including connectivity)	WSR = Wild & Scenic River

NOTE: Each question begins with a parenthesis which identifies the areas where the question applies and ends with NFP page references, RMP page references.

Questions 67-108 are not project related, but appropriate for the Annual Program Summary. They are described in the Question.aps document.

Questions relating directly to S&Gs in either the NFP or RMP are rated against a set of answers as follows:

Exceeds S&G Meets S&G Doesn't Meet S&G Not Capable of Meeting S&G N/A

Most question have five potential responses as to how well the project meets the standards and guidelines (note: some questions can only be answered meets or fails to meet).

- Exceeds the biological requirements of the S&G (e.g., the S&Gs call for retaining trees felled for safety reasons to be kept on site when needed for coarse woody debris and more than enough coarse woody debris is retained, the project “exceeded” the S&G);
- Meets the S&G (if, in the above example, the needed amount was retained);
- Fails to meet the S&G (if, in the above example, felled trees were removed, even though coarse woody debris was needed);
- Not capable of meeting the S&G (e.g., if 120 feet of 16 inch logs are needed for coarse woody debris, but the site did not have enough 16 inch logs to meet the S&G. Thus, the S&G was not met, but there was no way to meet it); and
- Not applicable (e.g., if a question pertains to management of a Survey and Manage species and there are no occurrences of the species in the project area).

Questions better answered by Yes / No, or relating to Documentation and Issues not directly related to specific S&Gs, but important to monitor are rated against the following:

Yes No N/A

This Set of questions applies to the following project:

Q#	Question	Rating	Narrative Response
1.	(RR, KW) Was a watershed analysis completed before initiating actions in a Riparian Reserve or Key Watershed? (NFP B20) (RMP 7, 13)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
2.	(AL) Were the concerns identified in the watershed analysis addressed in the project EA? (NFP B20) (RMP 7, 13)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
3.	(AL) Were all streams & water bodies identified? (NFP C30-31) (RMP 12)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
4.	(AL) Were stream boundaries established correctly? (NFP C30-31) (RMP 12)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
5	(AL) Has the project reduced or maintained the net amount of roads in Key Watersheds? (NFP C7) (RMP 7, 70)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
6.	(RR) Were proposed activities within the RR clearly defined and stipulated in the project documentation?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

7.	(RR) Did documentation clearly show how the proposed activities meets or does not prevent attainment of the ACS objectives? (NFP B-10, C-31-38) (RMP 6, 13-17)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
8.	(AL) Was project implementation consistent with the EA and decision?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
9.	<i>Summary Question for 3 thru 8</i> (AL) Were the Riparian Reserves in the project area designed and implemented in accordance with the NFP S&Gs? (NFP C30) (RMP 13)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
10.	(RR) Were activities designed to minimize new road and landing construction, or where necessary, were they designed to minimize impacts to Riparian Reserves? (NFP C32) (RMP 13)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
11.	(RR) Are new structures and improvements (culverts, roads, bridges etc) in Riparian Reserves constructed to minimize the diversion of natural hydrologic flow paths? (NFP C32) (RMP 13-14, 69)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

12.	(RR) Are new structures and improvements (culverts, roads, bridges etc) in Riparian Reserves constructed to reduce the amount of sediment delivery into the stream? (NFP C32) (RMP 14, 69)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
13.	(RR) Are new structures and improvements (culverts, roads, bridges etc) in Riparian Reserves constructed to protect fish and wildlife populations? (NFP C32) (RMP 14, 69)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
14.	(RR) Are new structures and improvements (culverts, roads, bridges etc) in Riparian Reserves constructed to accommodate the 100-year flood? (NFP C32) (RMP 14, 69)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
15.	(RR) Is the project consistent with a road management or transportation management plan (includes; operations and maintenance, traffic regulations during wet periods, road management objectives, and inspection/ maintenance for storm events)? (NFP C32) (RMP 14, 70)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

