Veg B. Landings (Reference BMPs Veg-1, Veg-2, and Veg-6) DRAFT September 2009

Header (1 page)					
Type of review bein     Implementation		h implementation	<ol><li>If current review is to the implementation re</li></ol>		nat was the date of
Implementation E		d Effectiveness			
			3. Today's date:	8/2012	
	<del> </del>		1/2	8/2014	
4. Reviewer(s) and Ti	ile(s):	Sail sciens			
5. Region: 06		l Natroial Fore	7. District: Clae	Kames River R	anger District
8. Reason for monitor	-			1	
WO/RO Targets	s Forest Plan	Project Review	Other (specify):	·	
9. Name of timber sal	le: Swag Thin Ster	and ship	10. Harvest unit numbe	<sup>11</sup> 23	
	he subwatershed this	landina la las	900110306		
12. Is the landing loca	ted within a municipal	watershed?	13. Is the landing locate	ed within an SMZ?	
Circle one: (Yes	> No	·	Circle one: Yes		
	st water body located			ting and water body (pe	ercent):
watershed as the	landing (ft or m, specif	fy units): 155 A.	2000 to 652	Tild and water pool (be	
16. Date contract regu	uirements for the landi	- •		f landing (ac, ft², ha, m	enecify units):
	08/2011	ing more acceptant		acres	, aposity willey.
	anding? Circle one:			1	
		ence interval rainfall or	runoff event since landin	g use was ended?	
Circle one: Yes	No Don't know	·	=	•	
· ·		r? Circle one. During past mo		During the 1-2 past years ag	More than o 2 years ago
20. Conditions preser		•			
Circle all that app		the ground si	elting No now precipitation		÷
21. Does the Forest h affecting or poten	lave a contingency and tially affecting water, a	d emergency response equatic, or riparian reso	plan applicable to hand ources?	ling/treating chemical c	r tuel spills or leaks
Circle one: ((es	No No		•	•	
22a.	22b.	22c.	23a.	23b.	23c.
UTM Zone: 4 PS UTM Datum:	Easting:	Northing:	Latitude:	Longitude:	Lat/Long Datum:
NAO83	0576323	4991417	·	i	

lm	plementation (2 pages)
1.	Were all landing provisions from planning to protect water, aquatic, and riparian resources included in the contract? Circle one:
	a Not applicable, landing provisions to protect water, aquatic, and riparian resources were not developed during planning b. Yes  c. No
	If No, what provisions from planning were not included in the contract or plan?
!	
2.	Does the landing location meet Forest Service Handbook, Forest Plan, and NEPA decision requirements? Circle one:  a. Yes b. No
	If No, what requirements were not met?
3.	Does the landing size meet standards? Circle one:
	a. Yes b. No
	If No, what standards were not met?
<del></del> -	
4.	Have specified erosion control measures (mechanical, physical, vegetative) pertaining to landings been implemented fully?
	a. Not applicable, no specified erosion control measures
•	b. Yes
	If No, what measures should have been implemented that were not?
	•
5.	Were landing operations adjusted to control compaction, erosion, and/or runoff during wet periods? Circle one:
	a two apparation to wer periods during landing use
	b. Yes c. No
6.	Was supplemental erosion control applied to the landing? Circle one:
	(a. Not needed: )
	b. Needed but not applied
	c. Needed and applied
	If applied, what supplemental erosion control was used?
7.	Were chemical or fuel spills or leaks that were reported on this leading during the leading during the
	Were chemical or fuel spills or leaks that were reported on this landing during its use handled/treated according to the contingency and emergency response plan? Circle one:
	a. Not applicable, the Forest has no contingency and emergency response plan
	c. Yes, reported spills of leaks were handled/treated according to the sleet
	d. No, reported spills or leaks were not handled/treated according to the plan

Sway UZ3

•			-				
						•	
	•						
							•
			-		•		
	•		•				
		-		•			
				•			
						_	•
				•		-	
			•				
		-	•				
				,			
•	Provide Information about ada  Need discus					bout m	inimum
<b>).</b>						bout m	i'n imeum dengs —
١.						hout m	inimum Luys —
•	Provide Information about ada  Need discus  requirements  this one					hout m	inimum Lugs —
,						howt m to land	inimem Lengs —
•						hout m do land	inimum Luys —
						hout m do lans	i'n i'm um Lengs —
•						hout m do land	i'n i'm enn Rengs —
						hout m do land	inimum Rugs —
						hout m	inimum Rugs —
						hout m	inimum Rugs —
						hout m	inimum Rugs —
						hout m	inimum Rugs —
						hout m	inimum Rugs —
						hout m	inimum Rings —
						hout m	inimum Rings —
						hout m	i'n i'm um Rings —
				ning mee t alose enaste.		hout m	i'n i'm um Rings —
				ning mee t alose enaste.		hout m	i'n i'm um Rengs —
				ning mee t alose enaste.		hout m	inimum Rugs —
•				ning mee t alose enaste.		hout m	inimum Rugs —
•				ning mee t alose enaste.		hout m	inimum Rugs —
				ning mee t alose enaste.		hout m	inimema Rengs

