



2000

Monitoring and Evaluation Action Plan & Report

Kisatchie National Forest



Claiborne, Webster, Grant, Rapides, Natchitoches, Vernon, and Winn Parishes of Louisiana

Contents:

Introduction	2	Evaluation of Outcomes on the Land	34
Certification Statement	3	Summary of FY2001 M&E Actions	35
Summary of Results and Findings	4	Status of FY1999 Report Recommendations	37
Detailed M&E Results and Findings	7	Appendices	39

2000

I. Introduction to Monitoring and Evaluation Report

The Kisatchie National Forest (KNF) annually monitors and evaluates programs and projects to determine whether they are in compliance with management direction in the Revised Land and Resource Management Plan (Plan).



Monitoring and evaluation is an ongoing process, specifically designed to insure that Plan goals and objectives (Plan, pages 2-1 to 2-7) are being achieved; standards and guidelines (S&Gs) are being properly implemented; and environmental effects are occurring as predicted. It also indicates whether the application of management area prescriptions are responding to public issues as well as management concerns; and if the costs of

implementing the Plan are on target. The evaluation of monitoring results allows the Forest Supervisor to initiate action to improve compliance with management direction where needed, improve cost effectiveness, and determine if any amendments to the Plan are needed to improve resource management.

Monitoring is conducted by field reviews of projects and by inventory and survey work conducted by Forest Service resource specialists, Forest Service research scientists, universities, State resource agencies, and other cooperators.

This Monitoring and Evaluation Report is structured to correspond to the monitoring items listed in Chapter 5, *Monitoring and Evaluation*, of the Plan. These items were developed based on the Plan's desired future conditions, goals and objectives, and standards and guidelines. Each monitoring item considered in this report references the corresponding monitoring item from Table 5-1 of the Plan.

This report includes the implementation status of the previous fiscal year's monitoring recommendations in addition to the detailed results and action plan for this year's report. The next page contains a certification

statement from the Forest Supervisor indicating that he has evaluated the findings and recommended actions, and directs that the action plans developed to respond to the recommendations be implemented.



Certification:

I have evaluated the monitoring results and recommended actions in this Report. I have directed that the action plans developed to respond to these recommendations be implemented according to the timeframes indicated, unless new information or changed resource conditions warrant otherwise. I have considered funding requirements in the budget necessary to implement these actions.

With these completed changes the Forest Plan is sufficient to guide the management of the Kisatchie National Forest for fiscal year 2001, unless ongoing monitoring and evaluation efforts identify further need for change.

Any amendments or revisions made to the current Forest Plan will be made using the appropriate National Environmental Policy Act procedures.

Opportunity for comment:

If you have questions or comments regarding the accomplishments for fiscal year 2000, please call or write and let us know. Telephone: 318-473-7160. Address: USDA Forest Service, 2500 Shreveport Highway, Pineville, LA 71360.

Sincerely,



Lynn C. Neff
Forest Supervisor
Kisatchie National Forest



2000

Summary of M&E Results and Report Findings

A. ECOSYSTEM CONDITION, HEALTH, AND SUSTAINABILITY

- Prescribed burning projects were approved through decision memos. 32,084 acres of dormant season burns and 6,450 acres of growing season burns were completed by the districts during FY2000. These accomplishments are not within the Plan's range of expected outcomes. The prescribed burning goals were not accomplished due to a severe drought and a need to divert resources to help with a national fire emergency.
- Nineteen sites consisting of 539 acres were planted with longleaf pine seedlings in FY2000. Eight sites (222 acres) will require replanting. Thirty-four sites (807 acres) planted in FY1998, were evaluated for adequate stocking with longleaf pine seedlings. Twenty-five of the sites consisting of 503 acres were adequately stocked. Nine sites (304 acres) will require replanting.
- Although an overestimate of occupied acreage, data show "pinelands" as the largest rare plant habitat type in number of acres occupied (4,910 acres). The numbers and acreages of bogs and baygalls consists of 511 sites for 4,824 acres. Prairies occur on 63 sites for 2,306 acres; many prairies have some large areas of "historic" prairie. Sandy woodlands include 77 sites totaling 1,134 acres. Forty-three glades cover 420 acres. A few small areas for rare plants include three seeps (17.5 acres), a pond (10.7 acres), and a ruderal area (2.8 acres).
- During calendar year 2000, the Forest established 136 plant MIS plots. These are scattered over 4 broad habitat types or landscapes (upland longleaf pine, shortleaf pine/oak-hickory, mixed hardwood-loblolly pine and riparian forests) and were "piggybacked" onto existing neotropical migratory bird plots (R8 Bird Point Count sites). During the year, 85 of the 136 plots (63%) were sampled. Table 2 of this report summarizes these results.
- Population surveys for RCW conducted by Forest Service personnel reveal that: the Winn population remains small, but it appears stable; the Catahoula, Evangeline, and Vernon populations increased slightly; and the Kisatchie population decreased. The decrease in the Kisatchie population was attributed to excessive midstory resulting from infrequent prescribed burns. The Kisatchie National Forest and the US Fish & Wildlife Service are collaborating to resolve habitat problems with the Kisatchie population.
- The Forest lost 7,613 acres to wildland fires in FY2000. The acceptable range in NFMAS for FY2000 was 2,108 acres. The Forest was above the acceptable range by 5,505 acres.
- Final harvest treatments were completed on 390 acres in FY2000. This number of acres is far short of the planned estimate of 1,576 acres. The level of overstocked stands continues to increase with only 7,561 acres having been thinned in 2000. Overstocked stands are highly susceptible to southern pine beetle (SPB) infestations.

- A large number of young plantations are reaching the age for first thinning.
- Restoration activities included about 30 acres of watershed improvement projects and 26 acres of KV soil and water projects. Revegetation of these areas was successful with greater than 80 % cover.
 - The water quality of nine streams on the Winn, Catahoula, and Calcasieu Ranger districts were monitored on a quarterly basis in cooperation with the Louisiana DEQ. The monitoring data indicated that all these streams meet the criteria for designated uses, including propagation for fish and wildlife. Also, bi-weekly testing of fecal coliform levels at Stuart Lake, Kincaid Lake and Caney Lake swim beaches indicated that water quality standards for protection of public health and safety were met. Slightly elevated fecal coliform levels due to low water levels at Stuart Lake caused the swim beach to be closed for one week in August.
 - Valentine Lake was drawn down to repair the control structure. Bream were stocked (1,053, less than or equal to 3") in Valentine Lake after the drawdown. Largemouth bass were stocked (33,215 fingerlings) in 21 Forest Service lakes and ponds. Catfish were stocked (17,979 fingerlings) in five Forest Service lakes and ponds.
 - Fullerton Lake and Anderson Pond were drawn down for weed control. Christmas trees were placed in Valentine Lake for fisheries habitat improvement. Approximately 5 cubic yards of pea gravel and 159 tons of lime were applied to several lake and ponds in order to maintain and improve water quality and fish habitat.