16.	(RR) Are new recreation facilities within the Riparian Reserves designed so as not to prevent meeting Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives? (NFP C34) (RMP 14, 46)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
17.	(AL) Were activities designed to Protect all suitable MM habitat within .5 mile of activity center? (RMP 36)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
18.	(AL) Were activities designed to Protect or enhance unsuitable MM habitat within .5 mile of activity center? (RMP 36)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
19.	(LSR) Was REO review completed where required (i.e. salvage, silviculture...) and recommendations implemented? (RMP 19)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
20.	(LSR) Were activities designed to avoid timber harvest in stands over 80? (NFP C12) (RMP 19)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
21.	(LSR) Were activities designed to limit Salvage to areas greater than 10 acres and less than 40 percent canopy closure? (NFP C14) (RMP 19)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

22.	(LSR) Were Salvage activities designed to retain Standing live trees and snags? (NFP C14) (RMP 19)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
23.	(LSR) Were activities designed to avoid or minimize new road construction, or where necessary, were roads designed to minimize impacts to late-successional stands? (NFP C16) (RMP 20)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
24.	(LSR) Have habitat improvement projects been designed to improve conditions for fish, wildlife, or watersheds and to provide benefits to late-successional habitat? (NFP C17) (RMP 20)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
25.	(LSR) Has the project avoided the introduction of nonnative plants and animals into Late-Successional Reserves (if an introduction is undertaken, has an assessment shown that the action will not retard or prevent the attainment of LSR objectives)? (NFP C19) (RMP 21)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
26.	(MTX) Were "unmapped" LSRs in the vicinity of the project identified in the EA? (NFP C3, C39)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

27.	(MTX)Were activities designed to protect or enhance the “unmapped” LSR? (NFP C3,C39) (RMP 34, 36)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
28.	(MTX) Was suitable habitat around all occupied marbled murrelet sites protected during project planning? (NFP C3, C10) (RMP 36)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
29.	(MTX) Was recruitment habitat around all occupied marbled murrelet sites protected or enhanced during project planning? (NFP C3, C10) (RMP 36)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
30.	(MTX) Was suitable habitat within 100 acre core areas around all known (Before Jan. 1, 1994) spotted owl activity centers protected during project planning? (NFP C3, C10) (RMP 23)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
31.	(MTX) Was non-suitable habitat within 100 acre core areas around all known (Before Jan. 1, 1994) spotted owl activity centers protected or enhanced during project planning? (NFP C3, C10) (RMP 23)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

32.	(MTX) Do management activities within the range of Port-Orford cedar conform to the guidelines contained in the BLM Port-Orford cedar Management Guidelines? (RMP 23)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
33.	(MTX) Were Protection Buffers provided? (NFP C3, C10, C19, C23) (RMP 11)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
34.	(MTX) Are suitable (40% of potential) snags being left in timber harvest units? (NFP C41) (RMP 22, 27)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
35.	(MTX) Is Coarse Woody Debris (CWD) already on the ground retained and protected during and after regeneration harvest? (NFP C40) (RMP 22)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
36.	(MTX) Are 120 linear feet of decay class 1 and 2 logs per acre, at least 16" in diameter and 16' in length retained and protected during and after regeneration harvest? (NFP C40) (RMP 22, 53)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
37.	(MTX) Are 6-8 (12-18 in connectivity) green conifer trees per acre retained in regeneration harvest units? (NFP C41-42) (RMP 23, 28, 54)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

38.	(MTX) Was harvest consistent with retention of the 15% late successional stands analysis identified in the 5th field watershed? (NFP C44) (RMP 23, 28, 53)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
39.	(AL) If dust abatement measures were required during construction and log/rock hauling, was it implemented ? (RMP 24)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
40.	(AL) Concerning water and soil "Best Management Practices", were all potentially impacted beneficial uses identified in the EA? (NFP B32) (RMP 25, App D BMPs)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
41.	(AL) Were the appropriate BMPs designed to avoid or mitigate potential impacts to beneficial uses? (NFP B32) (RMP 25, App D)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
42.	(AL) Were the designed BMPs implemented? (NFP B32) (RMP 25, App D)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
43.	(LSR, RR) Are suitable snags being left in timber harvest units? What standard was used for each project and why? (NFP C40-41, C14-15) (RMP 19)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

