



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Modoc National Forest

Forest
Service

Annual Monitoring, Accomplishment, and Evaluation Report

September
2006

Final FY 2005 and Initial 2006



For Information Contact: Robert Haggard
800 West 12th Street
Alturas, CA 96101
530-233-5840

<http://www.r5.fs.fed.us/Modoc/management/monitoring/2005-2006>

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Table of Contents | iii |
| INTRODUCTION | ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. |
| Monitoring Activities and Evaluation | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| KEY FINDINGS AND CERTIFICATION | ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED. |
| Forest Supervisor’s Evaluation and Certification | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| <i>Mission, Strategies, Plans, and Types of Monitoring</i> | <i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i> |
| Forest Service Mission | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| National Strategic Plan | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) Monitoring ... | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Monitoring Levels | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Strategic Ecosystem Monitoring | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| National Reporting Requirements | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Program of Work | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| <i>Monitoring Results for Resource Program Areas</i> | <i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i> |
| Air Quality | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Energy and Firewood | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Fire & Fuels | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Heritage Resource Program | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Lands | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Minerals and Geology | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Range | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Wild Horse | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Recreation | Error! Bookmark not defined. |
| Visuals | 1 |
| Specially Designated Areas | 1 |
| Research Natural and Special Interest Areas | 1 |
| Wilderness | 2 |
| Sensitive Plants (Botany) | 3 |
| Pests and Noxious Weeds | 4 |
| Timber Management | 5 |
| Timber Products | 6 |
| Watershed (Soil and Water) | 8 |
| Soil | 8 |
| Water Quality and Quantity | 9 |
| Wildlife and Fish | 10 |
| Biological Diversity | 11 |
| Wildlife | 11 |
| Fisheries | 15 |
| <i>Monitoring Results for General Administration Goals</i> | 16 |
| Community Participation | 16 |
| Tribal Government Program | 16 |
| Environmental Education | 17 |
| Resource Advisory Committee Projects | 17 |
| Partnerships | 18 |
| Economic | 19 |
| Budget | 19 |
| Facilities | 21 |

Facilities 21
Roads and Trails 22
Human Resources 23
Workforce and Organization Change 23
Forest Planning 24
Data Management 24
Supporting Documentation 26
List of Contributors 26
Acronyms 27

Visuals

Strategic Plan Goals: Conduct mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals.

Forest Plan Goals: Maintain or improve the scenic attractiveness of the Forest as seen from major public use areas, manage visual resources to meet or exceed adopted visual quality objectives (VQOs), and rehabilitate areas not meeting VQOs.

Monitoring: Assessment of goal achievement for the Scenery Conservation Program is based on professional judgment of the Forest’s scenery specialists (landscape architects), public comments, and information from Forest, Regional and National scenery managers.

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Trend of visual character | Determine if desired character stated in plan is being approached or maintained | No analysis conducted. | |
| Visual condition of Forest | Determine compliance with visual quality Objectives (VQOs) | Projects are planned to meet VQO’s. | |

Accomplishments:

Scenic Integrity indicates the degree of natural appearance of the Forest, and the presence of scenery disturbance. In recent years scenic integrity has steadily improved, since human activities that historically create strong, visible disturbances have become less frequent (such as road construction, clearcuts and seed tree cuts). Some visual disturbances still occurred in 2005, but their visual effects were typically limited to retain a largely natural appearance and achieve Forest Plan Visual Quality Objectives (minimum scenic integrity thresholds). Some existing scenery disturbances, due primarily to past practices or natural events will persist for many years or decades.

Evaluation: Currently there is a widespread substantial threat to the Forest’s native scenic character that people value primarily from wildfire-related and insect caused mortality disturbances that would be in excess of the ecosystem’s historic scale and intensity. This native scenic character has historically been enhanced and perpetuated through natural wildfires, and is now being partially accomplished through vegetative thinning and fuels reduction projects. Forest Plan Revision is needed to update visual management system to reflect changes in policy and direction nation.

Specially Designated Areas

Research Natural and Special Interest Areas

Strategic Plan Goals: Conduct mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals.

Forest Plan Goals: The goals are to recognize special areas and values, provide information about these areas, develop partnerships for research within Research Natural Areas. Manage Special Interest Areas to protect the values for which they were established. Manage research natural areas to protect the values for which they were established.

Monitoring:

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Natural integrity of Research Natural Areas and Special Interest Areas | Assess preservation of features for which the area was established | No management activities occurred within or adjacent to the research natural areas or special interest | No management activities occurred within or adjacent to the research natural areas or special interest areas. A |

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|-----------|---|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| | | areas. | lightening fire occurred in the timber island in the Burnt Lava Flow SIA. |

Accomplishments:

Special Interest Areas are monitored through field visits as opportunities arise. Geologic Special Interest Areas and Research Natural Areas have received limited emphasis on the Forest.

Evaluation: No management activities occurred within or adjacent to the research natural areas or special interest areas. The lightening fire in the Burnt Lava Flow was allowed to burn naturally burning approximately one million board feet of large trees. No effort to evaluate fire damage or to salvage timber will be made due to the inaccessibility of the area and the dual designation as an inventoried roadless area.

Wilderness

Strategic Plan Goals: Provide outdoor recreational opportunities. Provide high-quality outdoor recreational opportunities on forests and grasslands, while sustaining natural resources, to help meet the Nation’s recreational demands. Improve public access to NFS land and water and provide opportunities for outdoor health-enhancing activities.

Forest Plan Goal: Manage the South Warner Wilderness to maintain or enhance wilderness qualities.

Monitoring: The assessment is based on the professional judgment of wilderness specialists, public comments, and information from Regional, Forest, and District Recreation Managers.

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| User (visitor) needs and expectations | Identify changing needs and expectations. Monitor interactions of wildlife, recreationists, and livestock. | Suggestions conflict with Wilderness direction, such as providing destination signing along the trails, with mileages etc. to inform hikers. The Forest continues to receive comments from visitors concerning adverse effects of grazing on wilderness characteristics and riparian health. | |
| Physical, social, and managerial setting for wilderness opportunities | Assure that wilderness attributes are maintained. | Areas around Patterson Lake continue to receive camping use that is too close to the lake and trail. Excessive firewood and campfires are degrading the area detracting from the wilderness setting. | |

Accomplishments:

| Forest Plan Goals and Objectives (Targets) | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|------|------|
| | Plan Base Year 1982 | Plan Goal 2000-2009 | 2005 | 2006 |
| Wilderness (M RVD) | 7.1 | 12.4 | 1.8 | 1.9 |

The above numbers are based on the information from those who signed in at the trailheads an unknown number of users do not sign trailhead sign-in sheets, estimates of sign in compliance varies with only 10% of 20% of people entering the wilderness signing the trail registers. Non-compliance estimates are based on infrequent monitoring of trailhead use and information gathered by trail crews and the wilderness ranger.

Onsite Wilderness use is primarily by recreationists and grazing permittees. Use levels are generally light compared to other wildernesses in the Region. Use continues to slightly increase.

Wilderness fire/fuel levels are increasingly high, partially due to historic fire suppression policies. The Forest’s Wildland Fire Use Management Strategy provides criteria for determining when to allow wildland fire to burn to achieve resource goals in wilderness, rather than always suppressing it as in the past. The availability of this tool is expected to help reduce fuel build-ups created as a result of past fire suppression; refer to Fire Management. Wilderness rangers patrolled trailheads during hunting season to issue campfire permits, validate deer tags, and informing them about fire safety and wilderness resource protection.

Trail improvement work occurs each year, including surveys, maintenance, or light reconstruction on high priority trails. About 70 miles of trail were opened and cleared each year, and trail reconstruction or heavy maintenance was performed to standard on about 5 miles of trail. Much of this work was done through service contracts with the California Conservation Corps, Backcountry Horsemen, Student Conservation Association, and from other local volunteer groups. Due to limited budgets, several other trails do not meet standards for clearing, tread maintenance, signing, and/or trail logs.

Limited campsite repair work occurred in high-use areas around Patterson Lake. Wilderness use site cleanup, restoration, and trash removal from fragile areas was performed at high use locations. The extent of exposed mineral soil and loss of native vegetation at many campsites indicates that localized degradation is occurring.

In 2005 the Trailhead campsite at Pepperdine was expanded to accommodate equestrian users with larger recreation vehicles and horse trailers.

In 2006 improvement work was undertaken at Emerson Trailhead and environmental analysis begun on the an effort to develop and improved and expanded trailhead for equestrian users at East Creek to prevent further degradation of the Patterson Campground by equestrian use.

Evaluation: Resource effects within wilderness are primarily due to recreational visitors, grazing use, historic fire suppression, and recent fire suppression activities. Most trailheads provide information about recreation opportunities and wilderness resource conservation measures. Management decisions regarding acceptable limits of key attributes and values, appropriate use zoning, and resource emphases are often made informally, frequently without support of coordinated plans or professionally established analysis

Sensitive Plants (Botany)

Strategic Plan Goals: Conduct mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals. Restore and maintain native and desired nonnative plant and animal species diversity in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and reduce the rate of species endangerment by contributing to species recovery.

National Strategic Plan: Restore and maintain native and desired nonnative plant and animal species diversity in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and reduce the rate of species endangerment by contributing to species recovery.

Forest Plan Goals: Protect habitat for sensitive species sufficient for eventual de-listing.

Monitoring:

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Sensitive plants | Detect changes in key populations of sensitive plants and assess mgmt impacts on populations and habitat | Sensitive plants monitored in 2005 included <i>Botrychium</i> species and <i>Calochortus longebarbatus</i> ssp. <i>longebarbatus</i> . Results of the <i>Botrychium</i> monitoring showed that | Sensitive plants monitored in 2006 was <i>Cypridium montanum</i> . This was the first year for this intensity of monitoring. The population monitored showed a 100% increase in the number of |

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|-----------|--|--|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| | | habitat for this species was being impacted by grazing. Results of the <i>Calochortus</i> monitoring showed change that most likely correlates with precipitation. | individual plants, however this was due to actual counting rather than previous estimates. It is also due to the larger area surveyed. |

Accomplishments: TE & S effects analysis was performed in conjunction with the analysis of all projects.

