

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
2	<b>II.A.1 Riparian Areas/Meadows</b>	5	Incorporate riparian standards and guidelines (S&G's) (Exhibit D) into NEPA process and plan amendment.	Riparian Standards & Guidelines (S&Gs) incorporated into direction in SNFPA in the Riparian Conservation Objectives. All direction falls under previously signed/passed direction and Public Laws, such as the Clean Water Act, sections 208 and 319.	SNFPA 2001 ROD, pp. Appendix A-52-59 and 2004 ROD pp 63-66. Water Quality Management for Forest Service Land in California Best Management Practices, 9/2000. Document from Forest Hydrologist on: Riparian Conservation Areas, Stream Side Management Zones, and Riparian Conservation Objectives 2007, explains how to apply the SNFPA direction.	X	X			
3	<b>II.A.2 Riparian Areas/Meadows</b>	5	Implement riparian S&G's during interim before plan amendment.	See sample National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and project results monitoring. Best Management Practices (BMP) monitoring reports. See document from BMP review team regarding BMP effectiveness. Similar S&G's are in SNFPA 2001.	1998 BMPEP Accomplishment Report; Excerpts from NEPA and BMPEP reports, Example from timber sale, Letter from Forest Hydrologist from II.A.1 above, MSA 1994 Annual Report BMP Effectiveness Peer Review, pp 21-24, MSA 2005 Annual Report, BMP Review pages 10-11. SNFPA 2001 ROD, pp. A-52-59.					
4	<b>II.A.2 Riparian Areas/Meadows</b>	5	Any timber sale contract predating MSA will be modified to conform to Riparian Standards & Guidelines.	These sales are no longer available and interim direction is assumed completed.						
5	<b>II.A.3 Riparian Areas/Meadows</b>	6	Do not re-use landings and roads in SMZ.	None proposed or planned. Rabbit Timber Sale: Subsection H: Watersheds (1990). BMP's discourage placing landings in SMZ's. Roads are not placed in SMZ's except at designated crossings and commensurate with BMP direction. Riparian Conservation Objectives in SNFPA provide direction to use BMP's.	Excerpts from Rabbit Timber Sale: Subsection H: Watersheds (1990) and BMPEP reports, MSA 1993 Annual Report BMP Effectiveness Peer Review, see exhibit 3 from II.A.2 above. SNFPA (2001) ROD, p. A-53.		X			
6	<b>II.B.1.a,b Groves</b>	6	Implement interim Giant Sequoia direction.	I.a and b are background with no task assigned.	These are grove management goals to be addressed in the GSNM management plan.			X		
7	<b>II.B.1.c Groves</b>	6	Portion of Converse Basin available for logging.	Converse Basin environmental impact statement (EIS) started in 1998. Proclamation changed this direction.	See Hume Lake RD Project Initiation Letter - Converse Basin Giant Sequoia Grove "Plan to Project" Analysis (January 23, 1998).			X		
8	<b>II.B.2.a.(1) Groves</b>	7	Interim Grove Boundaries restrictions, no logging, restricted mechanical entry.	Followed interim direction. See example from Buck Rock timber sale, Unit #97.	The final recommendations of this team on grove boundaries were accepted by Art Gaffrey, Forest Supervisor, on May 18, 1998.					
9	<b>II.B.2.a.(1)(a) Groves, Interim Grove Boundaries restriction subject to exceptions for the purposes of this Agreement: The following mechanical/motorized uses only will be permitted inside an interim or final grove boundary line.</b>	7	Expansion of parking lot at the Trail of 100 Giants.	Completed.				X		
10	<b>II.B.2.a.(1)(b) Groves, Interim Grove Boundaries restriction subject to exceptions for the purposes of this Agreement: The following mechanical/motorized uses only will be permitted inside an interim or final grove boundary line.</b>	7	Use of existing roads.	Use of existing roads for official agency vehicles continues to be an acceptable allowance under the MSA guidelines.				X		

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
11	II.B.2.a.(1)(c) Groves, Interim Grove Boundaries restriction subject to exceptions for the purposes of this Agreement: The following mechanical/motorized uses only will be permitted inside an interim or final grove boundary line.	7-8	Designated OHV trails.	Proclamation changed the use of mechanical/motorized uses in the monument.	Order No. 00-15: Forest Development Trails, Sequoia National Forest, Giant Sequoia National Monument (Signed 12/31/2000); Presidential Proclamation 7295 (signed 4/15/2000) "motorized vehicle use will be permitted only on designated roads, and non-motorized mechanized vehicle use will be permitted only on designated roads and trails."			X		
12	II.B.2.a.(1)(d) Groves, Interim Grove Boundaries restriction subject to exceptions for the purposes of this Agreement: The following mechanical/motorized uses only will be permitted inside an interim or final grove boundary line.	8	Management in accordance with fuel load reduction plans.	See fuels reduction plan for Tule River Reservation Protection (TRRP) as an example (development of an environmental impact statement).				X		
13	II.B.2.a.(1)(e) Groves, Interim Grove Boundaries restriction subject to exceptions for the purposes of this Agreement: The following mechanical/motorized uses only will be permitted inside an interim or final grove boundary line.	8	Use of light equipment to build and/or maintain trails.	Freeman Creek Trail Maintenance & Reconstruction (2001) work completed in 2007. Trail of 100 Giants removed dead & dying trees with trail (re)construction (2004).	Decision Memo and FONSI for Freeman Creek Trail Reconstruction Project File(10/19/01). Project file for Trail of 100 Giants Hazard Tree project (8/20/2004).			X		
14	II.B.2.a.(1)(f) Groves, Interim Grove Boundaries restriction subject to exceptions for the purposes of this Agreement: The following mechanical/motorized uses only will be permitted inside an interim or final grove boundary line.	8	Use of equipment to fight wildfire (use of heavy equipment off of existing roads will require Forest Supervisor approval).	Deep Fire (2004) Forest Supervisor Art Gaffrey approved use of equipment.				X		
15	II.B.2.a.(2) Groves	8	Interim Grove Influence Zone (GIZ), 500 feet.	See example from Buck Rock timber sale, Unit #97 (stand record card). Amendment needed to formally adopt grove boundaries.	Buck Timber Sale stand record card.			X		
16	II.B.2.a.(3) Groves	8,9	No logging in interim GIZ (plus 1,000').	During interim GIZ, none were proposed.				X		
17	II.B.2.b.(1) Groves	9	Desirable to inventory all GS > 3' dbh, request funding (this was a desired, not required goal).	Did not inventory trees > 3 feet dbh, but completed grove inventories in 50% of groves. Expect to finish inventory in 2009. Unable to track funding request. Did receive funding to map groves. GSNM Plan to recognize as an ongoing process.	MSA 1992 Annual Report, page 9-10; MSA 1993 Annual Report, page 10-11.					X
18	II.B.2.b.(2) Groves	9	Begin to inventory fuel load in groves, prioritize treatments.	Completed grove inventories in 50% of groves. Expect to finish inventory in 2009. Grove prioritization for fuel treatment based on fire susceptibility completed; GSNM Plan to recognize as an ongoing process.	Giant Sequoia National Monument Grove Prioritization Methodology, 07/08			X		
19	II.B.2.b.(3) Groves	10	No new road building, logging, mechanical entry within Grove admin boundary except for fuels reduction as part of adopted fuels reduction plan.	Has not been applicable to implemented projects; have not built roads, logged, or mechanically treated within grove administrative boundary, only salvaged roadside hazard trees in groves. The Tule River Restoration (TRRP) Project is an example of the exceptions allowed. During implementation of 2004 Monument Plan, implemented the Dry Converse Fuels Reduction Project.	Proclamation changed some of this direction. See Sequoia Grove Management Requirements for a graphic illustrations of the management boundaries. Notice of Intent (NOI) for TRRP Project, <i>Federal Register</i> Vol. 73, No. 166, pp 50301-50302			X		

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
20	<b>II.B.2.c Groves</b>	11 - 24	The interim direction for this section is explained in II.B.2.c.(2) (a) through (i) and identifies what constitutes a grove and what must be done as a minimum to delineate one. It continues to identify what further procedures can be taken to better delineate a particular grove boundary.	The Grove Boundary Team consisted of Joe Fontaine (Sierra Club), Robert Jasperson (Save-the-Redwoods League), Glen Duysen (Sierra Forest Products), and Lew Jump (US Forest Service). The final recommendations of this team on grove boundaries were accepted by Art Gaffrey, Forest Supervisor, on May 18, 1998.	Completed. Final grove boundaries accepted by Art Gaffrey, Forest Supervisor, letter dated May 18, 1998.					X
21	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(i) Groves, Black Mtn Grove</b>	16	Forest Road 21S12 beyond its intersection with road 21S25 shall be closed to the public.	Road is closed to public use, open for administrative use only. Needs a Forest Order to document closure.	Requires site specific environmental analysis.					
22	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(ii) Groves, Belknap/McIntyre/Wheel Meadow Grove complex</b>	16	Treat as one large grove.	Belknap, McIntyre, and Wheel Meadow Groves were mapped as one unit in 2002. Formally adopt grove boundaries in GSNM Plan.		X		X		
23	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(iii) Groves, Greater Evans Grove complex</b>	17	Manage as one large grove: Lockwood, Evan, Kennedy, Burton, Little Boulder, Boulder.	Evans, Lockwood, Kennedy, Burton, Little Boulder, & Boulder were mapped and inventoried as one unit called Evans Complex in 2002. Formally adopt grove boundaries in GSNM Plan.		X		X		
24	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(iv)(a) Groves, Freeman Creek Grove and Watershed</b>	17	No logging and no motorized vehicle use by public anywhere in Freeman Creek Grove Management area. Shall manage as a botanical area.	There has been no public motor vehicle use or logging in the Freeman Creek Grove Management Area. Freeman Creek Grove currently managed as botanical area. This should be part of every alternative. Botanical area designation would need to follow a specific process.		X		X		
25	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(iv)(b) Groves, Freeman Creek Grove and Watershed</b>	18	Manage area outside botanical area as Regulation Class II.	No vegetation management projects in the watershed. Proclamation changed management direction. Class II designation no longer applies.		X		X		
26	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(iv)(c) Groves, Freeman Creek Grove and Watershed</b>	18	Portion of Freeman Creek Trail Designated as Sensitivity Level 1.	Not Done. No longer use Sensitivity Level, Visual Quality Objectives for scenic/visuals management. It has been replaced by the Scenery Management System (SMS).	Scenery Management System (SMS) replaced the Visual Management System in 1997. SMS uses Concern Levels which are similar to the Sensitivity Levels. The three categories of Concern Levels are 1-High, 2-Moderate, and 3-Low. A Concern Level of High would be assigned to heavily used areas or visually sensitive routes/sites.	X		X		
27	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(v) Groves, Indian Basin Grove</b>	18	(a) Mgt. direction for Princess Campground No logging except for safety near campground (Indian Basin Grove). (b) 500 ft no logging, restricted mechanical entry zone outside perimeter, plus 500 ft GIZ.	Campground has been entered for hazard tree reduction. Boundaries have been posted.	District Ranger Exline letter to Forest Supervisor Gaffrey, dated 05/04/06, Subject: Princess Campground Fuelwood Removal.	X		X		
28	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(vi) Groves</b>	19	500 ft no logging, restricted mechanical entry zone outside perimeter line, plus 500 ft GIZ: Bearskin, Big Stump, Deer Creek, Grant, Landslide, Long Meadow, Packsaddle, Peyrone, Red Hill, Redwood Mountain, Starvation, Tenmile.	The Grove Boundary Team consisted of Joe Fontaine (Sierra Club), Robert Jasperson (Save-the-Redwoods League), Glen Duysen (Sierra Forest Products), and Lew Jump (US Forest Service). The final recommendations of this team on grove boundaries were accepted by Art Gaffrey, Forest Supervisor, on May 18, 1998.	Completed. Final grove boundaries accepted by Art Gaffrey, Forest Supervisor, letter dated May 18, 1998.	X		X		