Eff	ectiveness (2 pages)	_
1.	Is there evidence of erosion or sedimentation from the landing? Circle one; when multiple occurrences would yield different answers, select the most severe occurrence, with severity increasing from a to d.	
1	(a. No evidence (go to question 7) 9	
1	b. Evidence on the landing, but not moving off of it (go to question 9)	
1	c. Evidence off of the landing, but not reaching the SMZ (go to question 6)	
i	d. Evidence in the SMZ, but not reaching the water body (go to question 2)	
<u> </u>	e. Evidence of sediment transport to or deposition in the water body (go to question 3)	
2.	What is the shortest distance between the evidence and the nearest water body? (ft or m, specify units):	
З.	To what type of water body is the SMZ adjacent or was the sediment delivered? Circle one:	
ı	a. Ephemeral stream	
ı	b. Intermittent stream c. Perennial stream/river	
ı	d. Pond	
ı	e. Lake	
ı	f. Wetland or wet meadow	
	g. Other (specify):	
4.	The state of the control of the state of the	_
5.	Is this the same SMZ that was evaluated on form Veg A? Circle one:	_
1	a. Yes	
<u> </u>	b. No	
6.	For all of the occurrences of erosion/sedimentation observed in the area you identified in effectiveness question 1, what is the evidence? Circle all that apply:	
ı	***	
ł	a. Sheet erosion b. Rills	
ľ	c. Guilles	
ł	d. Head cuts	
۱.	e. Slumping	
1	f. Mass wasting	
1	g. Sediment plumes or sediment accumulations	
	h. Turbidity	
7.	What is the source? Circle all that apply:	_
Į.	a. Landing deck	
١.	b. Landing fillslope	
	c. Landing drainage outlet	
1	d. System road e. Other (specify);	
8.	What is the cause? Circle all that apply:	
l ".		
	No water control features installed     improper spacing of water control features	
	c. Improper construction of water control features	
	d. Improper or inadequate maintenance of water control features	
	e. Poorly located landing	
[	f. Improper grade	
	g. Fallure to rip landing	
[	h. Poor erosion control on roads and trails that contribute water onto the landing	
1	i. Other causes associated with the use of this landing (specify):	
l	j. Other causes not associated with the use of this landing (specify):	•
l		
9.	is there evidence at chemical or trial spiles or looks, or chamical as full weeks.	
	Is there evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks, or chemical or fuel waste containers on the landing or traceable to the landing that have not been reported on another BMP form during this evaluation? Circle one:	g
	a. Yes (go to question 10)	
	b. No (go to question 11)	
10.	What is that evidence? Circle all that apply:	_
I	a. Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks on the lending but not moving off of the	
ł	b. Evidence of chemical fuels or splits or leaks extending from the landing into the harvest area, but not reaching the SMZ	_
l		۷
l	c. Evidence of chemical or fuel spills extending from the landing into the SMZ, but not reaching the water body	
٠ ا	- Live not of changes of fuel spills extending from the landing to the world had.	
	e. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers, but not in the SMZ  f. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the SMZ	
	g. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the SMZ	
L	Section of the manual contentions in the water body	
		_