Evaluation: The Modoc National Forest is currently completing an Environmental Assessment for the control or eradication of 14 identified species of noxious weeds occurring on the Forest. The purpose of this document is to implement an integrated noxious weed control program over the entire Forest.

During FY 05 the Forest hired a new botanist to assist with the heavy botany workload.

The Modoc National Forest noxious weed program has been very successful in developing partnerships throughout Modoc County for the program elements of education/awareness, inventory, control and treatment of noxious weeds. In 2005 and 2006 our partnership projects included the attending coordination meetings and participation in annual weed tours and education events.

Pests and Noxious Weeds

Strategic Plan: Reduce the impacts from invasive species. Improve the health of the Nation's forests and grasslands by reducing the impacts from invasive species. Improve the effectiveness of treating selected invasive species on the Nation's forests and grasslands.

Forest Plan Goals: Manage weeds using an integrated weed management approach in order of priority set forth in FSM 2081.2. Provisions for implementing this management direction are embodied in the noxious weeds management standards and guidelines.

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Noxious weeds Goal 2 Objective 1 | Determine if noxious weeds have increased to damaging levels | 500 acres of Mediterranean sage were hand treated in areas covered by earlier NEPA. Inventory of noxious weed sites is ongoing. | 37 acres of various noxious species were hand treated in disturbed areas and other areas covered by earlier NEPA. Inventory of noxious weed sites is ongoing. |
| Forest Pests | Early detection and evaluation of pest-related problems and damage | Aerial detection flights conducted. | Aerial detection flights conducted. |

Accomplishments: Insect and Disease control efforts were accomplished on all the Districts. Most of the activities included thinning in plantations for bark beetle prevention efforts as part of other vegetation management treatment projects. Limited hand treatments were accomplished as part of other projects or incidental to inventory activities.

| Forest Accomplishments Using Common Target Tracking Measures | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Accomplishment item | Unit of Measure | 2005 Planned | 2005 Actual | 2006 Planned | 2006 Actual |
| Noxious Weed Treatment | Acres | 810 | 500 | 150 | 37 |

Evaluation: Noxious weed treatment is being addressed in the Noxious Weed Treatment EIS small size and lack of funds for immediate analysis and treatment.

Timber Management

Strategic Plan Goals: Conduct mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals.

Forest Plan Goals: The goals are to implement silvicultural prescriptions to achieve desired conditions, reforest lands allocated to sustained timber production within five years of harvest, actively reforest areas damaged by extreme events (such as floods, wind, fires, insect infestations), offer the allowable sale quantity, utilize dead and dying trees, implement post-sale treatments, and manage insects and disease.

Encourage increased utilization of wood products. Inform the public to foster an understanding of silvicultural practices. Implement post-sale treatments commensurate with resource needs and economics. Implement Tree Measurement Sales for low defect timber as opportunities occur. Reforest suitable land planned for regeneration within 5 years of harvest. Achieve and maintain, through the interdisciplinary process, quality timber sale layout and associated transportation system planning.

Monitoring: The annual Planned Timber Sale Accomplishment Report has been used for assessing the allowable sale quantity goal. The reforestation and timber stand improvement goals are assessed each year by comparing accomplishments to targets, particularly for survival and certification of planted stands. The results are documented in the Forest Service Activity Tracking System and the yearly Plantation Survival Report.

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Annual sale quantity and acreage. | Ensure consistency of the timber sale program with the Forest Plan | Limited Budgets and limitations imposed by standards and guidelines prevent meeting the ASQ or treatment acres established in the Forest Plan. | |
| Reforestation and timber stand improvements | Verify consistency with scheduled acre outputs and FOREST PLAN prescriptions | Limited Budgets and limitations imposed by standards and guidelines prevent meeting the reforestation and timber stand improvement acres or fully implementing the prescriptions called for in the Forest Plan. | |
| Timber-forage plantations | Evaluate growth and survival of conifers and pounds of forage produced | Survival studies were conducted indicating that plantations met stocking requirements. | |
| Land suitability for timber | Verify classification of land as to suited or not suited for timber production | Land suitability for timber is examined for every proposed stand treatment action. However a forest-wide evaluation of suitability has not been done since the 1991 Forest plan. | |
| Growth and yield projections. | Determine if growth and yield projections for silvicultural prescriptions are occurring as projected | The MDF examines every plantation and the results of timber stand improvement activity to gauge the success of the activity in improving stand health. Recent monitoring in the Hackamore area indicates success. However no in-depth comparisons of field results to growth and yield projections were conducted. | |
| Reforestation survival | Determine success of reforestation practices, (Adequately restocked within 5 years) | Survival exams performed for each plantation indicate that stand establishment can not reach acceptable stocking in five years due to establishment and growth of competing vegetation. | |
| Timber stand improvement | Determine success of release and stand improvement practices | Recent thinning activities are successful. Overstocked plantations sapling and pole stands represent fire threats | |

Accomplishments:

| Forest Plan Goals and Objectives (Targets) | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|-------|
| | Plan Base Year 1982 | Plan Goal 2000-2009 | 2005 | 2006 |
| Allowable Sale Quantity (MMCF) | 8.3 | 7.6 | ASQ as designated in the Forest Plan can not be meet due to budget limitations and forest wide standards and guidelines put in place by the NWFPA and the SNFPA In addition it is important to note that the Plan was based on sawtimber production while the currently much of the volume is fuelwood and biomass. See production tables by year below. | |
| (MMBF) | 50.4 | 45.5 | | |
| Long Term Sustained Yield (MMCF) | 9.7 | | Long Term Sustained Yield will be re-evaluated during Forest Plan Revision. | |
| (MMBF) | 58.9 | | | |
| Big Valley Federal Sustained-Yield Unit (MMBF) | 13.7 | 9.0 | .03 | 9.2 |
| Reforestation (M Acres) | 3.7 | 3.9 | 2,346 | 0 |
| Timber Stand Improvement (M Acres) | 3.9 | 7.3 | 2,094 | 3,572 |

The Forest continued its efforts to meet timber targets assigned by the Region. The Forest continues to emphasize timber stand improvement activities. Treatments include a combination of older and younger plantations. Accomplishments are completed using both trust funds and appropriated funding. Integration with the fuels program is continuing with emphasis on treating stands within the wildland/urban interface to reduce fuel hazards. The Forest used mechanized equipment, masticators, to assist in reducing fuels while completing precommercial thinning actions. The reforestation program remains at a low level, due mostly to the lack of regeneration harvesting. Most of the reforestation efforts are confined to interplantings of under stocked plantations and the reforestation of wildfires. Survival rates for plantations checked in 2005 and 2006 are below acceptable levels due to competing vegetation and animal damage. Animal damage efforts have concentrated on controlling gopher and deer problems on some of the younger plantations.

Timber Products

The Modoc National Forest sold 18 timber sales in Fiscal Years 2005 and 2006 totaling 27 million board feet (MMBF) or 68,445 hundred cubic feet (CCF) and harvested 25 million board feet (47,289 CCF) during these years.

| 2005 Volume Sold | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------|--------------|--------|
| Sale Name | Ranger District | Product | MBF | Biomass Tons | CCF |
| Sunflower Biomass Fire Salvage | WM | Chips, Biomass | 10 | 25,560 | 10,224 |
| Bell Stratlet – Service Contract | BV | Chips, Biomass | 1,890 | 9,450 | 3,780 |
| Blue Mtn – Service Contract | DG | Chips, Biomass | 2,420 | 12,100 | 4,840 |
| Roney Hazard Tree Removal | BV | Sawtimber | 6 | | 9 |
| Four Mile SSTS | DG | Sawtimber | 215 | | 430 |
| South Main Roadside Salvage | DG | Sawtimber | 30 | | 49 |
| Timber Fire Salvage | DH | Sawtimber | 161 | | 322 |
| Coal Insect Salvage Resale | WM | Sawtimber | 165 | | 329 |
| Lost | DG | Sawtimber | 9,155 | | 22,876 |
| Bell Fire Salvage Reoffer | DG | Sawtimber | 158 | | 317 |
| Black Stain | BV | Sawtimber | 1,166 | | 2,427 |
| Oregon Rim – Service Contract | DG | Chips, Biomass | 6,072 | 30,360 | 12,144 |
| Highland Camps HT Removal | DH | Sawtimber | 26 | | 52 |
| Total | | | 21,474 | 77,470 | 57,799 |

| 2005 Volume Harvested | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Sale Name | Ranger District | Product | MBF | Biomass Tons | CCF |
| Blue Lake Biomass | WM | Chips, Biomass | 1,161 | 5,805 | 2,322 |
| West Valley Juniper - Service Contract | WM | Chips, Biomass | 750 | 3,750 | 1,500 |
| Amore | DG | Sawtimber | 251 | | 637 |
| Spaulding | DG | Sawtimber | 210 | | 601 |
| Badfuels PCT – Service Contract | DG | Chips, Biomass | 1,226 | 6,130 | 2,452 |
| Badshort PCT – Service Contract | DG | Chips, Biomass | 3,116 | 15,580 | 6,232 |
| Studley Hazard Tree Removal | BV | Sawtimber | 30 | | 51 |
| Sorhog Mech PCT – Service Contract | DG | Chips, Biomass | 1,892 | 9,460 | 3,784 |
| Pullplug | WM | Sawtimber | 1,574 | | 3,330 |
| Long Valley Biomass Fire Salvage | WM | Chips, Biomass | 60 | 300 | 120 |
| East Bridge Biomass Fire Salvage | WM | Chips, Biomass | 190 | 950 | 380 |
| Cinder Corp Biomass Fire Salvage | WM | Chips, Biomass | 240 | 1,200 | 480 |
| Boyd | BV | Chips, Biomass | 1,100 | 5,500 | 1,258 |
| Ryan Forest Products | BV | Biomass | 1,230 | 6,150 | 2,460 |
| Bell Stratlet – Service Contract | BV | Chips, Biomass | 1,890 | 9,450 | 3,780 |
| Manny's Camp Blow down Salvage | BV | Sawtimber | 26 | | 45 |
| Bell Fire Salvage Re-offer | DG | Sawtimber | 158 | | 317 |
| Cottonwood Hazard Tree Salvage | DG | Sawtimber | 19 | | 30 |
| Timber Fire Salvage | DH | Sawtimber | 105 | | 210 |
| Total | | | 15,228 | 64,275 | 29,989 |