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
29	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(vii) Groves</b>	19	300 ft no logging, restricted mechanical entry zone outside perimeter line, plus 300 ft GIZ: Powderhorn, Alder Creek, Abbott Creek, Cherry Gap, Mountain Home, Cunningham.	The Grove Boundary Team consisted of Joe Fontaine (Sierra Club), Robert Jasperson (Save-the-Redwoods League), Glen Duysen (Sierra Forest Products), and Lew Jump (US Forest Service). The final recommendations of this team on grove boundaries were accepted by Art Gaffrey, Forest Supervisor, on May 18, 1998.	Completed. Final grove boundaries accepted by Art Gaffrey, Forest Supervisor, letter dated May 18, 1998.	X		X		
30	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(viii) Groves</b>	19	Converse Grove, 600 acres (preservation) 500 ft no logging, restricted mechanical entry zone outside of preservation area.	John Exline, Hume Lake District Ranger, developed three alternatives displaying different strategic locations of the preservation area that meet this direction. The final decisions has not been made. Prolamation changed this management direction.		X		X		
31	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(ix) Groves</b>	20	Groves protected already and do not require precise boundary determinations: Agnew (Wilderness Area); Burro Creek (to be proposed as Wilderness); Deer Meadow (protected as part of Agnew Roadless Area); Dillonwood (to be proposed as Wilderness); Maggie Mountain (Wilderness), Middle Tule (part Wilderness and part to be proposed as Wilderness) and Silver Creek Grove (to be proposed Wilderness).	Existing direction is sufficient; do not need to do anything more. Dillonwood grove was transferred to the National Park Service.				X		
32	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(x) Groves</b>	20	Naturally occurring isolated giant sequoia (3 ft & larger) located inside or outside GIZ shall be protected by restricted mechanical entry within an area 2/3 the height of the tree; single tree selection logging permitted, as long as giant sequoia is protected.	See Timber Sale Administration Agreement And/Or Notice dated 10/20/92 issued under the Hyde Insect Salvage Sale on the Hume Lake Ranger District. Address direction in all GSNM Plan alternatives.	See letters dated August 10, 1994 and October 5, 1994 to the Grove Boundary Team. These areas have administrative boundaries. Timber Sale Administration Agreement And/Or Notice, dated 10/20/92, issued under the Hyde Insect Salvage Sale on the Hume Lake Ranger District	X		X		
33	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(xi) Groves</b>	20-21	Naturally occurring giant sequoia (under 3 ft) located inside GIZ shall be protected from all logging operations, including specifically the root systems. Every reasonable effort made to protect giant sequoia outside GIZ.	The Forest is in compliance with direction stated in this portion of the MSA. Address direction in all GSNM Plan alternatives.		X		X		
34	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(xii) Groves</b>	21	Detached naturally occurring group (10 or more giant sequoia, with 4 trees 3 ft or larger) designate as a grove; 300 ft no logging, restricted mechanical entry zone within grove boundary, plus 300 ft GIZ.	Monarch Grove discovered during the boundary mapping process (helicopter mapping of the Agnew Grove). Designated as a separate grove and lies totally within the Monarch Wilderness in the Hume Lake Ranger District. See grove boundary notes. GSNM Plan will address future management and modification of grove boundaries.	Monarch Grove boundary and map accepted 11/1/96. Suggest modification to remove the part about the grove boundary team. If a new grove is located or an existing grove boundary needs modification, the Forest Supervisor will partner with the public to identify or adjust a grove boundary.	X		X		X
35	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(j)(xiii) Groves</b>	22	Discovery of unknown giant sequoia modify GIZ to include the trees.	GSNM Plan will address future management and modification of grove boundaries.		X		X		

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
36	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(k-1) Groves</b>	22-23	Rational Basis for Grove Boundary Team to adjust Final boundaries.	GSNM Plan will address future management and modification of grove boundaries.	Suggest modification to remove the part about the grove boundary team. If a new grove is located or an existing grove boundary needs modification, the Forest Supervisor will partner with the public to identify or adjust a grove boundary.	X		X		X
37	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(3) Groves</b>	23	Special written notice - any logging within 1,000 ft. of grove boundary.	Public notification is part of the project planning process.	Special Notice: As agreed to in the MSA when logging upslope of Grove (12/18/1992).					X
38	<b>II.B.2.c.(2)(5) Groves</b>	24	Groves with final administrative boundaries shall remain outside the suitable land base.	The final recommendations of the Grove Boundary Team were accepted by Art Gaffrey, Forest Supervisor, on May 18, 1998 documenting the grove boundary agreements, administrative boundaries, and influence zones with management restrictions that remove these areas from the suitable land base as required. Consistent with Proclamation which states that no part of the GSNM will be considered suitable for timber production.	Completed. Final grove boundaries accepted by Art Gaffrey, Forest Supervisor, letter dated May 18, 1998.	X		X		
39	<b>II.B.2.d.(1) Complementary management in Groves Influence Zones and Outside of Groves</b>	24-25	Regulation class 2, uneven age management within GS grove GIZ.	No projects were proposed. Proclamation changed management direction.		X		X		
40	<b>II.B.2.d.(2) Complementary management in Groves Influence Zones and Outside of Groves</b>	25	Special written notice - Road construction or logging upslope of GS.	Public notification is part of the project planning process. Proclamation only allows road construction to further the purposes of the monument.	Special Notice: As agreed to in the MSA when logging upslope of groves, letters dated 12/18/1992, and 2/14/2007. See Sequoia Grove Management Requirements for a graphic illustration of the management boundaries.					X
41	<b>II.B.2.d.(3) Complementary management in Groves Influence Zones and Outside of Groves</b>	26	Consider reg. class 2 helicopter yarding upslope of GS groves.	Considered in Hotel Planning Area EA (1997). Proclamation changed management direction.		X		X		
42	<b>II.B.2.e.(1) Groves (Special area designations)</b>	26	Manage Freeman Creek Grove as a botanical area.	Freeman Creek Grove currently managed as a botanical area. Designation of a botanical area follows a separate process. Consider in all GSNM Plan alternatives.		X		X		
43	<b>II.B.2.e.(2) Groves (Special area designations)</b>	26	Converse Grove Management.	Began planning for Converse Basin Grove EIS in 1998. On hold since GSNM proclamation. Proclamation changed management direction.	See Hume Lake RD Project Initiation Letter - Converse Basin Giant Sequoia Grove "Plan to Project" Analysis (January 23, 1998). See line No. 7.	X		X		
44	<b>II.B.2.f (1) Regeneration of cut-over giant sequoia groves</b>	27	Objectives of regenerating cutover giant sequoia groves will be to restore these areas, as nearly as possible, to the former natural forest condition.			X		X		

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
45	<b>II.B.2.f (2) Regeneration of cut-over giant sequoia groves</b>	27	Implementation of regeneration plan required by the Stipulation for Entry for Judgment dated 12/27/89, in Sierra Club v. U.S. Forest Service Case No. CVF-87-263 EDP.	Stand Record Cards. Requires implementation of court stipulation on regeneration (See Sierra Club v. USFS, 12/27/89) which was completed in 1992.	Completed					X
46	<b>II.C.1 Grazing and Oak Management</b>	28	Amend plan to clarify AUMs allotted will not be increased over 68,000.	AUM's have not been increased since the signing of the MSA. See Greenhorn West Grazing EA that reflects reductions in AUM's within the project area.	Propose changing to "not to exceed historical levels." See Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 2209.13, Chapter 90.	X		X	X	X
47	<b>II.C.2.a(1) Grazing and Oak Management amend LMP Rx BO6</b>	28	Give priority to maintaining and enhancing blue oak.	Implemented by Forest Supervisor letter (8/14/90) (implementation of MSA). Permits revised to reflect change.	See letter of August 14, 1990, to all Sequoia employees from Supervisor Crates, Subject: Settlement Agreement for Forest Plan. See permit modifications circa 1990, 1995, 2001, 2004. Implemented by SNFPA 2001 ROD: p. A-14, A-27, A-31 and 2004 ROD: p. 35; Standards # 18-26; page 53.	X	X			
48	<b>II.C.2.a(2) Grazing and Oak Management amend LMP Rx BO6</b>	28	Develop water, fences, trails, etc. to facilitate optimum use of forage.	No change from 1988 LMP direction. No specific plan amendment per MSA guidance. Implemented by project-specific NEPA.	See vegetation reports for Tule River and Greenhorn West Grazing EAs for project specific analysis.					X
49	<b>II.C.2.a(3) Grazing and Oak Management amend LMP Rx BO6</b>	28	Retain 700 lbs residual dry matter (RDM).	Plan amended by SNFPA. See permit modifications in permittee files at Supervisor's Office for implementation prior to amendment.	SNFPA (2001: A-31) (2004: p. 56, #51)	X	X			
50	<b>II.C.2.a(4) Grazing and Oak Management amend LMP Rx BO6</b>	29	Winter grazing allotments limited to <15% of preferred browse and <5% of staple species in heavily browsed condition.	Implemented by project specific NEPA. Permits modified circa 1990. Implementation: browse condition addressed only winter allotments, i.e., Oat Mountain and West Trimmer on Hume Lake RD. Forest Plan amended by SNFPA	Consider grazing utilization paragraphs in SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-31 and SNFPA 2004 ROD, p.56, #51.	X	X			
51	<b>II.C.2.a(5) Grazing and Oak Management</b>	29	Allotment management plans will emphasize wildlife use of mast crops.	SNFPA desired conditions for Lower Westside Hardwood Ecosystems include: "Hardwood ecosystems are present in sufficient quality and quantity to provide important habitat elements for wildlife and native plant species.. Policy in place for project-specific NEPA. Example: Tule River West Grazing EA.	SNFPA 2001 ROD, A-14; SNFPA 2004 ROD, pages. 35, 55.	X	X			
52	<b>II.C.2.a(6) Grazing and Oak Management</b>	29	Frost, McDougald study as a threshold for oak recruitment. Adopt allotment-specific thresholds for oak recruitment.	See Tule River West and Greenhorn West Grazing EAs.	Recruitment of oaks and oak management addressed in SNFPA 2001 ROD, A-31; 2004 ROD, page 55, S&G #50.	X	X			
53	<b>II.C.2.a.7 Grazing and Oak Management</b>	30	Frost, McDougald study as a threshold for oak recruitment. Develop long-term strategies for oak recruitment where allotments below are threshold.	See Tule River West Grazing EA.	Recruitment of oaks and oak management addressed in SNFPA 2001 ROD, page A-27; 2004 ROD, page 53-55.	X	X			
54	<b>II.C.3.a Oak Management</b>	30	In mixed conifer-hardwood stands leave at least 20 sq ft. per acre basal area where this currently exists.	No projects proposed to remove oaks in BO6 prescription (no mixed conifer in this LMP prescription); (except incidental damage in prescribed fire, no removal of blue oaks). Policy in place. Plan amended by SNFPA.	SNFPA 2001 ROD: pp. A-14, A-27, A-31; 2004 ROD: pp.35, 53 Items 18-26, 55 Item 50.	X	X			
55	<b>II.C.3.b Oak Management</b>	30	Where it currently exists in pure hardwood stands maintain a minimum average of 50 sq ft. per acre basal area. Leave heavy mast-producing trees in any harvest of oaks.	CASPO (1993) and then SNFPA (2001, 2004) eliminated clearcuts and set new guidelines for oak management. Both SNFPA RODs stress the retention of oaks.	SNFPA 2001 ROD, A-27; 2004 ROD, page 53, Items 18-21, 26.	X	X			