#11, 12 & General Comments = & Form Veg B Draft September 2009

Sway U23

# Veg C. Ground-Based Mechanical Harvest (Reference BMPs Veg-1, Veg-2, and Veg-4) DRAFT September 2009

Header (1 page)				
Type of review being performed today. Circle one:     Implementation Effectiveness Both Implementation and Effectiveness.		the implementation	for effectiveness only n review for this site?	, what was the date of
		3. Today's date:	1/31/2012	
4. Reviewer(s) and Title(s): . Guen Collier, district Soil	Scie	nd 31-		
5. Region: 06 6. Forest: 14. Hood Nationa	l For	7. District: CL	ickamas River	Ranger District
8. Reason for monitoring. Circle all that apply:	•			
· WO/RO Targets Forest Plan Project Review	Other	(specify):		
9. Name of timber sale: Swag Thin Stewardship		10. Harvest unit num	ber: 23	
11. 6 <sup>th</sup> level HUC for the subwatershed this harvest unit is it	n: 17	090011030	6	
12. Is the harvest unit located within a municipal watershed	? Circle	one: (es) No		
13. Describe the treatment within harvest unit: Thimming - processor/hand cut. Adver Skidding on all skidneis to this	se.	14. Date harvest ope	• 08	/2011
landing. 25% to 45%		15. Date harvest ope	erations ended: 09	/2011
16. Has there been a 2-yr or greater recurrence interval rain	nfall or r	unoff event since groun	nd based harvesting w	as completed?
Circle one: Yes No Don't know		_		
If Yes, how recently did that event occur? Circle one:	During past mo		During the 1-2 past years	
17. Conditions present today:			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Circle all that apply: Rain Snow Snowpack on the ground	sne	lting No ow precipitation	)	.*
18. Does the Forest have a contingency and emergency re potentially affecting water, aquatic, and riparian resource. Yes No	sponse es?	plan applicable to hand	iling/treating chemical	or fuel spills affecting or
19a. 19b. 19c.		20a.	20b.	20c.
UTM Zone: UPS Easting: Northing: UTM Datum: 0576298 49915	u	Latitude:	Longitude:	Lat/Long Datum:
NA083 0576298 49915	<u>~T</u>		<u> </u>	

IM	plementation (2 pages)
1.	Were all ground-based harvesting provisions from planning to protect water, aquatic, and riparian resources included in the contract? Circle one:
	a. Not applicable, ground-based harvesting provisions to protect water, aquatic, and riparian resources were not developed during planning  b. Yes
	b. Yes
	If No, what provisions from planning were not included in the contract?
Ļ	
2.	Where were ground-based mechanical harvest areas identified and delineated? Circle all that apply:
	a. Sale area maps/project maps b. On the ground
	c. Neither on maps nor on the ground
3.	Did locations of all skid roads/tralls and other temporary roads meet Forest Service Handbook, Forest Plan, and NEPA decision requirements? Circle one:
	a. Not applicable, no temporary roads constructed, or no temporary road location requirements     b. Yes     c. No
	If No, what requirements were not met?
Ļ	Processor on >40% Stopes  Oct skratteril processor paths not on mat of slash as required.  Order of the transmission of paths them probably needed.
4.	Did the areal extent of the transportation system (skid roads/trails, temporary roads, system roads, and landings) within the sample unit meet standards? Circle one:
ĺ	a. Not applicable, no area standards b. Yes
	D. Yes C. No
ĺ	If No, what standards were not met? Destrinental Soil Condition was > 1500
l	If No, what standards were not met? Destrinental Soil Condition was > 15% (was greater before this horsest entry)
l	
	·
5.	Have specified erosion control measures (mechanical, physical, vegetative) pertaining to ground-based mechanical harvesting been implemented fully? Circle one:
	a. Not applicable, no specified erosion control measures b. Yes?
	C. No
	If No, what measures should have been implemented that were not?
6.	Were harvesting and/or skidding operations adjusted to control compaction, erosion, and/or runoff during wet periods? Circle one:
	a. Not applicable, no wet periods during operations
	b. Yes c. No
7.	Was supplemental erosion control applied within the project area? Circle one:
• •	was arribiguistical adoption control arbitica minimi me biolect steat. Oticis 006:
	a. Not needed
	a. Not needed b. Needed but not applied
	a. Not needed b. Needed but not applied c. Needed and applied
	a. Not needed b. Needed but not applied
	a. Not needed b. Needed but not applied c. Needed and applied
8.	a. Not needed b. Needed but not applied c. Needed and applied If applied, what supplemental erosion control was used?  Were chemical or fuel spills or leaks that were reported in this unit during around board and be in the second of the spills or leaks that were reported in this unit during around board and be in the second of the spills or leaks that were reported in this unit during around board and be in the spills or leaks that were reported in this unit during around board and be in the spills of leaks that were reported in this unit during around board and be in the spills of leaks that were reported in this unit during around board and be in the spills of leaks that were reported in this unit during a spill that the spills of leaks that were reported in this unit during the spills of leaks that were reported in this unit during the spills of leaks that were reported in this unit during the spills of leaks that were reported in this unit during the spills of leaks that were reported in this unit during the spills of leaks that were reported in this unit during the spills of leaks that were reported in this unit during the spills of leaks that were reported in this unit during the spills of leaks that were reported in the spills of leaks that were reported in this unit during the spills of leaks that were reported in the spills of leaks the spill of leaks the
8.	a. Not needed b. Needed but not applied c. Needed and applied lf applied, what supplemental erosion control was used?  Were chemical or fuel spills or leaks that were reported in this unit during ground-based mechanical harvesting handled/treated according to the contingency and emergency response plan? Circle one:
8.	a. Not needed b. Needed but not applied c. Needed and applied If applied, what supplemental erosion control was used?  Were chemical or fuel spills or leaks that were reported in this unit during ground based and applied