MBF=Biomass=CCF, the conversion factors vary by sale and diameter of material

The Volume shown do not include any forest products sold such as tops, limbs, boughs, pinecones, plants, Christmas trees, etc.

| 2006 Volume Sold | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Sale Name | Ranger District | Product | MBF | Biomass Tons | CCF |
| Briles | WM | Sawtimber | 889 | | 1743 |
| Blue Camp HT Salvage | WM | Sawtimber | 110 | | 220 |
| Pack Aspen | WM | Sawtimber | 261 | | 521 |
| Tionesta Forest Products | DH | Sawtimber | 62 | | 123 |
| | DH | Chips, Biomass | 3,985 | 19,923 | 7,969 |
| Cedar & Mill HT Salvage | WM | Sawtimber | 35 | | 70 |
| Total | | | 5,342 | 19,923 | 10,646 |

| 2005 Volume Harvested | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Sale Name | Ranger District | Product | MBF | Biomass Tons | CCF |
| Long Valley Biomass Fire Salvage | WM | Chips, Biomass | 10 | 50 | 20 |
| East Bridge Biomass Fire Salvage | WM | Chips, Biomass | 545 | 2,725 | 1,090 |
| Cinder Corp Biomass Bire Salvage | WM | Chips, Biomass | 65 | 325 | 130 |
| Coal Insect Salv Resale | WM | Sawtimber | 199 | | 113 |
| Boyd Forest Products | BV | Chips, Biomass | 3,142 | 8,977 | 3,591 |
| Blue Mtn – Service Contract | DG | Chips, Biomass | 2,420 | 12,100 | 4,840 |
| Blue Camp HT Salvage | WM | Sawtimber | 129 | | 260 |
| Bigdonlet PCT – Service Contract | BV | Chips, Biomass | 601 | 3,005 | 1202 |
| Roney Hazard Tree Removal | BV | Sawtimber | 40 | | 60 |
| South Main Roadside Salvage | DG | Sawtimber | 43 | | 70 |
| Tionesta | DH | Chips, Biomass | 2,878 | 14,390 | 5,755 |
| Four Mile SSTS | DG | Sawtimber | 85 | | 169 |
| Does not reflect September Volume | | | | | |
| Total | | | 10,157 | 41,572 | 17,300 |

MBF=Biomass=CCF, the conversion factors vary by sale and diameter of material

The Volume shown do not include any forest products sold such as tops, limbs, boughs, pinecones, plants, Christmas trees, etc.

Evaluation: Forest products activities and their outputs are presumed to be within sustainable limits because the levels of most outputs today are significantly less than the historical levels. If the Forest Service is to achieve “products and services...for subsistence, commercial, and noncommercial uses within sustainable limits,” the agency must establish how sustainability will be defined and measured. Processes designed to assess sustainability are under development, but in the meantime, periodic assessments of inventory and monitoring data must serve as indicators of sustainability.

Watershed (Soil and Water)

National Strategic Plan: Improve watershed condition. Increase the area of forest and grassland watersheds in fully functional and productive condition. Assess and restore high-priority watersheds and maintain riparian habitat in these watersheds. Monitor water quality impacts of activities on NFS lands. Restore and maintain native and desired nonnative plant and animal species diversity in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and reduce the rate of species endangerment by contributing to species recovery.

Soil

Forest Plan Goals: The goals are to provide adequate instream flows, and to maintain water table levels in wet meadows. Maintain natural nutrient balance to ensure long-term soil productivity. Restore areas of soil degradation. Enhance soil productivity on selected sites. Accurately assess the capabilities, suitability’s and limitations of soils for better management decisions and recommendations.

Monitoring: The best management practices program and the aquatic conservation strategy are the primary mechanisms for ensuring the maintenance of water quality. Best management practices are monitored as described under Physical Environment. Aquatic conservation strategy monitoring is described in the Geology and Aquatic Conservation Strategy sections. The water quality-monitoring element is tied to the Physical Environment goal of achieving water quality objectives.

There are no monitoring elements in the Forest Plan Monitoring Plan for providing adequate instream flows and maintaining water table levels in wet meadows. The Forest manages flows for domestic use, but does not control flows on rivers controlled by dams such as the Modoc River or flows on the Scott River within Scott Valley. Stream flows on the Modoc and Scott Rivers are monitored by other agencies.

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Soil compaction. | Assess loss in productivity; evaluate compaction on 5% of disturbed areas | FY 05 was Year 3 of a 5 year monitoring study performed under the monitoring requirements of the SN Amendment. | FY 06 was Year 4 of a 5 year monitoring study performed under the monitoring requirements of the SN Amendment. |
| Significant change in soil productivity | Assess compliance and effectiveness of prescribed mitigation measures and soil-related BMPs to maintain productivity | FY 05 was Year 3 of a 5 year monitoring study performed under the monitoring requirements of the SN Amendment. | FY 06 was Year 4 of a 5 year monitoring study performed under the monitoring requirements of the SN Amendment. Based on BMPEP, there have been no significant changes to soil productivity. |
| Response to fertilization | Identify which soil types respond to fertilization and their level of response at selected sites | Fertilization projects were not initiated. | Fertilization projects were not initiated. |
| Soil and water | Accomplish projects in | No projects completed. | 5 projects completed |

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|----------------|---|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| improvement projects Goal – 5 objective 1 | priority order | | involving hand mulching, and water barring of hand and tractor skid trails. |

Accomplishments:

The Forest Plan did not establish any soil objectives (targets). See Water Quality and Quantity for acres of soil and watershed improvements.

Evaluation: The monitoring activities and objectives established in the Forest Plan Chapter 5 are not necessary or repetitive from other monitoring programs such as BMP monitoring. Soil compaction is not necessarily an effective measure of soil productivity as large scale logging and other compacting activities are no longer a primary soil disturbing activity. The change in the agency activities which may be of more importance to soil productivity is the impact of wildfires, wildland fire use, and prescribed fire, the Forest probably should amend or revise the Forest Monitoring Plan accordingly.

Water Quality and Quantity

Forest Plan Goals: Use Best Management Practices (BMPs) to meet water quality objectives. Rehabilitate degraded watershed areas impairing water quality. Acquire and maintain water rights for the Forest. Ensure Forest activities will not adversely affect groundwater quality.

Monitoring: The best management practices program and the aquatic conservation strategy are the primary mechanisms for ensuring the maintenance of water quality.

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Water quality management Goal - 5 objective 2. | Assess compliance with BMPs, S&G's direction, and State water quality Objectives. Evaluate the effectiveness of BMPs | BMP monitoring was completed for identified projects. During FY 05 intensive water quality sampling was done in relation to the Rainbow event. Water quality samples showed no impairment. | BMP monitoring was completed for identified projects. See final 2006 BMP monitoring report. |
| Sierra Nevada Wilderness Lake Water Quality Monitoring | | Patterson Lake Water quality review conducted by PSW Research Station | Patterson Lake Water quality review conducted by PSW Research Station |
| Watershed condition Goal - 5 objective 1. | Determine existing watershed condition and provide basis for watershed restoration program | A current watershed inventory is being maintained to identify out year watershed improvement needs. | A current watershed inventory is being maintained to identify out year watershed improvement needs. |
| Cumulative watershed effects Goal – 5 objective 1. | Identify adverse cumulative impacts in specific watersheds | Cumulative watershed effects were analyzed during project planning. Migrating measures were included in decision documents. | Cumulative watershed effects were analyzed during project planning. Migrating measures were included in decision documents. |
| Cumulative watershed effects Goal – 5 objective 2 | Determine effectiveness and validity of cumulative watershed effects modeling process, and management thresholds | The Forest monitored riparian areas ensuring compliance with standards and guidelines. | The Forest monitored riparian areas ensuring compliance with standards and guidelines |

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Riparian areas Goal – 5 objective 2 | Evaluate compliance w Forest Plan goals & effectiveness of BMPs and S&G's in protecting riparian dependent resources | Soil compaction and productivity were monitored for ongoing projects. | Soil compaction and productivity were monitored for ongoing projects. |
| Soil and water improvement projects Goal – 5 objective 1 | | No projects completed. | 5 projects completed involving hand mulching, and water barring of hand and tractor skid trails. |

Accomplishments:

| Forest Plan Goals and Objectives (Targets) | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|------|------|
| | Plan Base Year 1982 | Plan Goal 2000-2009 | 2005 | 2006 |
| Quality (M acre-feet meeting objectives) | 357.1 | 458.0 | FNA | FNA |
| Quantity (M acre-feet) | 565.8 | 568.3 | FNA | FNA |
| Watershed Improvement (Acres) | 0.0 | 230.0 | 0 | 5 |

| Forest Accomplishments Using Common Target Tracking Measures | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Accomplishment item | Unit of Measure | 2005 Planned | 2005 Actual | 2006 Planned | 2006 Actual |
| Soil & Water Resource Improvements | Acres | 5 | 0 | 5 | 5 |

Evaluation: Wilderness water quality monitoring indicates that water quality is affected by air pollution from the dust from the alkaline lakes located to the East of the Wilderness. Most of the goals in the Forest Plan are not reflected in the monitoring plan or objective tacking system. The Forest Plan goals and/or the monitoring and objective tacking system should be amended or revised to be more reflective of the Forest Plan. There are not cost effective measures or procedures to evaluate the effects forest management activities have on ground water. Protecting surface waters should be sufficient in protecting ground water. The Forest can not effectively monitor and report on the quality and quantity in acre feet coming off the Forest.