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
56	<b>II.C.3.c Oak Management</b>	31	Where it currently exists, leave a minimum of 30 sq ft per acre basal area of oaks in mixed conifer hardwood stands identified as key deer areas.	Project-specific NEPA based on retaining oaks in clearcuts. CASPO and then SNFPA eliminated clearcuts and SNFPA set new guidelines for oak management. Both SNFPA RODs stress the retention of oaks.	See SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-27 and SNFPA 2004 ROD, page 53, items 18-21, 26.	X	X			
57	<b>II.C.3.d Oak Management</b>	31	Live oak stands will not be subject to vegetative manipulations other than prescribed burning, thinning for vigor, or for wildlife and watershed habitat improvement.	No projects proposed. CASPO and then SNFPA eliminated clearcuts and SNFPA set new guidelines for oak management. Both SNFPA RODs stress the retention of oaks.	See SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-27 and SNFPA 2004 ROD, page 53, items 18-21, 26.	X	X			
58	<b>II.C.3.e Oak Management</b>	31	In mixed hardwood-conifer or hardwood stands, favor retention of oak trees exhibiting active use as cavity-nesting sites or graineries.	No removal of oaks unless a hazard post CASPO. See discussion in project-specific pre-CASPO NEPA regarding selection of wildlife clumps or islands. See also Camp Nelson (Western Divide Ranger District) regarding favoring and protecting oaks. Both SNFPA RODs stress the retention of oaks.	Camp Nelson Interface Project Decision Memo, dated 2/17/05. SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-27 and SNFPA 2004 ROD, page 53, items 18-21, 26.	X	X			
59	<b>II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6</b>	31-33	Livestock grazing will be emphasized in black oak woodlands.	Specific task is to change wording in the plan. SNFPA amended hardwood management. SNFPA modified emphasis and opportunities through new standards that may limit grazing.	SNFPA 2004 ROD, pages 35 and 55, #50.	X	X			
60	<b>II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6 Fish and wildlife a.</b>	32	Provide for 1.5 snags/ac (see section J.1.c).	CASPO and then SNFPA amended plan to retain 4 snags. SNFPA provided for a more protective standard.	SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-28 and SNFPA 2004 ROD p. 51.	X	X			
61	<b>II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6 Fish and wildlife b.</b>	32	Maintain at least 50 sq ft basal area per acre of oaks where it currently exists.	No projects proposed in OW6 management emphasis area other than prescribed fire. No cutting of oaks proposed. Plan amended by 2001 SNFPA to retain all large (> 12" dbh) montane hardwoods... trees <12" would likely only have minor contribution to basal area.	Plan amended by SNFPA 2001 ROD A-28.	X	X			
62	<b>II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6 Fish and wildlife c.</b>	32	Maintain understory vegetation to provide horizontal and vertical diversity.	No change from 1988 LMP. Black Gulch Prescribed Fire Project and Camp Nelson Fuels Reduction Project are representative of the implementation of this item.	Direction further amended by SNFPA 2001 ROD, page A-27, and SNFPA 2004 ROD, page 53. Black Gulch Prescribed Fire Project, 7/1/98.		X			
63	<b>II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6 Fish and wildlife d.</b>	32	Ensure a stable and upward supply of oaks.	See SNFPA 2001 ROD regarding age class diversity and regeneration of oaks.	SNFPA 2001 ROD p. A-27.	X	X			
64	<b>II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6 Fish and wildlife e.</b>	33	Distribution of all age classes of oaks	See SNFPA 2001 ROD and SNFPA 2004 ROD regarding age class diversity and regeneration of oaks.	SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-27 and SNFPA 2004 ROD p. 51.	X	X			
65	<b>II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6 Range a.</b>	33	Develop water, fences, trails, etc to facilitate optimum use of forage.	No change from 1988 LMP. See Greenhorn West EA for project specific example.	Greenhorn West EA.					
66	<b>II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6 Range b.</b>	33	Retain 700 lbs residual dry matter (RDM).	Plan amended by SNFPA 2001 and 2004 RODs. See permit modifications in permittee files at Supervisor's Office for implementation prior to amendment.	SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-31, 2004 ROD p. 56, #51. Sample permit modification, dated 2/28/94.	X	X			
67	<b>II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6 Range c.</b>	33	Winter grazing allotments will limit browse utilization to a change of no more than 15% of preferred browse or 5% of staple species in heavily browsed conditions.	Also implemented by project specific NEPA. Permits modified circa 1990. See vegetation reports for Tule River West and Greenhorn West EAs for project implementation (browse condition addressed only winter grazing allotments: Oat Mountain and West Trimmer NEPA on Hume Lake Ranger District). SNFPA provided for a more protective standard.	SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-31, 2004 ROD p. 55 #50. West Trimmer, Oat Mountain, LeFever Allotments Decision Memo (9/16/08).	X	X			

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
68	<b>II.C.4 Black Oak LMP Rx OW6 Range d</b>	33	Allotment management plans will emphasize wildlife use of mast crops.	Desired conditions for Lower Westside Hardwood Ecosystems include: "Hardwood ecosystems are present in sufficient quality and quantity to provide important habitat elements for wildlife and native plant species." (SNFPA 2001 ROD, Appendix A - 14); (SNFPA 2004 ROD, pages. 35 and 55, #50). Mast crops have never been allocated to livestock use.	SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-14, A-27; SNFPA 2004 ROD, pages. 35 and 55, #50.	X	X			
69	<b>II.C.5 Livestock Grazing of Burned Mixed Chaparral modify LMP prescription MC6 Fish &amp; Wildlife a.</b>	34	Provide wildlife adaptations in all water developments.	No change from 1988 LMP. Project specific NEPA for new water developments. This policy is in place for all trough-type water developments.	Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05 makes this nationwide policy.	X				
70	<b>II.C.5 Livestock Grazing of Burned Mixed Chaparral modify LMP prescription MC6 Fish &amp; Wildlife b.</b>	34	Consider wildlife needs for cover and edge in vegetation manipulation projects.	Project specific NEPA example is Black Gulch Prescribed Fire Project NEPA (Kern River Ranger District).	Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05 makes this nationwide policy. Black Gulch Prescribed Fire Project, 7/1/98.	X	X			
71	<b>II.C.5 Livestock Grazing of Burned Mixed Chaparral amend LMP Rx MC6 Range a.</b>	34	Use Prescribed Fire as a primary method to accomplish age class management	No change from 1988 LMP. Further amended by SNFPA regarding management of brushland.	SNFPA ROD 2001, A-25. See Coffee Prescribed Burn Decision Memo 03/06/98, Camp Nelson Interface Project Decision Memo, 2/17/05, (Western Divide Ranger District) and Greenhorn West Grazing EA (mentions Alder Creek prescribed burn).	X	X			
72	<b>II.C.5 Livestock Grazing of Burned Mixed Chaparral amend LMP Rx MC6 Range b.</b>	34	Implement vegetative manipulation on slopes <40% when crown cover > 70% or average height exceeds 5 feet.	Minor wording change to 1988 LMP. Amended by SNFPA regarding management of brushland.	SNFPA ROD 2001, A-25. See Coffee Prescribed Burn Decision Memo 03/06/98, Camp Nelson NEPA (Western Divide RD) and Greenhorn West Grazing EA (mentions Alder Creek prescribed burn).	X	X			
73	<b>II.C.5 Livestock Grazing of Burned Mixed Chaparral amend LMP Rx MC6 Range c.</b>	34	Develop water supplies, fences and trails where needed on intensively treated lands.	No change from 1988 LMP. No areas intensively treated for range where this management would be appropriate.	Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05, makes this nationwide policy.	X	X			
74	<b>II.C.5 Livestock Grazing of Burned Mixed Chaparral amend LMP Rx MC6 Range d.</b>	35	Allotment Management Plans (AMPs) will be used to prescribe management strategies for the first 3 growing seasons following prescribed fire.	Permit files for annual operating instructions for allotments within fires ( Burnt country, Dunlap, Cannell Meadow, A. Brown). Current direction is to update AMPs to implement grazing NEPA decisions, i.e., AMPs are not done without current NEPA.	Letter to permittee dated 5/23/95, Annual operating plan for Burnt Country and Trout Creek allotments.	X	X			
75	<b>II.C.6 Effects of prescribed fire on age-class and diversity in mixed chaparral</b>	35	a. and b. Change management indicator species (MIS) for early seral stage habitats to include deer and California quail.	Plan amended For MIS. SNFPA 2007. Early seral habitat in mixed chaparral no longer tracked. Mountain quail is a management indicator species (MIS) for early seral habitat in coniferous forest. California quail was considered for the Sequoia NF, but not chosen.	SNFPA MIS EIS, Appendix B, p. 111 and 178.	X	X			

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
76	<b>II.C.7.a Changes to prescription MC5, Fish and Wildlife</b>	36	a. Addresses distribution of chaparral age classes to maintain a healthy viable stand.	Amended by SNFPA. Regarding management of brushland. No large chaparral projects have been proposed that would significantly change age class distribution over a large area.	SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-25.	X	X			
77	<b>II.C.7.b Changes to prescription MC5, Fish and Wildlife</b>	36	b. Implement vegetative manipulation projects only when crown density of browse species is greater than 70% or average height exceeds 5 feet.	No change from 1988 LMP. Amended by SNFPA regarding management of brushland. See Coffee Prescribed Burn Decision Memo as an example of implementation.	SNFPA 2001 ROD A-25. Coffee Prescribed Burn Decision Memo 03/06/98	X	X			
78	<b>II.C.7.c Changes to prescription MC5, Fish and Wildlife</b>	36	c. Develop water supplies on intensively treated lands.	No change from 1988 LMP. No areas intensively treated for range where this management would be appropriate.	Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05 makes this nationwide policy.	X	X			
79	<b>II.C.7.d. Changes to prescription MC5, Fish and Wildlife</b>	36	d. Treat vegetation on slopes > 40% to establish a 31+ year age class rotation.	Amended by SNFPA regarding management of brushland. No large chaparral projects have been proposed that would significantly change age class distribution over a large area.	SNFPA 2001 ROD p. A-25.	X	X			
80	<b>II.C.8.a Changes to prescription MC6 Fish and Wildlife a.</b>	37	a. Provide wildlife adaptations in all water developments.	No change from 1988 LMP. Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05 makes the nationwide policy. Project specific NEPA will address new water developments.	Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05 makes this nationwide policy.	X	X			
81	<b>II.C.8.b. Changes to prescription MC6 Fish and Wildlife b.</b>	37	b. Consider wildlife needs for cover and edge in vegetation manipulation projects.	Project specific NEPA will address wildlife needs.	Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05 makes this nationwide policy	X	X			
82	<b>II.C.8.a Changes to Rx MC6 Range a.</b>	37	a. Use prescribed fire as a primary method to accomplish age class management.	No change from 1988 LMP. Amended by SNFPA regarding management of brushland. See Coffee Camp and Camp Nelson environmental analyses.	SNFPA ROD 2001, A-25. See Coffee Prescribed Burn Decision Memo 03/06/98, Camp Nelson Interface Project Decision Memo, 2/17/05 (Western Divide Ranger District) and Greenhorn West Grazing EA (mentions Alder Creek prescribed burn).	X	X			
83	<b>II.C.8.Changes to prescription MC6, Range b.</b>	37	b. Implement vegetative manipulation on slopes <40% when cover > 70% or average height exceeds 5 feet.	No change from 1988 LMP.	SNFPA ROD 2001, A-25. See Coffee Prescribed Burn Decision Memo 03/06/98, Camp Nelson Interface Project, 2/17/05, (Western Divide Ranger District) and Greenhorn West Grazing EA (mentions Alder Creek prescribed burn).	X	X			
84	<b>II.C.8. Changes to prescription MC6 Range c.</b>	37	More than 50% of the prescribed fire are to occur in the late summer and fall.	Very little spring burning but not specifically tracked.	Coffee Prescribed Burn Decision Memo 03/06/98. SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-25; SNFPA 2004 ROD, pp. 49-50.	X	X			

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
85	<b>II.C.8.a Changes to prescription MC6 Range d.</b>	38	d. Develop water supplies, fences and trails where needed on intensively treated lands.	No change from 1988 LMP. No areas intensively treated for range where this management would be appropriate.	Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05 makes this nationwide policy.	X	X			
86	<b>II.C.9 Type Conversion</b>	38-39	Requiring Plan Amendment to change and delete phrases in regard to type conversion.	Since the Forest has not done a Plan Amendment, this portion of action is not ripe. Type conversion was never proposed. Partially amended by SNFPA regarding management of brushland.	SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-25	X	X			
87	<b>II.C.10.a Allotment Plans and Effectiveness</b>	39	a. Add to forestwide S&Gs on LMP page 4-30: Allotment management plans will include specific information, etc.	See allotment specific documentation in the Greenhorn West EA and Piute Mountain Grazing Project Decision Memo.	Greenhorn West EA and Piute Mountain Grazing Project Decision Memo, 9/29/08.	X	X			
88	<b>II.C.10.b.Allotment Plans and Effectiveness</b>	39-40	b. Monitor effectiveness of Riparian S&Gs: The item states that forest wide standards and guidelines on Pages 4-30. of the plan ...shall be amended to change the sentence to read, "Monitor the effectiveness of the SQF's riparian and wetland S&G."	In 1994, riparian area monitoring was conducted across the forest on key areas within allotments. There are roughly 35 sites. February 14, 1994 Forest Supervisor Sandra Key sent out a letter to permittees defining changes in the grazing practices that describes riparian area monitoring on pages 5 & 6. As part of the MSA, a range review was done. References include 2/14/1994 letter to permittees describing changes in the range program which included monitoring riparian Standards and Guidelines; MSA 1993 Annual Report: Range Program (page 14); Riparian Monitoring Document example 1994 for Lloyd Meadow, Little Kern Allotment.	References include 2/14/1994 letter to permittees describing changes in the range program which included monitoring riparian Standards and Guidelines; MSA 1993 Annual Report: Range Program (page 14); MSA 1994 Annual Report, pp 11-14, Appendix C, Range Management Program Review, 1994.	X	X			
89	<b>II.C.10.c.Allotment Plans and Effectiveness</b>	40	Include allot. mgt. plan revision on project planning schedule.	See Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA), Tule River West or Greenhorn West Grazing EAs. Hume Lake Ranger District (Greeley and West Trimmer/Oat Mountain allotments). Planned grazing environmental analysis is placed on the SOPA (not the AMP). The AMP is prepared to implement the grazing decision.	Schedule of Proposed Actions. Dated 7/17/2007.					X
90	<b>II.D 2. Allowable Sale Quantity (ASQ)</b>	41	Allowable sale quantity.	Moot for the monument. ASQ was only applicable to 2000 (one decade). The Proclamation reduced acreage upon which ASQ was set. ASQ eliminated in non-Monument by SNFPA 2001 until forest plan revision. Calculation of new ASQ for non-monument lands deferred to plan revision. 2004 SNFPA ROD does not schedule any regulated timber harvest.	SNFPA 2001 ROD, page 11 and 2004 ROD, p. 15.				X	X
91	<b>II.D 3. Short fall in Timber Sale Program FY 1988 &amp; 1989</b>	42	Make up volume using salvage of dead and dying trees.	MSA 1991 Annual Report, page 4.	No longer applicable. MSA 1991 Annual Report, page 4.					X
92	<b>II.D 4. Existing Timber Sales under Contract</b>	42-43	Suspend logging & related activities Scraps TS units 12, 32, 33, 34, & 39, until compliance with section D.5.b(2).	Scraps timber sale records are no longer available. Scraps sale closed in August, 1994.	Presumed completed; no longer applicable.					X
93	<b>II.D. 5 a. (1-5) Interim Timber Sale Program</b>	44-46	Watershed review - site specific field inspection if watershed threshold of concern (TOC) is above 80%.	All projects maintained TOC below 80% until the CWE methodology was reviewed as per section CWE.II.N.3(D)(8). Saddle Fuels Reduction Project documentation addresses thresholds of concern (TOC) over 80%.	Completed. Saddle Fuels Reduction Project EA, pp 10-15, Two letters to Regional Forester dated 9/15/99 and a letter to the District Rangers, dated 9/9/99.					X
94	<b>II.D. 5 a. (6) Interim Timber Sale Program</b>	47	Post-project monitoring: Will be conducted in accordance with the Sierra (sic) National Forest Monitoring Plan. Monitoring will be conducted ... to ascertain if mitigation was implemented and effective	Monitoring results of projects are provided at the back of each MSA Annual Report. Examples of project monitoring can be found in Appendix B of the MSA 1994 Annual Report.	Completed. MSA 1994 Annual Report, Appendix B.					X