10. Provide information about adaptive management actions needed to improve Implementation.  Howe activerse skill discussions during planning — Stipulate slope limit in EA.		the college people to improve implementation
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.	9.	Provide information about corrective actions needed to Improve implementation.
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		an angent and
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		·
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		•
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.	ļ	•
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.	1	·
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.		
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.	1	•
Have adverse skid discussions during planning — stipulate slope limit in EA.	10.	Provide information about adaptive management actions needed to improve implementation.
		11 1. alert lie en tra l'appendite
		Hove activerse skill discussions during prounting -
·		Slope limit in Ext.
·		$\cdot$
·	1	
·	İ	
· .	1	
· .		
· .	1	•
· .	1	
· .		
· .	1	
·	1	
1		•
		·
	•	

- = 7	es estivo:	
	1ecuve	ness (3 pages)
1.	EXCIUU:	ng water body crossings and their approaches, is there evidence of erosion or sedimentation caused by harvesting or
		g/transporting logs? Circle one; when multiple occurrences would yield different answers, select the most severe
ľ	(a.	No evidence (ao to question 9)
	b.	Evidence within the harvest area, but not reaching the SMZ (go to greation 6)
	C.	Evidence in the SMZ, but not reaching the water hody (go to question 2)
l_	d.	Evidence of sediment transport to or deposition in the water body (go to question 3)
2.	What is	the shortest distance between the evidence and the nearest water body? (ft or m. specify units):
3.	To what	t type of water body is the SMZ adjacent or was the sediment delivered? Circle one:
	a.	Ephemeral stream
	b.	Intermittent stream
	C.	Perennial stream/river
1	d. e.	Pond Lake
	e. f.	Lake Wetland or wet meadow
	g.	Other (specify);
4.		the design width of the SMZ associated with the water body? (ft or m, specify units):
5.	le this ti	and design within of the GMZ associated with the water body? (it or m, specify units):
	15 III S III 8.	ne same SMZ evaluated on BMP form Veg A for this harvest unit? Circle one:
	а. b.	No ·
6.		
	evidenc	of the occurrences of erosion/sedimentation observed in the area you identified in effectiveness question 1, what is the
	a.	Sheet erosion
l	b.	Rills
	C.	Gullies
l	d.	Head cuts
	e. f	Slumping Mass westing
ĺ	f. g.	Mass wasting Sediment plumes or areas of codiment commutation
l	g. h.	Sediment plumes or areas of sediment accumulation Turbidity
7.		the source? Circle all that apply:
ĺ	a.	Skids road/skid trail
i	b.	Other temporary road
ı	c.	System road
	d.	Harvest practice/technique
	e.	Other (specify):
8.		the cause? Circle all that apply:
	a. L	No water control features installed
	b.	Improper spacing of water control features on skid roads/trails and/or temporary roads
	c. d.	improper construction of water control features
	a. e.	Improper or inadequate maintenance of water control features Poor treatment prescription
	f.	Poorly located skid roads/trails and/or temporary roads
	g.	Improper grades on skid roads/trails and/or temporary roads
	ħ.	Mechanical additions of sediment
	į.	Exposed soil not associated with skid made/trails or attentions as
	).	Other causes associated with ground-based mechanical harvesting (specify):
_		
•	ē	
	k.	Other causes not associated with ground-based mechanical harvesting (specify):
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
9.	At water!	andy proceings and their approaches as all a reading to
•.	sediment	body crossings and their approaches on skid road/trails or temporary roads, is there evidence of erosion or ation? Circle one; when multiple occurrences would yield different answers, select the most severe occurrence, with
	severity in	ncreasing from a to d.
	(a.	Not applicable, no water body crossings precent on skill and a facility
	Б.	No evidence (go to question 10)
	C.	Evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water back (see to see all
	u.	Evidence of sediment transport to or deposition in the water body (go to question 10)

- 10. For all of the crossings that your answer for effectiveness question 9 is applicable, what types of water bodies were crossed? Circle all that apply: Ephemeral stream Intermittent stream Perennial stream/river Pond Lake
- Wetland or wet meadow Other (specify): 11. What types of water body crossing structures were employed for the crossings involved in your answer to effectiveness
  - question 10? Circle all that apply:
    - Unhardened ford
    - Hardened ford
    - Culvert
    - Bridge
    - Low water crossing
    - Mats
    - Other (specify):
- 12. Is there evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks, or chemical or fuel waste containers in the unit being reviewed that have not been reported on another BMP form during this evaluation? Circle one:

  - O. No (go to question 14)
- 13. What is that evidence? Circle all that apply:
  - Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks in the treatment unit, but not reaching the SMZ or water body
  - Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks in the SMZ, but not reaching the water body
  - Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks delivered to or in the water body
  - Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the treatment unit, excluding the SMZ and water body
  - Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the SMZ
  - Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the water body
- 14. Provide information about corrective actions needed to improve effectiveness.

