
Appendix V – Monitoring Plan for the Proposed RMPs

Monitoring is an essential component of an RMP. Monitoring provides information to determine whether the BLM is following the RMP management direction (implementation monitoring) and to verify if the implementation of the RMP is achieving plan-level desired results (effectiveness monitoring).

The monitoring plan for the Proposed RMP focuses specifically on monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of the RMP and is not intended as an all-encompassing strategy that addresses all ongoing monitoring and research efforts. This monitoring plan does not attempt to address research-based questions. There are many ongoing research-based efforts in which the BLM participates that address evaluating whether the RMP is based on correct assumptions (validation monitoring).

The use of this monitoring plan by all BLM offices in the decision area would provide a basis for consistent and coordinated monitoring, and allow district information to be compiled and considered at the scale of the entire decision area. The BLM would evaluate the monitoring questions at each monitoring interval to ascertain if the questions, reporting, methods, sample size, or intervals need to be changed. The BLM would make such changes to the monitoring plan through plan maintenance.

Effectiveness Monitoring

The BLM would continue to rely on the existing interagency effectiveness monitoring modules to address key questions about whether the RMP is effectively meeting its objectives. The existing interagency effectiveness modules are aquatic and riparian ecosystems, late-successional and old growth, marbled murrelet, northern spotted owl, socioeconomic, and tribal. Although there are differences in the objectives in the 1995 RMP and this Proposed RMP, the key questions that the existing interagency effectiveness modules are designed to answer are still relevant to the objectives of the Proposed RMP, as detailed below. These key questions address fundamental conditions and processes that underlie the objectives of both the 1995 RMP and this Proposed RMP. As such, answering these key questions through effectiveness monitoring will continue to provide a basis for the BLM to determine whether the RMP is effectively meeting its objectives.

The aquatic and riparian ecosystems effectiveness monitoring program assesses status and trends in watershed condition to answer the basic question:

- Is implementation of the RMP maintaining and restoring aquatic and riparian ecosystems to desired conditions on Federal lands in the planning area?

This monitoring effort determines riparian watershed condition status for every 6th field watershed (with > 5 percent Federal ownership along the stream length) based on upslope and riparian data derived from GIS layers and satellite imagery. In-channel attributes are also measured using a statistically valid survey design to assess aquatic watershed condition. Changes in riparian and aquatic conditions provide information for tracking status and trend based on management activities, natural disturbance, and wildfire. More information on the aquatic and riparian ecosystems effectiveness monitoring is contained in the 20-year Monitoring Report (Miller *et al.* 2015), which is incorporated here by reference.

The late-successional and old growth (LSOG) ecosystems effectiveness monitoring program characterizes the status and trend of older forests to answer the basic question:

- Is implementation of the RMP maintaining and restoring late-successional and old growth forest ecosystems to desired conditions on Federal lands in the planning area?

This monitoring effort determines the current status of forest vegetation from classification of satellite imagery and analysis of inventory and other available data. Remote sensing change detection and trend analysis provide information for tracking losses and gains in forest conditions from management activities, natural succession, and wildfire. More information on the late-successional and old growth ecosystems effectiveness monitoring is contained in the 20-year Monitoring Report (Davis *et al.* in press), which is incorporated here by reference.

The marbled murrelet effectiveness monitoring program assesses status and trends in marbled murrelet populations and nesting habitat to answer the basic questions:

- Are the marbled murrelet populations associated with the planning area stable, increasing, or decreasing?
- Is implementation of the RMP maintaining and restoring marbled murrelet nesting habitat?

This monitoring effort determines marbled murrelet population size and trends by sampling of populations in near-shore waters, using standardized and consistent methodology. Trends in the amount, quality, and distribution of nesting habitat in the planning area are evaluated periodically using a model approach that applies current vegetation maps along with other data derived from GIS layers and other available sources. More information on the marbled murrelet effectiveness monitoring is contained in the 20-year Monitoring Report (Falxa *et al.* 2015), which is incorporated here by reference.

The northern spotted owl effectiveness monitoring program assesses status and trends in northern spotted owl populations and habitat to answer the basic questions:

- Will implementing the RMP reverse the downward trend in spotted owl populations?
- Is implementation of the RMP maintaining and restoring owl habitat necessary to support viable owl populations?

Population monitoring documents survival, reproductive success, and annual rate of population change in northern spotted owl demographic study areas. Maps depicting habitat suitability are produced using habitat models applied to current vegetation maps developed by the LSOG monitoring program along with other available data sources. More information on the northern spotted owl effectiveness monitoring is contained in the draft 20-year Monitoring Report (Davis *et al.* 2015), which is incorporated here by reference.

The socio-economic effectiveness monitoring program assesses social and economic impacts of Federal forest management, framed as two questions:

- Are predictable levels of timber and non-timber resources available and being produced?
- Are communities and economies experiencing positive or negative changes that may be associated with Federal forest management?

The key objectives of the socio-economic effectiveness monitoring program are to identify communities experiencing significant positive or negative conditions or trends, as well as those that are not, and to improve understanding of the relationship between Federal forest management and social and economic change. To address the objectives above, the monitoring program analyzes trends in data for timber and non-timber resources. The monitoring program considers social and economic indicators derived from U.S. census data, analysis of quantitative data from agency databases, along with other available data. More information on the socioeconomic effectiveness monitoring is contained in the 20-year Monitoring Report (Grinspoon *et al.* 2015), which is incorporated here by reference.

The tribal effectiveness monitoring program addresses conditions, trends, and access to resources protected by treaty or of interest to American Indian tribes, the condition of and access to religious and cultural heritage sites, and the quality of the government-to-government relationship. The basic effectiveness monitoring questions are:

- How well and to what degree is government-to-government consultation being conducted under the RMP?

- Have the goals and objectives of the consultation been achieved?
- Is the consultation occurring because of effects on resources of tribal interest on Federal lands or trust resources on tribal lands?

Effectiveness monitoring data are collected during interviews using a standardized questionnaire developed by Federal agency officials. All federally recognized Tribes with Tribal lands and/or territories within the RMP area will be invited to participate in interviews. More information on the tribal effectiveness monitoring is contained in the 20-year Monitoring Report (Vinyeta and Lynn 2015), which is incorporated here by reference.