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
95	<b>II.D. 5 b. Spotted Owl Review (1-2)</b>	47-49	For listed sales, identify sale units within 1.5 miles of the center of a SOHA.	Completed. See Fish Timber sale.	Completed. Letter to the Cannell Meadow District Ranger, dated 2/11/93, Subject: Fish Timber Sale Review.					X
96	<b>II.D. 5 c. Casa-Guard timber sale</b>	49	Address erosion problem at Rodeo Flat, repair water bars & side drains within Fish Creek drainage.	Rodeo Flat rehab monitoring and maintenance plan done around 1994, implemented in 1995 and monitored in 1996. Documents are located in Special Area II.H.6.11,12.	Completed. Rodeo Flat Rehab and Maintenance documents.					X
97	<b>II.D. 5 d. Miscellaneous timber sales</b>	49	Meet with appellants- Hyde, Flat, & Rabbit- to meet settlement direction.	See letter dated 8/21/92.	Completed. See letter dated 8/21/92 to the Forest Supervisor, subject: CEA Approval Contingency Memo.					X
98	<b>II.D.6 Timber Industry Fund</b>	50	Finance watershed improvement, reforestation, or recreation-related projects.	See MSA 1993 Annual Report, page 29 for an example of the accomplishment of this item.	MSA 1993 Annual Report, page 29. Industry no longer participating.					X
99	<b>Regional Forester agrees to expedite and decide all remaining pending administrative appeals involving Sequoia NF timber sales within 30 days of the date of signing this agreement....</b>	50-51			Completed.					X
100	<b>II.E.Old Growth, Wildlife Species, &amp; Fisheries 2. Spotted Owl Habitat Areas (SOHA) a.</b>	51-52	Review SOHAs.	This guidance superseded by CASPO 1993 replacing spotted owl habitat areas (SOHAs) with protected activity centers (PACs) and home range core areas (HRCAs). SNFPA 2001 and 2004 retained the PAC concept. Amended LMP and did away with SOHAs.	Completed. CASPO 1993 Decision Notice, page 4, EA p. III-2. SNFPA 2001 ROD p A-33, A-43, and 2004 ROD P. 37.		X			
101	<b>II.E.Old Growth, Wildlife Species, &amp; Fisheries 2. Spotted Owl Habitat Areas (SOHA) b.(1 - 3)</b>	52-55	Biological Evaluations for Spotted Owls.	This guidance superseded by Regional Office (RO) direction letter, dated 5/23/95, from Regional Forester. CASPO Interim Guidelines EA Cumulative Effects Analysis process for spotted owls. RO direction on spotted owl analysis and survey amended by CASPO Interim Guidelines. See Fish Timber Sale EA spotted owl review for application of MSA guidelines.	Regional Office direction in letter, dated 5/23/95, from Regional Forester, see 1993 CASPO Interim Guidelines EA page III-7 and Appendix B for Cumulative Effects Analysis process for spotted owls. RO direction on spotted owl analysis and survey amended by CASPO Interim Guidelines Page III-5 of the EA. See Fish TS spotted owl review, letter dated 9/22/93, for application of MSA guidelines. SNFPA 2001 ROD pp A-33-34 and 2004 ROD P. 37. Internal management direction: FSM 2670 Wildlife, Fish, and Sensitive Plants Habitat Management, dated 8/8/08.		X			

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
102	<b>II.E.3 Furbearers a.,c.-e.</b>	55-58	Furbearer (threatened and endangered and sensitive species management).	Retention of all habitat except red fir with >40% canopy cover mandated by CASPO Interim Guidelines EA where it currently exists. SNFPA 2001 extended this to aggregations of habitat with > 40% that are 1 acre or larger. SNFPA 2004 retains at least 50% canopy cover with some exceptions to 40%. SNFPA established furbearer monitoring and identified a land allocation for furbearers. Direction in FSM 2670 is followed.	CASPO Interim Guidelines EA p. III-3. SNFPA 2001 ROD p. A-1. SNFPA 2004 ROD p 51. FSM 2670 Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Plants and Animals.	X	X			
103	<b>II.E.3 Furbearers b.</b>	56	Sierra Nevada red fox, pine marten, and fisher managed as sensitive species.	Amended/accomplished by Regional Forester sensitive species list update (1998 See Forest Service Manual (FSM) 2670 supplement for Region 5). Forest and Regional mesocarnivore surveys (1991 to current, surveys available from Forest). Direction for fisher, marten, Sierra Nevada red fox amended by direction in SNFPA 2001 ROD and 2004 ROD.	Regional Forester sensitive species list update (1998 See Forest Service Manual (FSM) 2670 supplement for Region 5). Forest and Regional mesocarnivore surveys (1991 to current, surveys available from Forest). SNFPA 2001 Rod p. A-4, A-40, A-45; and 2004 ROD, p. 47.	X	X			
104	<b>II.E.4 Bald Eagles</b>	58	Protect roost trees & feeding areas for bald eagle at Pine Flat & Kern River.	Project-by-project analysis.	Biological Assessment for the Oat Management Vegetation Project, dated June 11, 1998, p 16.	X	X			
105	<b>II.E.5 Goshawk</b>	58-59	Protection of identified goshawk nests; establish goshawk network.	Superseded by 2004 SNFPA ROD and 2001 SNFPA RO. Framework guidelines apply.	2004 SNFPA ROD pp. 38-39, 59; 2001 SNFPA ROD p. A-36.	X	X			
106	<b>II.E.6 Condors</b>	59	Management of potential/active condor habitat until condor recovery plan is implemented.	Condors provisions terminated with the adoption of the Condor Recovery Plan in 1996. Some areas that are not addressed in the recovery plan say to follow forest plan direction (LMP and MSA say to follow recovery plan). 2004 Monument Plan Condor recovery proposal is an example of site specific consultation with FWS as projects are proposed.	The Forest Service consults with the Fish and Wildlife Service whenever projects are proposed within the range of the California condor. Meeting notes from 12/17/92 meeting with US Fish & Wildlife Service.		X			
107	<b>II.E.6.a.(1 - 3) Suitability Criteria for Evaluating Nesting Sites</b>	59	Management of potential condor nest sites in giant sequoia. (Previously inventoried potential condor nest trees in giant sequoias).	19 potential nest sites found in groves documented in letter as identified in memo from Ken Jimenez-Anderson (no requirement for survey of all groves).			X			
108	<b>II.E.6.Condor b.(1)</b>	60	Management of potential nesting habitat. No clear cutting w/in .5 miles.	No clear cutting since 1990.			X			
109	<b>II.E.6.Condors b. (2)</b>	60	Prohibits construction of new roads and trails w/in .5 miles of any potential condor nesting site.	No construction proposed.			X			
110	<b>II.E.6.Condors b.(3)</b>	61-64	When condors are released and capable of nesting; in consultation with Condor Recovery Team, implement road and trail closure plan.	Condors are not currently nesting on Sequoia NF. Only incidental use by condors under current management, which is based on consultation with United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). If there is potential for condors to nest in Sequoia NF, then forest will re-evaluate the need for closure of existing trails and roads. See MSA 1993 Annual Report, page 28. Defers to Condor Recovery Plan if condor return to the Sequoia Forest to nest.	MSA 1993 Annual Report, page 28.		X			
111	<b>II.E.6.Condors b.(3)(a)</b>	61-62	All roads and trails within .5 miles of a potential nest site shall be closed to all use, January 1 through June 30, can lift after April 15 if condors are not nesting.	Inapplicable, no condor nesting in Sequoia NF.			X			
112	<b>II.E.6.Condors b.(3)(b)</b>	62	If condors nesting with 1.5 miles of roads and trails, closure for balance of calendar year.	Inapplicable, no condor nesting in Sequoia NF.			X			
113	<b>II.E.6.Condors b.(3)(c)</b>	62-63	Exceptions: areas to remain open.	Inapplicable, no condor nesting in Sequoia NF.			X			
114	<b>II.E.6.c. Condors Management of Active Nesting Habitat</b>	64	Limit water drafting near active nest sites.	Inapplicable, no condor nesting in Sequoia NF.			X			

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
115	<b>II.E.6.d. Condors, Management of Roosting Habitat</b>	64	In roosting habitat: designate wildlife habitat management areas; prepare and implement road and trails closure plan.	Designated wildlife habitat management areas (see 2008 GIS layer).	Completed. See MSA 1993 Annual Report, page 28.		X			
116	<b>II.E.7.a Fisheries</b>	64	Amend plan regarding miles of stream needing repair in decade one.	Decade one is over; no longer applicable. Miles of stream needing improvement in revision will be based on current survey at time of plan revision. Concept of fisheries restoration/enhancement has changed since MSA. No longer restore "miles of stream." Assess for habitat type and natural range of variability. This information provides the necessary parameters to assess functioning systems. Streams are assessed using Regional Stream Channel Improvement (SCI) Protocol as in the SNFPA. Stream channels are assessed in response to reaches where improvements would be appropriate. It is inappropriate to treat transport or source reaches for fisheries habitat/enhancement. These types of channels comprise the bulk of the forest's channel types.	SCI direction: <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/publications/water_resources/sci/techguide-v5-08-2005-a.pdf">http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/publications/water_resources/sci/techguide-v5-08-2005-a.pdf</a> , SCI Surveys 2001-2008 & list of sites.	X	X			
117	<b>II.E.7.b Fisheries</b>	65	Complete repair or enhancement of streams at 10% of needs/yr to achieve 50 miles within decade as prioritized by WINI.	Requirement satisfied through the adoption of the riparian conservation areas in the SNFPA. Rise to the Future is an outdated program, as the understanding of fisheries habitat and hydrology has evolved, and is no longer used by the Forest Service. The goals in the MSA are unrealistic based on available fisheries habitat and appropriate restoration. See response in II.E.7.a above. The forest has continued to restore riparian areas as funding and capability allow. A project has been in either the analysis, design, or implementation stage every year since the signing of the MSA. Last year's project was Big Meadows Plug and Pond. This year we are working on Osa Meadow Restoration and Last Chance Meadow Restoration.	SNFPA 2001 ROD, pages Appendix A-51-59 and 2004 ROD pp. 62-66. See MSA 1991 Annual Report, page 18-19; MSA 1992 Annual Report, pages 26-27; MSA 1993 Annual Report, page 26; MSA 1994 Annual Report, page 29-30, MSA 1995 Annual Report, page 22-28, 31; MSA 1996 Annual Report, page 18; MSA 1997 Annual Report, page 20; MSA 1998 Annual Report, pages 18-, 26-28, MSA 1999 Annual Report, pages 20-23, 38-40. Big Meadows Improvement Project Soil and Water Forest Plan Analysis Document, pp 1-19.	X	X			
118	<b>II.E.7.c Fisheries</b>	65	Amend Plan goals on 4-3 to add: Promote recreational opportunities by striving to increase fisheries biomass by 20% via habitat improvement projects.	Task is to revise wording in LMP to reflect measurable goal. Our current Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with State of California, Department of Fish and Game, and the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture (9/25/1995), is to manage for habitat and not biomass. Riparian Conservation Objectives in the SNFPA provide direction and address this issue relative to the creation of Critical Aquatic Refuges (CARs) for protection of rare aquatic/riparian species.	SNFPA 2001 ROD, pages Appendix A-51-59 and 2004 ROD pp. 62-66. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with State of California, Department of Fish and Game, and the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture (9/25/1995).	X	X			
119	<b>II.E.7.d.(1) Fisheries</b>	66	Portion of Section 30 in Slate Mountain roadless area managed for Kern River Rainbow Trout.	California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) continues to work with the University of California-Davis to identify where Kern River rainbow trout may be present. When populations are confirmed through genetic analysis, they may contribute as donor stock for the Kern River hatchery to raise and re-introduce into portions of the upper North Fork Kern River. The sites where Kern River rainbow trout may be introduced have not been selected. CDFG (C.McGuire) was not aware of any significance related to this Slate Mountain site, and it is outside of endemic habitat for this species. The Forest continues to work with CDFG under the Upper Kern River Basin Fisheries Management Plan (1995).	FS personnel do not know why this item was inserted into the MSA. Upper Kern River Basin Fisheries Management Plan (1995).	X	X			X
120	<b>II.E.7.d.(2) Fisheries</b>	66	Develop riparian demonstration area in critical habitat for Little Kern Golden Trout (LKGT).	No riparian demonstration area was developed. The SNFPA identifies 6 CARs on the Sequoia NF as known locations of five TES species including one for Little Kern Golden Trout. The Little Kern River basin containing critical habitat for Little Kern golden trout was established as a critical aquatic refuge (CAR) in the SNFPA 2001 ROD.	FS personnel are unsure of what was expected to be developed in a riparian demonstration area. SNFPA 2001 ROD, Appendix, p. A-51 and 2004 ROD, p. 63. Reference Riparian Incentives (1989).	X	X			X