B. SUSTAINABLE MULTIPLE FOREST AND RANGE BENEFITS

- Population levels for game species were stable. Deer populations are and have been considerably below the habitat's carrying capacity; herd densities are too low to provide adequate aesthetic enjoyment for non-consumptive users.
- All roads reviewed were observed to be serviceable by the intended user and required no significant increase in the level or frequency of maintenance.
- Harvest levels dropped from FY1999 (85,000 CCF) to FY2000 (54,000 CCF). An accompanying reduction in payments to the State of Louisiana was also felt. Future declines in harvest levels and accompanying dollar values are expected to be substantial until the outputs outlined in the Forest Plan are achieved.

- In FY2000, only 17,000 CCF were offered and sold as bona fide new timber sales. This relatively small amount of volume in the pipeline and its consequences should affect the outcome of next year's Report findings. The expectation is for a very substantial reduction in volume harvested and the accompanying value, which relates to returns to the parish and local jobs/income. This situation is primarily the result of ongoing litigation challenges to proposed timber sales that implement the Forest Plan's direction.

- FY2000 grants assisted three minority communities to successfully increase local economy through tourism, suggested opportunities for new recycling industries in north Louisiana, and contributed to community efforts to support conservation education.

C. ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

- The Forest Plan was revised in 1999. During FY2000, only minor changes occurred on the Forest from implementation of the revised Forest Plan due to appeal and litigation requests and updating of project analyses that began under the previous Plan.

- On July 13, 2000, the Sierra Club, et al., filed a lawsuit in Region 8 of the Forest Service alleging violation of several laws. The controversy in this lawsuit centered around monitoring of Management Indicator Species (MIS). The lawsuit was settled on May 16, 2001. This M & E report covers only FY2000 findings and recommendations; however, monitoring information for MIS were extrapolated from compilation of information contained in the Forest's MIS Population and Habitat Trends Report, prepared in May of 2001. This information is believed to be accurate for this report
- Several issues emerged pertaining to how MIS habitat and population trends should be analyzed in site-specific environmental analysis documents. This work was still in progress by the end of FY2000, but was subsequently completed in FY2001. Appendix D of this report shows the results of the analysis done for avian MIS population trends. During the next 5-Year Review (which should occur in 2004), the Forest will look at appropriate changes to Plan MIS selection and direction. The Forest anticipates that any needed changes in Plan direction can be incorporated as amendment(s) or errata at that time.
- The Forest is in the process of completing the Meaningful Measures inventory, data entry and the documentation of funding needs to meet standards. Critical standards are being met. Full compliance with all Meaningful Measures standards is not possible at current funding level.
- The Forest Service and LSU established a challenge cost share agreement to help one another accomplish mutually beneficial objectives related to the impacts of off road vehicles (ORV) to soil, water and other resources of the Kisatchie National Forest. The current Kisatchie National Forest ratings will be refined and modified in order to classify the suitability of areas for ORV traffic. These data will be incorporated into the Forest Service's GIS database and should help the Forest Service determine how to best manage these areas.
- The Forest's estimated Plan-level budget was \$19,529,120 (in FY2000 dollars). The actual FY2000 budget for the Forest was \$17,370,619, or \$2,158,501 less than estimated in Appendix C of the Forest Plan. Most of the cost difference was due to lower costs associated with Timberland Management, especially timber road construction and KV-funded project work.

2000

II. Detailed M&E Results and Report Findings

The following information is the detailed Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Report for 2000 with recommended actions. The M&E Report is structured to correspond with Chapter 5 of the *Kisatchie National Forest Revised Land and Resources Management Plan (Forest Plan; Plan)*.

THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROCESS

This process documents the Forest Plan M&E program for fiscal year 2000 (FY2000). The Kisatchie National Forest annually monitors and evaluates its programs and projects to determine progress toward achieving Forest Plan management goals, objectives, and standards and guidelines.

Monitoring and evaluation is an ongoing process, documented through annual reviews by the Forest Supervisor, Forest staff and district rangers. Information from the reviews is compiled in this comprehensive report after the fiscal year is ended. Monitoring indicates whether management direction in the Plan is being effectively carried out and points out needed modification of that direction. It also shows whether effects of imple-

menting the Forest Plan are occurring as predicted; whether the application of management area prescriptions responds to public issues as well as management concerns; and if the costs of implementing the Forest Plan are on target.

PLAN AMENDMENTS

The original 1986 Forest Plan was revised in 1999. There are currently no amendments to it. The revised Plan contains new or changed monitoring items, more appropriate to meeting its new direction. These monitoring items are listed in Chapter 5 of the Plan. Implementation of the revised Plan began November 29, 1999 (the first quarter of FY2000) so it is still too early to make meaningful recommendations for many monitoring items. However, the general recommendation for FY2001 is to continue implementing the revised Plan using guidance provided in Chapters 2 and 3 of the Plan in order to reach the objectives stated. Long term goals for the Forest are to reach the Desired Future Conditions (DFC) stated for the Forest and the DFC stated for individual management

and sub-management areas.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The following results of monitoring and evaluation are presented in accordance with Chapter 5 of the Forest Plan. The specific monitoring requirements are listed in Table 5-1, on pages 5-7 through 5-14 of that document. The table includes goals, objectives, and monitoring questions needed to meet the direction of the revised Plan. This report is formatted similar to Forest Plan Table 5-1. Additionally, the monitoring items are grouped here into the following categories: *A. Ecosystem Condition, Health, and Sustainability*, *B. Sustainable Multiple Forest and Range Benefits*, and *C. Organizational Effectiveness*. Information for each monitoring element includes a description of the Plan objective, the monitoring question and monitoring type (i.e., 'I' for implementation, 'E' for the effectiveness, and 'V' for validation), the results of monitoring, and finally, FY2001 recommended actions if any.