44.	(LSR, RR) Is Coarse Woody Debris (CWD) already on the ground retained and protected during density management harvest? What standard was used for each project and why? (NFP C40-41, C14-15) (RMP 13, 19)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
45.	(LSR, RR) Is sufficient Coarse Woody Debris retained following harvest activities? (NFP C40-41, C14-15) (RMP13, 19)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
46.	(AL) Are special habitats (i.e. talus, cliffs, caves) being identified and protected? (RMP 28)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
47.	(RR) Were potential adverse impacts to fish habitat and fish stocks identified in the EA? (RMP 30)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
48.	(AL) Were design features and mitigating measures for fish species identified in EA and contract? (RMP 30)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
49.	(AL) Were design features and mitigating measures for fish species implemented? (RMP 30)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

50.	(AL) For Appendix C-1 “Survey and Manage (S&M) Species” and “protection buffer species”, have required surveys been conducted? (NFP C5, C19, C47) (RMP 32)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
51.	(AL) If any species were found, what species were they and what management actions were implemented? (NFP C5)	Narrative Response required	
52.	(AL) Are special status species being considered in deciding whether or not to go forward with forest management and other actions?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
53.	(AL) During forest management and other actions that may impact special status species, are steps taken to adequately mitigate disturbances? (RMP 32)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
54.	(AL) Was analysis conducted and appropriate consultation with USFWS and NMFS completed on special status species to ensure consistency under existing laws? (NFP 53-54, A2-3, C1) (RMP 32)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

55.	(SA) Are BLM actions and BLM-authorized actions/uses adjacent to or within special areas consistent with resource management plan objectives and management direction for special areas? If NOT, what is being done to correct the situation? (RMP L 15)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
56.	(SA) Are actions needed to maintain or restore the important values of the special areas being implemented? (RMP 38)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
57.	(AL) Are cultural resources being addressed in deciding whether or not to go forward with forest management and other actions? (RMP 40)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
58.	(AL) During forest management and other actions that may disturb cultural resources, are steps taken to adequately manage and protect disturbances? (RMP 40)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
59.	(AL) In VRM Class II and III areas, were visual resource design features and mitigating measures identified in the EA and contract (RMP 41)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

60.	(WSR) For projects or research within designated segments (eligible or suitable) of a Wild and Scenic River, were potential impacts to outstandingly remarkable values identified? (RMP 42)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
61.	(AL) For actions within the identified Rural Interface Areas, Are design features and mitigation measures developed and implemented to minimize the possibility of conflicts between private and federal land management? (RMP 44)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
62.	(AL) Was creation of a “fire hazard” considered during project planning? (RMP 76)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
63.	Did the IDT plan for fire hazard reduction? (RMP 76)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
64.	(AL) Are all mining related structures , support facilities and roads located outside the Riparian Reserves? (NFP C34) (RMP 15, 57)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
65.	(RR) Are mining related activities within the RR meeting the objectives of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy? (NFP C34) (RMP 15)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	

66.	(AL) Are all solid and sanitary waste facilities related to mining excluded from Riparian Reserves or located, monitored and reclaimed in accordance with SEIS record of decision Standards and Guidelines and resource management plan management direction? (NFP C34) (RMP 15, 57)	Exceeds S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Meets S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't Meet S&G <input type="checkbox"/> Not Capable of Meeting S&G <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	
-----	--	--	--

Coos Bay District

APS Related RMP Implementation Monitoring Questions

Abbreviation legend:

NFP = Northwest Forest Plan	RMP=Resource Management Plan
RR = Riparian Reserve	LSR= Late Successional Reserve
KW = Key Watershed	AL = All land use allocations
MTX = matrix (including connectivity)	SA = Special Area (ACEC, RNA, EEA)
WSR = Wild & Scenic River	
REQ = Requirement reference from RMP appendix L	

NOTE: Each question begins with a parenthesis which identifies the areas where the question applies and ends with NFP page references, RMP page references and RMP requirement number that applies to question.

Questions 1-66 were project related questions and are found in the question document.