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
121	<b>II.E.7.d.(3) Fisheries</b>	66	Rainbow Trout population surveys in connection with stream channel surveys for MIS monitoring.	Presence-absence surveys completed as part of stream surveys. Forest Service now uses benthic macroinvertebrates for MIS when the 2008 Sierra Nevada Forests Management Indicator Species Amendment superseded earlier direction. Rainbow trout was removed as an MIS. This MSA requirement specifies population survey; guidelines for MIS changed; population surveys no longer applicable.	2008 Sierra Nevada Forests Management Indicator Species Amendment, USDA, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region, ROD, p. 3. SCI Surveys 2001-2008 & list of sites, Macro Studies 2002-2007.	X	X			
122	<b>II.E.7.d.(4) Fisheries</b>	66	Base line data generated from stream surveys, fish assessment model and beneficial uses.	Stream Condition Inventory is used to assess habitat, surveys still record presence/absence population data. Prior to 2001 fish surveys performed. SCI started in 2001. Beneficial uses data base commensurate with Central Valley Water Quality Control Board (CVWQCB) has been developed from past surveys and is provided as a reference.	See references noted in section II.E.7.b (Line 117) Fisheries and SCI direction <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/publications/water_resources/sci/techguide-v5-08-2005-a.pdf">http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/publications/water_resources/sci/techguide-v5-08-2005-a.pdf</a> , SCI Surveys 2001-2008 & list of sites from section II.E.7.d.3 (Line 121) Fisheries; Beneficial uses database.	X	X			
123	<b>II.F.1 Suitable Lands</b>	66	Suitable land base.	Those areas within the Monument will no longer be considered suitable for timber production per Proclamation. Entire GSNM was declared unsuitable and unregulated for timber harvest by proclamation.	Proclamation 7295, p. 24097; SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. 11 and 2004 ROD, p. 15.			X	X	
124	<b>II.F.2. Suitable Lands</b>	67	Identify lands not suitable for timber harvesting.	Not relevant for the monument. Outside the monument deferred to plan revision process. Suitability Assessment for the Piute Project .		X		X	X	

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
125	II.F.3. Suitable Lands	67	Remove specific areas from suitable land base.	Partially satisfied and superseded by the Proclamation. Monument Plan will make the finding that there is no suitable land base in the monument. Non-monument lands will be analyzed in the Forest Plan revision. In 1990, the Forest created a GIS layer of capable, available, and suitable lands. All areas listed in Exhibit H of the MSA have been excluded from the suitable timber land base as required by the MSA. This is evidenced by the Timber Management Regulation Class designation "Unregulated" given these areas in the Land Suitability Class GIS data. The GIS theme sqfplsc97_2 was built by the USDA-FS, R5 Remote Sensing Lab and is filed in the Forest GIS library.	Proclamation 7295, p. 24097	X		X	X	
126	II.F.4,5,6 Suitable Lands	67-69	Address reforestation surveys in timber sale EA's.	Done. June, 1991 Reforestation Report, Robert R. Rogers, June 1991 (see attached letter). See Suitability Assessment for the Piute Project.	Completed. Example document is the suitability assessment for the Piute project.					X
127	II.G.Roadless Areas, 2. Hume Lake District	69-70	Agnew Roadless Area.	Proposed amendment: Agnew Roadless Area west of Lightning Creek will be classified as unregulated. No road building or logging will occur. The area will be managed for giant sequoias, watershed, wildlife, and roadless recreation.		X		X		
128	II.G.Roadless Areas, 3. Tule River District	70	Moses Roadless Area.	Proposed amendment: The Regional Forester shall recommend that the mapped portions of the Moses Roadless Area (Exhibit I) be included in the Wilderness System. Pending final disposition, mapped portions of the Moses Roadless Area shall be removed from the available timber land base and the area will be managed to preserve its wilderness character. Will be recommended to be added to Golden Trout Wilderness.	Two actions required: 1. Roadless and 2. Addition to Golden Trout Wilderness.	X		X		
129	II.G.Roadless Areas, 3. Tule River District	70-71	Slate Mountain Roadless Area will be divided into regulated and unregulated areas as shown on MSA Exhibit J. No commercial logging or timber roads will be allowed in the unregulated area, except in conjunction with proposed Peppermint Ski Resort. Portions of Section 30 will be managed to protect habitat of the Kern River rainbow trout. Coy drainage managed to protect Camp Nelson viewshed and together with Rogers Camp saddle to provide old growth habitat between Slate Mountain and Black Mountain. Logging of regulated are will be limited to Reg. II sanitation, etc.	Proclamation changed the management direction for this area. Unsure of why the Kern River rainbow trout is addressed here, CDFG (C.McGuire) was not aware of any significance related to this Slate Mountain site, and it is outside of endemic habitat for this species.		X		X		
130	II.G.Roadless Areas, 3. Tule River District	71	Black Mountain Roadless Area.	Proposed Amendment: to be classified as unregulated. No road building or logging will occur. The area will be managed for giant sequoias, watershed, wildlife (deer mitigation corridor, old-growth species), roadless recreation, and sugar pine gene resources. Proclamation changed this direction.		X		X		
131	II.G.Roadless Areas, 3. Tule River District	71	Dennison Roadless Area.	Proposed Amendment: to be classified as unregulated. It will retain its current Plan designated as a Semi-Primitive, Non-motorized area.		X		X		
132	II.G.Roadless Areas, 4. Hot Springs District	71	Lion Ridge Roadless Area	Proposed Amendment: to be divided into regulated and unregulated areas as shown on MSA Exhibit J. No road building or logging will be allowed in the unregulated area. Logging section 35 and the northwest corner of section 36 will be limited to Reg II sanitation, single tree selection.... Proclamation changed this direction.		X		X		
133	II.G.Roadless Areas, 5. Cannell Meadow Ranger District	72	Woodpecker Roadless Area	Woodpecker mostly incorporated into Dome Land Wilderness.		X			X	
134	II.G.Roadless Areas, 5. Cannell Meadow Ranger District	72	South Sierra Roadless Area	South Sierra designated wilderness.	Completed					X

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
135	<b>II.G.Roadless Areas, 5. Cannell Meadow Ranger District</b>	72-75	Rincon Roadless Area	Proposed amendment: Dispersed recreation and habitat protection for golden trout will be emphasized in a corridor along Durwood Creek. Corridor will be 300 feet each side of the creek as measured from the highwater mark, and it will be unregulated. Remainder of Rincon roadless are will be classified as CF7. Timber will be managed by uneven-aged management (group and single tree selection).		X			X	
136	<b>II.G.7,8, 9 Roadless Areas</b>	72-75	Follow roadless area and first entry EIS direction.	Follow current Roadless Rule.	Completed. Policy in place.					
137	<b>II.H.1. Special Areas</b>	75	1. Trail from Cannell Cabin to Kern River.	MSA recommended Sensitivity Level 1, with foreground retention VQO. Will change to Scenery Management System for analysis.	Scenery Management System (SMS) replaced the Visual Management System in 1997. SMS uses Concern Levels which are similar to the Sensitivity Levels. The three categories of Concern Levels are 1-High, 2-Moderate, and 3-Low. A Concern Level of High would be assigned to heavily used areas or visually sensitive routes/sites.	X			X	
138	<b>II.H.2. Special Areas</b>	75	2. Salmon Creek trail to Horse Meadow Camp to Salmon Falls.	MSA recommended Sensitivity Level 1, with foreground retention VQO. Will change to Scenery Management System for analysis.	Scenery Management System (SMS) replaced the Visual Management System in 1997. SMS uses Concern Levels which are similar to the Sensitivity Levels. The three categories of Concern Levels are 1-High, 2-Moderate, and 3-Low. A Concern Level of High would be assigned to heavily used areas or visually sensitive routes/sites.	X			X	
139	<b>II.H.3. Special Areas</b>	75	3. Big Meadows area on the Hume Lake District.	Big Meadows area follows special area direction. See Pebble Timber Sale EA - 1996 Visual Quality Objectives input. Proclamation changed the direction allowed in this area.	Pages 11-13 and maps from Pebble Timber Sale EA, 1996.	X		X		
140	<b>II.H.4. Special Areas</b>	76	4. Freeman Creek Area.	In interim, Freeman Creek Trail sensitivity level was made a Level One in respect to MSA guidelines. Will change to Scenery Management System for analysis.	Scenery Management System (SMS) replaced the Visual Management System in 1997. SMS uses Concern Levels which are similar to the Sensitivity Levels. The three categories of Concern Levels are 1-High, 2-Moderate, and 3-Low. A Concern Level of High would be assigned to heavily used areas or visually sensitive routes/sites.	X		X		
141	<b>II.H.5. Special Areas</b>	76	5. California Riding and Hiking Trail.	CA Riding Trail, no action taken. Addressed in trail plan that was not finalized. Will be addressed in plan amendment or revision.		X		X	X	
142	<b>II.H.6. Special Areas</b>	76	6. Fish Creek watershed restoration in Fish Creek.	Extensive watershed restoration was accomplished and is ongoing. Each project is addressed separately. Fish Creek Watershed designated as a critical aquatic refuge (CAR) in SNFPA 2001 FEIS, Appendix I; and SNFPA 2004 ROD, p. 43 affirmed the CAR designations in SNFPA 2001. Watershed restoration activities were identified and a subset of these implemented for Fish (1803000202) Creek Watershed. The Forest conducts annual monitoring of bank stability and evaluates channel form every year using SCI, under the Conservation Assessment and Strategy for the California golden trout (2004).	Fish Creek Watershed Improvement Needs Inventory and Implementation documentation. More information may be found in the WINI Accomplishment Reports and photos for the specific year activities took place. Annual monitoring reports from site in Fish Creek CAR submitted to CDFG and are available at SO. SNFPA 2001 FEIS, Appendix I and SNFPA 2004, p. 43. Conservation Assessment and Strategy for the California Golden Trout (2004).	X	X			
143	<b>II.H.7. Special Areas</b>	77	7. Breckenridge, SOHAs and Condor roost areas.	In interim, policy in place until Forest Plan Amendment is done, to honor MSA intent to protect Condor Roost. NEPA document demonstrates consultation with USFWS. SOHAs and spotted owls are addressed in the spotted owl sections of this document. Deferred to Forest Plan revision.		X			X	
144	<b>II.H.8. Special Areas</b>	77	8. Basket Pass condor rooting areas protection	In interim, policy in place until Forest Plan Amendment is done, to honor MSA intent to protect Condor Roost. NEPA document show consultation with FWS.	NEPA documents show consultation with FWS. Consultation documented in 1998 trail plan (page K-5-6) and 2004 GSNM (page 242) plan. Plans were withdrawn or revoked but the consultation stands. Additional plan amendment for condor roosts in process with travel management.	X			X	
145	<b>II.H. 9.Special Areas</b>	77	9. Converse Basin Giant Sequoia Grove.	Converse Basin Grove follows special area direction. Began planning for Converse Basin Grove EIS in 1998 (see project initiation letter). On hold since GSNM Proclamation.		X		X		
146	<b>II.H.10. Special Areas</b>	77	10. Lion and Blue Ridges condor roost areas.	Protection is being done on a case by case basis in consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service. In interim, policy in place until Monument Plan Amendment is done, to honor MSA intent to protect condor roost. NEPA document show consultation with FWS. Incorporation in GSNM plan.	NEPA documents show consultation with FWS. Consultation documented in 1998 trail plan (page K-5-6) and 2004 GSNM (page 242) plans. Plans were withdrawn or revoked but the consultation stands. Additional plan amendment for condor roosts in process with travel management.	X		X		