#15 + General Comments = \$

Swag 423

Form Veg C Draft September 2009

# Veg C. Ground-Based Mechanical Harvest (Reference BMPs Veg-1, Veg-2, and Veg-4) DRAFT September 2009

Header (1 page)					
Type of review being implementation		le one: implementation Effectiveness	the implementation	for effectiveness only n review for this site?	, what was the date of
	_		3. Today's date:	/31/2012	
4. Reviewer(s) and Tit	le(s): ir, dostrict s	soil schend	-rs4		·
5. Region: 06	3. Forest: Head N	Jatronal Force	7. District: Clack	amus River 1	Runger District
8. Reason for monitori	ng. Circle all that apply				-
WO/RO Targets	Forest Plan Proje	ct Review Other	(specify):		
9. Name of timber sale	vaq Thön Sfewa	rdship	10. Harvest unit num	iber: 24	
11. 6 <sup>th</sup> level HUC for th	e subwatershed this ha	neat unit in inc	0900110401		
12. Is the harvest unit I	ocated within a municip	al watershed? Circle	one: (Yes) No		
13. Describe the treatme	nent within harvest unit: n 35 - 45% slope Skid, mainly n	Thinning.	14. Date harvest ope	erations began: 10	/2011
Slope skid to	skid, mainly n	n old cross	15. Date harvest ope	erations ended: 12	/2011
	-yr or greater recurrenc	e interval rainfall or r	unoff event since grou	probably 12	vas completed?
Circle one: Yes	No Don't know	_		The same in the sa	· .
If Yes, how recent	y did that event occur?	Circle one: During past mo		During the 1-2 past year	
17. Conditions present	today:			<del></del>	
Circle all that apply		nowpack on Me the ground sn	iting No precipitation	$\supset$	
Circle one: Yes	water, aquatic, and inpa	mergency response arian resources?	plan applicable to hand	dling/treating chemical	or fuel spills affecting or
19a.	19b.	19c.	20a.	20b.	20c.
UTM Zone: UPS UTM Datum: NAU する	Easting: 05770120	Northing:	Latitude:	Longitude:	Lat/Long Datum:
					1

	unç	piementation (2 pages)
Γ	1.	Were all ground-based harvesting provisions from planning to protect water, aquatic, and riparian resources included in the contract? Circle one:
	-	<ul> <li>Not applicable, ground-based harvesting provisions to protect water, aquatic, and riparian resources were not developed during planning</li> </ul>
l		b. Yes
l		If No, what provisions from planning were not included in the contract?
ŀ	2.	Where were ground-based mechanical harvest areas identified and delineated? Circle all that apply:
l		a. Sale area maps/project maps b. On the ground c. Neither on maps nor on the ground
ŀ	3.	Did locations of all skid roads/trails and other temporary roads meet Forest Service Handbook, Forest Plan, and NEPA decision
l		requirements? Circle one:  a. Not applicable, no temporary roads constructed, or no temporary road location requirements
		b. Yes c. No
		If No, what requirements were not met?
l		
Ī	4.	Did the areal extent of the transportation system (skid roads/trails, temporary roads, system roads, and landings) within the sample unit meet standards? Circle one:
l		a. Not applicable, no area standards bYes
ı		Ala No.
ı		If No, what standards were not met? Destrimental Soil Condition. Prior to this ontry the standard was acceeded. This entry added to it.
l		entry the standard was acceeded this entry added to it.
l		
ľ	5.	Have specified erosion control measures (mechanical, physical, vegetative) pertaining to ground-based mechanical harvesting been implemented fully? Circle one:
I		Not applicable, no specified erosion control measures     Yes
l		C. NO
l		If No, what measures should have been implemented that were not?
I		Ground cover (slash or mulde) should have been placed
L		on bare ground 22000. The main skidtrail is bare in some areas where slopes are > 20%
l	6.	Were harvesting and/or skidding operations adjusted to control compaction, erosion, and/or runoff during wet periods? Circle one:  a. Not applicable, no wet periods during operations
l		b. Yes
ŀ	7.	C. No Was supplemental erosion control applied within the project area? Circle one:
ı		a. Not needed
I		b. Needed but not applied c. Needed and applied
		If applied, what supplemental erosion control was used?
L		
l	8.	Were chemical or fuel spills or leaks that were reported in this unit during ground-based mechanical harvesting handled/treated according to the contingency and emergency response plan? Circle one:
l		a. Not applicable, the Forest has no contingency and emergency response plan
		c. Yes, reported spills or leaks were handled/treated according to the clan
		d. No reported spills or lasks were not handled translations to the standard translation to the standard translations.