The interagency effectiveness monitoring modules would continue to report every 5 years. The BLM would continue to use these reports to state the findings and conclusions made through monitoring, and to serve as a report to managers and the public. Effectiveness monitoring reports would also include analysis of whether the BLM is achieving desired conditions based on effectiveness monitoring questions and, where possible, inform adaptive management.

In addition to the six interagency effectiveness monitoring modules, the BLM would conduct effectiveness monitoring of hazardous fuels treatments through the Fuels Treatment Effectiveness Monitoring (FTEM) system. The FTEM is a centralized interagency web-based hub for recording on-the-ground documentation describing the effect of hazardous fuels reduction treatments on the wildland fire environment, framed around two key questions:

- Did the fire behavior change as a result of the treatment (as planned in the treatment objectives)?
- Did the treatment contribute to control of the fire?

The FTEM system is intended to identify the extent which hazardous fuels treatments are affecting the wildland fire environment. Field personnel from each field office will fill out an online form for every hazardous fuels reduction treatment intersected by a wildfire, within 90 days of the wildfire burning in the treated area.

The BLM will conduct monitoring of employment effects on low-income populations in Coos and Curry Counties.⁵⁶ The Proposed RMP/Final EIS identified that the RMP will have disproportionately negative employment effects on low-income populations in Coos and Curry counties. Although the BLM will monitor the level and type of timber harvest, payments to counties, and changes in resource conditions, these measurements will not tell the BLM how low-income populations are being affected. The BLM will conduct monitoring, that will identify and track appropriate indicators of social and economic conditions. The BLM will conduct primary research, such as focus groups or interviews with community residents, leaders, and others, to supplement and interpret the secondary data. The results of the monitoring will allow the BLM and its partners to identify environmental justice impacts that have not been mitigated through the RMP as implemented or by other means, pointing the way toward potential mitigation actions.

Implementation Monitoring

The implementation monitoring plan for the Proposed RMP would assess the level of management activity and would examine if the BLM is implementing actions in accordance with management direction of the RMP.

⁵⁶ This monitoring component is not effectiveness monitoring in the same sense as the other components described in this section, in that it would not be directly evaluating whether the RMP is effectively meeting its objectives. Instead, this monitoring would evaluate whether the employment effects in Coos and Curry Counties identified in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS are occurring as analyzed and would identify any potential mitigation measures that would be revealed by the monitoring of effects, such as changes to the intensity or extent of management actions under specific resource programs.

The BLM would employ sampling or evaluation of a subset of implementation actions. The BLM has designed the monitoring plan for the Proposed RMP to avoid prohibitive costs and effectively answer monitoring questions and reporting levels of activities. It is not necessary or desirable for the BLM to monitor every implementation action of an RMP. The BLM would select projects to be monitored based on those that would yield a greater amount of information or be more beneficial. For example, a random sample may result in monitoring of a relatively small straightforward project that would yield limited information, whereas a more sophisticated or complex project might be available for monitoring that would yield more information or be more effective. As much as possible, project implementation monitoring would be integrated among resources and programs. This integration saves time and costs, and helps build common information and understanding between various resources and programs.

The BLM would conduct sampling at the level of the entire administrative unit to which the resource management applies (e.g., Medford District or Klamath Falls Field Office).

The BLM would report implementation monitoring results annually in a monitoring report, which may be combined with other documents, such as an annual program summary. The monitoring report would report, track, and assess the progress of plan implementation, state the findings and conclusions made through monitoring, and serve as a report to managers and the public. Monitoring reports would also include any discussions and analysis of non-compliance and recommendations for corrective action.

Some management direction in the Proposed RMP is not measurable or quantifiable, or does not have a standard or threshold of acceptability, and therefore would not lend itself to being addressed through monitoring questions that are almost always dependent on a quantifiable basis of measurement. The level of activity for certain management direction that does not have standards or thresholds of acceptability would be monitored in the form of a program reporting item. The BLM will use the information in the program reporting items, to assess the level of management activity and examine if the BLM is implementing actions consistent with the analytical assumptions in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS.

In some cases, where monitoring indicates very high compliance with the plan, the BLM would subsequently adjust the frequency or interval of monitoring for cost and time efficiency.

Monitoring of certain questions would not take place in the early years of implementation, because the BLM would not yet have completed projects and, therefore, would not be ready for monitoring. Although incomplete projects may be informally examined by managers to assess progress towards implementing management actions and achieving objectives, the evaluation of incomplete projects would not be part of formal plan monitoring. Not all programs or resources have monitoring questions.

Monitoring Questions

Late-Successional Reserve

M1. Monitoring Question: Have the number of snags been created in the appropriate size classes as described in the management direction (**Appendix B, Table B-3**)?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least one completed timber sale in a Late-Successional Reserve per field office. Report the number of snags created > 20" DBH and > 10" DBH per project.

Monitoring Interval: Annual; change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

M2. Monitoring Question: Has the amount of down woody material described in the management direction been retained when implementing fuels or prescribed fire treatments (**Appendix B, Table B-4**)?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least one fuels or prescribed fire treatment in the Late-Successional Reserve per field office. Report the percent cover of down woody material and the method used to measure percent cover.

Monitoring Interval: Annual; change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

Late-Successional Reserve – Dry

M3. Monitoring Question: Have the Medford District and the South River Field Office of the Roseburg District applied selection harvest or commercial thinning to meet decadal acreage targets set forth in the RMP? Note that acreage in untreated skips counts towards total treatment acreage for this calculation.

Monitoring Requirement: Report acres of thinning and selection harvest sold and the cumulative total since approval of the plan. Also, report as an annual average and compare with the annual average required to meet decadal acreage targets.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

Riparian Reserve

Note: Monitoring questions M4–M9 do not apply to Eastside Management Area – Riparian Reserve.