A. ECOSYSTEM CONDITION, HEALTH, AND SUSTAINABILITY

1. Biodiversity

Objective 2-1: Manage to restore or maintain the structure, composition, and processes of the four major landscape forest ecosystems known to occur on the Forest, and unique or under-represented inclusional communities embedded within them. Long-term objectives for each major forest community is as follows:



ˆ **Longleaf pine forest: 263,000 acres.**



ˆ **Shortleaf pine / oak-hickory forest: 62,000 acres.**



ˆ **Mixed hardwood-loblolly pine forest: 27,800 acres.**



ˆ **Riparian forest: 181,000 acres**

Are management practices designed to restore or maintain the structure, composition, and processes of the four major landscape forest ecosystems and the embedded plant communities within them being implemented? (I)

FY2000 results: An insufficient number of project decisions with accompanying proposed management practices were approved for implementation during FY2000. Without documentation of planned practices, proper analysis and determination of compliance with the Forest Plan direction cannot be accomplished. Prescribed burning projects were approved through decision memos. Only 32,084 acres of dormant season burns and 6,415 acres of growing season burns were completed by the districts during FY2000 due to extended drought conditions and a national fire emergency. Fire is essential for the restoration and maintenance of native plant com-

munities on the Kisatchie National Forest.

Longleaf Pine Landscapes: Nineteen sites consisting of 539 acres were planted with longleaf pine seedlings in FY2000. Eight sites (222 acres) will require replanting. Thirty-four sites (807 acres) planted in FY1998, were evaluated for adequate stocking with longleaf pine seedlings. Satisfactorily stocked sites require a minimum of 300 well-distributed seedlings per acre. Twenty-five of the sites consisting of 503 acres were adequately stocked. Nine sites (304 acres) will require replanting. The failures are primarily due to competition but drought was another contributing factor, especially on sites with deep sandy soils. Increased prescribed burning during the growing season will be necessary to restore native plant communities and achieve the desired future conditions.

Shortleaf Pine/Oak-hickory Landscapes: Six sites consisting of 172 acres were planted with shortleaf pine seedlings in FY2000. The planting spacing was wide enough to allow for a hardwood component.

Mixed hardwood-Loblolly Pine Landscapes: Two sites consisting of 71 acres were planted with loblolly pine seedlings in FY2000.

Riparian Communities: Very few timber harvesting projects that incorporate the new Forest standards and guidelines regarding streamside and riparian area protection zones have been implemented

FY2001 recommended actions: Prepare documents addressing management needs on

approximately 10 percent of the Kisatchie National Forest ownership. Strive to implement harvesting levels consistent with Plan levels. Increase the number of prescribed burn acres to allow the completion of 125,000 to 150,000 acres in FY2001. Continue to increase the number of growing season burn acres. Identify by calendar date when growing season burns begin in the spring and end in the summer. Publish these dates in the fire management handbook.

On longleaf pine landscapes change method of site preparation from chop and burn to herbicide and burn when the native ground cover has not been established prior to a final harvest cut. Establish native ground cover by implementing growing season burns prior to harvest. Apply growing season burns on the stocked sites. If competing hardwood stems are not controlled with the burns then apply herbicide treatment with a follow-up burn. Continue to monitor sites for additional treatment needs. Conduct growing season burn training sessions in cooperation with the Southern Research Unit for all Forest personnel involved with the prescribed burning program. Increase the number of acres burned during the growing season. Increase the number of acres planted to longleaf pine.

Are the management practices successfully restoring or maintaining quality forest ecosystems; and, the structure, composition, and processes of the four major landscape forest ecosystems? (E)

FY2000 results: The Kisatchie National Forest is developing a tracking method for rare plant communities using the Forest level geographic information system (GIS). This process started with bog mapping in 1994 and has since expanded to include all occupied rare plant communities. Table 1 on the next page shows a summary of rare plant habitats.

The data in Table 1 shows "pinelands" as the largest rare plant habitat type in number of acres occupied (4,910 acres). This number is a large overestimate of actually occupied acres. One rare species, a grass, was reported as occurring in the Palustris Experimental Forest without a specific location. This record is based on a historical record from a herbarium specimen. As a result, the entire Experimental Forest was included in GIS as a potential site of the species. The numbers and acreages of bogs and baygalls (511 sites for 4,824 acres) reflects reality much more closely. The data on prairies (63 sites for 2,306 acres) is slightly more accurate, but also a bit skewed; many prairies have GPS'ed locations, but the total includes some large areas of "historic" prairie. Prairies are discussed in more detail below. Sandy woodlands include 77 sites totaling 1,134 acres. Forty-three glades cover 420 acres. A few small areas for rare plants include three seeps (17.5 acres), a pond (10.7 acres), and a ruderal area (2.8 acres).

Table 1 also lists 14 areas totaling 974 acres as "SIA". This represents areas within

Table 1: Rare Plant Habitats

<u>Type of Habitat</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Number of sites</u>
Pinelands	4,910	3
Bogs and baygalls	4,824	511
Prairie	2,306	63
Mesic slopes and bottomland forests	1,494	56
Sandy woodlands	1,134	77
SIA	974	14
Glade	420	43
Unclassified	178	13
Seep	17.5	3
Pond	10.7	1
Ruderal area	2.8	1
Limestone outcrops	0	0

the Keiffer and Tancock Special Interest Areas (SIA), which are not prairie habitat, but are mapped because they lie within those SIAs. In addition, it may seem unusual that zero sites totalling zero acres are listed for “limestone outcrop” habitat. This habitat once supported four ferns, rare to Louisiana. The ferns were extirpated from private lands within the administrative boundary. The habitat is listed here in the hope that sites for these species will be found on Forest Service lands in the future.

A conservation assessment for prairies (Hyatt 1999) included the status of prairies at that time. This document classified the prairies with an intergrading series (A, B, C, D, and F, with various intergrades such as AB, AC, BC, etc.). It also compared the grading

done by the author with an assessment of prairie conditions made by Michael and Barbara MacRoberts in 1996. In summary, Hyatt (ibid) found 64.7 prairie acres improved “because of changed conditions”, and 68.7 acres downgraded (or degraded slightly) for the same reasons. The same report also lists differences of opinion in the grading of some prairies, with little overall difference between the two observers. This report provides a baseline for future evaluation of prairie conditions.

In a similar fashion, Appendix 2 of the conservation assessment for hillside seepage bogs (Hyatt 1998) provides a system for classifying the condition of bog habitats. This classification scheme is based on bog size, presence or absence of rare species, and bog condition (level of shrub encroachment,

amount of disturbance or rutting). This system lists the bogs as A, B, C, D, or E, but has not been widely used.

At the present, we are expanding the above systems to include the entire scale of rare plant habitats on the Forest. Grading of specific sites can only occur as time permits visits to those sites for accurate grading.