Sway 424

9. Provide information about corrective actions needed to improve implementation.

Mulch or bough is needed in some steeper areas of main skidtrail.

10. Provide information about adaptive management actions needed to improve implementation.

Discuss in planning meetings - stating slope limits for adverse yarding in EA
- mobil yarding similar areas in the future.

Swag 424

	rectiveness (3 pages)
1.	Excluding water body crossings and their approaches, is there evidence of erosion or sedimentation caused by harvesting or skidding/transporting logs? Circle one; when multiple occurrences would yield different answers, select the most severe occurrence, with severity increasing from a to d.
	a. No evidence (go to question 9)  5. Evidence within the harvest area, but not reaching the SMZ (go to question 6)
	c. Evidence in the SMZ, but not reaching the water body (go to guestion 2)
L	d. Evidence of sediment transport to or deposition in the water body (go to question 3)
2.	What is the shortest distance between the evidence and the nearest water body? (ft or m, specify units):
3.	To what type of water body is the SMZ adjacent or was the sediment delivered? Circle one:
i	a. Ephemeral stream b. Intermittent stream
	c. Perennial stream/river
	d. Pond e. Leke
	f. Wetland or wet meadow
4.	g. Other (specify):
5.	What is the design width of the SMZ associated with the water body? (ft or m, specify units):  Is this the same SMZ evaluated on BMP form Veg A for this harvest unit? Circle one:
~	a. Yes
L	b. No
6.	For all of the occurrences of erosion/sedimentation observed in the area you identified in effectiveness question 1, what is the evidence? Circle all that apply:
ł	a. Sheet erosion  D. Rills
	c. Gullies
	d. Head cuts e. Stumping
	f. Mass wasting
	g. Sediment plumes or areas of sediment accumulation h. Turbidity
7.	What is the source? Circle all that apply:
	Skids road/skid trail     Other temporary road
	c. System road
l	d. Harvest practice/tectinique e. Other (specify):
8.	What is the cause? Circle all that apply:
]	a. No water control features installed
ľ	Improper spacing of water control features on skid roads/trails and/or temporary roads     Improper construction of water control features
	d. Improper or inadequate maintenance of water control features
ĺ	e. Poor treatment prescription f. Poorly located skid roads/trails and/or temporary roads
ļ	g. Improper grades on skid roads/trails and/or temporary roads
	h. Mechanical additions of sediment
	i. Exposed soil not associated with skid roads/trails or other temporary roads j. Other causes associated with ground-based mechanical harvesting (specify): Exposed 5 oil on
	skidtrail some processor tracks
	k. Other causes not associated with ground-based mechanical harvesting (specify):
9.	At water body crossings and their approaches on skid road/trails or temporary roads, is there evidence of erosion or sedimentation? Circle one; when multiple occurrences would visible differences to the contract of the con
	sedimentation? Circle one; when multiple occurrences would yield different answers, select the most severe occurrence, with severity increasing from a to d.
	Not applicable, no water body crossings present on skild readerfulls as towns and a few and a fe
	b. No evidence (go to question 10)  C. Evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water back (so to evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water back (so to evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water back (so to evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water back (so to evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water back (so to evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water back (so to evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water back (so to evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water back (so to evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water back (so to evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water back).
	c. Evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water body (go to question 10) d. Evidence of sediment transport to or deposition in the water body (go to question 10)

Swag 424

10.	For all of the crossings that your answer for effectiveness question 9 is applicable, what types of water bodies were crossed?  Circle all that apply:
	a. Ephemeral stream b. Intermittent stream
	c. Perennial stream/river
	d. Pond
	e. Lake f. Wettand or wet meadow
	g. Other (specify):
11.	What types of water body crossing structures were employed for the crossings involved in your answer to effectiveness question 10? Circle all that apply:
	a. Unhardened ford b. Hardened ford
	c. Culvert
	d. Bridge e. Low water crossing
	f. Mats
	g. Other (specify):
12.	Is there evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks, or chemical or fuel waste containers in the unit being reviewed that have not been reported on another BMP form during this evaluation? Circle one:
1	a. Yes (go to question 13)  b. No (go to question 14)
13.	What is that evidence? Circle all that apply:
-	a. Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks in the treatment unit, but not reaching the SMZ or water body
Í	b. Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks in the SMZ, but not reaching the water body
Ī	<ul> <li>Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks delivered to or in the water body</li> <li>Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the treatment unit, excluding the SMZ and water body</li> </ul>
1	e. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the SMZ
<b> </b>	f. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the water body
'*`	Provide information about corrective actions needed to improve effectiveness.
1	
1	
1	r
ĺ	•
ĺ	
1	·
ŀ	