M4. Monitoring Question: Is the width of the Riparian Reserve established adjacent to regeneration harvests in the Moderate Intensity Timber Area or Low Intensity Timber Area in accordance with the RMP?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate all streams within at least one completed timber sale per field office.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

M5. Monitoring Question: When thinning treatments are applied in the Riparian Reserve along fish-bearing streams and perennial streams, is a minimum of 30 percent canopy closure and 60 trees per acre retained? Are thinning treatments excluded from the inner zone of the Riparian Reserve along perennial and intermittent fish-bearing streams?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate all fish-bearing streams and perennial streams treated within at least one completed thinning timber sale per field office.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

M6. Monitoring Question: When thinning treatments are applied in the Riparian Reserve along intermittent non-fish-bearing streams, is a minimum of 30 percent canopy closure and 60 trees per acre retained? Are thinning treatments excluded within inner zone of the Riparian Reserve along intermittent non-fish bearing streams?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate 0.25 mile of streams within thinning projects completed within the past year per field office.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

M7. Monitoring Question: Were Best Management Practices that were identified as applicable (as indicated through NEPA decision record or contract stipulations) applied during project implementation?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least one project with identified Best Management Practices per field office. Projects from any land use allocation may be selected for evaluation.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

M8. Monitoring Question: Have the number of snags been created in the appropriate size classes as described in the management direction (**Appendix B, Table B-3**)?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least one completed timber sale that includes Riparian Reserve per field office. Report the number of snags created > 20” DBH and > 10” DBH per project.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

M9. Monitoring Question: Has the amount of down woody material described in the management direction been retained when implementing fuels or prescribed fire treatments (**Appendix B, Table B-4**)?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least one fuels or prescribed fire treatment in the Riparian Reserve per field office. Report the percent cover of down woody material and the method used to measure percent cover.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

Note: Monitoring question M10 applies only to Eastside Management Area – Riparian Reserve.

M10. Monitoring Question: Has the amount of streams in proper functioning condition been maintained or increased? (Eastside Management Area – Riparian Reserve only)

Monitoring Requirement and Monitoring Interval: Monitoring and reporting would be through the use of the statewide report, Table 1 from USDI TR-1737-9 1993 (or similar), of lotic and lentic waterbodies in properly functioning; functioning at risk with trend up, down or not apparent; and not properly functioning. (Note: Table 1 is available online, with instructions, at <http://www.blm.gov/nstc/library/pdf/Final%20TR%201737-9.pdf> and is also provided below (Table V-1 for reference purposes.)

State: _____

Table V-1. Example of Table 1–Functioning Condition Status from USDI TR-1737-9 (1993)

Habitat Types	Proper Functioning Condition	Functional – At Risk			Non-functional	Unknown	Totals
		Trend Up	Trend Not Apparent	Trend Down			
Riverine Miles (Lotic)							
Non-riverine Acres (Lentic)*							

* Report only acres associated with lentic riparian-wetland areas. Do not include acres associated with lotic riparian-wetland areas.

Eastside Management Area

M11. Monitoring Question: Are snags and coarse woody debris retained in accordance with RMP requirements?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least one completed timber sale.

Monitoring Interval: Annual, or each year in which there is a completed timber sale.

M12. Monitoring Question: Is a stand average relative density of 15–55 maintained after commercial harvest conducted for the removal and sale of timber and biomass?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least one completed timber sale.

Monitoring Interval: Annual, or each year in which there is a completed timber sale.

Harvest Land Base

M13. Monitoring Question: Has the allowable sale quantity been offered for sale within the variation provided for in the plan?

Monitoring Requirement: Report annual sale quantity offered for sale by sustained-yield unit and the cumulative total since approval of the plan. Also report as volume offered by harvest type (selection harvest, commercial thinning, regeneration harvest, and timber salvage) by sustained-yield unit.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

M14. Monitoring Question: Have the number of snags been created in the appropriate size classes as described in the management direction (**Appendix B, Table B-2**)?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least one completed timber sale per field office. Report the number of snags created > 20" DBH and > 10" DBH per project.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

M15. Monitoring Question: Are regeneration harvest areas, salvage harvest areas, and group selection openings being reforested in accordance with the RMP?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least one completed timber sale per field office.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

Harvest Land Base – Uneven-Aged Timber Area

M16. Monitoring Question: Is a stand average relative density of 20–45 percent maintained after commercial harvest?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least one completed timber sale per field office. Report the stand average relative density per stand treated within each timber sale evaluated.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

Harvest Land Base – Moderate Intensity Timber Area and Low Intensity Timber Area

M17. Monitoring Question: Is a stand average relative density of 25–45 percent maintained after commercial thinning?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least one completed timber sale per field office. Report the stand average relative density per stand treated within each timber sale evaluated.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

M18. Monitoring Question: Are trees retained after regeneration harvest in accordance with targets set forth in the RMP?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least one completed timber sale per field office.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

Air Quality

M19. Monitoring Question: Have smoke intrusions occurred in areas designated as Class I for air quality and non-attainment occurred as a result of BLM prescribed fire?

Monitoring Requirement: Report intrusions through Oregon Department of Forestry as required under the Oregon Smoke Management Plan.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

M20. Monitoring Question: Are important and relevant values being maintained or restored?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate 20 percent of the Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.

Monitoring Interval: Rotate the monitoring of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, so that all of the areas would be monitored over a 5-year period.

Rare Plants and Fungi

M21. Monitoring Question: Is management of plant species that are listed under the Endangered Species Act consistent with recovery plans and designated critical habitat?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least two completed projects per field office that ‘may affect’ ESA-listed species.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

M22. Monitoring Question: Have protection measures maintained populations of BLM special status plant and fungi species?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least two completed projects per field office in which the BLM implemented protection measures for BLM Special Status plant and fungi species.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

Cultural and Paleontological Resources Including American Indian Traditional Uses

M23. Monitoring Question: Were previously unknown sites discovered within project areas after the commencement of ground-disturbing activities? If yes, how many?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least 20 percent of management activities per field office that involve ground disturbance that have been completed within the past year.

Monitoring Interval: Annual

M24. Monitoring Question: Have ground-disturbing actions avoided previously recorded sites that are listed (or eligible for listing) on the National Register of Historic Places?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate 100 percent of recorded listed or eligible sites that lie within the boundaries of a ground-disturbing project after the project is completed. Report number of sites present and number of sites avoided.

Monitoring Interval: Annually when listed or eligible sites are present and avoidance prescribed.