The Forest Plan has been amended to include many requirements and lots of program direction to protect watersheds and riparian areas. These planning consideration are minimum requirements for project implementation, the Forest Plan should be revised to combine, streamline, and consolidate the direction to insure implementation of protection measures on the ground. All the management direction dealing with watersheds from the National office down to the Forest Plan places heavy emphasis on watershed restoration; while, the budget allocations provide little direct funding for this activity. Budget direction is heavy on recommendations to include watershed restoration as part of other program activities; however these activities can only be placed in areas that are not placed in watersheds that are degraded or in danger of being degraded.

Wildlife and Fish

National Strategic Plan: Restore and maintain native and desired nonnative plant and animal species diversity in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and reduce the rate of species endangerment by contributing to species recovery.

Forest Plan Goals: Attain recovery goals for state and federal threatened and endangered species. Maintain or exceed habitat quality and quantity necessary for viable populations of sensitive species. Provide habitat quality and quantity, on a seasonal and year-round basis, necessary to meet the Forest's share of population objectives in State management plans for deer, pronghorn and other species. Fully develop and maintain suitable Forest wetlands. Improve and maintain habitat for species dependent on

snags, nest cavities, and dead/down wood. Cooperate with State, federal and other agencies in wildlife habitat planning and improvement. Meet habitat or population objectives for Management Indicator Species. (From page 4-4 of Forest Plan)

The wildlife program on the Modoc National Forest consists of habitat quantification and wildlife species surveys. There are two types of habitat monitoring on the Modoc NF. The first type is completed as a component of assessing the requirements for Management Indicator Species (MIS) with respect to the types and amounts of habitat. The second type is effectiveness monitoring for habitat improvement projects. Under the biodiversity section, only the habitat monitoring for MIS will be discussed. Habitat project effectiveness monitoring and wildlife species surveys will be discussed in the Wildlife Section.

Biological Diversity

Forest Plan Goals: The goals are to manage for healthy diverse ecosystems, species habitat, and desired populations, and to provide vegetative diversity to maintain viable populations and other resource objectives, including scenic quality, wildlife, and reduced wildfire loss. (From page 4-2 of Forest Plan)

Monitoring: Habitat monitoring for MIS focuses on species listed under the Endangered Species Act as threatened or endangered, designated by the Regional Forester as sensitive, and identified in the Forest Plan as other MIS such as game species. This monitoring looks at components at both landscape and stand scales. The landscape monitoring consists of mapping vegetation for a given project, and then performing some type of field validation to determine not only the changes in the amounts of habitat types, but also how these changes will affect wildlife.

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Snags | Assess the numbers, distribution and characteristics of snags on each management area. Assess effectiveness of S&G's | Snags and snag distribution is not an issue. The Forest has been inundated with snag creation due to wildland fires, insect, and disease. Projects have retained snags while and excessive snags occur within and adjacent to project areas. No detailed monitoring has been accomplished. | |
| Diversity | Assess the amounts, types and distribution of vegetation communities and seral stages. Assess and validate S&G's | The Forest has not been able to meet early seral stage development by management area for over 15 years due to the near ban on regeneration harvesting. | |
| Size of Harvest Openings | Ensure openings meet Regional policy. | Timber operations did not have any harvest openings. All harvests were thinning from below to increase growth and remove fuel ladders. No openings were created. | |
| Dispersal of harvest openings | Ensure that spacing of harvest openings conforms to Regional Policy | | |

This information concerning the changes in habitat in response to a given project is placed in various documents. Biological Assessments are prepared with each proposed project to analyze the effects to federally listed species and their habitats. Biological Evaluations address project effects on sensitive species and their habitats. The other MIS are evaluated through a review of effects of project level activities on habitat conditions.

Wildlife

Forest Plan Goals: In addition to those stated in the Biological Diversity section, the goals are to coordinate habitat improvement with the California Department of Fish and Game and to maintain unique wildlife habitats.

Monitoring: Monitoring activities include those described in the Biological Diversity section, but are expanded to cover species not designated as threatened, endangered, sensitive or management indicator species, such as big game and migratory birds. The Forest relies in part on monitoring efforts conducted

by the state, research groups (private and federal), universities, and landbird monitoring conducted through partnerships with qualified groups to determine current habitat conditions and species presence. Forest Service Biologists, temporary employees, and occasionally contractors gather the majority of the species information.

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Bald eagle (breeding) | -Determine trend and productivity of breeding population; -Evaluate trend of habitat delineated to meet Recovery Plan Objectives. Assess effectiveness of S&Gs | The Forest monitored 37 Bald eagle territories in FY 05, 14 on the Big Valley RD , 7 (all) on the Warner Mountain RD, and 16 on the Devil's Garden / Doublehead RDs. | The Forest monitored 38 Bald eagle territories in FY 06, 14 on the Big Valley RD , 7 (all) on the Warner Mountain RD, and 17 on the Devil's Garden / Doublehead RDs. |
| Bald eagle (wintering) | Determine condition and trend of identified active and potential roost sites. Assess effectiveness of S&Gs | Modoc NF participated in mid-winter Bald Eagle Surveys conducted by the Santa Cruz Predatory Bird Research Group. The population trend is upward. In addition, a winter roost was monitored on the BV in 2006. | |
| Peregrine falcon | Verify nesting and reproductive success during and after reintroduction. Assess effectiveness of S&Gs | There are no known Peregrine aeries on the Forest. | There are no known Peregrine aeries on the Forest. |
| California spotted owl | Survey to determine if nesting pairs occur on Forest. Assess effectiveness of S&Gs | The only territory on the Forest received a full contract survey. | The only territory on the Forest received a check with follow up mousing. Nest was not identified or located. |
| Northern spotted owl | Survey to determine if nesting pairs occur on Forest. Assess effectiveness of S&Gs | No new projects initiated so no monitoring was conducted in FY 2005. | No new projects initiated so no monitoring was conducted in FY 2006. |
| Bighorn sheep | Evaluate habitat condition, population trend and livestock or recreation interactions | No monitoring completed since the herds have died out. | |
| Goshawk | Determine population and habitat trends; evaluate prescription effectiveness | Level 2 and level 3 protocol surveys were conducted in and adjacent to Goshawk PACs. The Forest monitored 43 territories/activity centers on the Big Valley RD, 0 on the Doublehead RD, 19 on the Devil's Garden RD, and 11 on the Warner Mountains. Trend is stable or upward depending on district. | Level 2 and level 3 protocol surveys were conducted in and adjacent to Goshawk PACs. The Forest monitored 39 territories/activity centers on the Big Valley RD, 0 on the Doublehead RD, & 14 on the Devil's Garden RD, and 14 on the Warner Mountains. Trend is stable or upward depending on district. |
| Marten, Pileated woodpecker | Insure quantity and quality of available habitat to maintain viable populations. Assess effectiveness of S&G's | One month of remote camera and snow tracking surveys were conducted on the BVRD in 2005. One day was completed on the BVRD in 2006. Incidental sightings were noted on the rest of the Forest. | |
| Mule deer | Evaluate habitat condition, population trend and effectiveness of S&Gs | State Department of Fish and Game conducted an inventory (composition counts). Deer herds are stable to decreasing. | |
| Pronghorn | Determine habitat condition, population trend and effectiveness of S&G's | This inventory is completed by State Department of Fish and Game. Trend is unknown. | |
| Canada goose, Mallard, | Verify production due to wetland improvements and evaluate | No formal monitoring completed for waterfowl. | Monitoring was completed in areas of the Devil's |

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Sandhill crane | habitat condition. Assess effectiveness of S&Gs | The MDF reports known sightings. Monitoring was completed for sandhill cranes on Big Valley RD. | Garden/Warner Mt. and Big Valley RD's. |
| Sage grouse | Determine trends in population and habitat. Assess effectiveness of S&Gs | Only known active lek within the forest on the Clear Lake NWR was monitored. Ten sage grouse were fitted with radio-transmitters & translocated to the lek; USFWS monitored the radioed birds on the Refuge & the Doublehead RD. The DHRD Wildlife Biologist participated on a local inter-agency working group to develop a Conservation Strategy for the Devil's Garden/Clear Lake Population Management Unit. Several historic leks on the Big Valley RD were monitored by CDFG. | Only known active lek within the forest on the Clear Lake NWR was monitored. Fifteen sage grouse were fitted with radio-transmitters & translocated to the lek; USFWS & the CDFG monitored the radioed birds on the Refuge & the Doublehead RD. The DHRD Wildlife Biologist participated on a local inter-agency working group to complete the final draft Conservation Strategy for the Devil's Garden/Clear Lake Population Management Unit. Several historic leks on the Big Valley RD were monitored by CDFG. |
| Western gray squirrel, Blue grouse | Monitor acres of habitat and application of S&Gs | No formal monitoring completed. Incidental sightings were noted during surveys for other species. Presence is verified but trends can not be determined. | |
| Hairy woodpecker | Verify acres of required vegetation, snag numbers and trends, and implementation of other S&G's | No formal monitoring completed. Incidental sightings were noted during surveys for other species. Presence is verified but trends can not be determined. | |
| Prairie falcon, Osprey, Golden eagle | Ensure existing or potential nest territories are maintained. Assess effectiveness of S&G's | Monitoring for raptors is as follows. DHRD: 1 osprey site 1 prairie falcon site 1 golden eagle site DGRD: 6 osprey sites 3 prairie falcon site 3 golden eagle sites BVRD: 4 osprey sites 1 prairie falcon site 13 golden eagle sites WMRD: 2 osprey sites 1 prairie falcon site 2 golden eagle sites | Monitoring for raptors is as follows. DHRD: 1 osprey site 1 prairie falcon site 1 golden eagle site DGRD: 6 osprey sites 2 prairie falcon site 4 golden eagle sites BVRD: 5 osprey sites 16 golden eagle sites WMRD: 3 osprey sites 1 prairie falcon site 2 golden eagle sites |
| Swainson's hawk | Ensure existing or potential nest territories are maintained. Assess effectiveness of S&G's | No monitoring completed | No monitoring completed |
| Riparian species: (Red-breasted and Red-naped sapsuckers; willow flycatcher, yellow warbler) | Determine trends in woody vegetation and habitat capability in riparian areas. Assess effectiveness of S&G's | Survey protocols were conducted on the Warner Mountain RD for Willow Flycatcher. | Survey protocols were conducted on the Warner Mountain/Devil's Garden RD, and Doublehead RD for Willow Flycatcher. |
| Habitat improvement | Determine compliance with planned habitat | Implementation monitoring is conducted at the project level. | |