In summary, all embedded plant communities have been mapped using GIS, but only prairie habitats have quality rankings. Many sites have been GPS’ed, especially on the Catahoula and Winn districts, and on the Evangeline unit. GPS’ing of sites nails down the number of acres of habitat occupied by rare plants. It should be stated here that the GPS’ed acres include a buffer zone of 1 chain (66 feet) for most habitats, and 3 chains (198 feet) for bogs. The monitoring to date indicates little change in prairie condition from 1996 to 1999 (Hyatt 1999); this trend continues, based on field observations. Classification and monitoring of other habitats continued. The monitoring purpose is being achieved, and further monitoring is required.

FY2001 recommended actions: Include development of a classification system for all habitats by the end of FY2002, and the continued monitoring of individual sites as time permits. Strive to implement harvest levels consistent with the Plan direction.

Objective 2–2: Provide for healthy populations of all existing native and desirable nonnative wildlife, fish, and

plants by managing major forest ecosystems at the scale and distribution appropriate to maintain species viability. In the next 10 years, management indicator habitat objectives are as follows:

ˆ **Longleaf pine, all stages: 121,000 acres.**

ˆ **Shortleaf pine / oak-hickory, early stages: 0 acres.**

ˆ **Shortleaf pine / oak-hickory, mid-late stages: 16,000 acres.**

ˆ **Mixed hardwood-loblolly pine, early stages: 42,000 acres.**

ˆ **Mixed hardwood-loblolly pine, mid-late stages: 252,000 acres.**

ˆ **Riparian, small streams: 85,000 acres**

ˆ **Riparian, large streams: 92,000 acres**

Are management practices successfully expanding quality habitats for management indicators? (E)

FY2000 results: During the calendar-year 2000, the Kisatchie National Forest established 136 MIS plots. These are scattered over 4 broad habitat types or landscapes (upland longleaf pine, shortleaf pine/oak-hickory, mixed hardwood-loblolly pine and riparian forests) and were “piggybacked” onto existing neotropical migratory bird plots.

During the year, 85 of 136 plots (63%) were sampled. Table 2 summarizes the per-

centage of plots containing a particular plant MIS species. Eight species are under represented or absent in the year 2000 sample. There are two reasons for this: (a) Five species (*Carex louisianica*, *Echinacea pallida*, *Monarda fistulosa*, *Podophyllum peltatum* and *Sanicula canadensis*) are present and/or identifiable (for the most part) in the spring and early summer. The first plot was not sampled until July 26 and plot sampling was not in “full swing” until mid-September. (b) Three species (*Crataegus viridus*, *Saururus cernuus*, and *Tilia americana*) are under rep-



resented or entirely absent from the 2000 samples because their habitat is under represented or absent in the neotropical bird points. Green Hawthorn (*Crataegus viridus*) and Lizard’s Tail (*Saururus cernuus*) are found in wet-mesic or frequently-flooded bottomland hardwood areas of major streams such as Corney Bayou, Cunningham Brake, Saline Bayou, Bayou Boeuf, and the Red River - a habitat that is absent from representation by the neotropical bird points. Basswood (*Tilia americana*) is found in rich mesic forests such as Brushy Creek on the Evangeline Unit of the Calcasieu RD, a habitat that is under represented by the neotropical bird points.

This data provides an initial baseline for MIS plant status on the Kisatchie National Forest. Due to the recent listing of these plant species as MIS, no comparison data is currently available. A report on the status of all MIS on the Forest has recently been completed (May 2001) . That report includes a variety of other data on plant MIS on the Forest. Table 2 on the next page simply provides an initial baseline for documenting the current status of plant MIS. Refinement of the MIS monitoring methods is expected. Acres for coverage of plant MIS species has not yet been calculated due to the low sample size.

Table 2: Plant MIS Frequency Occurrence

Southern Red Oak (<i>Quercus falcata</i>)	78%
Loblolly Pine (<i>Pinus taeda</i>)	72%
Little Bluestem (<i>Andropogon scoparius</i>)	55%
Longleaf Pine (<i>Pinus palustris</i>)	47%
Flowering Dogwood (<i>Cornus florida</i>)	46%
Mockernut Hickory (<i>Carya tomentosa</i>)	42%
White Oak (<i>Quercus alba</i>)	40%
Ironwood (<i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>)	27%
American Beech (<i>Fagus grandifolia</i>)	27%
Southern Magnolia (<i>Magnolia grandiflora</i>)	26%
Partridgeberry (<i>Mitchella repens</i>)	25%
Noseburn (<i>Tragia urticifolia</i>)	18%
Shortleaf Pine (<i>Pinus echinata</i>)	16%
Swamp Chestnut Oak (<i>Quercus michauxii</i>)	16%
Cherrybark Oak (<i>Quercus pagoda</i>)	16%
Christmas Fern	

(<i>Polystichum acrostichoides</i>)	14%
Bigleaf Snowbell (<i>Styrax grandifolia</i>)	12%
Partridge Pea (<i>Cassia fasciculata</i>)	9%
Inland Sea Oats (<i>Chasmanthium latifolium</i>)	9%
Black Hickory (<i>Carya texana</i>)	8%
Virginia Dutchman's Pipe (<i>Aristolochia serpentaria</i>)	7%
Black Snakeroot (<i>Sanicula canadensis</i>)	6%
Wild Azalea (<i>Rhododendron canescens</i>)	5%
Louisiana Sedge (<i>Carex louisianica</i>)	1%
Pale Purple Coneflower (<i>Echinacea pallida</i>)	1%
Wild Bergamot (<i>Monarda fistulosa</i>)	1%
Basswood (<i>Tilia americana</i>)	1%
Green Hawthorn (<i>Crataegus viridus</i>)	0%
Mayapple (<i>Podophyllum peltatum</i>)	0%
Lizard's Tail (<i>Saururus cernuus</i>)	0%

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue plant MIS monitoring, and reevaluate procedure for collecting that data for 2001.

Are the habitat objectives for selected management indicators providing for healthy populations of all existing native and desirable nonnative wildlife, fish, and plants? (V)

FY2000 results: Bird surveys on Kisatchie National Forest from 1990 to 1999 reveal:

(a) increasing populations of: White-Eyed Vireos and Yellow-Billed Cuckoos;

(b) decreasing populations of: Northern Bobwhite;

(c) stable populations of: Acadian Flycatchers, Bachman's Sparrows, Eastern Wood-Peewees, Hooded Warblers, Kentucky Warblers, Northern Parulas, Pileated Woodpeckers, Red-Headed Woodpeckers, Summer Tanagers, and Wood Thrushes; and

(d) populations of Cooper's Hawks, Louisiana Waterthrushes, Prairie Warblers, Red-Cockaded Woodpeckers, Warbling Vireos, White-Breasted Nuthatches, and Worm-Eating Warblers were too sparse to ascertain population trends.