M25. Monitoring Question: Are mitigation measures employed on sites that are listed (or eligible for listing) on the National Register of Historic Places prior to disturbance (when disturbance cannot be practically avoided) through practices such as data recovery, including excavation, relocation, or documentation?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate 100 percent of sites that are listed (or eligible for listing) on the National Register of Historic Places that were at risk of loss from ground disturbing management activities that have been completed within the past year. Report number of sites at risk and number of sites that were mitigated and with what methods.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

M26. Monitoring Question: Are cultural and paleontological resources that are threatened by natural processes or human activity (other than Federal undertakings) stabilized and protected or excavated and the data recovered where warranted by the scientific importance of the site?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate 100 percent of cultural and paleontological resources threatened or impacted by events that have happened within the past year. Report number of sites threatened or impacted and report number of sites stabilized or protected and with what measures.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

Energy and Minerals

M27. Monitoring Question: Has the level of opportunities for the exploration and development of locatable, leasable, and salable mineral resources been maintained?

Monitoring Requirement: Identify new closures and withdrawals.

Monitoring Interval: Five years.

Fire and Fuels Management

M28. Monitoring Question: Were fuels managed to reduce wildfire hazard, risk to communities, and negative impacts to ecosystems, and highly valued resources?

Monitoring Requirement: Summarize the primary and secondary reason for treatments and the primary and secondary initiative for all treatments, based on spatial inventory treatment data.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

M29. Monitoring Question: Have fuels treatments created fuel beds and fuel breaks intended to reduce potential fire behavior, reduce potential wildfire severity, or improve fire management opportunities?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least one treatment per field office.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

M30. Monitoring Question: Did risk-based wildfire management decisions implemented in response to natural ignitions include an examination of the full range of fire management options?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate 100 percent of Wildland Fire Decision Support System decisions completed.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

M31. Monitoring Question: Did land management treatments intersected by wildfires change fire behavior, minimize negative wildfire effects and damage to resource values, or positively contribute toward fire management opportunities?

Monitoring Requirement: Complete a treatment effectiveness assessment of 100 percent of treatments intersected by wildfire.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

Hazardous Materials

M32. Monitoring Question: Has the response to hazardous material incidents included cleanup, proper notifications, criminal investigations, and site assessments as applicable?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate 100 percent of hazardous material incidents.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

M33. Monitoring Question: Are hazardous materials stored, treated, and disposed of in accordance with applicable laws and regulations?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate 100 percent of district-stored, treated, and disposed hazardous materials.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

Invasive Species – Port-Orford-cedar Root Disease (*Phytophthora lateralis*)

M34. Monitoring Question: Are General Direction requirements from the Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan Amendment for Management of Port-Orford-cedar in Southwest Oregon, Coos Bay, Medford, and Roseburg Districts (USDI BLM 2004) for maintaining and reducing the risk of *Phytophthora lateralis* infections being implemented?

Monitoring Requirement: Describe the general activities accomplished for maintaining and reducing the risk of *Phytophthora lateralis* infections, which may include modifying Port-Orford-cedar bough collection permits to include prevention practices, applying adaptive management, community outreach, and eradication activities.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

M35. Monitoring Question: Are project-specific management actions applied as required in the Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan Amendment for Management of Port-Orford-cedar in Southwest Oregon, Coos Bay, Medford, and Roseburg Districts (USDI BLM 2004) when a need is indicated by using the Port-Orford-cedar Risk Key on page 32?

Monitoring Requirement: Describe where Port-Orford-cedar root disease management actions have been incorporated into project-specific implementation monitoring programs. Port-Orford-cedar root disease management actions could include seasonal restrictions, using uninfested water, unit scheduling, designating access routes, and public education through signage in site-specific project design and implementation.

Monitoring Interval: Annual.

Lands, Realty, Access, and Transportation

M36. Monitoring Question: Have the acres of O&C lands of all classifications and the acres of O&C and public domain lands that are available for harvesting been reduced through disposal, exchange, or purchase?

Monitoring Requirement: Review O&C lands records through the Oregon State Office. Evaluate total net change in land tenure of O&C lands in the decision area. Evaluate changes at 10-year intervals keyed from 1998, the date of the legislation that provides for no net loss of O&C lands.

Monitoring Interval: Three years.

Livestock Grazing

Note: Monitoring questions **M37** through **M39** apply only to the Medford District and the Klamath Falls Field Office of the Lakeview District.

M37. Monitoring Question: Has the condition of public rangelands been maintained or improved compared to the baseline year of 2015?

Monitoring Requirement and Monitoring Interval: In ‘I’ category allotments, examine trend plots every five years, determine condition every 10 years, and record utilization data every other year. In ‘M’ allotments, determine trend and condition every ten years and utilization every five years. Monitoring in ‘C’ allotments is limited to periodic inventories and observations to measure long-term resource condition changes.⁵⁷

M38. Monitoring Question: Are areas disturbed by natural and human-induced events (including wildland fire, prescribed burns, timber-management treatments, and juniper reduction treatments) rested from livestock grazing? Is livestock grazing resumed only after a determination that soil and vegetation has recovered sufficient to support livestock grazing (except where livestock grazing would either not impede site recovery, or where livestock grazing could be used as a tool to aid in achieving recovery objectives)?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate 10 percent of disturbance events.

Monitoring Interval: Annual; change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

M39. Monitoring Question: For streams with ESA-listed or anadromous fish species, is livestock restricted from riparian areas during spawning, incubation, and until 30 days following the emergence of juveniles from spawning beds?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate 20 percent of streams with ESA-listed or anadromous fish species within active grazing allotments.

Monitoring Interval: Annual; change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

Recreation

M40. Monitoring Question: Are Special Recreation Management Areas managed in accordance with their planning frameworks?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate 20 percent of the Special Recreation Management Areas.

Monitoring Interval: Annual. The monitoring of Special Recreation Management Areas would be rotated so that over a five-year period 100 percent of the areas would be monitored.

⁵⁷ Grazing allotments are assigned to one of three management categories: (I) Improve (M) Maintain, and (C) Custodial.

Soils

M41. Monitoring Question: Have land management actions created more than a 20 percent level of detrimental soil conditions at the unit treatment scale?

Monitoring Requirements: Evaluate 10 percent of each treatment unit per Field Office that has the potential to affect the existing soil resource condition. Use Forest Soil Disturbance Monitoring Protocol (Page-Dumroese *et al.* 2009a, 2009b) to determine level of compaction and disturbance, amount of organic matter removed, and extent and intensity of prescribed burning or fuel reduction treatment areas.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

Visual Resource Management

M42. Monitoring Question: Is the level of change in character for the areas designated to be managed as VRM Class I, II, and III consistent with RMP requirements?