15 - nothing entered

Swag 424

#### **General Comments**

Implementation #4. you may want to include a question relating to how this harvest entry added to or improved how a standard is met. In the two units I monitored, the standard had been exceeded prior to this harvest entry.

Other suggestions for Veg Forms A(5MZ), B (Landings), C (ground based) + O (suspended horvest):

- 1 would help if the Footer title at the bottom of all pages of the forms included the word description as well as letter. in Form Veg B- Landings
- D Include a box on the heading pages, somewhere hear the name of timber sale, that asks the name of the Environmental Assessment that addresses this particular unit.
- B would be beneficial to have box on heading page for name of Sale Administrator. Can be an explaination for why certain things occurred.
- DI got a lecture from two different timber sale administrators about how they did not fill out daily diaries that the correct term for them is "Timber sale Inspection Report" Apparently angineers and other CORS etc. fill out daily diaries. So I'd suggest using both terms, where appropriate, on the lust nictions of forms,

Veg B. Landings (Reference BMPs Veg-1, Veg-2, and Veg-6) DRAFT September 2009

Header (1 page)			d	et upo the date of	
Type of review being performed today. Circle one:		<ol><li>If current review is for the implementation re</li></ol>	r effectiveness only, who eview for this site?	at was the cate of	
Implementation Effectiveness Both Implementation and Effectivenes					
		3. Today's date: 1/3	0/2012		
A. Doudoworld) and Title(a):					
4. Reviewer(s) and Title(s): Green Collier, district Soil Scientist					
Charles - 1			•		
5. Region: Olo 6. Forest: Hood National	Fores	7. District: Clackame	es River Rang	er vistnot	
8. Reason for monitoring. Circle all that apply:					
WO/RO Targets Forest Plan (Project Review) Other (specify):					
9. Name of timber sale:  Rotor Thin Steward Ship		10. Harvest unit numbe	<sup>"</sup> 5		
1 44 cli lovoi III (C for the exhunterched this landing is in:					
12. Is the landing located within a municipal watershed?  13. Is the landing located within an SMZ?					
Circle one: Yes No	•	Circle one: Yes (No)			
14. Distance to nearest water body located in the same  15. Slope between landing and water body (percent):				ercent):	
watershed as the landing (ft or m, specify units): 130	10th & 65%				
16. Date contract requirements for the landing were accepted: 17. Approximate size of landing (ac, ft², ha, m², specify units):					
06/2011.	0.6 acres				
18. Is this an on-site landing? Circle one: Yes (No)					
19. Has there been a 2-yr or greater recurrence interval rainfail or runoff event since landing use was ended?					
Circle one: (Yes) No Don't know					
If Yes, how recently did that event occur? Circle one: During the During the During the 1-2 More than past month past 6 months past year years ago 2 years ago					
20. Conditions present today.					
Circle all that apply: Rain Snow Snowpack on Melting No					
the ground	SI	now precipitation	! 		
21. Does the Forest have a contingency and emergency response plan applicable to handling/treating chemical or fuel spills or leaks					
affecting or potentially affecting water, aquatic, or riparian resources?  Circle one: Yes No					
22a. 22b. 22c.		23a.	23b.	23c.	
UTM Zone: UPS Easting: Northing:		Latitude:	Longitude:	Lat/Long Datum:	
UTM Datum: NAO 83 0546323 4998	326				