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
147	II.H.11. Special Areas	77	11. Taylor Creek watershed restoration.	Projects for Taylor Creek do not exist. Activities planned for Taylor Creek, dropped when timber sale lost on appeal; projects identified in project environmental assessment would have been funded through KV funds.	Taylor Creek rehabilitation was proposed in the Church Timber Sale Contract, but operations were halted by court order prior to performing the work in the rehab unit on Taylor Creek.	X			X	
148	II.H.12. Special Areas	77	12. Fay and Caldwell Creeks watershed restoration.	Extensive watershed restoration was accomplished and is ongoing. Each project is addressed separately. Watershed restoration activities were identified and a subset of these implemented for Fay (1803000204) Creek Watershed. Projects for Caldwell Creek do not exist.	Fay Creek Watershed Improvement Needs Inventory and Implementation documentation. More information may be found in the WINI Accomplishment Reports and photos for the specific year activities took place.	X			X	
149	II.H.13. Special Areas	78	13. Rancheria Road managed as foreground partial retention visual objective.	Rancheria Road is on partial retention visual quality objective. Visual quality objectives system replaced by Scenery Management System.	Scenery Management System (SMS) replaced the Visual Management System in 1997. SMS uses Concern Levels which are similar to the Sensitivity Levels. The three categories of Concern Levels are 1-High, 2-Moderate, and 3-Low. A Concern Level of High would be assigned to heavily used areas or visually sensitive routes/sites.	X			X	
150	II. (I) Timber	78-88	Conform to revised S&G's for timber mgt. (Exhibit N & p. 80-89).	LRMP pages 4-31 to 4-33 and Exhibit N are not applicable in the monument. These MSA pages address rotation age, clearcuts, fir regeneration, suitable slopes, sugar pine management, diversity in planting, uneven age management and seed tree. All of this is changed or amended by the the Proclamation, SNFPA (2001, 2004) and regional direction on sugar pine management. Direction on involving Bob Heald (UC Berkeley, Blodgett Experimental Forest since retired) is amended by SNFPA direction on uneven age management and implemented by the recent paper by Stine, et al. SNFPA 2001 & 2004, page A-27 2001, pages 49 to 66, 2004 SNFPA Record of Decision and page 363 2004 Vol. 1. These standards and guidelines have been amended, but would still apply in cases where they were more constraining than those in the 2001 (in monument) or 2004 (rest of forest) SNFPA.	SNFPA (2001) ROD, pp. A-14-15, A-25-28, A-40-42, FEIS VOL 4 Appendix D, pp. D5-11, D17, D19-21, D25-29, D30-31, D32-33, D36-38, D40-41, D43-48, D59, D74-75, D79, D81; SNFPA 2004 ROD, pp. 49-66, SNFPA FSEIS, Vol. 1, Appendix A pp. 363-364, 367-368.	X	X	X	X	
151	II.J Snags	88-91	Snag management.	SNFPA met intent of MSA by the retention of 3-6 snags per acre. FIA inventories - EA write-up (Rabbit Timber Sale.). CASPO Interim Guidelines EA amended snag guidelines (EA p.III-3). SNFPA (2001 ROD p. A-28; 2004: p. 51) amends snag and down log management guidelines. 11/20/90 "Down Log Snag Inventory for the Rabbit Sale Area."	CASPO Interim Guidelines EA p.III-3. SNFPA (2001 ROD p. A-28; 2004: p. 51), 11/29/90 Down Log Snag Inventory for the Rabbit Sale Area. Buck Rock timber sale snag inventory p. 16 from the EA.	X	X			
152	II.K Demonstration /research areas/ projects	92	SQF "shall identify timber sales of other projects, such as site preparation activities, which will be used to test and evaluate new approaches ..." At least two such projects for discussion at each annual meeting of the parties.	New perspectives letter for Tule River (Western Divide).	Completed. MSA 1992 Annual Report, pages 33-34. Letter to Regional Forester, dated 8/23/91, Subject: Pilot District New Perspectives Accomplishments.					X
153	II.L.2.a. Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV)	93-99	2. SPNM Areas. a. Sirretta Peak trail management and loop trail.	Direction in the MSA is being implemented. EIS and Supplements have been prepared. No Record of Decision was signed.	Will be addressed in site specific analysis and forest plan revision if needed. (The Siretta Trail project is site specific--where forest plan comes in is if change is needed to SPNM.)				X	
154	II.L.2.b. Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV)	99-101	2. SPNM Areas. b. Dry meadow/Long Valley OHV trail in SPNM.	To be addressed in Piute Motorized Travel Management Plan. Currently following MSA interim direction.						
155	II.L.3.a. Trail Plan Considerations	102	a. Develop more 4WD trails to create a better balance among users.	Proclamation designated routes on roads only. The issue of where 4-wheel drive and OHVs are allowed is partially superseded in the monument by the Proclamation (2000) which required that motorized vehicles be only allowed on designated roads. The issue of open areas versus designated routes is superseded by the national travel management rule, which required designated routes. The travel management project covers areas where open riding was allowed. Proclamation requires a transportation plan for the monument, dealing with both roads and trails. The rest of the forest will be addressed in forest plan revision or other environmental documents.			X	X		

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
156	<b>III.3.b. Trail Plan Considerations</b>	102-103	b. Inventory of trails and roads documenting tradeoffs.	Proclamation designated routes on roads only. The issue of where 4-wheel drive and OHV's are allowed is partially superseded in the monument by the Proclamation (2000) which required that motorized vehicles be only allowed on designated roads. The issue of open areas versus designated routes is superseded by the national travel management rule, which required designated routes. The travel management project covers areas where open riding was allowed. Proclamation requires a transportation plan, dealing with both roads and trails.				X	X	
157	<b>III.3.c. Trail Plan Considerations</b>	103-104	c. Collaboration and cooperation to balance use.	Extensive public involvement during the development of the Motorized Travel Management Plan currently out for comment.	Public involvement is part of the project planning process.			X	X	
158	<b>III.3.d. Trail Plan Considerations</b>	104	d. Locate hiking and equestrian trails in other parts of the forest, especially along the Western Divide between Slate Mountain and Greenhorn Summit.	Consideratons for future planning.				X	X	
159	<b>III.4.a.(1) Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV), Plan Revisions</b>	104-105	4. a. Prescriptions OW5, MC5, PS5, and CF5. (1) Dispersed Recreation.	Change proposed: Increase opportunities for public enjoyment and benefits.		X		X	X	
160	<b>III.4.a.(2) Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV), Plan Revisions</b>	105	4. a. (2) Under Dispersed Recreation #4.	Change proposed: Manage recreation activities by location and period of use based on wildlife needs (e.g., excluding incompatible use from key areas during fawning and/or nesting.)		X		X	X	
161	<b>III.4.b. Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV), Plan Revisions</b>	105-106	4. b. Prescription CF5	Change proposed: Create and/or maintain a vegetative buffer strip along trail to reduce impacts to wildlife.		X		X	X	
162	<b>III.4.c. Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV), Plan Revisions</b>	106	4. c. Prescriptions BO6, OW6, MC6, PS6, and CF6.	Change proposed: Restrict or reduce recreation use seasonably to mitigate significant conflicts with grazing.		X		X	X	
163	<b>III.4.d. Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV), Plan Revisions</b>	106	4. d. Prescription CF6.	Change proposed: Remove trails from meadows, wherever necessary to protect meadow resources.		X		X	X	
164	<b>III.4.e. Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV), Plan Revisions</b>	106-107	4. e. Prescription CF7.	Change proposed: Enhancement of recreation opportunities will be considered in timber sale planning where appropriate.		X			X	
165	<b>III.4.f. Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV), Plan Revisions</b>	107	4. f. Amend Table 4.2 on page 4-13 through 4-15.	Change proposed: add the following: References to trail mileage such as: miles open to OHV use, miles closed to OHV use, miles with seasonal closures, miles to be constructed/reconstructed/relocated are estimates. Final mileage to be developed in the trail plan.	Superseded by Proclamation.	X			X	
166	<b>III.4.g. Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV), Plan Revisions</b>	107	4. g. Recreation Standards and Guidelines, p. 4-16.	Change proposed: Under Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS), add: Minor adjustment may be made to the ROS class boundaries based on analysis in various plan and/or projects, such as the Forest Trail Management Plan, Spotted Owl Habitat Area Managements.		X		X	X	
167	<b>III.4.h. Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV), Plan Revisions</b>	107	4. h. Add to p. 4-20 under "non-motorized."	Change proposed: non-motorized cross-country travel may be restricted to prevent resource damage.	Superseded by Proclamation only for non-motorized mechanized (mountain bikes) okay for other non-motor (hike, horse).	X		X	X	
168	<b>III.4.i. Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV), Plan Revisions</b>	108	4. i. Strike from p. 4-90.	Change proposed: remove: OHV use be allowed on designated trails if such use does not threaten values within the SIA. Deferred until we do further travel management planning.	Superseded by Proclamation.	X			X	
169	<b>III.M Yield/ASQ</b>	108	Addresses basis for timber yield and allowable sale quantity.	Yield Tables were completed in 1993 for the CASPO report by the Regional Office. Subsequent Yield Tables were developed by the RO for the 2001 SNFPA, 2003 GSNM EIS, and the 2004 SNFPA (phone conversation with Klaus Barber, Regional Analyst). The calculation of a Forest ASQ and Forest Plan amendment became irrelevant with the 2000 Presidential Proclamation creating the GSNM. This does not apply to the monument. The rest of the forest will be addressed during plan revision.		X			X	

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
170	<b>II.N.3.a. et al. Cumulative Watershed Effects (CWE)</b>	109-117	Implementation of Panel Recommendations -- CWE Methodology.	CWE methodology and direction incorporated into Sequoia manual on CWE. The CWE analysis procedures were accomplished in 1991 with the development of the Cumulative Watershed Effects Field Guide by Kaplan-Henry and Machado. Beneficial use database was developed to identify what uses are most sensitive to watershed disturbances. Stream Condition Inventory surveys are installed to monitor the pre and post condition of all activities and "test" the predictions of the CWE modeling as well as monitor the condition of the watershed. Forest was divided into 7th field Hydrologic Units (HUC's) using federal direction. These watersheds are roughly between 250 and 2,000 acres.	MSA 1991 Annual Report, pages 11-12; MSA 1992 Annual Report, pages 13-15; Beneficial uses database (MSA 1992 Annual Report, Appendix E); CWE Manuel; GIS 7th field watershed map. The forest is following FSH 2509.22, Chapter 20, Supp 1, 7/88 Cumulative Watershed Effects Analysis; NEPA, 40 CFR Sec. 1508.1 and 1508.25; Federal Water Pollution Act 1977 Sec. 208(2)(F)A.	X		X	X	
171	<b>II.N.3.a.(1)(a) Cumulative Watershed Effects (CWE), CWE Methodology, (1) Beneficial Uses of Water., Proposed standards to add to the Forest Plan.</b>	110	(a) The beneficial uses that are most sensitive to watershed disturbance are fish habitat and domestic supply. The Forest shall manage any watershed in which it has identified one of these as a beneficial use to protect such use, as per RWQCB Basin Plans, using developed criteria. The Forest shall identify and protect sensitive reach(es) (weakest links) in the watershed. In all cases, the Forest shall protect soil productivity.			X		X	X	
172	<b>II.N.3.a.(1)(b) Cumulative Watershed Effects (CWE). CWE Methodology, (1) Beneficial Uses of Water., Proposed standards to add to the Forest Plan.</b>	110	(b) The Forest shall determine the proper use of the watershed unit to be subject to CWE analysis based on the identified beneficial use(s). The unit size will generally range from 250 to 2,000 acres.			X		X	X	
173	<b>II.N.3.a.(1)(c) Cumulative Watershed Effects (CWE). CWE Methodology, (1) Beneficial Uses of Water., Proposed standards to add to the Forest Plan.</b>	110-111	c. Each project NEPA document shall identify the beneficial uses of water and the most sensitive stream reach(es) as part of the CWE analysis.			X		X	X	
174	<b>II.N.3.a.(2)(a-f) Cumulative Watershed Effects (adapting regional guidelines on CWE analysis procedures)</b>	111-114	"Facilitation of CWE analysis procedures...this will require taking field measurements during 1990-1991 and follow-up measurements during the 1991 season.	Cumulative Watershed Effects Field Guide was finalized in 1991 (Kaplan-Henry and Machado). This document was prepared in response to the MSA. The CWE Model resulted from the guidelines laid out by the MSA. It was decided that sediment was the controlling processes of concern [II.N(a)(2)(a)]. It assesses sediment impacts, relative changes in erosion and sediment delivery [II.N(a)(2)(b)]. It identifies the most crucial process controlling the system through evaluation of watershed sensitivity that evaluates soil, topography, climate, geology, vegetation, and fluvialgeomorphology [II.N(a)(2)(c)]. It establishes a process for developing and evaluating coefficients to assess activities through basic erosion rates that are modified through a series of factors that reflect site-specific watershed characteristics. These include: Sensitivity to disturbances, sediment delivery, slope, geologic erosion potential, and routing potential [II.N(a)(2)(d&e)]. CWE Workshop was convened on December 6-7, 1993; details are in MSA 1995 Annual Report, page 26 and a letter from Gordon Grant, dated 1/11/1994 [	Completed. Aquatics files, Fisheries section II.E.7.b (Line 117), Fisheries section II.E.7.d.3 (Line 121), NRIS database.					

