

Best Management Practices Evaluation

Veg B. Landings

(Reference BMPs Veg-1, Veg-2, and Veg-6)

DRAFT September 2009

Header (1 page)

1. Type of review being performed today. Circle one: Implementation Effectiveness Both Implementation and Effectiveness		2. If current review is for effectiveness only, what was the date of the implementation review for this site?	
		3. Today's date: 1/28/2012	
4. Reviewer(s) and Title(s): Gwen Collier, district Soil Scientist			
5. Region: 06	6. Forest: Mt. Hood National Forest	7. District: Clackamas 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 number: 23	
11. 6 th level HUC for the subwatershed this landing is in: 170900110306			
12. Is the landing located within a municipal watershed? Circle one: Yes No		13. Is the landing located within an SMZ? Circle one: Yes No	
14. Distance to nearest water body located in the same watershed as the landing (ft or m, specify units): 155 ft.		15. Slope between landing and water body (percent): 20% to 65% unit 65% 20' Stream	
16. Date contract requirements for the landing were accepted: 08/2011		17. Approximate size of landing (ac, ft ² , ha, m ² , specify units): 0.2 acres	
18. Is this an on-site landing? Circle one: Yes No			
19. Has there been a 2-yr or greater recurrence interval rainfall 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 past month During the past 6 months During the past year 1-2 years ago More than 2 years ago			
20. Conditions present today. Circle all that apply: Rain Snow Snowpack on the ground Melting snow No 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. UTM Zone: 4PS UTM Datum: NA083	22b. Easting: 0576323	22c. Northing: 4991417	23a. Latitude:
			23b. Longitude:
			23c. Lat/Long Datum:

Best Management Practices Evaluation

Implementation (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?

4. Have specified erosion control measures (mechanical, physical, vegetative) pertaining to landings 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?

5. Were landing operations adjusted to control compaction, erosion, and/or runoff during wet periods? Circle one:
- a. Not applicable, no wet 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 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
- b. Not applicable, no spills or leaks were reported during the use of this landing
- c. 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

Sway U23

Best Management Practices Evaluation

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

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

Need discussion during planning meetings about minimum requirements for berms that close roads to landings - this one seems inadequate.

Swag U 23

Best Management Practices Evaluation

Effectiveness (2 pages)

<p>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.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input checked="" type="radio"/> a. No evidence (go to question 7) 9 <input type="radio"/> b. Evidence on the landing, but not moving off of it (go to question 9) <input type="radio"/> c. Evidence off of the landing, but not reaching the SMZ (go to question 6) <input type="radio"/> d. Evidence in the SMZ, but not reaching the water body (go to question 2) <input type="radio"/> e. Evidence of sediment transport to or deposition in the water body (go to question 3) </p>
<p>2. What is the shortest distance between the evidence and the nearest water body? (ft or m, specify units):</p>
<p>3. To what type of water body is the SMZ adjacent or was the sediment delivered? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Ephemeral stream <input type="radio"/> b. Intermittent stream <input type="radio"/> c. Perennial stream/river <input type="radio"/> d. Pond <input type="radio"/> e. Lake <input type="radio"/> f. Wetland or wet meadow <input type="radio"/> g. Other (specify): </p>
<p>4. What is the design width of the SMZ associated with the water body? (ft or m, specify units):</p>
<p>5. Is this the same SMZ that was evaluated on form Veg A? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Yes <input type="radio"/> b. No </p>
<p>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:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Sheet erosion <input type="radio"/> b. Rills <input type="radio"/> c. Gullies <input type="radio"/> d. Head cuts <input type="radio"/> e. Slumping <input type="radio"/> f. Mass wasting <input type="radio"/> g. Sediment plumes or sediment accumulations <input type="radio"/> h. Turbidity </p>
<p>7. What is the source? Circle all that apply:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Landing deck <input type="radio"/> b. Landing flintlope <input type="radio"/> c. Landing drainage outlet <input type="radio"/> d. System road <input type="radio"/> e. Other (specify): </p>
<p>8. What is the cause? Circle all that apply:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. No water control features installed <input type="radio"/> b. Improper spacing of water control features <input type="radio"/> c. Improper construction of water control features <input type="radio"/> d. Improper or inadequate maintenance of water control features <input type="radio"/> e. Poorly located landing <input type="radio"/> f. Improper grade <input type="radio"/> g. Failure to rip landing <input type="radio"/> h. Poor erosion control on roads and trails that contribute water onto the landing <input type="radio"/> i. Other causes associated with the use of this landing (specify): <input type="radio"/> j. Other causes not associated with the use of this landing (specify): </p>
<p>9. 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:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Yes (go to question 10) <input checked="" type="radio"/> b. No (go to question 11) </p>
<p>10. What is that evidence? Circle all that apply:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks on the landing but not moving off of it <input type="radio"/> b. Evidence of chemical fuels or spills or leaks extending from the landing into the harvest area, but not reaching the SMZ or water body <input type="radio"/> c. Evidence of chemical or fuel spills extending from the landing into the SMZ, but not reaching the water body <input type="radio"/> d. Evidence of chemicals or fuel spills extending from the landing to the water body <input type="radio"/> e. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers, but not in the SMZ <input type="radio"/> f. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the SMZ <input type="radio"/> g. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the water body </p>