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Habitat improvement effectiveness | Improvement program Determine effectiveness of habitat improvements | Effectiveness monitoring is conducted at the project level. | |

Accomplishments:

| Forest Plan Goals and Objectives (Targets) Based on Pages 4-8 and 4-9 of Forest Plan | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | Plan Base Year 1982 | Plan Goal 2000-2009 | 2005 | 2006 |
| Bald Eagle Active Territories (Summer) | 7.0 | 21.0 | 33 | 33 |
| Peregrine Falcon (Active Territories) | 0 | 3 | No known sites | |
| Bighorn Sheep (Individuals) | 20.0 | 50.0 | Habitat is not available due to proximity of domestic and feral sheep and goats, which has spread disease that eliminated both herds on the Modoc. | |
| Deer (M Individuals) | 24.1 | 37.8 | Counted and managed by California Department of Fish and Game. | |
| Interstate, Glass Mountain, Warner Mountain and Adin Deer Herds. | 24.1 | 37.8 | Counted and managed by California Department of Fish and Game. | |
| Goshawk (Pairs) | 71.0 | 100.0 | 117 territories occupied in last 10 years | |
| Total Wildlife and Fish User Days (MWFUDS) (is not double-counted with dispersed recreation) | 83.1 | 121.6 | No longer Calculated | |
| Big Game (MWFUD) | | | No longer Calculated | |
| Big Game Direct Habitat Improve. | 32.8 | 53.0 | 644 | 388 |
| Big Game Induced Habitat Improve. | | 0.5 | 0 | 0 |
| Upland Game, Waterfowl, & Nongame (MWFUD) | | 17.0 | No longer Calculated | |
| Upland Game, Waterfowl, & Nongame Direct Habitat Improve. | 24.6 | 32.1 | Figures Not Available | Figures Not Available |

The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) manages the deer herd numbers and works with the Forest Service to insure that management projects maintain or increase habitat for the deer herds. CDFG establishes hunting levels.

Although no wetlands projects have been implemented in the last two years, work on the Weed Valley & Fourmile Valley Wetland Restoration and Maintenance Project has been underway. The Modoc National Forest has entered into a Challenge Cost Share Agreement with Ducks Unlimited to repair water control structures and spillways; to create loafing and low profile nesting islands for waterbirds; and to create potholes, and a system of channels to provide connectivity of water in these wetlands. Grant dollars from the North American Wetlands Conservation Act Program have been received for completion of this project. Construction will take place in the fall of 2007. This project is part of the much larger "Modoc Plateau/Pit River Wetlands Project", which has multiple partners including private and United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

| Forest Accomplishments Using Common Target Tracking Measures | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Accomplishment item | Unit of Measure | 2005 Planned | 2005 Actual | 2006 Planned | 2006 Actual |
| Wildlife TES Species Habitat Restored / Enhanced | Acres | 1,000 | 1,400 | 300 | 500 |

Fisheries

Forest Plan Goals: Maintain or improve instream habitat for desired fish. Manage riparian areas to optimize fish habitat or populations.

Monitoring: Monitoring consisted of a review of Forest Plan goals, standards and guidelines, best management practices, national program goals, action items established by the 1995 Recreational Fisheries Executive Order, restoration guidelines and procedures (Fish Passage restoration was a focus of 2005) and numbers/types of public awareness activities.

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Modoc Sucker | Determine condition and trend in critical habitat and populations, effectiveness of BMPs and S&G's | Trends up. Cooperative surveys with the California Department of Fish and Game and the US Fish and Wildlife Service were completed. | Trends up. Cooperative surveys with the California Department of Fish and Game and the US Fish and Wildlife Service were completed. Exotic fish removed within critical habitat. |
| Lost River and Shortnose suckers | Determine habitat and population trends, effectiveness of BMPs and S&G's | Population trend presently unknown, but habitat condition on the MDF is improving. | Population trend presently unknown, but habitat condition on the MDF is improving. |
| Goose Lake redband trout Lake run | Determine habitat and population trends, effectiveness of BMPs and S&G's | Trend Static and habitat condition on the MDF is improving. The Forest actively participated in the Goose Lake Fisheries Working Group. | Trend Static and habitat condition on the MDF is improving. The Forest actively participated in the Goose Lake Fisheries Working Group. |
| Fisheries (trout and largemouth bass) | Determine habitat and population trends, effectiveness of BMPs and S&G's | This inventory is completed by State Department of Fish and Game. Trend is unknown. | This inventory is completed by State Department of Fish and Game. Trend is unknown. |

Accomplishments:

| Forest Plan Goals and Objectives (Targets) | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|------|
| | Plan Base Year 1982 | Plan Goal 2000-2009 | 2005 | 2006 |
| Modoc Sucker (Suitable Stream Miles) | 13.4 | 19.4 | 19.4 | 21.5 |
| Resident Fish (M Pounds)-All | 116.0 | 121.5 | No longer Calculated | |
| Resident Trout (M Pounds) | 43.0 | 46.9 | No longer Calculated | |
| Warmwater Fish (M Pounds) | 73.0 | 74.7 | No longer Calculated | |
| Resident Fish (M WFUD) | 25.7 | 36.5 | No longer Calculated | |
| Direct Habitat Improve. | | 0.6 | 0 | 0 |
| Induced Habitat Improve. | | 0.4 | 0 | 0 |

| Forest Accomplishments Using Common Target Tracking Measures | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Accomplishment item | Unit of Measure | 2005 Planned | 2005 Actual | 2006 Planned | 2006 Actual |
| Wildlife TES Species Habitat Restored / Enhanced | Acres | | | | |

Evaluation of Fish and Wildlife Monitoring: Fifteen years experience shows that the Management Indicator Species process will not work to maintain wildlife on the Forest. This information, however,

does not provide the ability to tease out cause and effect monitoring information needed that is inherent in the assumption of managing wildlife by proxy inherent in the MIS scenario. The cost would be prohibitive for all 32 MIS and their habitat. Moreover, the information garnered would still not answer the question of how management actions are affecting all wildlife species on the Forest. Demographic monitoring for California spotted owls cost roughly \$250,000 for 80,000 acres on the Sierra National Forest (B. Laudenslayer, pers. comm.). This cost could become even higher for wide ranging species with low natural densities.

A second problem was that the Forest Plan did not make allowances for natural changes in habitat or populations due to management activities or natural events. Predation, disease, hunting, conditions in other parts of the globe, competition, and other considerations outside the influence of land management may cause populations to fluctuate. While the Forest Service may be able to enhance or manage habitat for a species, stochastic events can still cause precipitous declines in natural population levels. Therefore, the best the Forest can do is to provide the habitats to allow wildlife species to occur.

Likewise, attempting to count and monitor recreation visitor days associated with hunting, fishing, or bird/animal watching is not within the Forest ability to monitor on an annual basis. Use by recreation type is estimated on a 4-5 year basis utilizing the National Recreation Visitor Use Survey. The outdated measure of WFUDs – Wildlife and Fish User Days is no longer utilized by the Forest Service or other land management agency.

Monitoring Results for General Administration Goals

National Strategy: Goal 6: Conduct mission-related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals. Improve the productivity and efficiency of other mission-related work and support programs. Provide current resource data, monitoring, and research information in a timely manner. Meet Federal financial management standards and integrate budget with performance. Maintain the environmental, social, and economic benefits of forests and grasslands by reducing their conversion to other uses. Maintain Office of Safety and Health Administration standards. Develop and maintain the processes and systems to provide and analyze scientific and technical information to address agency priorities.

Forest Plan Goals: Work toward an effectively staffed organization. Maintain effective communications and relations within the organization and support a positive and bilateral program of labor-management relations. Develop an organizational climate that encourages open communication, understanding and dedication to Forest Goals. Develop a workforce that is representative of the population, and has a high level of professionalism with opportunities for development. Conduct an informational and educational program to inform and involve the public, other agencies, and Forest employees in activities and issues.

Community Participation

Strategic Plan Goals: Conduct mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals.

Forest Plan Goals: Involve and cooperate with federal, State and local agencies, industry, private landowners, and the general public in planning resource use, protection and management of government and other land. Solicit viewpoints in developing the Forest Plan and programs.

Tribal Government Program

Strategic Plan Goals: Conduct mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals.

Forest Plan Goals: The goals are to improve relationships with Indian people, develop partnerships with local Native American organizations, and emphasize increased understanding, communication, and partnerships with Indian tribes, organizations, and communities.