Monitoring Requirements: Evaluate 20 percent of activities that have the potential to affect the existing character in VRM Class I, II, and III.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

Wild Horses

M43. Monitoring Question: Is the population of wild horses in the Pokegama Herd Management Area maintained at the appropriate management level of 30–50 head?

Monitoring Requirement: Report on population surveys or censuses.

Monitoring Interval: Five years.

M44. Monitoring Question: Are horses from other herd areas periodically introduced to the Pokegama herd to maintain the genetic diversity of the herd?

Monitoring Requirement: Report all introductions.

Monitoring Interval: Five years.

M45. Monitoring Question: Are water developments maintained or established to provide season-long water for wild horses within the herd management area?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate 100 percent of water developments.

Monitoring Interval: Annual; change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

Wilderness Characteristics

M46. Monitoring Question: Are wilderness characteristics maintained in accordance with RMP requirements?

Monitoring Requirements: Report all management activities that would adversely affect wilderness characteristics in Wilderness Study Areas and Wilderness Areas and District-Designated Reserve – Lands Managed for their Wilderness Characteristics. Monitor for amount of degradation or loss of inventoried wilderness characteristics resulting from undue or unnecessary degradation as a result of human or natural causes.

Monitoring Interval: Five years.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

M47. Monitoring Question: Are the outstandingly remarkable values of designated Wild and Scenic river corridors (including those classified as Wild, Scenic, or Recreational) being maintained?

Monitoring Requirements: Evaluate 100 percent of BLM-authorized activities that have the potential to affect the outstandingly remarkable values of Wild and Scenic River corridors.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

M48. Monitoring Question: Are the outstandingly remarkable values of the eligible Nestucca River Segment B and suitable Little North Santiam River, North Fork Siletz River, Rogue River, Sandy River, Table Rock Fork – Molalla River, and West Fork Illinois River Wild and Scenic river corridors (including those classified as Wild, Scenic, or Recreational) being maintained?

Monitoring Requirements: Evaluate 100 percent of BLM-authorized activities that have the potential to affect the outstandingly remarkable values of these Wild and Scenic River corridors.

Monitoring Interval: Annual; change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

Wildlife

M49. Monitoring Question: Is management of species that are listed under the Endangered Species Act consistent with recovery plans and designated critical habitat?

Monitoring Requirement: Evaluate at least two completed projects per field office that ‘may affect’ ESA-listed species.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

M50. Monitoring Question: Have BLM actions in the Harvest Land Base caused the abandonment (i.e., caused a site to not be occupied during the year following the BLM action) of more than 10 percent of northern spotted owl occupied sites in the Harvest Land Base during the first decade of RMP implementation, more than an additional 15 percent of northern spotted owl occupied sites in the Harvest Land Base during the second decade of RMP implementation, and more than an additional 20 percent of northern spotted owl occupied sites in the Harvest Land Base per decade beginning with the third decade of RMP implementation?

Monitoring Requirements: The BLM State Office wildlife program lead will coordinate this monitoring requirement. BLM wildlife biologists in each district will estimate the number of sites in the Harvest Land Base occupied by a northern spotted owl territorial pair or resident single. Biologists will base their estimates on the most recent year of protocol surveys supplemented by the previous four years of protocol surveys and, if no protocol surveys of a site has been completed during the previous five years, by the most recent ten years of protocol surveys. BLM wildlife biologists in each district will examine all actions in the Harvest Land Base implemented under the RMP and estimate the number of northern spotted owl occupied sites in the Harvest Land Base that have been abandoned by northern spotted owls due to BLM actions in the Harvest Land Base. Although the behaviors of individual northern spotted owl pairs and singles vary, in general, the following are evidence that BLM actions caused site abandonment:

- The BLM modified or removed habitat in the nest patch, which commonly extends 300 meters from the occupied site.
- Following a BLM action in the 500-acre core use area surrounding the occupied site, less than 250 acres of the core use area supported nesting-roosting habitat, when all land ownerships are considered, regardless of the amount of nesting-roosting habitat in this area before the BLM action.
- Following a BLM action in the median provincial home range areas surrounding the occupied site, less than 40 percent of the home range area supported nesting-roosting habitat, when all land ownerships are considered, regardless of the amount of nesting-roosting habitat in this area before the BLM action.

If, following a BLM action, survey indicates that a site is occupied by a territorial pair or resident single, the biologist will determine that the BLM action did not cause site abandonment.

The State Office wildlife program leader will collect results from all BLM districts, make the plan-wide monitoring calculations, and report the results to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Monitoring Interval: Biologists will annually document all BLM actions associated with northern spotted owl occupied sites in the Harvest Land Base, and every 5 years will estimate the percent of occupied sites in the Harvest Land Base that were abandoned due to BLM actions implemented under the RMP.

M51. Monitoring Question: Have BLM actions avoided adverse effects to Fender’s blue butterfly, Oregon silverspot butterfly, Taylor’s checkerspot butterfly, streaked horned lark, vernal pool fairy shrimp, Oregon spotted frog, Lower Columbia River Distinct Population Segment of Columbian white-tailed deer, or western snowy plover, except when done in accordance with an approved recovery plan, conservation agreement, species management plan, survey and monitoring protocol, or critical habitat rule, and when the action is necessary for the conservation of the species?

Monitoring Requirements: Evaluate at least 20 percent of actions that ‘may affect’ Fender’s blue butterfly, Oregon silverspot butterfly, Taylor’s checkerspot butterfly, streaked horned lark, vernal pool fairy shrimp, Oregon spotted frog, Lower Columbia River distinct population segment of Columbian white-tailed deer, or western snowy plover.

Monitoring Interval: Annual – change interval to once every 3 years if 3 consecutive years of monitoring show 100 percent compliance.

Program Reporting Items

Program reporting items involve activities that are related to: (1) certain analytical assumptions that are pertinent to non-specific management actions; or (2) analytical assumptions pertinent to the analysis of environmental consequences in the Proposed RMP/Final EIS. Not all programs or resources have reporting items.

Late-Successional Reserve

R1. Program Reporting Item: Report the volume of non-ASQ timber offered for sale from the Late-Successional Reserve. Reporting would be annual.