#11, 12 + General Comments = \emptyset
 Form Veg B Draft September 2009

Swag 423

Best Management Practices Evaluation

Veg C. Ground-Based Mechanical Harvest

(Reference BMPs Veg-1, Veg-2, and Veg-4)

DRAFT September 2009

Header (1 page)

1. Type of review being performed today. Circle one: Implementation Effectiveness Both Implementation and Effectiveness		2. If current review is for effectiveness only, what was the date of the implementation review for this site?	
		3. Today's date: 1/31/2012	
4. Reviewer(s) and Title(s): Gwen Collier, district soil scientist			
5. Region: 06	6. Forest: Mt. Hood National Forest	7. District: Clackamas 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 number: 23	
11. 6 th level HUC for the subwatershed this harvest unit is in: 170900110306			
12. Is the harvest unit located within a municipal watershed? Circle one: Yes No			
13. Describe the treatment within harvest unit: Thinning - processor/hand cut. Adverse skidding on all skid trails to this landing. 25% to 45%		14. Date harvest operations began: 08/2011	
		15. Date harvest operations ended: 09/2011	
16. Has there been a 2-yr or greater recurrence interval rainfall or runoff event since ground based harvesting was completed? Circle one: Yes No . Don't know If Yes, how recently did that event occur? Circle one: During the past month During the past 6 months During the past year 1-2 years ago More than 2 years ago			
17. Conditions present today: Circle all that apply: Rain Snow Snowpack on the ground Melting snow No precipitation			
18. Does the Forest have a contingency and emergency response plan applicable to handling/treating chemical or fuel spills affecting or potentially affecting water, aquatic, and riparian resources? Circle one: Yes No			
19a. UTM Zone: 4PS UTM Datum: NA083	19b. Easting: 0576298	19c. Northing: 4991524	20a. Latitude:
			20b. Longitude:
			20c. Lat/Long Datum:

Best Management Practices Evaluation

Implementation (2 pages)

<p>1. Were all ground-based harvesting provisions from planning to protect water, aquatic, and riparian resources included in the contract? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Not applicable, ground-based harvesting provisions to protect water, aquatic, and riparian resources were not developed during planning</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. <u>Yes</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. No</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">If No, what provisions from planning were not included in the contract?</p>
<p>2. Where were ground-based mechanical harvest areas identified and delineated? Circle all that apply:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. <u>Site area maps/project maps</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. <u>On the ground</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. Neither on maps nor on the ground</p>
<p>3. Did locations of all skid roads/trails and other temporary roads meet Forest Service Handbook, Forest Plan, and NEPA decision requirements? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Not applicable, no temporary roads constructed, or no temporary road location requirements</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. Yes</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. <u>No</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">If No, what requirements were not met?</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>Processor on >40% slopes off skidtrail processor paths not on mat of slash as required. Greater number of paths than probably needed.</i></p>
<p>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:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Not applicable, no area standards</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. Yes</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. <u>No</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">If No, what standards were not met? <i>Detrimental Soil Condition was >15% (was greater before this harvest entry)</i></p>
<p>5. Have specified erosion control measures (mechanical, physical, vegetative) pertaining to ground-based mechanical harvesting been implemented fully? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Not applicable, no specified erosion control measures</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. <u>Yes</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. No</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">If No, what measures should have been implemented that were not?</p>
<p>6. Were harvesting and/or skidding operations adjusted to control compaction, erosion, and/or runoff during wet periods? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Not applicable, no wet periods during operations</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. <u>Yes</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. No</p>
<p>7. Was supplemental erosion control applied within the project area? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. <u>Not needed</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. Needed but not applied</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. Needed and applied</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">If applied, what supplemental erosion control was used?</p>
<p>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:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Not applicable, the Forest has no contingency and emergency response plan</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. <u>Not applicable, no spills or leaks were reported during ground-based harvesting</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. Yes, reported spills or leaks were handled/treated according to the plan</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">d. No, reported spills or leaks were not handled/treated according to the plan</p>