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
175	<b>II.N.3.b.(2)(a),(b) Cumulative Watershed Effects</b>	117-119	Data Gathering & Monitoring	Peppermint Study, 10/97, documents the findings of a six-year study of the Peppermint and Holby Creek watersheds. Water quality, watershed condition and beneficial uses were evaluated to validate the extent of the effects of management activities as indicated by the Sequoia National Forest CWE methodology. The CWE analysis of these watersheds was performed for this study and not as part of an environmental analysis. The results of this study provide a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of the Forest's CWE methodology. The CWE analysis indicated that the Needles I and Needles II Timber Sales would have a very low potential for cumulative effect in the Peppermint Creek watershed and that these sales together with past management and the subdivision in Holby Creek would have a higher potential for impacts. The Peppermint and Holby in-channel monitoring study supports the results of the CWE analysis for the basins. There were few physical, chemical, or biological differences between the Control Area of Peppermint Creek and Lower Peppermint Creek. (Continued next column)	The physical differences between the Control Area and Lower Peppermint were within environmental norms with the different stream gradients within the areas. The differences between the fish habitat at higher flows were also within environmental norms given the different channel types. The lack of differences between these areas is an indication that the current management activities are having little or no effect on the stream. It also indicates that the Best Management Practices (BMPs) are working. If the BMPs were not working, then sediment would be entering the stream. There were chemical and biological differences between Holby Ck and the Control Area of Peppermint Ck. The water flow in Holby Ck was much less than in the Control Area. The consequences of the lesser flow were manifested in differences in the water chemistry, but mostly in the aquatic macroinvertebrate community. // Completed. MSA 1991 Annual Rpt pages 13-14; MSA 1992 Annual Rpt, Appendix D1-D-30 and Appendix E; MSA 1993 Annual Rpt, p 24; MSA 1995 Annual Rpt p 21; MSA 1996 Annual Rpt, pp 18-19; and MSA 1999 Annual Rpt Appendix C.					X
176	<b>II.N.3.b.(2)(c) CWE</b>	119	Data Gathering & Monitoring	All SCI plots provide photo documentation of surveyed reaches, gage stations used for regional discharge curves are photographed and surveyed. The Sequoia National Forest Aquatics personnel have spent the past 18 years working on evaluation of gage data.	Completed. See references for Fisheries II.E7.d.3 (Line 121); and Riparian II.A.1 Line 2).					X
177	<b>II.N.3.b.(2)(d), CWE</b>	120	Data Gathering & Monitoring	SCI data collects fish habitat information, past surveys integrated with fisheries.	Completed. See references for Fisheries II.E7.d.3 (Line 121); and Riparian II.A.1 (Line 2).					X
178	<b>II.N.3.b.(2)(e),CWE</b>	120	Data Gathering & Monitoring	Surveys done for response reaches as commensurate with SCI protocol.	Completed. See references for Fisheries II.E7.d.3 (Line 121); and Riparian II.A.1 (Line 2).					X
179	<b>II.N.3.b.(2)(f), CWE</b>	120	Data Gathering & Monitoring	Soil movement measured through BMP Monitoring and Soil Quality Standards.	Completed. See soils section II.O (Lines 191-192)for references.					X
180	<b>II.N.3.b.(2)(g) CWE</b>	120	Data Gathering & Monitoring	WINI monitored, See BMPEP monitoring reports and administrative forms. There is one in the Special Areas section. All restoration projects are monitored after they are implemented. Current SNFPA direction is to perform SCI prior to ground disturbing activities.	Completed. Recent example is SCI on Big Meadows pre and post project implementation. Pre project is in fisheries section II.E.7.b (Line 117).					X
181	<b>II.N.3.b.(2)(h), CWE</b>	120-122	Data Gathering & Monitoring	Records are stored in LMP Storage Room #20 of the GSNM Supervisor's Office in Porterville, CA.	Completed.					X
182	<b>II.N.3.c. Cumulative Watershed Effects</b>	122-123	Field Techniques	SCI is current protocol to evaluate channel condition. Forest still uses Pfankuch Stream Stability Inventory and Riparian Ecotype evaluation, Kaplan-Henry 2000. Fisheries and Hydrology surveys have been integrated since 1990. Surveys prior to SCI 2001.	Completed. Fisheries References II.E.7.d.(3) (Line 121).					X

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
183	<b>II.N.3.d.(1) Cumulative Watershed Effects</b>	123	Thresholds of Concern, Mitigation, Cessation of Management Activities.	The Sequoia collected fish habitat data at locations throughout the forest, dictated by projects that have the potential to affect water quality. Pre project plots are installed prior to project implementation and post project plots are surveyed in the same location. The survey techniques follow the regional direction outlined in the Stream Condition Inventory direction. The purpose of the Pacific Southwest Region Stream Condition Inventory (SCI) is to collect intensive and repeatable data from stream reaches to document existing stream condition and make reliable comparisons over time within or between stream reaches. SCI is therefore an inventory and monitoring program. It is designed to assess effectiveness of management actions on streams in managed watersheds (non-reference streams), as well as to document stream conditions over time in watersheds with little or no past management or that have recovered from historic management effects (reference streams). This level of habitat/stream condition survey has been ongoing since 2001. This does not include those streams surveyed in 2008.	Completed. Stream Condition Inventory (SCI), Technical Guide, Pacific Southwest Region, July 2005, United States Department of Agriculture, Version 5.0, Forest Service, <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/publications/water_resources/sci/techguide-v5-08-2005-a.pdf">http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/publications/water_resources/sci/techguide-v5-08-2005-a.pdf</a> .					X
184	<b>II.N.3.d.(2) Cumulative Watershed Effects</b>	124	Thresholds of Concern, Mitigation, Cessation of Management Activities.	BMPEP Monitoring evaluates off-site impacts associated with projects. SCI monitors the "BMP prescriptions" for the watershed. All projects are required to have pre and post monitoring plots to assess effects.	Completed. See References for Monitoring II.R.2.a,b, (Line 213). MSA 2005 Annual Report, Appendix C, BMP Review pages 21-24 documents in II.A.2 Riparian above.					X
185	<b>II.N.3.d.(3) Cumulative Watershed Effects</b>	124-125	Thresholds of Concern, Mitigation, Cessation of Management Activities.	Forest currently monitors 100% of all fuels/timber related projects for BMP implementation. A subset of these monitoring sites provide effectiveness monitoring locations.	Completed. See BMP reports in section II.R.2.a,b (Line 213).					X
186	<b>II.N.3.d.(4) Cumulative Watershed Effects</b>	125	Thresholds of Concern, Mitigation, Cessation of Management Activities.	BMP Review was conducted in October 25-27, 1993; findings are documented in MSA 1993 Annual Report, BMP Effectiveness Peer Review, MSA 2005 Annual Report, BMP Review pages 21-24 in Appendix C which are included in the riparian section II.A.2 Riparian.	Completed. See References for Monitoring II.R.2.a,b, (Line 213). MSA 2005 Annual Report, Appendix C, BMP Review pages 21-24 documents in II.A.2 Riparian above.					X
187	<b>II.N.3.d.(5-7) Cumulative Watershed Effects</b>	125-126	Thresholds of Concern, Mitigation, Cessation of Management Activities.	Forest recognized 80% CWE as trigger to conduct site specific field inspection. 80% is the trigger to identify mitigation to reduce the potential for CWE. Forest has a review of CWE allowing Forest to bring watersheds to TOC as per section II.N.3.d.(8) (Line 188) below.	Completed. Section II.D.5.a (1-5) (Line 93) Interim Timber Sale Program. Highway Fire Rehab Soil Hydrology Report (see discussion on CWE on pages 9-11).					X
188	<b>II.N.3.d.(8) Cumulative Watershed Effects</b>	126-127	Thresholds of Concern, Mitigation, Cessation of Management Activities.	Independent Review of CWE was performed by Entrix. Methodology was validated on all points. CWE Review was held two times. The first review was by a group of watershed experts from Forest Service, industry, environmental groups and range. Only one of the three provided documentation of their findings. A second review was held by Entrix, an independent contractor.	Completed. MSA 1994 Annual Report, page 26, Letter dated 1/11/94 from Gordon Grant, Research Hydrologist, Subject: Technical Review of Sequoia's CWE Methodology. MSA 1999 Annual Report, page 19 and Appendix D, Independent Review of Sequoia National Forest's Cumulative Watershed Effects Methodology.					X
189	<b>II.N.3.d.(9) Cumulative Watershed Effects</b>	127	Thresholds of Concern, Mitigation, Cessation of Management Activities.	SCI plots are repeated for range areas to evaluate impacts.	Completed. Golden Trout Wilderness Grazing, Greenhorn West, etc. See Fisheries II.E.7.d.3 (Line 121) for SCI locations and related project document.					X
190	<b>II.N.3.e. Cumulative Watershed Effects</b>	127	NEPA Documentation.	CWE spreadsheets and database provide status of all past projects and fires. Coefficients are applied to potential effects. This data is part of hydrology working papers for project level NEPA.	Completed. CWE program database, Example of CWE printout. See example of printout in paired watershed study for Peppermint Section CWE II.N.3(b) (Line 175); MSA 1991 Annual Report page 13-14; MSA 1992 Annual Report, Appendix D1-D30.					X
191	<b>II.O. 1. Soil Quality Standards</b>	127-128	Background information identifying needs and opportunities for improvement of soil and retention of soil organic material.	Regional Soil Quality Standards are included as part of the SNFPA. Ground cover, compacted sites, organic material, etc., are monitored through BMPEP monitoring and soil transects.	Completed. SQF Soils Direction Document, Soil Quality Standards Reports BMPEP Monitoring with soils transects for skid trail density, suspended yarding and vegetative removal. MSA 1991 Annual Report, pages 15-17; MSA 1992 Annual Report, pages 16-23; MSA 1993 Annual Report, page 22; MSA 1994 Annual Report, pages 25; MSA 1996 Annual Report, page 15; MSA 1999 Annual Report, page 24.					

