

SEQUOIA NATIONAL FOREST
GIANT SEQUOIA NATIONAL MONUMENT

MSA Provisions Addressed By Current Management Direction

Important management requirements and forest plan amendments have been implemented since the signing of the MSA. Many of the MSA elements, other than giant sequoia management, timber management, and allowable sale quantity (ASQ) were included in the 2001 Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (SNFPA), which amended the forest plans of the 11 national forests in the Sierra Nevada, including the Sequoia. The 2001 SNFPA, recognized the Sequoia National Forest Mediated Settlement Agreement, 1990, and the Presidential Proclamation, 1992, as defining the management of giant sequoia groves while the Sequoia National Forests completed a forest plan amendment governing giant sequoia grove management. With respect to the Sequoia National Forest, the SNFPA met the Forest Service's obligations regarding the NEPA process for

1. riparian area management
2. livestock grazing,
3. oak management,
4. old growth,
5. wildlife, and
6. fisheries.

Areas in the settlement agreement not addressed in the SNFPA FEIS include allowable sale quantity, suitable lands, roadless areas, special areas, and off highway vehicle use. (2001 SNFPA FEIS, Volume I, Chapter 2, page 21)

In addition, the April 2000 Presidential Proclamation, creating the Giant Sequoia National Monument (Monument) provided management direction in the Monument. Some MSA elements, such as those addressing allowable sale quantity (timber), suitable lands (timber), and timber management, were negated by the proclamation.

We believe many of the MSA provisions were addressed in the SNFPA, and therefore do not need to be listed again as proposals in future management plans for the forest and monument. The subject areas, such as riparian areas and meadows, wildlife, fisheries, etc., will be discussed as part of the analysis for any future planning. The information below identifies those MSA provisions which have been considered in previous planning documents, are included in policy or manual direction.

MSA Page 5

- **II.A.1 Riparian Areas/Meadows:** Incorporate riparian standards and guidelines (S&G's) (Exhibit D) into NEPA process and plan amendment.

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.

MSA Page 28

- **II.C.2.a(1) Grazing and Oak Management amend LMP Rx BO6:** Give priority to maintaining and enhancing blue oak.

Letter of August 14, 1990, to all Sequoia employees from Supervisor Crates, Subject: Settlement Agreement for Forest Plan. Grazing permits were modified 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.

- **II.C.2.a(3) Grazing and Oak Management amend LMP Rx BO6:** Retain 700 lbs residual dry matter (RDM).

SNFPA (2001: A-31) (2004: p. 56, #51)

MSA Page 29

- **II.C.2.a(4) Grazing and Oak Management amend LMP Rx BO6:** Winter grazing allotments limited to <15% of preferred browse and <5% of staple species in heavily browsed condition.

Consider grazing utilization paragraphs in SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-31 and SNFPA 2004 ROD, p.56, #51.

- **II.C.2.a.(5) Grazing and Oak Management:** Allotment management plans will emphasize wildlife use of mast crops.

SNFPA 2001 ROD, A-14; SNFPA 2004 ROD, pages. 35, 55.

- **II.C.2.a.(6) Grazing and Oak Management:** Frost, McDougald study as a threshold for oak recruitment. Adopt allotment-specific thresholds for oak recruitment.

Recruitment of oaks and oak management addressed in SNFPA 2001 ROD, A-31; 2004 ROD, page 55, S&G #50.

MSA Provisions Addressed By Current Management Direction

MSA Page 30

- **II.C.2.a.(7) Grazing and Oak Management:** Frost, McDougald study as a threshold for oak recruitment. Develop long-term strategies for oak recruitment where allotments below are threshold.

Recruitment of oaks and oak management addressed in SNFPA 2001 ROD, page A-27; 2004 ROD, page 53-55.

- **II.C.3.a Oak Management:** In mixed conifer-hardwood stands leave at least 20 sq ft.per acre basal area where this currently exists.

SNFPA 2001 ROD: pp. A-14, A-27, A-31; 2004 ROD: pp.35, 53 Items 18-26, 55 Item 50.