Riparian Reserve

Note: Program Reporting Item R2 *does not* apply to Eastside Management Area – Riparian Reserve.

R2. Program Reporting Item: Report the volume of non-ASQ timber offered for sale from the Riparian Reserve. Reporting would be annual.

R3. Program Reporting Item: Report the number of fish-passage blockages that have been corrected and the number of resulting miles of stream habitat that are newly accessible. Reporting would be annual.

R4. Program Reporting Item: Report the miles of permanent road construction, road renovation, road improvement, and road decommissioning within the Riparian Reserve. Reporting would be annual.

R5. Program Reporting Item: Report the overall level of stream and riparian restoration activities (e.g., placement of large wood and boulders in streams, planting, and thinning). Report the level of stream restoration activities in high intrinsic potential streams, or streams with high priority fish populations. Reporting would be annual.

Eastside Management Area

R6. Program Reporting Item: Report the acres of group selection, commercial thinning, density management, and regeneration harvest. Reporting would be annual, or each year in which there is an completed timber sale.

Harvest Land Base

R7. Program Reporting Item: Report acres by treatment type for silvicultural treatments listed in the following table by Harvest Land Base sub-allocation. Compare against modeling results for the appropriate decade of implementation; see **Table V-2** and **Table V-3** for decade one and two values. See the Proposed RMP/Final EIS for subsequent decades. Report commercial thinning, selection harvest, regeneration harvest, and timber salvage harvest as acres sold, and report other treatment type categories as acres treated. Reporting would be annual.

Table V-2. Decade 1 modeled acres by treatment type by Harvest Land Base sub-allocation

Decade 1 Treatment Type*	Coos Bay			Eugene			Klamath Falls				Medford				Roseburg				Salem			Grand Total (Acres)
	MITA (Acres)	LITA (Acres)	Total (Acres)	MITA (Acres)	LITA (Acres)	Total (Acres)	UTA (Acres)	MITA (Acres)	LITA (Acres)	Total (Acres)	UTA (Acres)	MITA (Acres)	LITA (Acres)	Total (Acres)	UTA (Acres)	MITA (Acres)	LITA (Acres)	Total (Acres)	MITA (Acres)	LITA (Acres)	Total (Acres)	
Commercial Thinning*	840	430	1,270	3,000	420	3,420	-	-	-	-	-	200	1,410	1,610	-	4,200	4,580	8,780	6,310	910	7,220	22,300
Selection Harvest*	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,750	-	-	5,750	28,170	-	-	28,170	1,810	-	-	1,810	-	-	-	35,730
Regeneration Harvest*	2,620	510	3,130	9,460	980	10,440	-	110	340	450	-	420	2,590	3,010	-	3,110	3,020	6,130	11,120	1,100	12,230	35,380
Timber Salvage Harvest*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,940	-	-	1,940	80	220	-	300	-	-	-	2,240
Reforestation†	3,320	650	3,970	12,580	1,300	13,890	1,150	140	430	1,710	6,670	480	2,980	10,130	380	4,160	3,780	8,310	13,350	1,320	14,670	52,690
Manual Cutting	4,450	870	5,320	8,510	880	9,400	580	60	180	810	7,880	500	3,110	11,490	300	2,590	2,360	5,250	11,790	1,170	12,960	45,230
Mulching	-	-	-	-	-	-	350	30	100	480	980	60	360	1,400	260	2,260	2,050	4,580	-	-	-	6,450
Tubing	1,810	350	2,160	9,460	980	10,440	120	10	30	160	340	30	180	550	260	2,300	2,080	4,640	5,560	550	6,110	24,060
Shading	-	-	-	950	100	1,040	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,050
Trapping	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	650	40	230	920	-	-	-	-	1,670	170	1,830	2,760
Scalping	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	660	40	260	960	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	960
Pre-commercial Thinning	3,110	810	3,920	10,900	1,200	12,100	810	160	790	1,760	4,810	460	4,070	9,330	260	3,700	3,640	7,610	12,870	1,150	14,010	48,740
Pruning	260	50	310	1,890	200	2,090	230	20	70	320	330	20	130	480	20	200	180	400	560	60	610	4,220
Stand Conversion	100	20	120	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	120

* Acreage includes untreated portion of stand (i.e., skips, aggregate retention areas)

† Natural and artificial reforestation

‡ These estimates represent analytical results based on the vegetation modeling assumptions described in **Appendix C**. The BLM has made these assumptions and estimations solely for analytical purposes. These acreages of silvicultural treatments by district office and by Harvest Land Base sub-allocation for each decade do not represent management direction or restrictions on silvicultural treatments under the RMP. Silvicultural treatments would be implemented consistent with the management direction for the Harvest Land Base sub-allocation and consistent with project-level analysis and decision-making.

Table V-3. Decade 2 modeled acres by treatment type by Harvest Land Base sub-allocation

Decade 2 Treatment Type [‡]	Coos Bay			Eugene			Klamath Falls				Medford				Roseburg			Salem			Grand Total (Acres)		
	MITA (Acres)	LITA (Acres)	Total (Acres)	MITA (Acres)	LITA (Acres)	Total (Acres)	UTA (Acres)	MITA (Acres)	LITA (Acres)	Total (Acres)	UTA (Acres)	MITA (Acres)	LITA (Acres)	Total (Acres)	UTA (Acres)	MITA (Acres)	LITA (Acres)	Total (Acres)	MITA (Acres)	LITA (Acres)		Total (Acres)	
Commercial Thinning*	2,350	520	2,870	11,300	1,100	12,400	-	-	20	20	-	50	640	690	-	2,510	5,710	8,220	13,590	1,590	15,180	39,380	
Selection Harvest*	-	-	-	-	-	-	7,360	-	-	-	7,360	27,840	-	-	27,840	2,210	-	-	2,210	-	-	-	37,410
Regeneration Harvest*	1,680	500	2,180	4,450	770	5,220	-	90	350	440	-	200	2,610	2,810	-	3,090	3,380	6,470	8,750	980	9,730	26,850	
Timber Salvage Harvest*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,610	-	-	1,610	-	80	580	660	-	-	-	2,270
Reforestation [†]	2,140	630	2,770	5,920	1,020	6,940	1,470	110	440	2,020	6,450	230	3,010	9,680	440	3,960	4,950	9,350	10,500	1,170	11,680	42,440	
Manual Cutting	2,860	850	3,710	4,010	690	4,700	740	50	180	960	7,640	240	3,140	11,010	350	2,470	3,090	5,920	9,280	1,040	10,310	36,630	
Mulching	-	-	-	-	-	-	440	30	110	570	950	30	370	1,340	310	2,150	2,700	5,160	-	-	-	7,090	
Tubing	1,160	340	1,510	4,450	770	5,220	150	10	40	190	330	10	180	530	310	2,180	2,730	5,230	4,380	490	4,870	17,530	
Shading	-	-	-	450	80	520	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	530	
Trapping	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	630	20	240	880	-	-	-	-	-	1,310	150	1,460	2,350
Scalping	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	640	20	260	920	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	920	
Pre-commercial Thinning	1,680	500	2,180	4,450	770	5,220	1,030	90	350	1,470	4,630	200	2,610	7,440	310	3,170	3,960	7,440	8,750	980	9,730	33,480	
Pruning	170	50	220	890	150	1,040	290	20	70	380	320	10	130	460	20	190	240	450	440	50	490	3,040	
Stand Conversion	70	20	90	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90	