Sway U23

Best Management Practices Evaluation

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

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

*Have adverse SKid discussions during planning — stipulate
slope limit in EA.*

Best Management Practices Evaluation

Effectiveness (3 pages)

<p>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.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input checked="" type="radio"/> a. No evidence (go to question 9) <input type="radio"/> b. Evidence within the harvest area, but not reaching the SMZ (go to question 6) <input type="radio"/> c. Evidence in the SMZ, but not reaching the water body (go to question 2) <input type="radio"/> d. Evidence of sediment transport to or deposition in the water body (go to question 3) </p>
<p>2. What is the shortest distance between the evidence and the nearest water body? (ft or m, specify units):</p>
<p>3. To what type of water body is the SMZ adjacent or was the sediment delivered? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Ephemeral stream <input type="radio"/> b. Intermittent stream <input type="radio"/> c. Perennial stream/river <input type="radio"/> d. Pond <input type="radio"/> e. Lake <input type="radio"/> f. Wetland or wet meadow <input type="radio"/> g. Other (specify): </p>
<p>4. What is the design width of the SMZ associated with the water body? (ft or m, specify units):</p>
<p>5. Is this the same SMZ evaluated on BMP form Veg A for this harvest unit? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Yes <input type="radio"/> b. No </p>
<p>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:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Sheet erosion <input type="radio"/> b. Rills <input type="radio"/> c. Gullies <input type="radio"/> d. Head cuts <input type="radio"/> e. Slumping <input type="radio"/> f. Mass wasting <input type="radio"/> g. Sediment plumes or areas of sediment accumulation <input type="radio"/> h. Turbidity </p>
<p>7. What is the source? Circle all that apply:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Skids road/skid trail <input type="radio"/> b. Other temporary road <input type="radio"/> c. System road <input type="radio"/> d. Harvest practice/technique <input type="radio"/> e. Other (specify): </p>
<p>8. What is the cause? Circle all that apply:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. No water control features installed <input type="radio"/> b. Improper spacing of water control features on skid roads/trails and/or temporary roads <input type="radio"/> c. Improper construction of water control features <input type="radio"/> d. Improper or inadequate maintenance of water control features <input type="radio"/> e. Poor treatment prescription <input type="radio"/> f. Poorly located skid roads/trails and/or temporary roads <input type="radio"/> g. Improper grades on skid roads/trails and/or temporary roads <input type="radio"/> h. Mechanical additions of sediment <input type="radio"/> i. Exposed soil not associated with skid roads/trails or other temporary roads <input type="radio"/> j. Other causes associated with ground-based mechanical harvesting (specify): </p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> k. Other causes not associated with ground-based mechanical harvesting (specify): </p>
<p>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 yield different answers, select the most severe occurrence, with severity increasing from a to d.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input checked="" type="radio"/> a. Not applicable, no water body crossings present on skid roads/trails or temporary roads (go to question 12) <input type="radio"/> b. No evidence (go to question 10) <input type="radio"/> c. Evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water body (go to question 10) <input type="radio"/> d. Evidence of sediment transport to or deposition in the water body (go to question 10) </p>

Swag 423

Best Management Practices Evaluation

<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Ephemeral stream b. Intermittent stream c. Perennial stream/river d. Pond e. Lake f. Wetland or wet meadow g. Other (specify): 	
<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Unhardened ford b. Hardened ford c. Culvert d. Bridge e. Low water crossing f. Mats g. Other (specify): 	
<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Yes (go to question 13) b. No (go to question 14) 	
<p>13. What is that evidence? Circle all that apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks in the treatment unit, but not reaching the SMZ or water body b. Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks in the SMZ, but not reaching the water body c. Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks delivered to or in the water body d. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the treatment unit, excluding the SMZ and water body e. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the SMZ f. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the water body 	
<p>14. Provide information about corrective actions needed to improve effectiveness.</p>	

#15 + General Comments = ~~0~~

Swag 423

Best Management Practices Evaluation

Veg C. Ground-Based Mechanical Harvest

(Reference BMPs Veg-1, Veg-2, and Veg-4)