67. (RR) What types of projects are being implemented within riparian reserves to achieve the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives? (NFP C32) (RMP 7, 13)

The following projects were implemented in FY 2000 by the Myrtlewood Resource Area:

JITW projects

- Placement of Large Wood instream for habitat development and sediment control on Steel Creek and Yankee Run Creek.
- Installation of structures for bats under bridges and withing riparian areas.
- Removal of 12 stream crossing or drainage culverts and sediment control of closed roads. Full decommissioning and gravel removal (1.35 miles) from roads and landings. Road closures of 12.9 miles of roads scattered within the East Fork Coquille 5th field watershed.
- Removal of 6 stream crossing culverts within designated Key Watershed of the North Fork of the Chetco River. Decommissioning of 3.87 miles (2.7 miles full decommissioning) for sediment and hydrological restoration purposes. Subsoiled road after treatment.
- Culvert replacement on the Little Creek drainage culvert under the County road in cooperation with the Curry Co. road department.
- Fence/ plant and place boulder weirs on Myrtle Creek to create habitat and reduce stream temperatures in the future. Remove cattle from riparian area and provide upland watering facility.

ERFO Repairs

- Road relocation of failing section of Baker Creek road. Constructed new traffic-way with removal of old surface and stream crossings to come next year during instream window.
- Closure of approximately 0.8 mile of road in Elk Creek drainage in addition to road repair on the 28-11-36.0 road.

Other Actions

- Maintenance of previously planted trees within riparian areas to ensure establishment and growth.
- Addition of small diameter conifers (old Christmas trees) to large woody debris structures to close gaps and increase pools and sediment retention abilities.

The following projects were implemented in FY 2000 by the Umpqua Resource Area:

JITW projects

- Large Woody Material (LWM) in the form of 43 large logs were placed in a 0.50 mile reach of Alder Creek to help regain proper functioning condition and provide structure and cover for resident and anadromous fish species.
- 120 large boulder clusters were placed in 2.0 miles of the West Fork Smith River to provide channel structure, absorb stream energy and reduce water velocity, and provide cover for fish.
- 1 large boulder weir was placed on a high energy bedrock channel of the West Fork Smith River to provide a gravel deposition site and pool habitat.
- 2 fish passage culverts were modified with the placement of 7 step weirs to provide juvenile fish passage and habitat structure on bedrock stream channels.
- 15 large conifer trees were lined, as whole trees, into a high energy stream channel to reduce water velocity, collect drifting organic matter and provide cover for resident and anadromous fish.
- fully decommission approximately 3 miles of floodplain road along fish bearing streams.

ERFO Repairs

- Completion of the Fitzpatrick Creek road repair and “low water crossing” which was designed to pass flood flows and debris torrents as well as migrating resident and anadromous fish.
- Repair road failures and stream crossings on approximately 3 miles of road.

Other Actions

- Maintenance of previously planted trees within riparian areas to ensure establishment and growth.

68. (RR) Do watershed analyses identify mitigation measures where existing recreation facilities are not meeting Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives? Have they been implemented? (NFP C34) (RMP 14)

The South Fork Coos River watershed analysis updated in FY 2000, did not identify conditions in the developed Burnt Mountain Cabin recreation facility needing mitigation in order to meet ACS objectives. (This is the only developed recreation site within the watershed.) An ACS evaluation was completed for the proposed actions and alternatives as part of a recreation area management plan and environmental assessment.

69. (LSR) Have Late-Successional Reserves assessments been prepared prior to habitat

manipulation activities? (NFP A7, C11, C26) (RMP 18)

The *Oregon Coast Province - Southern Portion LSR* Assessments completed in 1997 and the *South Coast - Northern Klamath LSR* Assessment completed in 1998 address habitat manipulation activities. Prior to completion of these LSR Assessment documents, individual project assessments were prepared and submitted to REO for review.

70. (LSR) What is the status of development and implementation of plans to eliminate or control nonnative species which adversely impact late-successional objectives? (NFP C19) (RMP 21)

Control of nonnative species occurring within LSRs is discussed in both the *Oregon Coast Province - Southern Portion* and the *South Coast - Northern Klamath LSR* Assessments. Specific plans have not been developed or implemented at this time. The noxious weed inventory conducted under the Jobs-in-the-Woods program will assist in developing these plans.

71. (AL, LSR) What land acquisitions occurred, or are underway, to improve the area, distribution, and quality of Late-Successional Reserves? (NFP C17) (RMP 20)

No land acquisitions specifically for improvement of LSRs occurred, or are underway at this time.