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
192	<b>II.O. 2. Soil Quality Standards</b>	128	2. The Plan shall be amended to incorporate the Soil Quality Objectives and Soil Quality Standards set forth in the Draft FSH 2509.18 Soil Management Handbook (FSH 1989, R-5, Supp. 1) dated September 1988 (attached as appendix to Monitoring Plan) as interim direction pending finalization. Any more stringent standard set forth in the Plan or this Agreement shall govern.	Regional Soil Quality Standards are included as part of the SNFPA.	SNFPA FEIS Vol 2, Ch 3, Part 3.8, pages 355-368 and SNFPA FEIS Vol. 4, Appendix F-1 to F-5.	X	X			
193	<b>II.O.3.a. Soil Quality Standards. Plan shall be amended to include the following standards to protect the Forest soils:</b>	128	a. Site preparation measures will be devised to retain substantial ground cover and still reduce the risk of catastrophic fires.			X	X			
194	<b>II.O.3.b. Soil Quality Standards. Plan shall be amended to include the following standards to protect the Forest soils:</b>	129	b. Silvicultural prescription shall be designed to maintain soil organic matter and provide for the continual recruitment of coarse woody debris.			X	X			
195	<b>II.O.3.c. Soil Quality Standards. Plan shall be amended to include the following standards to protect the Forest soils:</b>	129	c. After site prep, as much organic material as possible shall be left on the ground for soil protection, consistent with fire protection, wildlife, reforestation and other resource needs as specified in project NEPA document.			X	X			
196	<b>II.O.3.d. Soil Quality Standards. Plan shall be amended to include the following standards to protect the Forest soils:</b>	129	d. Jackpot burning, gross yarding, and/or lop-and-scatter shall be evaluated as alternatives to broadcast burning as a means of reducing slash and for site preparation. These options shall be discussed in each timber sale EA or EIS. Consistent with reduction of clearcutting and other appropriate considerations, the Forest Service shall reduce the amount of broadcast burning on the Forest.			X	X			
197	<b>II.O.3.e. Soil Quality Standards. Plan shall be amended to include the following standards to protect the Forest soils:</b>	129	e. Where broadcast burning is prescribed, the environmental documentation and decision notice shall include documentation of specific justification for the practice. The prescription shall have an objective of leaving ground cover commensurate with the erosion potential of each specific site. Slope will be considered within the site analysis. Each broadcast burn shall be monitored to determine whether the prescribed ground cover objective has been met, and the monitoring results shall be included in the annual report required by the Monitoring Plan and Five Year Review sections below.			X	X			
198	<b>II.P.2.a,b EA/EIS information</b>	130	Notice and consultation.	SOPA and scoping includes MSA partners. Current appeal regulations require meeting to resolve differences. Have a much larger mailing list now.						X

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
199	II.P.2.c EA/EIS information	130	Field review.	Field reviews are conducted prior to publication of final document if requested. Access to project areas prior to decisions have been accommodated (see McNally field tour schedule in NEPA document). Opportunity is always available upon request. Many times field review is part of the public involvement process for the project.						
200	II.P.3 EA/EIS information	130-135	substantive information requirements in NEPA document.	See stand record cards, Wildlife Clumps Buck Rock Timber Sale (1993); MSA checklist items.	See Stand Record Cards, Wildlife Clumps Buck Rock Timber Sale (1993). Pebble Timber Sale MSA Checklist.					
201	II.Q.1,2,3 Database Improvement	135	Inventories and surveys of areas where land disturbing projects are proposed.	Documented in MSA requirements summaries for EA & EIS's (see Pebble Timber Sale example from Hume Lake District).	Pebble Timber Sale MSA Checklist.					X
202	II.Q.4a,b Database Improvement	135-136	Forest agrees to seek budgets annually that are sufficient to develop information in Section c.	Forest Budgets are shown in MSA Annual Reports.						X
203	II.Q.4.c.(1) Database Improvement	137	WINI database updated annually.	Database still exists however has not been updated through 1997. Viable projects have been identified and continue to be surveyed in SCI per SNFPA. Depending on the extensive nature of surveys they may be housed in their own file/binder. Deferred to NRIS development and migration. Forest is working with Regional Office and BETA testing new WINI datasheet. Improvements are still ongoing and sites are recorded in detail in SCI plots. Efforts have been taken to have all field time available to identify and report WINI sites.	MSA 1992 Annual Report page 24; MSA 1993 Annual Report, Appendix D, database. See response to ILE.7.b (Line 117) Fisheries above.					X
204	II.Q.4.c.(2) Database Improvement	137	Meadow inventory.	Multiple meadow databases exist with different formats. District hard copy format has WINI information, wildlife parameters, generally includes photos from early 1980s through early 1990s. The Watershed files contain meadow inventories and stream inventories as far back as the 1970s. Again SCI plots are throughout the forest and provide detailed measurements of habitat condition in both meadows and streams surveyed.	Examples 1982 Meadow on Plateau; 1992 Meadow Inventory Data; Section Allotment Management Plans II.C.10.b (Line 88) for examples of the riparian monitoring of key grazing areas (which includes some meadows, see database in front of example), SCI data inventory for recent survey information in fisheries section II.E.7.d.3 (Line 121).					X
205	II.Q.4.c.(3) Database Improvement	137	Stream channel Surveys.	Stream Surveys have been continuous. Historic files exist from 1970s and continue through present SCI surveys. Surveys have changed with Regional Direction and SNFPA. Fish Habitat and Stream Channel Surveys are integrated surveys.	Aquatics files, Fisheries section II.E.7.b (Line 117), Fisheries section II.E.7.d.3 (Line 121), NRIS database.					X
206	II.Q.4.c.(4) Database Improvement	138	Fish habitat data.	Stream channel surveys and SCI plots continue. SCI is current direction for Fisheries Habitat Evaluations. This includes collection of macro invertebrates which is currently the Management Indicator Species for aquatic health versus fish surveys.	See response to I.L.N 3(d) (Line 183) Cumulative Watershed Effects, Fisheries sections II.E.7.b (Line 117) and II.E.7.d.3 (Line 121). SCI direction <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/publications/water_resources/sci/techguide-v5-08-2005-a.pdf">http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/publications/water_resources/sci/techguide-v5-08-2005-a.pdf</a> .					X
207	II.Q.4.c.(5) Database Improvement	138	Sensitive species habitat data.	NRIS FAUNA database shows detections and surveys. GIS layers for suitable habitat for all sensitive species based on CWHR and detections/range maps. Habitat in vegetation layer, special data for WIFL meadows. Fish layer shows suitable streams. Amphibian database from Museum of Vertebrate Zoology (MVZ) and other sources, California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) electronic files (most of CNDDB and MVZ databases duplicated in FAUNA).						X
208	II.Q.4.c.(6) Database Improvement	138	MIS monitoring.	Amended by MIS SNFPA (2007). RO SNFPA monitoring databases, Breeding Bird Surveys online data, and data noted in II.Q.4.c.5 (Line 207).			X			X
209	II.Q.4.c.(7) Database Improvement	138	T & E species for recovery plans.	Bald Eagle and peregrine falcon de-listed. Have historic survey data on file. Condors tracked by US Fish & Wildlife Service, no more annual counts. Have USFWS data on condor movement and roost sites in GIS. New T/E species in GIS CLSP6. CDFG monitoring Little Kern golden trout (LKGT) and genetics.						X
210	II.Q.4.c.(8) Database Improvement	139	Sensitive Plants.	Since 1990, the Botany program has transferred all sensitive plant paper map locations and data to electronic spatial/tabular databases (NRIS TESP).						X

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
211	<b>II.Q.4.c.(9) Database Improvement</b>	139	Ecological status of range allotments.	Hard copy of range trend and ecological status from historic plots and CDFG/ FS deer herd brush plots on file districts and Supervisor's Office electronic file. New ecological trend plots by Wexilman available online ( <a href="http://fsweb.r5.fs.fed.us/unit/nrm/range/monitoring/2006_R5_range_monitoring_rpt.pdf">http://fsweb.r5.fs.fed.us/unit/nrm/range/monitoring/2006_R5_range_monitoring_rpt.pdf</a> ) or on Compact Disk available by request from the District, Supervisor's Office and the Regional Office.						X
212	<b>II.R.1 Monitoring</b>	139	The Plan will be amended to include the monitoring plan set forth in Exhibit O.	See Big Meadows Improvement Project Monitoring Report. Funds have not been available for full implementation. Region has always provided dollars for BMPEP Monitoring (water quality) and for the first time we have received funds for SCI monitoring. BMP monitoring has occurred since 1990. BMP monitoring documents/files/binders and reports to Central Valley Water Quality Board are available for review.	Big Meadows Improvement Project Monitoring Report. See BMP reports in section II.R.2.a,b (Line 212). See MSA 1994 Annual Reports, page 3.	X		X	X	
213	<b>II.R.2.a,b Monitoring</b>	139	Each Timber Sale will be monitored after contract and after site preparation.	The Sequoia Forest did full ID team reviews with documentation for several years. Currently only BMPEP and water quality waiver information provided. The Monitoring specified in Exhibit O has been and is being done. References would be MSA annual reports, implementation monitoring report, annual management team reviews. All ground disturbing activities, including fire, are required to be monitored for water quality by Central Valley Water Quality Control Board (CVWQCB); this is specific to timber sales. A report of the monitoring pre and post project using SCI protocol is provided to the CVWQCB in July. MSA Annual Reports documented all BMPEP monitoring since started in 1991. Surveys of timber sites as well as other sites go back to 2001; however the Board never required documentation until 2006. Soil Quality Standards Monitoring was performed with BMP's and were assessed separately, as well, for some years.	BMPEP Reports, 2003, 2004, 2007, 2008; MSA 1994 Annual Report, pages 17-20; MSA 1995 Annual Report, pages 16-19; SCI protocol ( <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/publications/water_resources/sci/techguide-v5-08-2005-a.pdf">http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/publications/water_resources/sci/techguide-v5-08-2005-a.pdf</a> ), References are 2006-2008 reports to CVWQCB and all SCI data plots. See soils Section II.O (Line 191), MSA 1996 Annual Report, pages 11-14; MSA 1997 Annual Report, pages 13-15; MSA 1998 Annual Report, pages 12-17; MSA 1999 Annual Report, pages 12-18; MSA 2000 Annual Report, pages 11-16; MSA 2005 Annual Report, pages 10-11; MSA 2006 Annual Report, page 10; Monitoring report completed for the Buck Rock Timber Sale, Hume Lake RD, 9/25/91.				X	
214	<b>II.R.3 Monitoring (Wildlife)</b>	140	Program monitoring shall include monitoring of wildlife habitat trends in accordance with Tri-forests Plan.	The 2007 MIS amendment to SNFPA eliminated the tri-Forest monitoring effort as MIS for the Sierra and Stanislaus and Sequoia.	Forest Service Handbooks, Forest Plan, and SNFPA all require monitoring.		X			
215	<b>II.R.4 Monitoring</b>	140	Monitoring efforts will be documented in annual report.	MSA Annual Reports (1992, 1994, 2006).	References are 2006-2008 reports to CVWQCB and all SCI data plots.					x
216	<b>II.S.1. Implementation of Agreement</b>	140	Priority to initiating the plan amendment process.	Pending plan amendment, have implemented MSA Standards and Guidelines (S&Gs). ID team reviews with documentation for several years. Currently only do BMPEP and water quality waiver information does not specifically address fuels projects.	Completed.					
217	<b>II.S.2. Implementation of Agreement</b>	140-141	Employment of Tule River Indian Tribe members.	See example of MSA 1994 Annual Report, page 35.	Completed. MSA 1994 Annual Report, page 35.					
218	<b>II.S.3. Implementation of Agreement</b>	141-142	Letter to employees to emphasize importance of MSA.	See letter of August 14, 1990.	Completed. See letter of August 14, 1990, to all Sequoia employees from Supervisor Crates, Subject: Settlement Agreement for Forest Plan.					
219	<b>II.T Budget</b>	142-145	Budget and reporting on implementation of projects, mitigation, restoration projects.	See examples: MSA 1994, 1999 Annual Reports, pages 2-6.	MSA 1994 Annual Report, pages 2-5; MSA 1999 Annual Report, pages 2-6.					X
220	<b>II.U. Multiple Use Liaison Committee (MULC) and Fact-finding</b>	145-151	Process and agenda for annual meeting.	Meetings were held the first couple of years, then the MSA Annual Report was published each year.						X
221	<b>II.V. Public Information and records</b>	151-152	Designates reading room for all public records required in MSA, updated semi-annually.	In LMP Storage Room #20.	Completed.					X

1	Subject Area	MSA page ref.	Interim Direction	Implementation	References and Remarks	Plan Amendment Needed per MSA	Addressed in SNFPA	Address in Monument Plan EIS	Address in Forest Plan Revision	Seek Modification of MSA Language
222	<b>II.W. Annual report and 5-year review</b>	152-153	Process for preparation and disclosure of annual accomplishments including monitoring and mitigation as well as 5 year review and determination of need for amendment.	See MSA 1993 Annual Report, page 5. MSA Annual Reports on file.	MSA 1993 Annual Report, page 5.					
223	<b>II.X. Enforcement</b>	153	Rules for enforcement revocation of agreement.	No tasks to be accomplished.						
224	<b>II.Y. NEPA Compliance</b>	154	Process for amending LMP.	No plan amendment has been completed by the Forest. The SNFPA amended portions of the Forest Plan. No parties have chosen to void the agreement.						
225	<b>III. Additional Matters</b>	155	Rules for appeal and conduct.	No tasks to be accomplished.						