The Kisatchie National Forest MIS (Management Indicator Species) Population and Habitat Trends report (Byrd, et al. 2001) provides baseline data for plant (and other) MIS species. Most plant data is based on a variety of historic data, and an initial study of plant MIS plots. In 2000, plant MIS plots were established with the purpose of documenting the frequency of the newly revised list of MIS species. Forest Plan revision in

1999 has increased the number of plant MIS from one to 30. Measurements of the numbers of plant MIS species were taken on 85 of the 136 plant MIS plots. This data will provide a baseline for future evaluation. The figures are considered preliminary, since no trends can be established with only a single year of data collection. In addition, some monitoring of MIS plots was done late in the year (as late as November), when some plant MIS were difficult to find.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue bird surveys on Kisatchie National Forest. Evaluate monitoring methods for plant MIS in FY2001. Some changes in the timing of plot measurement are expected. This should be done in order to target plant MIS species in specific habitats at the peak of their season of availability. All plant MIS plots should be measured in the appropriate season by the end of FY2002. Current results from the 2000 monitoring season brought up few concerns. The primary concern of timing of plot measurement will be addressed in 2001. A secondary concern exists about the absence of some species in *all* MIS plots measured to date. This will be reviewed after *all* MIS plots have been checked during the appropriate season. Perhaps additional plots will need to be selected to catch some species absent in plots measured to date, such as Mayapple and Louisiana Sedge. These “missed” species may just be of localized occurrence and so were not found in the initial plots that were measured during 2000.

Objective 2–3: Manage to protect, improve, and maintain habitat conditions for all threatened, endangered, sensitive, and conservation species occurring on the Forest. Manage habitat conditions on 303,000 acres of pine and pine-hardwood within 5 established Red-Cockaded Woodpecker (RCW) habitat management areas to achieve a long-term forest-wide RCW population of 1,405 active clusters.

Are management practices designed to protect, improve, and maintain threatened, endangered, sensitive, and conservation species being implemented?
Are management strategies designed for Red-Cockaded Woodpecker habitat management being implemented within designated habitat management areas?
(I)

FY2000 results: Few timber harvesting projects were implemented during 2000. Monitoring of selected projects found that all were being carried out in compliance with the Forest Plan direction, project design, and the NEPA decisions.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue monitoring projects as work continues on new projects.

Are habitat conditions for threatened, endangered, sensitive, and conservation species improving?
(E)

FY2000 results: The results of monitoring for Objective 2-1 on page 7 of this report provides detailed information on the quality and status of rare plant communities on the Kisatchie National Forest. This data provides an initial baseline of habitat conditions for embedded plant communities supporting PETS plants.

The monitoring to date indicates little change in prairie condition from 1996 to 1999 (Hyatt 1999); this trend continues, based on field observations. Classification and monitoring of other habitats continued. The monitoring purpose is being achieved, and further monitoring is required.

FY2001 recommended actions: Include development of a classification system for all habitats by the end of FY2002, and the continued monitoring of individual sites as time permits.

Are Red-Cockaded Woodpecker and Louisiana pearlshell mussel population trends responding positively to management strategies?
(V)

FY2000 results: Viable populations of mussels were found on and off the Forest. Streams on the Catahoula Ranger District in Grant Parish contained approximately 5,600 pearlshell mussels.

Population surveys for RCW conducted by Forest Service personnel reveal that: the Winn population remains small, but it appears stable; the Catahoula, Evangeline, and Ver-

non populations increased slightly; and the Kisatchie population decreased. The decrease in the Kisatchie population was attributed to excessive midstory resulting from infrequent prescribed burns. The Kisatchie National Forest and the US Fish & Wildlife Service are collaborating to resolve habitat problems with the Kisatchie population.

Table 3: 1995 – 2000 RCW Population Survey Results

<u>RCW Population</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u># Act.Clusters</u>
Catahoula	1995	26
	1996	28
	1997	29
	1998	29
	1999	30
	2000	34
Evangeline	1995	64
	1996	67
	1997	68
	1998	70
	1999	72
	2000	74
Kisatchie	1995	65
	1996	63
	1997	54
	1998	56
	1999	56
	2000	37
Winn	1995	12
	1996	12
	1997	12
	1998	14
	1999	17
	2000	17

Vernon	1995	187
	1996	201
	1997	198
	1998	194
	1999	155
	2000	152
Forest Totals	1995	354
	1996	371
	1997	361
	1998	363
	1999	330
	2000	314

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue public education efforts to encourage good land stewardship. Ensure adequate erosion control measures on newly constructed bridges. Continue beaver eradication efforts along mussel streams.

In cooperation with the Louisiana Natural Heritage Program and the US Fish & Wildlife Service, continue regularly scheduled surveys on a 5 year interval. Continue Inter-agency Agreement with USDA APHIS Wildlife Services for beaver control on mussel streams.

Survey known mussel beds on the Evangeline Unit of the Calcasieu Ranger District in Rapides Parish during the summer of 2001.

Closely monitor all RCW populations for population changes. Engage in RCW translocations to bolster populations, if feasible. Continue consultations with the US Fish & Wildlife Service.

Objective 2–4: Develop or maintain old-growth forest attributes, for their contribution to biological and visual diversity, habitats for plant and animal species, and maintenance of a natural gene pool, within designated patches on approximately 13 percent of the Forest based upon representation of the major forest ecosystems and old-growth community types. Long-term old-growth forest objectives are as follows:

- ˆ **Longleaf pine forest-dominated patches: 48,800 acres.**
- **Coastal plain upland mesic hardwood: 2,550 acres.**
- **Upland longleaf, woodland, and savanna: 45,350 acres.**
- **Southern wet pine forest, woodland, and savanna: 780 acres.**
- **Dry and xeric oak forest, woodland, and savanna: 120 acres.**
- ˆ **Shortleaf pine/oak-hickory forest-dominated patches: 13,500 acres.**
- **Coastal plain upland mesic hardwood: 1,290 acres.**
- **Dry and dry-mesic oak-pine forest: 11,630 acres.**
- **Dry and xeric oak forest, woodland, and savanna: 60 acres.**
- **Xeric pine and pine-oak forest and woodland: 50 acres.**
- **Seasonally wet oak-hardwood woodland: 350 acres.**

- **River floodplain hardwood forest: 120 acres.**
- **Mixed hardwood-loblolly pine forest-dominated patches: 6,100 acres.**
- **Coastal plain upland mesic hardwood: 700 acres.**
- **Seasonally wet oak-hardwood woodland: 300 acres.**
- **Dry and dry-mesic oak-pine forest: 4,650 acres.**
- **River floodplain hardwood forest: 450 acres.**
- **Riparian forest-dominated patches: 12,700 acres.**
- **Coastal plain upland mesic hardwood: 1,820 acres.**
- **River floodplain hardwood forest: 1,180 acres.**
- **Cypress-tupelo swamp forest: 1,400 acres.**
- **Eastern riverfront forest: 6,400 acres.**
- **Seasonally wet oak-hardwood woodland: 1,400 acres.**
- **Dry and dry-mesic oak-pine forest: 500 acres.**

Are management practices designed to develop old-growth forest attributes being implemented? (I)

FY2000 results: Project-level decision documents involving management practices designed to develop old-growth forest attributes have not yet been completed.