* Acreage includes untreated portion of stand (i.e., skips, aggregate retention areas).

[†] Natural and artificial reforestation

[‡] These estimates represent analytical results based on the vegetation modeling assumptions described in **Appendix C**. The BLM has made these assumptions and estimations solely for analytical purposes. These acreages of silvicultural treatments by district office and by Harvest Land Base sub-allocation for each decade do not represent management direction or restrictions on silvicultural treatments under the RMP. Silvicultural treatments would be implemented consistent with the management direction for the Harvest Land Base sub-allocation and consistent with project-level analysis and decision-making.

Rare Plants and Fungi

R8. Program Reporting Item: Report the acres of activities designed to maintain or restore natural plant communities on non-forest and non-commercial lands. Reporting would be annual.

Energy and Minerals

R9. Program Reporting Item: Report the number of biomass utilization projects. Reporting would be annual.

Fire and Fuels Management

R10. Program Reporting Item: Report the number of acres of hazardous fuels treatments by treatment type and by land use allocation (i.e., under burning, broadcast burning, hand pile and burn, landing pile and burn, machine pile and burn, slash and scatter, and mastication). Reporting would be annual.

Forest Management

R11. Program Reporting Item: Report the number of acres of silvicultural treatments by treatment type and by land use allocation, including commercial thinning, selection harvest, regeneration harvest, timber salvage harvest, reforestation (natural and artificial), manual cutting, mulching, tubing, shading, trapping, scalping, pre-commercial thinning, non-commercial thinning, pruning, and stand conversion. Report acres of commercial thinning, selection harvest, regeneration harvest, and timber salvage harvest as acres sold; report all other treatment types as acres treated. Reporting would be annual.

Invasive Species

R12. Program Reporting Item: Report the number of acres of manual, mechanical, cultural, chemical, and biological treatments used to manage invasive species infestations. Reporting would be annual.

R13. Program Reporting Item: Report the number of acres of invasive species inventories. Reporting would be annual.

R14. Program Reporting Item: Report the number of acres of inventory, manual, mechanical, cultural, and chemical treatments used to manage sudden oak death (*Phytophthora ramorum*) infections. Reporting would be annual.

Livestock Grazing

R15. Program Reporting Item: Report the findings of livestock grazing allotments towards meeting the Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management for Public Lands Administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the States of Oregon and Washington (USDI BLM 1997). Reporting would be annual.

R16. Program Reporting Item: Report the number of acres of prescribed livestock grazing used to control invasive plants, reduce fire danger, or accomplish other management objectives. Reporting would be annual.

R17. Program Reporting Item: Report the acres or number of range improvements. Reporting would be annual.

Socioeconomic

R18. Program Reporting Item: Report the payments to counties associated with BLM-administered lands including O&C, Coos Bay Wagon Roads, and Public Domain lands. Reporting would be annual.

R19. Program Reporting Item: Report receipts from timber sales, special forest products, recreation, and permits. Reporting would be annual.

R20. Program Reporting Item: Report appropriations; number of full time and temporary employees; and major new facility developments or improvements. Reporting would be annual.

Recreation

R21. Program Reporting Item: Report the number of service-oriented and outreach programs, including interpretation and education provided to visitors. Reporting would be annual.

R22. Program Reporting Item: Report the status of development of comprehensive travel management plans for off-highway vehicle management areas and travel management areas. Reporting would be annual.

R23. Program Reporting Item: Within Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs), conduct visitor studies or on-site monitoring to assess recreation outcome attainment, targeted recreation activity participation, and protection of recreation setting characteristics during the primary recreation use season. Reporting would be conducted along a rotating schedule, focusing on a cross section of SRMAs within one district each year. Monitoring cycle would run every six years between districts.

Special Forest Products

R24. Program Reporting Item: Report the number of permits for harvest and collection of special forest products. Reporting would be annual.

Soils

R25. Program Reporting Item: When greater than 20 percent of the acres treated in any manner have detrimental soil disturbance resulting from timber harvest or fuel reduction treatments, report the total number of treatment units and the representative percentage of total acres sampled these units entail. Base reporting on evaluation of at least 10 percent of the total number of completed timber harvest units and 10 percent of completed fuel reduction treatment units. Reporting would be annual.

Wildlife

R26. Program Reporting Item: Report the survey effort for marbled murrelet and the outcomes of that survey effort. For each survey polygon, report: acres of survey, years surveys were conducted, age of stand at time of survey, presence/absence of platform trees, protocol used for the survey, and occupied or presence detections of marbled murrelet. For consistency, an example table format is presented below (Table V-4). Reporting would be annual.

Table V-4. Marbled murrelet survey reporting

Survey Polygon (Name)	Survey Area (Acres)	Survey Date(s) (Years)	Stand Age (Years)	Protocol Used	Marbled Murrelet Detections		
					Occupied	Presence	None
<i>Sample Project</i>	<i>000</i>	<i>20XX-20XX</i>	<i>000</i>	<i>Citation</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>

R27. Program Reporting Item: Report the number of newly discovered occupied marbled murrelet sites. For each newly discovered occupied marbled murrelet site, report: name of site (master site number), associated survey that discovered the site, survey dates (years of survey), and acreage included in the occupied site designation. For consistency, an example table format is presented below (Table V-5). The table should present a running list of all occupied sites designated and the cumulative number and acreage of occupied sites. Reporting would be annual.