DRAFT September 2009

Header (1 page)

1. Type of review being performed today. Circle one: Implementation Effectiveness Both Implementation and Effectiveness		2. If current review is for effectiveness only, what was the date of the implementation review for this site?	
		3. Today's date: 1/31/2012	
4. Reviewer(s) and Title(s): Gwen Collier, District Soil Scientist			
5. Region: 06	6. Forest: Mt Hood National Forest	7. District: Clackamas 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 number: 24	
11. 6 th level HUC for the subwatershed this harvest unit is in: 170900110401			
12. Is the harvest unit located within a municipal watershed? Circle one: Yes No			
13. Describe the treatment within harvest unit: Thinning. Processor cut on 35-45% slopes below J landing. Uphill skid, mainly on old cross slope skid trail.		14. Date harvest operations began: 10/2011	
		15. Date harvest operations ended: probably 12/2011	
16. Has there been a 2-yr or greater recurrence interval rainfall or runoff event since ground based harvesting was completed? Circle one: Yes No Don't know If Yes, how recently did that event occur? Circle one: During the past month During the past 6 months During the past year 1-2 years ago More than 2 years ago			
17. Conditions present today: Circle all that apply: Rain Snow Snowpack on the ground Melting snow No precipitation			
18. Does the Forest have a contingency and emergency response plan applicable to handling/treating chemical or fuel spills affecting or potentially affecting water, aquatic, and riparian resources? Circle one: Yes No			
19a. UTM Zone: 4PS UTM Datum: NAD 83	19b. Easting: 05770120	19c. Northing: 4990622	20a. Latitude:
			20b. Longitude:
			20c. Lat/Long Datum:

Best Management Practices Evaluation

Implementation (2 pages)

<p>1. Were all ground-based harvesting provisions from planning to protect water, aquatic, and riparian resources included in the contract? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Not applicable, ground-based harvesting provisions to protect water, aquatic, and riparian resources were not developed during planning</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. <u>Yes</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. No</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">If No, what provisions from planning were not included in the contract?</p>
<p>2. Where were ground-based mechanical harvest areas identified and delineated? Circle all that apply:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. <u>Sale area maps/project maps</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. <u>On the ground</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. Neither on maps nor on the ground</p>
<p>3. Did locations of all skid roads/trails and other temporary roads meet Forest Service Handbook, Forest Plan, and NEPA decision requirements? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Not applicable, no temporary roads constructed, or no temporary road location requirements</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. <u>Yes</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. No</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">If No, what requirements were not met?</p>
<p>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:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Not applicable, no area standards</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. <u>Yes</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. <u>No</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">If No, what standards were not met? <i>Detrimental Soil Condition. Prior to this entry the standard was exceeded. This entry added to it.</i></p>
<p>5. Have specified erosion control measures (mechanical, physical, vegetative) pertaining to ground-based mechanical harvesting been implemented fully? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Not applicable, no specified erosion control measures</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. <u>Yes</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. <u>No</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">If No, what measures should have been implemented that were not?</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><i>Ground cover (slash or mulch) should have been placed on bare ground $\geq 20\%$. The main skid trail is bare in some areas where slopes are $> 20\%$</i></p>
<p>6. Were harvesting and/or skidding operations adjusted to control compaction, erosion, and/or runoff during wet periods? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Not applicable, no wet periods during operations</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. <u>Yes</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. No</p>
<p>7. Was supplemental erosion control applied within the project area? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. <u>Not needed</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. Needed but not applied</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. Needed and applied</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">If applied, what supplemental erosion control was used?</p>
<p>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:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. <u>Not applicable, the Forest has no contingency and emergency response plan</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">b. <u>Not applicable, no spills or leaks were reported during ground-based harvesting</u></p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">c. Yes, reported spills or leaks were handled/treated according to the plan</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">d. No, reported spills or leaks were not handled/treated according to the plan</p>

Sway U24

Best Management Practices Evaluation

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

Mulch or brush 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

Best Management Practices Evaluation

Effectiveness (3 pages)