72. (AL) Are late-successional retention stands being identified in fifth-field watersheds in which federal forest lands have 15 percent or less late-successional forest? (RMP 23)

As watershed analysis documents were prepared, an initial screening of fifth field watersheds was completed with the Siuslaw and Siskiyou National Forests. Results of this initial analysis were reported in the watershed analysis documents. The initial analysis applied to all actions with decisions prior to Oct 1, 1999. All FY 95-2000 sales sold under the RMP ROD have complied with the 15 percent rule per the initial analysis.

A joint BLM/FS Instruction Memorandum was issued on September 14, 1998. This provided the final guidance for implementing the 15 percent standards and guidelines throughout the area covered by the NFP. Implementation of this guidance is required for all actions with decisions beginning October 1, 1999. The final 15 percent analysis will be published concurrent the Coos Bay third year RMP evaluation.

73. (AL) What is the age and type of the harvested stands? (RMP 53, 54)

This information is displayed in Appendix Table B-1 in this APS.

74. (AL) Were efforts made to minimize the amount of particulate emissions from prescribed burns? (RMP 24)

All prescribed fire activities were conducted in accordance with the Oregon Smoke Management Plan and Visibility Protection Plan. In FY 2000, district prescribed fire activities totaled 163

acres. Proposed management activities are analyzed during the IDT review process and alternative fuels management methods are utilized where appropriate. Fuel consumption varies due to factors such as time of year, aspect, fuel type, ignition method, fuel continuity and treatment method. No intrusions occurred into designated areas as a result of prescribed burning activities on the District. Prescribed burning prescriptions target spring-like burning conditions when large fuel, duff and litter consumption, and smoldering is reduced by wetter conditions and rapid mop-up. Prescribed burning activities are implemented to improve seedling plantability, and survival as well as hazardous fuels reduction both in natural and activity fuels.

75. (AL) What in-stream flow needs have been identified for the maintenance of channel conditions, aquatic habitat and riparian resources (Watershed Analysis)? (RMP 25)

In-stream flow needs are being identified for New River in anticipation of applying for water rights.

76. (AL, KW) How many and what type of watershed restoration projects are being developed and implemented in Key Watersheds? In other watersheds? (NFP C7) (RMP 8)

Key Watersheds; Myrtlewood Resource Area

- Removal of 6 stream crossing culverts within the designated Key Watershed of the North Fork of the Chetco River.
- Road density reductions in North Fork Chetco drainage. Road relocation and future road reduction in Baker Creek drainage.

In other watersheds; Myrtlewood Resource Area, Refer to implementation monitoring question #67

Key Watersheds; Umpqua Resource Area

- Within the Paradise Creek Tier 1 Key watershed 2 fish passage culverts were modified with the placement of 7 step weirs to provide juvenile fish passage and habitat structure on bedrock stream channels.

In other watersheds: Umpqua Resource Area Refer to implementation monitoring question #67

77. (RR, AL) What fuel treatment and fire suppression strategies have been developed to meet Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives? (NFP C35) (RMP15)

Fuel treatment strategies are developed as a part of the IDT process. No chemical retardant, foam or other additives were used on or near surface waters. In accordance with BLM Prescribed Fire Manual 9214, Coos Bay District RMP, the District Fire Management Plan, and the ODF/BLM Protection Agreement, immediate and appropriate suppression action is to be applied on all wildfires.

In addition, machines (excavators) were used to pile slash on site preparation units. Operators were instructed to leave large woody pieces or sort pieces and distribute across the landscape thus

preventing them from burning.

78. (AL) Has a road or transportation management plan been developed and does it meet Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives? (NFPC33) (RMP 14, 70)

The District is continuing to operate under the 1996 Western Oregon Transportation Management Plan and its own District Implementation Plan developed in late 1998. Both of these plans have, as one of their two main goals, maintenance programs and operation plans designed to meet ACS objectives.

The district has re-issued its Maintenance Operation Plan outlining the prescribed maintenance levels for the transportation network. It is anticipated that these levels will not meet ACS objectives due to budgetary and manpower reductions.

79. (AL) What is the status of the reconstruction of roads and associated drainage features identified in watershed analysis as posing a substantial risk? (NFP C7) (RMP 69)

Through the IDT process culverts identified as barriers to fish passage continue to be replaced as funding becomes available. Roads determined to be potential sources of sediment delivery, disruptive to a natural hydrologic process or barriers to natural delivery of LWD are either decommissioned or upgraded to correct the condition. Lastly, ERFO projects continue to be completed to correct major failures due to catastrophic occurrences.