Table V-5. Marbled murrelet occupied site

Survey Dates (Years)	Occupied Site Name	Associated Survey (Name)	Area Designated (Acres)
<i>20XX, 20XX</i>	<i>Sample Project (MSNO XXXX)</i>	<i>Sample Project</i>	<i>000</i>
Cumulative Total	<i>000 sites</i>	-	<i>000</i>

R28. Program Reporting Item: Report the amount of marbled murrelet nesting habitat that was modified or removed within the Harvest Land Base *without* pre-disturbance surveys (i.e., 35–50 miles from the Pacific Ocean except within exclusion Areas C and D as described in Chapter 3 of the Proposed RMP/Final EIS). For stands of marbled murrelet nesting habitat modified or removed without surveys, report: harvest type, acres, date of treatment, and age at time of treatment. For consistency, an example table format is presented below (Table V-6). Reporting would be annual.

Table V-6. Marbled murrelet nesting habitat modified or removed *without* surveys

Project (Name)	Harvest Type	Area (Acres)	Date Modified/Removed (Year)	Stand Age at the Time of Modification/Removal (Years)
<i>Sample Project</i>	<i>Harvest Type</i>	<i>000</i>	<i>20XX</i>	<i>000</i>

R29. Program Reporting Item: Report the survey effort for the red tree vole north of Highway 20 within the North Oregon Coast DPS and the outcomes of that survey effort. For each survey polygon, report: acres of survey, year surveys were conducted, age of stand at time of survey, protocol used for the survey, number of active or inactive red tree vole sites discovered, and the total acreage of habitat areas established associated with the discoveries. For consistency, an example table format is presented below (Table V-7). Reporting would be annual.

Table V-7. Survey reporting for the North Oregon Coast DPS of the red tree vole

Survey Polygon (Name)	Survey Area (Acres)	Survey Date (Years)	Stand Age (Years)	Protocol Used	Red Tree Vole Discoveries			
					Active Sites (Number)	Inactive Sites (Number)	None (Number)	Total Habitat Area (Acres)
<i>Sample Project</i>	<i>000</i>	<i>20XX</i>	<i>000</i>	<i>Citation</i>	<i>000</i>	<i>000</i>	<i>000</i>	<i>000</i>

R30. Program Reporting Item (Coos Bay District only): Report number, type, and acres (as appropriate) of restoration actions for the western snowy plover. Reporting would be annual.

R31. Program Reporting Item: (Medford and Salem Districts and Klamath Falls Field Office only) Report number and acres of deer and elk forage planting projects within deer and elk management areas. Reporting would be annual.

R32. Program Reporting Item (applies to Eastside Management Area only): Report acres of thinning or removal of encroaching western juniper. Reporting would be annual.

References

- Davis, R. J., B. Hollen, J. Hobson, J. E. Gower, D. Keenum. 2015. Northwest Forest Plan—the first 20 years (1994–2013): status and trends of northern spotted owl habitats. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-XXX. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR. <http://www.reo.gov/monitoring/reports/20yr-report/NSO%20Habitat%2020yr%20Report%20-%20Draft%20for%20web.pdf>.
- Davis, R. J., J. L. Ohmann, R. E. Kennedy, W. B. Cohen, M. J. Gregory, Z. Yang, H. M. Roberts, A. N. Gray, and T. A. Spies. *in press*. Northwest Forest Plan—the first 20 years (1994–2013): status and trends of late-successional and old-growth forests. General Technical Report PNWGTR-XXX. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR. <http://www.reo.gov/monitoring/reports/20yr-report/LSOG%2020yr%20Report%20-%20Draft%20for%20web.pdf>.
- Falxa, G. A., and M. G. Raphael, technical editors. 2015. Northwest Forest Plan—The first 20 years (1994–2013): status and trend of marbled murrelet populations and nesting habitat. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-XXX. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR. http://www.reo.gov/monitoring/reports/20yr-report/MAMU%20GTR_for%20posting_26May2015.pdf.
- Grinspoon, E., D. Jaworski, and R. Phillips. *in press*. Northwest Forest Plan—The First 20 Years [1994–2013]: Socioeconomic Monitoring. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR. <http://www.reo.gov/monitoring/reports/20yr-report/20150511NWFP%20Soc%20Econ%20FinalFullReport.pdf>.
- Miller, S. A., S. N. Gordon, P. Eldred, R. M. Beloin, S. Wilcox, M. Raggon, H. Andersen, and A. Muldoon. 2015. Northwest Forest Plan—The first 20 years (1994–2013): watershed condition status and trend. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-932. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR. http://www.reo.gov/monitoring/reports/20yr-report/GTR_AREMP_DRAFT_MAY_2015.pdf.
- Page-Dumroese, D. A., A. M. Abbott, and T. M. Rice. 2009a. Forest soil disturbance monitoring protocol—Volume 1: Rapid assessment. General Technical Report WO-82a. USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Moscow, ID. 35 pp. http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs_other/wo_gtr082a.pdf.
- . 2009b. Forest soil disturbance monitoring protocol, Volume 2: Supplementary methods, statistics, and data collection. General Technical Report WO-82b. USDA Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Moscow, ID. 70 pp. http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs_other/wo_gtr082b.pdf.
- USDI BLM. 1997. Standards for rangeland health and guidelines for livestock grazing management for public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the states of Oregon and Washington. Oregon State Office, Portland, OR. 22 pp. http://www.blm.gov/or/resources/recreation/csnm/files/rangeland_standards.pdf.
- . 2004. Final - Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Management of Port-Orford-cedar in Southwest Oregon. SEIS. Portland, OR.
- Vinyeta, K., and K. Lynn. 2015. Strengthening the Federal-Tribal Relationship: A Report on Monitoring Consultation under the Northwest Forest Plan. USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR. <http://www.reo.gov/monitoring/reports/20yr-report/NWFP%20-%20Strengthening%20the%20Federal-Tribal%20Relationship%20WEB.pdf>.

Page intentionally left blank