<p>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.</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> a. No evidence (go to question 9) <input checked="" type="radio"/> b. Evidence within the harvest area, but not reaching the SMZ (go to question 6) <input type="radio"/> c. Evidence in the SMZ, but not reaching the water body (go to question 2) <input type="radio"/> d. Evidence of sediment transport to or deposition in the water body (go to question 3) </p>
<p>2. What is the shortest distance between the evidence and the nearest water body? (ft or m, specify units):</p>
<p>3. To what type of water body is the SMZ adjacent or was the sediment delivered? Circle one:</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> a. Ephemeral stream <input type="radio"/> b. Intermittent stream <input type="radio"/> c. Perennial stream/river <input type="radio"/> d. Pond <input type="radio"/> e. Lake <input type="radio"/> f. Wetland or wet meadow <input type="radio"/> g. Other (specify): </p>
<p>4. What is the design width of the SMZ associated with the water body? (ft or m, specify units):</p>
<p>5. Is this the same SMZ evaluated on BMP form Veg A for this harvest unit? Circle one:</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> a. Yes <input type="radio"/> b. No </p>
<p>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:</p> <p> <input checked="" type="radio"/> a. Sheet erosion <input type="radio"/> b. Rills <input type="radio"/> c. Gullies <input type="radio"/> d. Head cuts <input type="radio"/> e. Slumping <input type="radio"/> f. Mass wasting <input type="radio"/> g. Sediment plumes or areas of sediment accumulation <input type="radio"/> h. Turbidity </p>
<p>7. What is the source? Circle all that apply:</p> <p> <input checked="" type="radio"/> a. Skid road/skid trail <input type="radio"/> b. Other temporary road <input type="radio"/> c. System road <input type="radio"/> d. Harvest practice/technique <input type="radio"/> e. Other (specify): </p>
<p>8. What is the cause? Circle all that apply:</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> a. No water control features installed <input type="radio"/> b. Improper spacing of water control features on skid roads/trails and/or temporary roads <input type="radio"/> c. Improper construction of water control features <input type="radio"/> d. Improper or inadequate maintenance of water control features <input type="radio"/> e. Poor treatment prescription <input type="radio"/> f. Poorly located skid roads/trails and/or temporary roads <input type="radio"/> g. Improper grades on skid roads/trails and/or temporary roads <input type="radio"/> h. Mechanical additions of sediment <input type="radio"/> i. Exposed soil not associated with skid roads/trails or other temporary roads <input type="radio"/> j. Other causes associated with ground-based mechanical harvesting (specify): <i>Exposed soil on skid trail, some processor trucks</i> <input type="radio"/> k. Other causes not associated with ground-based mechanical harvesting (specify): </p>
<p>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 yield different answers, select the most severe occurrence, with severity increasing from a to d.</p> <p> <input checked="" type="radio"/> a. Not applicable, no water body crossings present on skid roads/trails or temporary roads (go to question 12) <input type="radio"/> b. No evidence (go to question 10) <input type="radio"/> c. Evidence of erosion but no deposition in the water body (go to question 10) <input type="radio"/> d. Evidence of sediment transport to or deposition in the water body (go to question 10) </p>

Swag U24

Best Management Practices Evaluation

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. Wetland 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: 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 b. Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks in the SMZ, but not reaching the water body c. Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks delivered to or in the water body d. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the treatment unit, excluding the SMZ and water body e. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the SMZ f. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the water body
14. Provide information about corrective actions needed to improve effectiveness.

15 - nothing entered

Swag 424

Best Management Practices Evaluation

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(SMZ), B(Landings), C(ground based) + D(suspended harvest):

- 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
- ② Include a box on the heading pages, somewhere near the name of timber sale, that asks the name of the Environmental Assessment that addresses this particular unit.
- ③ Would be beneficial to have box on heading page for name of Sale Administrator. Can be an explanation for why certain things occurred.
- ④ I 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 engineers and other CORs etc. fill out daily diaries. So I'd suggest using both terms, where appropriate, on the instructions & forms.

Best Management Practices Evaluation

Veg B. Landings

(Reference BMPs Veg-1, Veg-2, and Veg-6)

DRAFT September 2009

Header (1 page)

1. Type of review being performed today. Circle one: Implementation Effectiveness Both Implementation and Effectiveness		2. If current review is for effectiveness only, what was the date of the Implementation review for this site?	
		3. Today's date: 1/30/2012	
4. Reviewer(s) and Title(s): Gwen Collier, district Soil Scientist			
5. Region: 06	6. Forest: Mt. Hood National Forest	7. District: Clackamas 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: Rotor Thin Stewardship		10. Harvest unit number: 5	
11. 6 th level HUC for the subwatershed this landing is in: 170900110403			
12. Is the landing located within a municipal watershed? Circle one: Yes No		13. Is the landing located within an SMZ? Circle one: Yes No	
14. Distance to nearest water body located in the same watershed as the landing (ft or m, specify units): 130 ft.		15. Slope between landing and water body (percent): 10% & 65% <i>stream</i>	
16. Date contract requirements for the landing were accepted: 06/2011		17. Approximate size of landing (ac, ft ² , ha, m ² , specify units): 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 rainfall 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 past month During the past 6 months During the past year 1-2 years ago More than 2 years ago			
20. Conditions present today. Circle all that apply: Rain Snow Snowpack on the ground Melting snow No 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. UTM Zone: U PS UTM Datum: NA0 83	22b. Easting: 0566323	22c. Northing: 4998326	23a. Latitude:
		23b. Longitude:	23c. Lat/Long Datum:

Best Management Practices Evaluation

Implementation (2 pages)

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

Rotor U5

Best Management Practices Evaluation

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

Apply seed & mulch to entire landing, not just part.
Road that was re-opened to access landing needs
rocks replaced — closure rocks have been moved,
so now motorized vehicles can access the area
illegally.

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

Resulting closure is conducive to target shooting &
garbage dumping — (flat ground, small rocks, lots of parking).
Discuss similar situations in future planning meetings
and discuss how to get better closures in future stewardship
sales.

Best Management Practices Evaluation

Effectiveness (2 pages)

<p>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.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input checked="" type="radio"/> a. No evidence (go to question 9) <input type="radio"/> b. Evidence on the landing, but not moving off of it (go to question 9) <input type="radio"/> c. Evidence off of the landing, but not reaching the SMZ (go to question 6) <input type="radio"/> d. Evidence in the SMZ, but not reaching the water body (go to question 2) <input type="radio"/> e. Evidence of sediment transport to or deposition in the water body (go to question 3) </p>
<p>2. What is the shortest distance between the evidence and the nearest water body? (ft or m, specify units):</p>
<p>3. To what type of water body is the SMZ adjacent or was the sediment delivered? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Ephemeral stream <input type="radio"/> b. Intermittent stream <input type="radio"/> c. Perennial stream/river <input type="radio"/> d. Pond <input type="radio"/> e. Lake <input type="radio"/> f. Wetland or wet meadow <input type="radio"/> g. Other (specify): </p>
<p>4. What is the design width of the SMZ associated with the water body? (ft or m, specify units):</p>
<p>5. Is this the same SMZ that was evaluated on form Veg A? Circle one:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Yes <input type="radio"/> b. No </p>
<p>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:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Sheet erosion <input type="radio"/> b. Rills <input type="radio"/> c. Gullies <input type="radio"/> d. Head cuts <input type="radio"/> e. Slumping <input type="radio"/> f. Mass wasting <input type="radio"/> g. Sediment plumes or sediment accumulations <input type="radio"/> h. Turbidity </p>
<p>7. What is the source? Circle all that apply:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Landing deck <input type="radio"/> b. Landing fillslope <input type="radio"/> c. Landing drainage outlet <input type="radio"/> d. System road <input type="radio"/> e. Other (specify): </p>
<p>8. What is the cause? Circle all that apply:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. No water control features installed <input type="radio"/> b. Improper spacing of water control features <input type="radio"/> c. Improper construction of water control features <input type="radio"/> d. Improper or inadequate maintenance of water control features <input type="radio"/> e. Poorly located landing <input type="radio"/> f. Improper grade <input type="radio"/> g. Failure to rip landing <input type="radio"/> h. Poor erosion control on roads and trails that contribute water onto the landing <input type="radio"/> i. Other causes associated with the use of this landing (specify): <input type="radio"/> j. Other causes not associated with the use of this landing (specify): </p>
<p>9. 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:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Yes (go to question 10) <input checked="" type="radio"/> b. No (go to question 11) </p>
<p>10. What is that evidence? Circle all that apply:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input type="radio"/> a. Evidence of chemical or fuel spills or leaks on the landing but not moving off of it <input type="radio"/> b. Evidence of chemical fuels or spills or leaks extending from the landing into the harvest area, but not reaching the SMZ or water body <input type="radio"/> c. Evidence of chemical or fuel spills extending from the landing into the SMZ, but not reaching the water body <input type="radio"/> d. Evidence of chemicals or fuel spills extending from the landing to the water body <input type="radio"/> e. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers, but not in the SMZ <input type="radio"/> f. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the SMZ <input type="radio"/> g. Evidence of chemical or fuel waste containers in the water body </p>

11, 12, General Comments = 0

Form Veg B Draft September 2009

Rotor U5