- **II.C.3.b Oak Management:** 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.

SNFPA 2001 ROD, A-27; 2004 ROD, page 53, Items 18-21, 26.

MSA Page 31

- **II.C.3.c Oak Management:** 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.

See SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-27 and SNFPA 2004 ROD, page 53, items 18-21, 26.

- **II.C.3.d Oak Management:** Live oak stands will not be subject to vegetative manipulations other than prescribed burning, thinning for vigor, or for wildlife and watershed habitat improvement.

See SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-27 and SNFPA 2004 ROD, page 53, items 18-21, 26.

- **II.C.3.e Oak Management:** In mixed hardwood-conifer or hardwood stands, favor retention of oak trees exhibiting active use as cavity-nesting sites or granaries.

SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-27 and SNFPA 2004 ROD, page 53, items 18-21, 26.

MSA Pages 31-33

- **II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6:** Livestock grazing will be emphasized in black oak woodlands.

SNFPA 2004 ROD, pages 35 and 55, #50.

MSA Page 32

- **II.C.4. Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6, Fish and wildlife a.** Provide for 1.5 snags/ac (see section J.1.c).

SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-28 and SNFPA 2004 ROD p. 51.

- **II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6, Fish and wildlife b.** Maintain at least 50 sq ft basal area per acre of oaks where it currently exists.

Plan amended by SNFPA 2001 ROD A-28.

- **II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6, Fish and wildlife c.** Maintain understory vegetation to provide horizontal and vertical diversity.

Direction further amended by SNFPA 2001 ROD, page A-27, and SNFPA 2004 ROD, page 53.

- **II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6, Fish and wildlife d.** Ensure a stable and upward supply of oaks.

SNFPA 2001 ROD p. A-27.

MSA Page 33

- **II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6, Fish and wildlife e.** Distribution of all age classes of oaks.

SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-27 and SNFPA 2004 ROD p. 51.

- **II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6, Range b.** Retain 700 lbs residual dry matter (RDM).

SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-31, 2004 ROD p. 56, #51.

- **II.C.4 Black Oak amend LMP Rx OW6, Range c.** 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.

SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-31, 2004 ROD p. 55 #50.

- **II.C.4 Black Oak LMP Rx OW6, Range d.** Allotment management plans will emphasize wildlife use of mast crops.

MSA Provisions Addressed by Current Management Direction

SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-14, A-27; SNFPA 2004 ROD, pages. 35 and 55, #50.

MSA Page 34

- **II.C.5 Livestock Grazing of Burned Mixed Chaparral modify LMP prescription MC6 Fish & Wildlife a.** Provide wildlife adaptations in all water developments.

Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05, makes this nationwide policy.

- **II.C.5 Livestock Grazing of Burned Mixed Chaparral modify LMP prescription MC6, Fish & Wildlife b.** Consider wildlife needs for cover and edge in vegetation manipulation projects.

Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05, makes this nationwide policy.

- **II.C.5 Livestock Grazing of Burned Mixed Chaparral amend LMP Rx MC6 Range a.** Use Prescribed Fire as a primary method to accomplish age class management.

SNFPA ROD 2001, A-25.

- **II.C.5 Livestock Grazing of Burned Mixed Chaparral amend LMP Rx MC6 Range b.** Implement vegetative manipulation on slopes <40% when crown cover > 70% or average height exceeds 5 feet.

SNFPA ROD 2001, A-25.

- **II.C.5 Livestock Grazing of Burned Mixed Chaparral amend LMP Rx MC6 Range c.** Develop water supplies, fences and trails where needed on intensively treated lands.

Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05.

MSA Page 35

- **II.C.5 Livestock Grazing of Burned Mixed Chaparral amend LMP Rx MC6 Range d.** 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.

- **II.C.6 Effects of prescribed fire on age-class and diversity in mixed chaparral a. and b.** Change management indicator species (MIS) for early seral stage habitats to include deer and California quail.