80. (KW) What is the status of closure or elimination of roads to further Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives and to reduce the overall road mileage within Key Watersheds? (NFP C7) (RMP 7, 70)

Beginning in FY 2000 emphasis has shifted out of Key Watersheds and to more critical areas in non-key watersheds. Overall road mileage reduction remains an issue in key watersheds however with the majority of the critical areas already attended to, concerns have shifted to those roads in flood-plain areas in non-key watersheds.

Closures will continue to take place based on available funding and will continue to be prioritized by staff input.

81. (KW) If funding is insufficient to implement road mileage reductions, are construction and authorizations through discretionary permits, denied to prevent a net increase in road mileage in Key Watersheds? (NFP C7) (RMP 62-63)

It is not the policy of the agency to deny access to lands of private parties. The agency will review any request and fulfill its obligations under the appropriate laws and regulations governing issuance of such permits.

82. (AL) What watershed-based Coordinated Resource Management Plans and other

cooperative agreements have been developed with other agencies to meet Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives? (RMP 17, 25)

During FY 99, Field Office fish biologists were actively involved with the Coos and Coquille Watershed Associations, the Umpqua, Lower Rogue Council, and South Coast Coordinating Watershed Councils. Fish biologists provided technical support in the form of project recommendations, design and evaluation, basin action planning, monitoring plan development and implementation, database management, and special resources (such as aerial photography). MOUs have been developed between the District and each of the Associations/Councils.

83. (AL) Are presence of at-risk fish species and stocks, habitat conditions, and restoration needs being identified during watershed analysis? (RMP 30)

On the Coos Bay District there are two listed ESUs of anadromous salmonids. The Umpqua River cutthroat trout was delisted during FY 2000. The Oregon Coast coho and Southern Oregon/Northern California coho are listed as threatened. Listed fish along with candidate species are addressed in the watershed analysis process along with a description of the habitat conditions. Watershed restoration opportunities are identified to benefit the habitat needs of these fish.

84. (AL) Are high priority sites for category 3 S&M species being identified? (NFP C5) (RMP 34)

Identification of high priority sites for category 3 Survey and Manage species are being done at the regional level. The District has been recording locations of these species during pre-project surveys and have submitted these to the regional Interagency Species Management System (ISMS) database.

85. (AL) Are general regional surveys being conducted for category 4 S&M species to acquire additional information and to determine necessary levels of protection for arthropods, fungi species that were not classed as rare and endemic, bryophytes, and lichens? (NFP C6) (RMP 34)

During pre-project surveys, distribution and habitat information on all Survey and Manage species, including category 4 species is collected. This information is being sent to the regional database where this information will be used to determine the necessary management for these species.

86. (AL) What are we doing to implement approved recovery plans on a timely basis? (RMP 32)

The Section 7 consultation streamlining process developed in FY 96 was used again this year. Approved protocol for marbled murrelets, disturbance buffers for bald eagles, and current guidelines for northern spotted owls were used in preparation of the biological assessment for the consultation process with the USFWS. In addition, we are participating on the team developing

the Western Snowy Plover and Western Lily recovery plans.

87. (AL) What land acquisitions occurred or are under way, to facilitate the management and recovery of special status species? (RMP 33)

The District is continuing to work on acquisition of parcels adjacent to New River. Although acquisition is not specifically for the management of special status species, obtaining these parcels would be beneficial to the recovery efforts for the western snowy plover.

88. (AL) What site specific plans for the recovery of special status species were or are being developed?

There are no specific plans at this time.

89. (SA) What environmental education and research initiatives and programs are occurring in the research natural areas and environmental education areas? (RMP 38)

Two projects with CFER to determine the relative importance of processes inputting large woody debris to the stream channel environment and the potential production of the surrounding forest; and a study determining the diversity and abundance of forest floor arthropods were conducted within the Cherry Creek RNA. The field work on these projects were completed in FY 99, with manuscripts expected to be completed in FY 2002.

90. (AL) What mechanisms have been developed to describe past landscapes and the role of humans in shaping those landscapes? (RMP 40)

Watershed analysis is the primary mechanism used to describe past landscapes and the role of humans in shaping those landscapes, utilizing old photos, maps, literature, verbal discussion with many people, county records, agency records and tribal input.