A GIS theme (map) showing old-growth

patches on the Kisatchie National Forest is available for use. Scorecards for evaluating old-growth attributes have been developed.

FY2001 recommended actions: Complete NEPA documents for management practices necessary to achieve the desired future conditions in compartments 23 and 24 on the Kisatchie Ranger District and other compartments on the Forest. Review documents for Forest Plan compliance concerning old-growth patches.

Begin field visits to old-growth patches and rank for quality.

Are the management practices successfully developing or maintaining forest attributes similar to those found in old-growth? (E)

FY2000 results: Insufficient time to evaluate.

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

Objective 2–5: Manage to protect or enhance the unique plant and animal communities, special habitat features, habitat linkages and corridors, and aquatic ecosystems associated with streamside habitat and riparian areas.

Are streamside habitat protection zones and riparian area protection zones being delineated and managed as prescribed? (I)

FY2000 results: Habitat for the unique features of streamside and riparian zones was monitored for management compliance with Forest Plan direction. Several streamside zone communities occur on the Forest. Figure 1 shows one of the rare plant species of mesic slopes and bottomland forests, the Kentucky Ladyslipper (*Cypripedium kentuckiense*).

Projects were limited in the year 2000, but where reviewed were found to be in compliance with Forest Plan direction, project design, and the NEPA decisions.



Figure 1

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue monitoring of projects as they occur in 2001.

Are these zones successfully protecting or enhancing unique plant and animal communities, special habitat features, habitat linkages, and aquatic ecosystems? (E)

FY2000 results: Appendix A provides details about the embedded communities and their quality. This monitoring item addresses streamside species, including Louisiana Bluestar, Kentucky Ladyslipper, Barbed Rattlesnake Root, Bog Moss, and Yellow Pimpernel. Baseline data on the size and location of populations of these species has been established.

It should be noted that many of these habitat polygons have been created from shapefiles. Shapefiles are hand digitized polygons representing occupied habitats and the buffer zones around those habitats. Buffer zones normally extend one chain (66 feet). Shapefiles are much less accurate than GPS'ed locations, which also normally include a one-chain buffer zone. In other words, GPS'ing of these sites in the future may increase the accuracy of the above data.

Condition rankings for these habitat polygons have not yet been established.

FY2001 recommended actions: Establish and assign condition rankings for streamside zone habitats for rare plant species.

Objective 6-2: Utilize prescribed fire in fire-dependent ecosystems, including Kisatchie Hills Wilderness, to maintain natural plant communities by varying the timing, frequency, and intensity of fire. Apply prescribed fire on 80,000-105,000 acres annually, with 10-20 percent of the area burned during the growing season. Focus growing season burning on longleaf pine landscapes.



Are the prescribed fire regimes being applied to all appropriate landscapes as prescribed, to maintain fire-dependent ecosystems? (I)

FY2000 results: The prescribed burning goals were not accomplished due to the severe drought in FY2000. The Forest accomplished 38,534 acres, of which 32,084 acres was dormant season and 6,450 acres was growing season burns.

Prescribed burning occurred in the following LTA's:

LTA's	Dormant Season Acres	Growing Season Acres
LTA 1	15,658	5,144
LTA 2	9,769	0
LTA 3	3,328	300
LTA 4	1,167	527
LTA 5	2,162	479

FY2001 recommended actions: The Forest should continue to monitor the weather and take advantage of every burning opportunity. Strive to maximize the implementation of growing season burns on longleaf pine plant community landscapes.

Are the natural plant communities being maintained by the prescribed fire regimes? (E)

FY2000 results: Insufficient time to evaluate.

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

2. Forest Health

Objective 1–3: Manage for air quality consistent with the Clean Air Act by implementing practices which are designed to meet State air quality standards and are consistent with maintaining the general forest area in Class II air quality.

Are Forest Service and the La. Dept. of Agriculture & Forestry's smoke management guidelines and regulations being applied? Are performance requirements concerning air quality being incorporated in permitted activities? (I)

FY2000 results: Kisatchie National Forest staff including the Forest Fire Management Officer, Hydrologist/ Soil Scientist and district staff monitored and rated four randomly selected units on the Forest where prescribed burning and smoke management operations had been conducted in 2000. The monitoring indicated correct and effective implementation of air quality standards and guidelines.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue reviewing and evaluating smoke management activities using these procedures.

Does air quality meet NAAQS and State standards? (E)

FY2000 results: Grant Parish continues to meet the 1-hour ozone NAAQS as indicated by monitoring data which is being collected at Louisiana DEQ's monitoring station which is located on the Catahoula Ranger District (Bentley site, Grant Parish).

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

Objective 1–4: Provide a level of wildfire protection which emphasizes cost-effective wildfire prevention and suppression while minimizing loss of resources.

Is wildfire protection being provided in a cost-effective manner? Are losses to wildfire being minimized? (I)

FY2000 results: Wildland fire preparedness was still below the most efficient level. As a result, wildland fire losses were not being minimized due to the funding shortfall.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue to request wildland fire preparedness funding at the 100% efficient level and staff accordingly

Are resources identified in NFMAS being made available in accordance with budget funding levels? Are acres lost to wildfire within the range identified by NFMAS for the current budget level? (E)

FY2000 results: Resources identified in

NFMAS are being made available in accordance with budget funding level. The Forest lost 7,613 acres to wildland fires in FY2000. The acceptable range in NFMAS for FY2000 was 2,108 acres. The Forest was above the acceptable range by 5,505 acres.

FY2001 recommended actions: Manage for productive and healthy forest ecosystems by utilizing prescribed fire to prevent and minimize resource losses to wildland fires.

Objective 1–5: Manage for productive and healthy forest ecosystems by utilizing comprehensive integrated approaches designed to prevent and minimize resource losses or damage due to insects and disease.