SNFPA MIS EIS, Appendix B, p. 111 and 178.

MSA Page 36

- **II.C.7.a Changes to prescription MC5, Fish and Wildlife:** Addresses distribution of chaparral age classes to maintain a healthy viable stand.

SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-25.

- **II.C.7.b Changes to prescription MC5, Fish and Wildlife:** Implement vegetative manipulation projects only when crown density of browse species is greater than 70% or average height exceeds 5 feet.

SNFPA 2001 ROD A-25.

- **II.C.7.c Changes to prescription MC5, Fish and Wildlife:** Develop water supplies on intensively treated lands.

Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05 makes this nationwide policy.

- **II.C.7.d. Changes to prescription MC5, Fish and Wildlife:** Treat vegetation on slopes > 40% to establish a 31+ year age class rotation.

SNFPA 2001 ROD p. A-25.

MSA Page 37

- **II.C.8.a Changes to prescription MC6, Fish and Wildlife:** Provide wildlife adaptations in all water developments.

Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05 makes this nationwide policy.

- **II.C.8.b. Changes to prescription MC6, Fish and Wildlife:** Consider wildlife needs for cover and edge in vegetation manipulation projects.

Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05 makes this nationwide policy

- **II.C.8.a Changes to Rx MC6, Range:** Use prescribed fire as a primary method to accomplish age class management.

SNFPA ROD 2001, A-25.

- **II.C.8.Changes to prescription MC6, Range b.** Implement vegetative manipulation on slopes <40% when cover > 70% or average height exceeds 5 feet.

SNFPA ROD 2001, A-25.

- **II.C.8. Changes to prescription MC6, Range c.** More than 50% of the prescribed fire are to occur in the late summer and fall.

SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-25; SNFPA 2004 ROD, pp. 49-50.

MSA Page 38

- **II.C.8. Changes to prescription MC6, Range d.** Develop water supplies, fences and trails where needed on intensively treated lands.

Forest Service Manual 2240.3, effective 9/9/05 makes this nationwide policy.

MSA Pages 38-39

- **II.C.9 Type Conversion:** Requiring Plan Amendment to change and delete phrases in regard to type conversion.

SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. A-25

MSA Page 39

- **II.C.10.a Allotment Plans and Effectiveness:** Add to forestwide S&Gs on LMP page 4-30: Allotment management plans will include specific information, etc.

MSA Pages 39-40

- **II.C.10.b.Allotment Plans and Effectiveness:** 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."

MSA Page 41

- **II.D 2. Allowable Sale Quantity (ASQ):** Allowable sale quantity.

SNFPA 2001 ROD, page 11 and 2004 ROD, p. 15. 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.

MSA Pages 52-55

- **II.E.Old Growth, Wildlife Species, & Fisheries 2. Spotted Owl Habitat Areas (SOHA) b.(1 - 3)** Biological Evaluations for Spotted Owls.

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. 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.

MSA Pages 55-58

- **II.E.3 Furbearers a.,c.-e.** Furbearer (threatened and endangered and sensitive species management).

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.

MSA Page 56

- **II.E.3 Furbearers b.** Sierra Nevada red fox, pine marten, and fisher managed as sensitive species.

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.

MSA Page 58

- **II.E.4 Bald Eagles:** Protect roost trees & feeding areas for bald eagle at Pine Flat & Kern River.

MSA Pages 58-59

- **II.E.5 Goshawk:** Protection of identified goshawk nests; establish goshawk network.

2004 SNFPA ROD pp. 38-39, 59; 2001 SNFPA ROD p. A-36.

MSA Page 59-64

- **II.E.6 Condors:** Management of potential/active condor habitat until condor recovery plan is implemented.

The Forest Service consults with the Fish and Wildlife Service whenever projects are proposed within the range of the California condor.

MSA Page 64

- **II.E.7.a Fisheries:** Amend plan regarding miles of stream needing repair in decade one.

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: http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/publications/water_resources/sci/techguide-v5-08-2005-a.pdf, SCI Surveys 2001-2008 & list of sites.