91. (AL) What efforts are being made to work with American Indian groups to accomplish cultural resource objectives and achieve goals outlined in existing memoranda of understanding and develop additional memoranda as needs arise? (RMP 40)

The District continued to maintain the District Native American Coordinator position, as well as staff and management-level contacts with federally-recognized tribes whose current interests extend to Coos Bay BLM lands.

- The District completed the second year of a cost-sharing partnership with the Coquille Indian Tribe to continue field and analytic investigations into an archeological site on BLM lands.
- The District authorized a temporary road closure to motorized vehicles which was providing unauthorized access to culturally (and environmentally) sensitive meadows on Coquille

Indian Tribe forest land. This road is part of the previously designated mountain bike trail, and the closure does not restrict pedestrian, equestrian or non-motorized access. The Coquille Indian Tribe will contribute to this project by constructing the road closure gate.

92. (AL) What public education and interpretive programs were developed to promote the appreciation of cultural resources? (RMP 40)

In FY 2000 the District:

- Worked with the U.S. Coast Guard, Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, confederated Tribes of the Siletz Indians of Oregon, and Coquille Indian Tribe to manage Cape Blanco Lighthouse (listed on the National Register of Historic Places) and the 47 acre headlands at this site. Volunteers conducted interpretive programs, and tours of the lighthouse for over 23,000 visitors from around the world.

- An interpretive poster display was created showing development of the North Jetty of Coos Bay during 1890-1894. This was placed on display at the Coos County Historical Society Museum during Oregon Archaeology Celebration month, and subsequently has been placed on display at other museums on the Central Oregon Coast. The information presented was based on historic research conducted for the District by Dr. Stephen Dow Beckham.

93. (AL) What strategies and programs have been developed, through coordination with state and local governments, to support local economies and enhance local communities? (NFP App D) (RMP 45)

The District has made good use of new procurement authorities to support local businesses. These include:

- Using “Best Value Procurement” processes aware contracts and purchases to local business when it can be demonstrated the local capabilities result in a better product or outcome.
- Awarding contracts between \$2500 and \$25,000 to “small businesses.”
- Using check-writing capabilities to provide prompt payment to business with a minimum of paperwork.

94. (AL) Are resource management plan implementation strategies being identified that support local economies? (NFP App D) (RMP 45)

Yes, see response to #93.

In addition, the District small-sales program takes extra steps to assure that local business have the opportunity to acquire forest products in compliance with forest plan and consultation requirements.

95. (AL) What is the status of planning and developing amenities that enhance local communities, such as recreation and wildlife viewing facilities? (NFP App D) (RMP 45)

The District has been a major player in the Coos Trails Regional Partnership, a group whose goal is to develop a regional trails system for a variety of uses. In fact the district provides work space and office support for the project coordinator and has taken a major role in securing alternative sources of funding and labor to accomplish on the ground work.

The District is working in partnership with other groups to make some improvements at the Dean Creek Elk Viewing Area that will assure that this local attraction continues to support a health elk herd and safe viewing opportunities.

- 96. (AL) By land-use allocation, how do timber sale volumes, harvested acres, and the age and type of regeneration harvest stands compare to the projections in the SEIS record of decision Standards and Guidelines and resource management plan management objectives? (RMP 53, A-9)**

This information has been displayed in Appendix Table B-1 in this APS.

- 97. (MTX) Were the silvicultural (e.g., planting with genetically-selected stock, fertilization, release, and thinning) and forest health practices anticipated in the calculation of the expected sale quantity, implemented? (RMP A-2)**

This information has been displayed in Table 24 in this APS.

- 98. (AL) Have specific guidelines, consistent with the NFP and RMP, for the management of individual special forest products been developed and implemented? (RMP 55)**

The District continues to use the guidelines contained in the *Oregon/Washington Special Forest Products Procedure Handbook*.

- 99. (AL) Are noxious weed control methods compatible with LSR and Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives? (RMP 72)**

Noxious weed control methods have been discussed in both the *Oregon Coast Province - Southern Portion* and the *South Coast - Northern Klamath LSR* Assessments, as well as in Watershed Analyses. Further, each environmental document is reviewed for noxious weed impact and is supplemented by BMP (Best Management Practices) identified in Partners Against Weeds - A National Action Plan for the BLM (1/96).