Do management practices provide for correct site/species selection, reduce overstocked stands to optimum levels and insure prompt detection and control of insects and diseases? (I)

FY2000 results: Final harvest treatments were completed on 390 acres in FY2000. This number of acres is far short of the planned estimate of 1,576 acres. In the last two years we have fallen short of the final harvest acres which need to be harvested for restoration and forest health. Suitable species were planted on 782 acres. The level of overstocked stands continues to increase with only 7,561 acres having been thinned in 2000. Overstocked stands are highly susceptible to

southern pine beetle (SPB) infestations. A large number of young plantations are reaching the age for first thinning. No SPB infestations occurred on the Kisatchie National Forest in FY2000.

Without implementation of the Forest Plan, and subsequent timber sales, the number of acres of overstocked stands will continue to grow, with the potential for the outbreak of insect and disease and subsequent decline in forest health. This condition could also potentially have a negative effect on habitat for the RCW.

FY2001 recommended actions: Implement final harvest treatments at the Forest Plan level. Increase thinning treatments to at least 25,000 acres per year.

Has management resulted in a decrease of susceptibility of southern pine beetle and other pests? Are pest incidents decreasing with applied integrated management? (E)

FY2000 results: Insufficient time to evaluate.

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

3. Watershed conditions

Objective 1–1: Maintain or improve the Forest’s long-term soil productivity. This is accomplished through land management practices designed to

meet requirements for minimizing soil erosion and compaction, by not exceeding allowable soil loss for any given soil, by revegetating disturbed areas, and by restoring degraded areas to a natural condition.

Are management practices designed to minimize soil erosion, compaction and loss of soil productivity being applied? (I)

FY2000 results: Three timber removal units and four prescribed burning units were randomly selected and rated for compliance with standards and guidelines by a team consisting of Kisatchie National Forest soil and water and district staff. District personnel did a very good job of implementing the practices designed to protect soil resources. Good placement of skid trails, landings and retaining slash on site minimized soil loss. Disturbed areas including fire lines were restored and revegetated. There was some discussion about retaining a little more vegetation around and above old gullies so that they would not erode. The resulting report indicated that almost all practices met or exceeded the standards and guidelines.

In addition, 15 units on the Winn, Kisatchie, Catahoula and Calcasieu Ranger Districts were randomly selected and rated for the effectiveness of soil and water standards and guidelines and mitigating measures using monitoring scorecards. Effectiveness was

rated excellent on 13 units, fair on one unit and poor on one unit.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue monitoring and evaluating activities using these procedures.

Is allowable soil loss being exceeded? Are disturbed and degraded areas being restored and revegetated to a natural condition? (E)

FY2000 results: A study was completed on the Calcasieu Ranger District to determine the effects to the soil from an unusual “worst case” situation where a site prep burn had been extremely hot due to unforeseen changes in weather conditions (high winds). Twenty measured stakes were inserted on a site in order to get a measurement of soil loss and measurements taken for 17 months. The data indicated that the Maximum Tolerable (allowable) Soil Loss amount for Rustin/Smithdale soils for a recovery period was exceeded. Since the movement of soil from above the stake cannot be distinguished from the loss of soil at the stake, the method may overestimate the amount of soil loss. Data from past monitoring studies on the Kisatchie on similar soils, where site-preparation burning were conducted within prescribed burning parameters, has shown that the allowable soil loss was not exceeded and that soil loss on site-prepared areas was minimal after the first year.

Disturbed areas were being restored and revegetated. Six KV-funded soil and water projects were monitored and rated for effectiveness. Erosion control was effective though more waterbars were recommended in some areas.

Restoration activities included about 30 acres of watershed improvement projects and 26 acres of KV soil and water projects. Revegetation of these areas was successful with greater than 80 % cover.

FY2001 recommended actions: Develop more accurate procedures to evaluate soil loss. Develop procedures to evaluate impacts from user-created ORV trails. Monitor completed projects and perform maintenance and revegetation as needed. Continue restoration and revegetation activities.

How do timber management practices, especially timber harvesting and consequent compaction, affect soil productivity? (V)

FY2000 results: Preliminary results from the Long Term Soil Productivity Study indicate that when sites located on several soil types with a severe compaction hazard rating, including Malbis soils, were subjected to severe compaction, bulk densities recovered to near original undisturbed levels within five years. Preliminary results also indicate that soil productivity is maintained when slash is retained on site.

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

Objective 1–2: Maintain or improve the integrity of aquatic ecosystems to provide for high water quality, stream-channel stability, natural flow regimes, water yield, and aquatic resources by managing in accordance with the Clean Water Act and by meeting all State and federal water quality standards.

Are management practices designed to minimize contamination, sedimentation, and maintain stream channel stability being applied? (I)

FY2000 results: Procedures were developed for assessing implementation of standards and guidelines for protection of water quality. Three timber removal units on Kisatchie Ranger District and four prescribed burning units on the Calcasieu Ranger District were randomly selected and rated for compliance with soil and water standards and guidelines (best management practices) by a team consisting of Kisatchie National Forest hydrologist and silviculture staff and Louisiana DEQ, Non-Point Pollution Control staff. District personnel did a very good job of implementing the standards and guidelines. Streamside zones were implemented on all streams including all the numerous small side branches. Although the standards and guidelines from the Revised Forest Plan's new requirements for the larger Streamside Habitat Protection Zones (SHPZs) did not apply to

these operations, most of the zones on these units would comply with the new requirements. The units were laid out to avoid the need for any stream crossings that eliminated a major source of potential sedimentation. The resulting report indicated that all appropriate standards and guidelines were implemented and that practices met or exceeded the standards and guidelines.

As indicated previously, 15 units on the Winn, Kisatchie, Catahoula and Calcasieu Ranger Districts were randomly selected and rated for the effectiveness of soil and water standards and guidelines and mitigating measures using monitoring scorecards. Effectiveness was rated excellent on 13 units, fair on one unit due to streamside zone layout and poor on one unit due to erosion from a road.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue reviewing and evaluating silvicultural activities using these procedures.

Are State water quality standards and State anti-degradation policies being met? Is water quality being degraded? (E)

FY2000 results: The water quality of nine streams on the Winn, Catahoula, and Calcasieu Ranger districts were monitored on a quarterly basis in cooperation with the Louisiana DEQ. The data is included in the state's water quality database and may be accessed on the La. DEQ web pages. The monitoring data indicates that all these streams meet the

criteria for designated uses, including propagation for fish and wildlife. The criteria specify standards for chlorides, sulfates, dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature, and total dissolved oxygen. Almost all samples from these streams had turbidity levels that were well below 25 NTU, which is the criterion for natural and scenic streams. In addition to the criteria parameters, the streams were monitored for metals (arsenic, chromium, cadmium, copper, lead, mercury, nickel), nutrients (carbon, phosphates, potassium, nitrogen, nitrites, nitrates) and sulfates, suspended solids etc. The monitoring data indicates minimal or trace levels of these substances and no contamination that would affect fish or wildlife.