Ø 008

Imp	lementation (2 pages)
1.	Were all landing provisions from planning to protect water, aquatic, and riparian resources included in the contract? Circle one:
	a. Not applicable, landing provisions to protect water, aquatic, and riparian resources were not developed during planning
	c. No
ļ	If No, what provisions from planning were not included in the contract or plan?
	If No, what provisions from planning were not included in the conduct of planning
1	
2.	Does the landing location meet Forest Service Handbook, Forest Plan, and NEPA decision requirements? Circle one:
	a. Yes
l	. b. No
1	If No, what requirements were not met?
3.	Does the landing size meet standards? Circle one:
	a. Yes
	b. 100
1	If No, what standards were not met?
1	
1	
4.	Have specified erosion control measures (mechanical, physical, vegetative) pertaining to landings been implemented fully?
1 **	Circle one:
	Not applicable, no specified erosion control measures
l l	b. Yes c. No
	If No, what measures should have been implemented that were not?
1	mulch a grass seed on 3/4 of landing only
1	
5.	Were landing operations adjusted to control compaction, erosion, and/or runoff during wet periods? Circle one:
1	a. Not applicable, no wet periods during landing use
1	b. Yes
_	c. No
6.	Was supplemental erosion control applied to the landing? Circle one:
	Not needed     Needed but not applied
1	c. Needed and applied
1	If applied, what supplemental erosion control was used?
	statement was perfectived in the statement of the stateme
1	e se se
1	
7.	Were chemical or fuel spills or leaks that were reported on this landing during its use handled/treated according to the contingency and emergency response plan? Circle one:
1	a. Not applicable, the Forest has no contingency and emergency response plan
1	b. Not applicable, no spills or leaks were reported during the use of this landing Yes, reported spills or leaks were handled/treated according to the plan
	d. No, reported spills or leaks were not handled/treated according to the plan

8. Provide information about corrective actions needed to improve implementation.

Rood that was re-opened to access landing needs rocks replaced - Closure vocks have been moved, so more motorized vehicles can access the area. Illegally,

9. Provide information about adaptive management actions needed to improve implementation.

Resulting closure is condusive to target shooting of gurbaye dumping - (flat ground, small rocks, lots of parking).

Discuss similar situations in future planning meetings and discuss how to get better closures in fature starandship sales.

_=!!	ecuvelle:	ss (2 pages)
1.	answers, s	idence of erosion or sedimentation from the landing? Circle one; when multiple occurrences would yield different select the most severe occurrence, with severity increasing from a to d.
l	(a	No evidence (go to question 7)
1	b	Evidence on the landing, but not moving off of it (go to question 9)
l	C.	Evidence off of the landing, but not reaching the SMZ (go to question 6)
i	d. e.	Evidence in the SMZ, but not reaching the water body (go to question 2)  Evidence of sediment transport to or deposition in the water body (go to question 3)
<u> </u>		
2.		e shortest distance between the evidence and the nearest water body? (ft or m, specify units):
3.	-	pe of water body is the SMZ adjacent or was the sediment delivered? Circle one:
l		Ephemeral stream Intermittent stream
1		Perennial stream/tiver
i		Pond
		Lake
ļ	-	Wetland or wet meadow
<u> </u>	_	Other (specify):
4.		e design width of the SMZ associated with the water body? (ft or m, specify units):
5.		same SMZ that was evaluated on form Veg A? Circle one:
		Yes No
6.		
) ·	the eviden	he occurrences of erosion/sedimentation observed in the area you identified in effectiveness question 1, what is ce? Circle all that apply:
1		Sheet erosion
ł		
		Guilles
l	d.	Head cuts
,		Slumping
1	f.	Mass wasting
1	g.	Sediment plumes or sediment accumulations
7.		Turbidity
l '·		e source? Circle all that apply:
	a.	Landing deck
l .		Landing fillslope Landing drainage cutlet
ł		System road
		Other (specify):
8.	What is the	e cause? Circle all that apply:
1		No water control features installed
		Improper spacing of water control features
j	<b>c.</b> 1	Improper construction of water control features
ŀ	ď. I	improper or inadequate maintenance of water control features
ŀ	<b>e.</b> 1	Poorly located landing
		mproper grade
1	g. I	Failure to rip landing
	h. 1 i. (	Poor erosion control on roads and trails that contribute water onto the landing Other causes associated with the use of this landing (specify):
	. ,	Since cacaes associated with the use of this landing (specify):
		•
	j. (	Other causes not associated with the use of this landing (specify):
9.	is there evi	dence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks, or chemical or fuel waste containers on the landing or traceable to the landing
	that have n	ot been reported on another BMP form during this evaluation? Circle one:
ł	a,	es (ao to question 10)
		Vo (go to question 11)
10.		tt evidence? Circle all that apply:
	a. E	vidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks on the landing but not moving off of it
	D. E	evidence of chemical fuels or spills or leaks extending from the landing into the hervest area, but not receive the CALT
	c. E d. E	vidence of chemical or fuel spills extending from the landing into the SMZ, but not reaching the water body
	· · ·	vidence of chemicals or fuel spills extending from the landing to the water body vidence of chemical or fuel waste containers, but not in the SMZ
	i. C	:Vigence of chemical of fuel waste containers in the SM7
	g. E	vidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the water body
(1		

# 11,12, General Comments = 8
Form Veg B Draft September 2009
Rotor US