- 100. (RR) What cooperative efforts have been made with other agencies to identify and eliminate impacts which threaten continued existence and distribution of native fish stocks on federal land? (RMP 30)**

The BLM continues to work within the 1997 MOU with ODFW, regarding cooperative and comprehensive aquatic habitat inventory, to identify physical conditions threatening the continued existence and distribution of native fish stocks on federally-managed lands; a total of 31.0 miles of

stream habitat inventories were completed in FY 2000. Myrtlewood fisheries prepared formal consultation packages for actions in the OR Coast coho ESU (for Threatened coho salmon) and the Southern OR/Northern CA coho ESU (for Threatened coho salmon). Umpqua fisheries prepared formal consultation packages for actions in the OR Coast coho ESU (for Threatened coho salmon). Consultation workloads have increased this year due to ongoing litigation which requires additional documentation in the preparation of Biological Assessments.

101. (SA) Have management plans been prepared, revised and implemented for areas of critical environmental concern? (RMP 38)

The New River ACEC management plan was completed in FY 95, with implementation of the plan beginning in FY 95. The North Fork Hunter Creek and Hunter Creek Bog ACEC Management Plan was completed in FY 96 with implementation beginning in FY 97. At this time no other ACEC Management Plans are proposed for completion.

102. (AL) What is the status of the development and implementation of recreation plans for proposed sites, trails, SRMAs, etc.? (RMP 49)

The Sixes River and Edson Creek Recreation Area Management Plan was completed in FY 2000. The District began scoping for the Loon Lake SRMA Recreation Area Management Plan to be completed in FY 2001. Trail planning and much of the construction was completed for the Blue Ridge and Euphoria Ridge trails. An Environmental Assessment was started for the Wassen Creek trail plan. The Dean Creek Elk Viewing Area, New River ACEC, and Hunter Creek ACEC plans as well as project plans in these areas are being implemented. Project plans were completed and implemented for facility upgrades and renovations of the Loon Lake, Smith River Falls, Vincent Creek and Park Creek campgrounds in the Umpqua Resource Area as well as for the Sixes River and Edson Creek campgrounds in the Myrtlewood Resource Area.

There is currently no planning effort underway for the proposed Tioga SRMA, proposed Big Bend recreation site, several other proposed trails, or 5 proposed back country byways as well as the District OHV designation implementation plan.

103. (LSR) Was additional analysis and planning included in the LSR Assessment “fire management plan” to allow some natural fires to burn under specified conditions? (RMP 75)

Both the *Oregon Coast Province - Southern Portion* and the *South Coast - Northern Klamath LSR* Assessments considered and rejected allowing some natural fires to burn under specified conditions, based primarily on the fact that the ecosystems are not fire-dependent, and that permitting natural fires to burn would not be consistent with neighboring landowners management objectives.

104. (LSR) Did the LSR Assessment “fire management plan” emphasize maintaining late-successional habitat? (RMP 74)

The fire management plan contained in both the *Oregon Coast Province - Southern Portion* and the *South Coast - Northern Klamath LSR* Assessments call for full and aggressive suppression of all wildfires as well the use of prescribed fire to reduce activity and natural fuels buildup and to achieve a desired species mix.

105. (AL) Are Escaped Fire Situation Analyses being prepared for fires that escape initial attack? (RMP 75)

Yes, when fires escape initial attack. In FY 2000 the Coos Bay District had 6 wildfires, none of which escaped initial attack.

106. (AL) What wildlife habitat restoration projects were designed and implemented during the past year? (RMP 27)

These items have been discussed in the Wildlife Habitat section of the APS.

107. (AL) What wildlife interpretive facilities have been designed and implemented during the past year? (RMP 27, 45)

Two interpretive panels have been designed for placement at Floras Lake to improve the understanding of special status species and other wildlife present in the area.

108. (LSR) What is the status of the preparation and implementation of fire management plans for Late-Successional Reserves? (NFP C18) (RMP 21)

A fire management plan for the *South Coast - Northern Klamath LSR* Assessment covering the remaining LSRs located on the Coos Bay District was prepared and reviewed by REO in FY 98 and incorporated into the Districts Fire Management Plan.