Monitoring: Monitoring consists of tracking the actions taken to improve relations with tribal groups. The Forest Plan did not establish monitoring goals for tribal relations.

Accomplishments: Consulted on a variety of projects related to vegetation management, fuels reduction and wildlife habitat. We supported the Shasta-Trinity National Forest in resolving conflicts related to the Winemum Wintu Balas Chonas Puberty Ceremony. The Modoc is the lead Forest to develop a consistent approach for consultation between the Pit River Tribe and the Lassen, Shasta-Trinity and Modoc National Forests. A conflict-free traditional tribal gathering was held at Medicine Campground. We have incorporated the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment Record of Decision, VIII Implementation, Section E, Native American Items in our consultation and decision making.

Evaluation: The Modoc has had a tribal relations program for fifteen years. Our relationships with the tribes have improved steadily as the Forest is more able to stay on top of changes in tribal government, early identification of issues, rumor control and personal communication with key individuals. Many surrounding forests and other agencies rely on the expertise on the Modoc for assistance on their tribal relations problems and issues.

Environmental Education

Strategic Plan Goals: Conduct mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals.

Forest Plan Goals: Conduct an informational and educational program to inform and involve the public, other agencies, and Forest employees in activities and issues.

Monitoring: The Forest Plan did not assign monitoring targets for environmental education activities.

Accomplishments: Many Forest employees enthusiastically participate in conservation education programs in cooperation with the public schools by contributing their time and expertise in indoor and outdoor classroom education. A short list of activities conducted on an annual basis includes: participation in the Modoc High School Resource Academy, Modoc County Fair, Modoc County Children's Fair, Butte Valley Fair, Fandango Days, Adin School Resource Day, and numerous school environmental and fire prevention education presentations.

In 2005 the interpretive plan for the Emigrant Trails Scenic Byway was completed. The Forest also updated 36 recreation opportunity guides and produced one camping brochure during 2006.

Evaluation: The Forest focus on environmental education is providing quality information and maximum participating in local activities which provide an opportunity for the Forest to inform and involve the public in learning about the environment and Forest management activities. The national measured output is on the number of recreation interpretation and education products provided to standard.

Resource Advisory Committee Projects

The Modoc National Forest participates with a local Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) under the auspices of "The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000" (Public. Law No. 106-393) proposes projects and funding to the Secretary of Agriculture under section 203 of the Act. Projects are proposed by vote of RAC members. The Forest Service completes the grant forms and performs required environmental assessments under the National Environmental Policy Act. Grant forms are forwarded to the Chairman of the Modoc County Board of Supervisor's for signature. At this point, RAC projects are funded, tabled, or cancelled. Thus not all RAC project proposals are implemented. The membership requirements of the law require a balanced view of natural resource management among the participants. The current members of the Modoc National Forest's RAC consist of individuals from a broad spectrum of social, economic and environmental views. The Modoc County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) was chartered September 30, 2001. Since that time the RAC has made recommendations and provided funding to the Forest on projects that improve watershed, recreation, wildlife, facilities, forest health and roads on or adjacent to the MDF. In FY 05 – FY06, the Modoc County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) approved a total of 19 projects. The approval of many projects continues to supplement the forest's declining budget and enable us to accomplish our resource

objectives. The Modoc National Forest's RAC projects status and funding at the end of FY 2006 are listed below:

| Resource Advisory Committee Project Proposals Project Name | FUNDING | | Status |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | Approved | Spent | |
| Logan Slough Boat Ramp | \$15,020 | \$15,172 | Completed |
| Roney Flat Road Repair | \$3,000 | \$1,548 | Completed |
| Supplemental Range Help | \$40,000 | \$35,737 | Completed |
| North Parker/Granger Drift Fence | \$11,723 | \$9,738 | Completed |
| Guzzler Replacement | \$20,000 | \$22,907 | Active |
| Devils' Garden Guzzlers Partnership | \$6,825 | \$6,825 | Completed |
| Devil's Garden Wetlands Maintenance | \$16,275 | \$8,256 | Completed |
| Sugar Hill Lookout Renovation | \$90,000 | \$29,278 | Completed |
| Western Juniper Mgmt. Strategy Phase I, II and III | \$255,000 | \$255,000 | Active |
| Modoc RAC Secretary | \$7,500 | \$8,405 | Completed |
| Modoc Native Seeds | \$30,000 | | Cancelled |
| Carr Allotment Archeological Survey | \$14,175 | \$14,753 | Completed |
| West Valley Juniper Archeological Survey | \$20,239 | \$21,090 | Completed |
| Noxious Weeds Books | \$10,000 | \$3,392 | Completed |
| Cedar Creek Interpretive Trail Water / Sanitation Project | \$124,000 | \$109,021 | Active |
| Carr Allotment Phase II | \$90,000 | \$90,000 | Active |
| Pit River Workers' Coop | \$12,000 | \$12,000 | Active |
| Pepperdine Equestrian Facility | \$143,000 | \$119,404 | Completed |
| Wild Horse Well | \$41,000 | \$41,302 | Active |
| Modoc County Noxious Weeds Treatment Phase I | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | Completed |
| West Valley Juniper Removal | \$23,900 | \$20,123 | Completed |
| RAC Training / RAC Assistant | \$11,000 | \$9,573 | Active |
| Specialized Lumber (Juniper) | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | Completed |
| Warner Mountain RD Small Timber Sale Program | \$12,356 | 5,369 | Active |
| Modoc County Noxious Weeds Treatment Phase II | \$75,250 | \$75,000 | Completed |
| Modoc County Noxious Weeds ATVs | \$16,000 | \$16,000 | Completed |
| Rose Creek Meadow | \$63,000 | \$63,000 | Active |
| Road 10 Repair | \$60,000 | \$32,467 | Completed |
| Emerson Campground Repair | \$60,000 | \$36,239 | Active |
| Cal Pines Fuel Break II | \$45,000 | \$45,000 | Active |
| Day/Lassen Bench Fuel Reduction | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | Active |
| Two Mack Enterprise (Juniper Specialty) | \$25,000 | \$0 | Cancelled |
| Redtail Rim Trail Signs | \$7,500 | \$6029 | Active |
| Specialized Lumber Phase II | \$20,000 | \$20,000 | Active |
| Western Juniper Biomass Fuel Loading Study | \$63,200 | \$30,168 | Active |
| East Creek Campground and Trailhead | \$53,000 | \$9,646 | Active |
| Modoc County Noxious Weeds Treatment Phase III | \$80,000 | \$80,000 | Active |
| Day/Lassen Bench Fuel Reduction Phase II | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | Active |
| Modoc NF Noxious Weed Herbicide Treatment | \$25,000 | \$0 | Active |
| Triangle Allotment | \$76,000 | \$6,749 | Active |
| Sage Steppe DEIS | \$15,000 | \$0 | Active |
| Devil's Garden Wild Horse Trapping | \$22,205 | \$10,211 | Active |

The forest hosted a field trip for the Modoc County Resource Advisory Committee (RAC). The purpose of the field trip was to visit the various projects the RAC approved over the last several years. The field trip also included a tour of the Big Valley Power Plant, in Bieber, CA, that utilizes forest products in the manufacturing of small logs and forest biomass for generating power.

Partnerships

The forest is committed to developing partnerships with private businesses, nonprofit organizations, and federal and state agencies to integrate them into our program of work. At the end of fiscal year 2005, a Rural Development and Partnership position was filled on the forest. Brochures were developed describing partnership opportunities on the Modoc National Forest for distribution locally and at the

Regional Partnership Fair. The forest continues to work with local county and state agencies, other federal agencies, nonprofit organizations, and individuals to enter into partnerships to accomplish our program of work.

The forest is an active member of the Modoc Economic Vitality Work Group whose goal is to help provide direction for an expanded economic development program in Modoc County.

We coordinated with the Center for Nonprofit Resources out of Redding, CA, to put on a grant proposal writing and funding research workshop for representatives of the local school districts, county offices, and nonprofit organizations. Included in the workshop, was a section on Federal Grant Requirements put on by our Rural Development and Partnership Specialist.

We hosted community meetings for the presentation of the McConnell Foundation grant opportunity that just recently became available to Modoc County and also hosted a presentation on “How to Start a Sustainable Tourism Program” sponsored by the Conservation Fund.

The forest is actively working with the Surprise Valley Community and Visitor Center group in becoming a nonprofit organization and opening a visitor center in Surprise Valley.

Economic

Strategic Plan Goals: Conduct mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals.

Forest Plan Goals: The goals are to promote economic stability of local communities, develop partnerships for promoting economic stability, promote non-traditional Forest-based resource uses, emphasize a diversity of goods and services, highlight scenery and recreational opportunities, and encourage the utilization of wood products.

Monitoring: The Forest Plan did not designate any monitoring requirements for economic community stability. Commercial activities on the forest including firewood, grazing permits, road maintenance, commercial timber sales, etc were monitored to insure commercial products were available and produced follow environmental rules, regulations, and contracts.

Accomplishments: The Forest Plan did not designate any targets for environmental education.

In both 2005 and 2006 the Forest provided permits for commercial firewood providers, small timber and salvage sales, and participated or possessed grants for community development projects.

Evaluation: The production of goods and services continually falls below local community expectations. Enforcement of environmental laws and production restrictions are seen as overly aggressive, especially in the ranching community. Most commercial operators are frustrated by delays caused by Forest Service policy and procedures particularly in relation to the length of time it takes to complete NEPA and Appeals processes.

Budget

Strategic Plan Goals: Conduct mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals. Meet Federal financial management standards and integrate budget with performance.

Forest Plan Goals: The Forest Plan did not have goals for budget allocation or utilization. It did contain the following budget information and assumptions in relation to Forest outputs: Actual budgets may be less than required to achieve all outputs; Outputs are based on assumptions used in modeling- actual outputs from treatments may vary from those projected; Activities will comply with the management direction, i.e., standards and guidelines... Compliance with this direction may preclude full realization of projected outputs.