MSA Page 65

- **II.E.7.b Fisheries:** Complete repair or enhancement of streams at 10% of needs/yr to achieve 50 miles within decade as prioritized by WINI.

SNFPA 2001 ROD, pages Appendix A-51-59 and 2004 ROD pp. 62-66. SCI direction: http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/publications/water_resources/sci/techguide-v5-08-2005-a.pdf, SCI Surveys 2001-2008 & list of sites.

- **II.E.7.c Fisheries:** Amend Plan goals on 4-3 to add: Promote recreational opportunities by striving to increase fisheries biomass by 20% via habitat improvement projects.

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),

MSA Page 66

- **II.E.7.d.(1) Fisheries:** Portion of Section 30 in Slate Mountain roadless area managed for Kern River Rainbow Trout.

FS personnel do not know why this item was inserted into the MSA. Upper Kern River Basin Fisheries Management Plan (1995).

- **II.E.7.d.(2) Fisheries:** Develop riparian demonstration area in critical habitat for Little Kern Golden Trout (LKGT).

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).

- **II.E.7.d.(3) Fisheries:** Rainbow Trout population surveys in connection with stream channel surveys for MIS monitoring.

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.

- **II.E.7.d.(4) Fisheries:** Base line data generated from stream surveys, fish assessment model and beneficial uses.

See references noted in section II.E.7.b (Line 117) Fisheries and SCI direction http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/publications/water_resources/sci/techguide-v5-08-2005-a.pdf, SCI Surveys 2001-2008 & list of sites from section II.E.7.d.3 (Line 121) Fisheries; Beneficial uses database.

MSA Pages 66-67

- **II.F.1 Suitable Lands.** Suitable land base.

Proclamation 7295, p. 24097; SNFPA 2001 ROD, p. 11 and 2004 ROD, p. 15.

MSA Pages 69-75

- **II.G.Roadless Areas.**

National Roadless Policy in place.

MSA Page 75

- **II.H.1. Special Areas. 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.

- **II.H.1. Special Areas. 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.

- **II.H.1. Special Areas. 3. Big Meadows area on the Hume Lake District.** Special area direction for Big Meadows area.

Proclamation changed the direction allowed in this area.

MSA Page 76

- **II.H.1. Special Areas. 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.

MSA Page 76

- **II.H.6. Special Areas:** Fish Creek watershed restoration in Fish Creek.

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).

SNFPA 2001 FEIS, Appendix I and SNFPA 2004, p. 43. Conservation Assessment and Strategy for the California Golden Trout (2004).

MSA Page 78

- **II.H.6. Special Areas 13. Rancheria Road.** Managed as foreground partial retention visual objective.

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.

MSA Pages 78-88

- **II. (I) Timber:** Conform to revised S&G's for timber mgt. (Exhibit N & p. 80-89).

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.

MSA Pages 88-91

- **II.J Snags:** Snag management.

CASPO Interim Guidelines EA p.III-3. SNFPA (2001 ROD p. A-28; 2004: p. 51),

MSA Pages 109-117

- **II.N. Cumulative Watershed Effects (CWE)**

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.

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.

MSA Page 128

- **II.O. Soil Quality Standards:** 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.

SNFPA FEIS Vol. 2, Ch 3, Part 3.8, pages 355-368 and SNFPA FEIS Vol. 4, Appendix F-1 to F-5.

MSA Pages 130-135

- **II.P.2. EA/EIS information. Notice and consultation, field review, etc.**

SOPA and scoping includes MSA partners. Current appeal regulations require meeting to resolve differences. Have a much larger mailing list now. Field review and public field trips are available upon request. Many times part of the scoping includes a field trip.

MSA Pages 135-139

- **II.Q. Database Improvement:**

Multiple databases are maintained and updated for the subject areas listed.

MSA Page 139-140

- **II.R.3 Monitoring**

Forest Service Handbooks, Forest Plan, and SNFPA all require monitoring.