Monitoring: Budget allocations and all expenditures are monitored at the Regional and National level.

| Forest Plan Monitoring Accomplishments | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Unit costs and values | Improve Cost and Value Estimates for Planning Purposes | Unit cost estimates are above assigned unit costs values set for the Forest by the Region | Unit cost estimates are above assigned unit costs values set for the Forest by the Region |
| Budget | Determine if budgets have significantly affected production of projected outputs. | Fixed and declining budgets by program area have resulted in significant below plan achievements in nearly all areas. | Fixed and declining budgets by program area have resulted in significant below plan achievements in nearly all areas. |

Accomplishments:

| Forest Plan Goals and Objectives (Targets) | | | | |
|--|---|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| | Plan Base Year 1982 (In 1982 dollars no inflation) | Plan Goal 2000-2009 (1982 dollars no inflation) | 2005 (In 2005 Dollars) | 2006 (In 2006 Dollars) |
| Total Budget (MM\$) | 9.6 | 12.9 | 17.5 | 14.6 |
| Total Cost (MM\$) | 11.5 | 15.2 | 15.5 | 12.1 |
| | | | (In 1982 Dollars) | (In 1982 Dollars) |
| Total Budget (MM\$) | 9.6 | 12.9 | 10.05 | 8.25 |
| Total Cost (MM\$) | 11.5 | 15.2 | 8.90 | 6.84 |

The figures highlighted in this table are based on the Gross Domestic Product Deflator Inflation Calculator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which is located at <http://www1.jsc.nasa.gov/bu2/inflateGDP.html>

Evaluation: Declining or flat budgets in nearly all program areas continue to cause the Forest to miss Forest Plan projected outcomes. Budget planning errors of over 5 years ago when the Forest changed budgeting and allocation cause problems as the Region allocates much of the budget based on history rather than Forest Plans. Further, the Region budget allocation does not assign realistic unit costs in all cases. The original plans and amendments were not developed utilizing realistic budget projections and costs of implementation. Therefore, Forest Plan outputs may not be achieved due to high costs of extensive NEPA analysis, monitoring, base line data collection, and upward reporting requirements.

The objectives are average annual outputs and activities for the first two decades 1990-1999 and 2000-2010. These outputs provide long-term direction and help in developing annual work plans and budget requests. They are based on the computer-modeled outputs displayed for the Preferred Alternative in the EIS. Due to centralized budgeting and allocation processes put in place since the Forest Plan was developed, the Forest no longer submits budget requests. Our program of work is based on meeting assigned targets and program direction developed at the Regional and National utilizing Forest Plan direction and mitigations.

National budget rules prevent tracking of costs by individual projects as was done when the Forest Plan was developed. The centralized national processes have resulted in Forest managers having to develop and maintain cuff records and spreadsheets (unofficial records) in an attempt to keep projects within budgets. Now expenditures are tracked by major congressionally determined budget line items by Forest. The region determines costs per unit based on historical data and contract information which frequently fails to include all associated overhead, NEPA analysis, and other related support charge which have to be paid regardless of whether or not the project is completed by a contractor or FS employees.

The National and Regional emphasis on partnerships and grant utilization also fail to reflect the true costs of Forest participation. Partners and grant providers are often reluctant to participate at the Forest level

without the Forest Service providing a match or majority of the project funds. They are also unwilling to pay for support costs such as NEPA analysis, contract costs, and rents and utilities since they assume that these are already paid for by regularly allocated funds. Declining budget allocations make more and more difficult to utilize alternative sources of funding.

Annual changes in budget allocations make it impossible for the Forest to develop a coherent program of work or work force. In addition the constantly changing budget, allocation, and expenditure processes and procedures result in inconsistent data that can not be compared or analyzed. The Forest Plan monitoring plan should be adjusted to remove the existing criteria for budget monitoring as there is no link between Forest planning and the budget and allocation process.

Facilities

Strategic Plan Goals: Conduct mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals. Maintain Office of Safety and Health Administration standards.

Forest Plan Goals: The goals are to provide an economical, safe, and environmentally sensitive transportation system; emphasize maintenance and restoration over new construction; and provide safe and effective administrative sites and facilities.

Monitoring: Much of the work in transportation management is routine and done strictly within established best management practices. Program activities are currently monitored under forest resource programs. The transportation staff works closely with Forest resource personnel to identify road-related projects that will improve watershed health and mitigate potential resource impacts. Facility conditions are surveyed on a recurring basis. Comprehensive codes and regulations are used to ensure the accomplishment of proper planning, maintenance, construction, and accessibility upgrades.

Facilities

Strategic Plan Goals: Conduct mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals. Maintain Office of Safety and Health Administration standards.

Forest Plan Goals: Provide cost-effective administrative facilities. Provide a cost-effective communications system designed to meet resource objectives.

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Building, utility, and dam function | Evaluate facility maintenance, replacement needs, and energy consumption. | Inadequate facilities or excessive energy consumption. | Facilities funds lag maintenance needs by a large amount resulting in deteriorating buildings and inefficient energy consumption. Dams are inspected annually and meet current standards. The Facilities Master Plan was completed in FY04 Contracts were awarded for a new Warehouse and a new Construction and Maintenance facility . |

Accomplishments:

| Forest Plan Goals and Objectives (Targets) | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|------|------|
| | Plan Base Year 1982 | Plan Goal 2000-2009 | 2005 | 2006 |
| Dams Forest Service (Number) | 120.0 | 120.0 | 120 | |
| Dams Other Federal (Number) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | |
| Dams Other State/Local (Number) | 29.0 | 29.0 | 30 | |
| Dams Private (Number) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | |

| Forest Plan Goals and Objectives (Targets) | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|------|------|
| | Plan Base Year 1982 | Plan Goal 2000-2009 | 2005 | 2006 |
| Administrative Sites Forest Service Owned (Number) | 12.0 | 16.0 | 14 | |
| Administrative Sites Leased Number) | 4.0 | 0.0 | 4 | |

Evaluation: As in past years, the Forest was faced with declining budgets and increased maintenance costs. The Master Facilities Plan was completed in 2004. The monitoring requirements in the Forest Plan are not adequate to evaluate achievement of the Forest Plan goals. Communications infrastructure has been centralized into a National organization; the Forest no longer has the ability to influence cost of the communications system. Accounting for facilities such as dams and administrative sites is not necessary in the Forest Plan. Other established processes such as the Facilities Master Plan, the INFRA database, and capital investment tracking systems are more appropriate methods of tracking than establishing these facilities numbers as Forest Plan goals and objectives.

Roads and Trails

Strategic Plan Goals: Improve public access to NFS land and water and provide opportunities for outdoor health-enhancing activities. Improve the management of off-highway-vehicle use to protect natural resources, promote safety of all users, and minimize conflicts among various uses through the collaborative development and implementation of locally based travel management plans. Maintain Office of Safety and Health Administration standards.

Forest Plan Goals: Provide and manage a Forest Transportation System (roads and trails) to accomplish resource management objectives while protecting resource values.

| Forest Plan Monitoring Results | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| Activity, Effect, or Resource to be Measured | Objective | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2005 | Monitoring Conducted and General Results 2006 |
| Road and bridge construction, reconstruction, and maintenance, | Ensure road facilities support Forest National Strategic Objectives, protect resources, and comply with road development guidelines. | The forest has a large backlog of needed maintenance and reconstruction projects. The inventory of Un-Classified roads began in FY04. Updating the Forest Transportation Atlas and database continued through 2006. Final edits are still being completed. The atlas and database are complete current for 80-90% of the Forest. Inventory exceeds projected funding for maintenance but meets management needs. Individual projects evaluate if site specific short roads can be closed and removed from the roads system. | |
| Trail construction and maintenance. | Ensure adherence to the Trail system presented in Appendix & evaluate compliance with trail S&G's. | Facilities funds lag maintenance needs by a large amount resulting in deteriorating roads and trails. | |

Accomplishments: The NFS roads performance data is a national summary of what each region accomplishes at the forest level. At the forest level, data is collected by road program managers and verified by budget personnel. The forest data is then reviewed at the regional and Washington Office levels for accuracy.

| Forest Plan Goals and Objectives (Targets) | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|------|-------|
| | Plan Base Year 1982 | Plan Goal 2000-2009 | 2005 | 2006 |
| Trail Construction/Reconstruction (Miles) | 0.0 | 5.5 | 0 | 0 |
| Road Construction (Miles) | 9.3 | 10.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Road Reconstruction (Miles) | 21.7 | 25.0 | 0 | 0 |
| F.S. Road Maintenance (Miles) | 3,178.4 | 3,189.1 | 50 | 270.5 |

Evaluation: The Forest continues to receive insufficient funds to maintain the roads system. Only a small percentage of system roads were maintained. As a result, road quality continues to slowly decline.

The inventory and mapping (converted to electronic maps) of all classified and unclassified roads began in FY06. Work remains to tie the mapped data to the FS database. This information will be used to develop a system of designated roads, trails, and areas for use by motorized vehicles.

Human Resources

Strategic Plan Goals: Conduct mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals.

Forest Plan Goals: Provide opportunities for human resource program enrollees and volunteers to acquire knowledge, skills, and attitudes that will enhance their professional and personal goals.

Monitoring: The Forest Plan monitoring section did not designate any monitoring requirements for human resources area.

Accomplishments:

| Forest Plan Goals and Objectives (Targets) | | | | |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|------|------|
| | Plan Base Year 1982 | Plan Goal 2000-2009 | 2005 | 2006 |
| Programs (Enrollees) | 11.0 | 3.0 | 1 | 1 |

Evaluation: The Forest Plan targets were based on the number of program enrollees for programs such as the YCC, YACC, SCEP, etc. These programs are no longer run or administered by the Forest Service so this tracking target should be dropped from the Forest Plan. The Forest Plan goal of providing volunteers is also not appropriate to be included in the Forest Plan. Although volunteers are vitally important to achieving our annual program of work the monitoring and tracking volunteer achievements is carried out in separately from developing and monitoring goals within the NFMA process; therefore, this item should be removed from Forest Plan monitoring.

Workforce and Organization Change

Organizational change combined with fluctuating budgets has combined to make development of a consistent program of work and stable workforce difficult. Filling vacant positions is a source of concern. The forest also had between 30-40 vacant permanent or part time positions during any month during the past 2 years.

The Modoc National Forest has continually reduced its workforce by combining duplicative positions and combining duties to the fewest personnel possible. Reductions in positions assigned to Modoc started with combining operations activities in contracting, personnel, finance and information management technologies with the Lassen and Plumas National Forests. The Forest currently operates with two combined Districts and two District Rangers.

The Forest allocates funds to Forest employees for training and development. Employees complete an Employee Development Program with the approval of the employee's supervisor. Employees attend those training classes best suited for their professional development within budget limitations. Computer security awareness training, Safety, Civil Rights, and Prevention of Sexual Harassment courses are required for all employees.

The Modoc National Forest was in full compliance with law regulation and policy providing equal opportunity for employment for all positions.

The Title VI report indicates that permit holders who provide services on NFS lands are providing those services in compliance with laws and regulations, and that Forest Service programs are provided to all users without regard to race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, or marital or family status.

Due to the centralization of personnel functions the workforce numbers were not available during the development of this initial report. These figures will be entered during finalization of the 2005 and 2006 sometime during FY 2007.

Modoc National Forest Employment 1991 through 2006

| Year | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 |
|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Modoc NF Employed | 230 | 212 | 236 | 262 | 236 | 247 | 234 | 168 | 158 | 147 | 177 | 190 | 201 | 198 | | |

Forest Planning

Strategic Plan Goals: Conduct mission related work in addition to that which supports the agency goals.

Forest Plan Goals: Complete, implement, and monitor a Forest Land and Resource Management Plan as outlined in the National Forest Management Act and the Secretary of Agriculture's regulations. Revise, maintain, and create data bases for monitoring and Plan revision. Coordinate land management planning with local and private planning and assist with related projects.

Monitoring: Chapter 5 of the Forest Plan provides the direction for monitoring the Forest Plan:

Accomplishments: The Modoc National Forest has begun the preliminary analysis and work necessary to undertake a Plan Revision. In 2006 the Forest began work on the Environmental Management System (EMS) and the Cumulative Evaluation Report (CER), both of which need to be undertaken as part of the 2005 Planning Regulations.

The Modoc National Forest began working with the BLM, Modoc County, and others in developing a strategy and basis for Forest Plan Amendment or Revision concerning sagebrush steppe and related ecosystem restoration through juniper management by publishing a NOI to develop an EIS to outline future management strategies in 2005.

| Forest Accomplishments Using Common Target Tracking Measures | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Accomplishment item | Unit of Measure | 2005 Planned | 2005 Actual | 2006 Planned | 2006 Actual |
| LRMP Monitoring and Evaluation Reports | Reports | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| LRPM Forest Plan Amendments | Amendments | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Evaluation: The direction contained in the Forest Plan is adequate to prevent environmental damage. The restrictive and prohibitive nature of much of the language in the Forest Plan may lead to not meeting Forest Plan goals and objectives. The Forest needs to revise the Forest Plan to focus on achieving long range goals rather than focusing on maintaining or protecting existing conditions.

The monitoring plan needs to be completely revised again focusing on measurable effects that lead to achievement of long range goals rather than counting or maintaining existing conditions.

Data Management

Strategic Plan Goals: Provide current resource data, monitoring, and research information in a timely manner. Develop and maintain the processes and systems to provide and analyze scientific and technical information to address agency priorities.

Goals: The Forest Plan does not designate any monitoring goals or objectives for data.

Monitoring: The Forest Plan does not designate any monitoring. Monitoring of quantity and quality of data management is monitored by the Regional Office as well as Forest specialists. Both these groups are more than satisfied with quality and quantity of work accomplishments with Forest GIS operations.

Accomplishments: The Forest Service's evolving databases and communication systems are increasingly becoming corporate. For example, the Forest Service internet web-pages at the Washington, Regional, and National Forest levels now have the same look and tools to links to subjects of interest. The Modoc National Forest's website opens to a wealth of information about Forest programs and projects. (<http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/Modoc/>)

The Forest Geographic Information System (GIS) staff makes professional map products and provides information for resource analysis by combining a series of standard corporate databases and computer applications designed to support and give users an integrated numeric/geographic toolset for data exploration and management. The databases contain basic natural resource and socio-economic data in standard formats built to run within the Forest Service computing environment enabling production of high quality maps and providing analysis which promotes integrated management of natural resources.

The Forest Service Natural Resource Information System (NRIS) combines a standard corporate database and computer applications designed to support field-level users. NRIS databases contain basic natural resource data in standard formats built to run within the Forest Service computing environment. This system provides employees, our partners, and the public with access to essential natural resource data needed to support the management decisions that form the core business of the Forest Service.

The Infrastructure Application (INFRA) - INFRA is a corporate Oracle database system. Infra includes many Engineering modules such as buildings, water systems, roads, travel routes, bridges and major culverts, dams, power systems, and communication systems. Range information and the Special Uses database are also housed in INFRA.

Evaluation: Creating, maintaining, gathering, and reporting data to higher levels of the organization, for use in forest reports, and providing information to the public is increasing straining the limited number of personnel on the forest that are trained in operation and maintenance of databases and to field personnel who must validate and collect much of the information. Some INFRA data has not been updated simply because it was more important to conduct water quality samples than to enter data.

Supporting Documentation

The supporting information for this report is on file in the various resource departments in the Supervisor's Office and at the District Ranger Offices.

Annual Progress Report 2004 Interagency Regional Monitoring, Northwest Forest Plan – 2005

Heritage Program Annual Reports from 1996 to present, Modoc National Forest

Road Accomplishment Reports

Forest Land Surveyor Record of marked and maintained boundaries, Modoc National Forest

Special Use Permits and related inspection reports, Modoc National Forest

Mineral Plans of Operations and mineral leases, Modoc National Forest

Rangeland Implementation Monitoring Report, Modoc National Forest

Grants and Agreements Log, Modoc National Forest

And the Following Databases: INFRA, FACTS, NFPORS

List of Contributors

The principal contributors to the 2005 Monitoring and Evaluation Report are listed below. Please contact one of us if you have questions or want further information about the reported results. Monitoring activity on the Forest involves many people, far too numerous to list here. In addition, many volunteers contributed their time and expertise, as did Ranger District employees across the Forest.

| Name | Position |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| Anne Mileck | Certified Silviculturist |
| Bill Schoeppach | Timber Staff Officer |
| Buck Silva | Forest Fire Management Officer |
| Cheryl Beyers | Botanist |
| Dan Meza | Tribal Relations Coordinator |
| Dina McElwain | Partnership Coordinator |
| Edie Asrow | Ecosystem Staff Officer |
| Gerry Gates | Forest Archaeologist |
| Jane Moore | Resources Assistant |
| Jayne Biggerstaff | Special Use Administrator |
| Jed Parkinson | Forest Engineer |
| Jessie Berner | Recreation Staff Officer |
| Laura Williams | Public Affairs Staff Officer |
| Lynda Holloman | Chief Financial Officer |
| Marty Yamagiwa | Wildlife Staff Officer |
| Mary Flores | Wildlife Biologist |
| Mike Kelly | Wilderness Ranger |
| Rob Jeffers | Forest Range Staff Officer |
| Robert Haggard | Public Services Staff Officer |

Acronyms

| | | | |
|-------|--|-------|--|
| ACS | Aquatic conservation strategy | FMU | Fire Management Unit |
| ADA | American with Disabilities Act | FPM | Forest Pest Management |
| AMP | Allotment Management Plan | FS | Forest Service |
| ASQ | Allowable Sale Quality | FSH | Forest Service Handbook |
| AUM's | Animal Unit Months | FSM | Forest Service Manual |
| BIA | Bureau of Indian Affairs | FY | Fiscal Year |
| BLM | Bureau of Land Management | GIS | Geographic Information System |
| BMP | Best Management Practice | GPRA | Government Performance Results Act |
| BV | Big Valley Ranger District | HWY | Highway |
| CCF | Cubic Feet | INFRA | Infrastructure Application |
| CDFG | California Department of Fish and Game | MAR | Management attainment report |
| CE | Categorical Exclusion | MDF | Modoc National Forest |
| C&I | Criteria and Indicators | MEL | Most Efficient Level |
| DEIS | Draft Environmental Impact Statement | MICC | Modoc interagency command center |
| DG | Devils Garden Ranger District | MIS | Management Indicator Species |
| EA | Environmental Assessment | MMBF | Million Board feet |
| EAP | Economic Assistance Program | NEPA | National Environmental Policy Act |
| ER | Economic Recovery | NFP | National Fire Plan |
| ERA | Equivalent Roaded Acres | NRIS | National resource information system |
| FACTS | Forest Service Activity Tracking System | NWFPA | North West Forest Plan Amendment |
| FFPC | Fire Fight Production Capability | OHV | Off Highway Vehicle |
| FMIP | Financial Management Improvement Project | TANC | Transmission Agency of Northern California |
| RAC | Resource Advisory Committee | TES | Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive |
| RAMIS | Range Analysis Management Information system | TRACS | Timber Activity control system |
| S&G | Standards and Guidelines | VQO's | Visual Quality Objectives |
| SNFPA | Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment | WM | Warner Mountain Ranger District |
| SUP | Special Use Permits | | |
| SWW | South Warner Wilderness | | |
| | | | |