Bi-weekly testing of fecal coliform levels at Stuart Lake, Kincaid Lake and Caney Lake swim beaches indicated that water quality standards for protection of public health and safety were met. Slightly elevated fecal coliform levels due to low water levels at Stuart Lake caused the swim beach to be closed for one week in August.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue to monitor streams in cooperation with La. DEQ. Continue required monitoring of fecal coliform levels at swimming recreation sites.

Objective 2–6: Manage perennial and intermittent streams as well as natural and man-made lakes, reservoirs, and ponds for native and desirable nonnative fish species and aquatic communities.

Are lake predator-prey populations in balance? Are management practices sufficiently protecting stream and lake habitats? Are primary aquatic food chain organisms being impacted by siltation? (I)

FY2000 results: Relative weights [100(individual weight/standard weight at length)] of bass averaged over 80%.

Water quality was within acceptable norms. Turbidity ranged from 2.4 to 27.6 NTUs; pH ranged from 4.4 to 7.5; dissolved oxygen ranged from 4.3 to 10.9 mg/l; and conductivity ranged from 19 to 186 umhos/cm. Extremities were attributed to natural conditions.

Valentine Lake was drawn down to repair the control structure. Bream were stocked (1,053, less than or equal to 3”) in Valentine Lake after the drawdown. The Caney Lakes were not inventoried in the Fall, due to the blowdown that occurred in the vicinity.

Largemouth bass were stocked (33,215 fingerlings) in 21 Forest Service lakes and ponds. Catfish were stocked (17,979 finger-

lings) in five Forest Service lakes and ponds.

FY2001 recommended actions: Population structure and balance could benefit from supplemental stocking and improved habitat.

Are lake populations healthy? Are non-natives and / or generalist-omnivore natives affecting lake biomass and balance? Is lake habitat sufficient? (E)

FY2000 results: Caney and Corney Lakes were surveyed and fish populations appeared healthy.

Fullerton Lake and Anderson Pond were drawn down for weed control. Christmas trees were placed in Valentine Lake for fisheries habitat improvement. Approximately 5 cubic yards of pea gravel and 159 tons of lime were applied to several lake and ponds in order to maintain and improve water quality and fish habitat.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue monitoring Forest lakes for fish health.

B. SUSTAINABLE MULTIPLE FOREST AND RANGE BENEFITS

1. Outdoor Recreation Opportunities



Objective 2-7: Provide quality habitat for game and fish populations.

Are management practices successfully expanding quality habitats for game and fish species? (E)

FY2000 results: Overall, lakes throughout the Forest have adequate fish populations to provide the public with a pleasurable recreational experience.

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

Are habitat objectives for selected demand species providing game and fish populations sufficient for quality recreational opportunities? (V)

FY2000 results: Estimated population density of select game species on Kisatchie National Forest in 2001 compared to 1999 are as follows:

<u>White-Tailed Deer (acres/animal)</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>
Catahoula District	50	50
Evangeline Unit	75	75
Kisatchie District	75	75
Winn District	45	45
Vernon Unit	75	75
Caney District	35	40

<u>Wild Turkey (acres/animal)</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>
Catahoula District	55	100
Evangeline Unit	60	200
Kisatchie District	45	75
Winn District	55	75
Vernon Unit	60	75
Caney District	55	200

Fox Squirrel (acres/animal in upland hardwoods)

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>
Catahoula District	5	5
Evangeline Unit	5	5
Kisatchie District	5	5
Winn District	5	5
Vernon Unit	5	5
Caney District	5	5

Gray Squirrel (acres/animal in bottomland hardwood)

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>
Catahoula District	4	4
Evangeline Unit	4	4
Kisatchie District	4	4
Winn District	4	4
Vernon Unit	4	4
Caney District	4	4

Bobwhite quail (acres/covey)

	<u>1999</u>	<u>2000</u>
Catahoula District	1,300	1,300
Evangeline Unit	1,300	1,300
Kisatchie District	1,300	1,300
Winn District	1,300	1,300
Vernon Unit	1,200	1,200
Caney District	1,300	1,300

Population levels for game species were stable. Deer populations are and have been considerably below the habitat's carrying capacity; herd densities are too low to provide adequate aesthetic enjoyment for non-consumptive users.

FY2001 recommended actions: Work with Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries to identify factors contributing to low deer populations. Identify any needed changes in hunting regulations on National Forest lands.

Objective 2–8: Protect, restore, maintain, acquire, and improve habitat on the Forest for waterfowl and wetland wildlife, as stated in the North American Waterfowl Management Plan.

Are management practices designed to protect, restore, maintain, and improve waterfowl and wetland wildlife being implemented? (I)



FY2000 results: No new waterfowl or habitat improvement projects were implemented during FY2000

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

Are these management practices successfully providing for waterfowl and wetland wildlife? (E)

FY2000 results: Insufficient time to evaluate.

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

Objective 4–1: Manage the Forest to create and maintain landscapes having high scenic diversity, harmony, and unity for the benefit of society through the application of the Scenery Management System, and consistent with assigned scenic integrity objectives (SIO). The SIOs are as follows:

- ˆ Very high: 8,699 acres.
- ˆ High: 93,980 acres.
- ˆ Medium: 89,155 acres.
- ˆ Low: 415,020 acres.
- ˆ Very low: 1,278 acres.

Is the Forest being managed in accordance with the assigned SIOs? (I)

FY2000 results: Comparisons of project designs with SIO guidance were not made due to staffing limitations.

FY2001 recommended actions: Dedicate additional resources to accomplishing this task in future years.

Objective 4–2: Provide visitors the opportunity to pursue a wide variety of developed and dispersed recreation activities, with a minimum amount of regulation, consistent with the assigned recreation opportunity spectrum (ROS) class. The Forest’s ROS class objectives are as follows:

- ˆ Primitive: 8,700 acres.
- ˆ Semiprimitive nonmotorized: 57,269 acres.
- ˆ Semiprimitive motorized: 89,963 acres.
- ˆ Roaded natural-appearing: 217,152 acres.
- ˆ Roaded natural modified: 191,671 acres.
- ˆ Rural: 6,162 acres.

Has class eligibility shifted significantly? (E)

FY2000 results: Comparisons were not made due to staffing limitations. However, shifts in ROS class eligibility are not likely to have occurred because only minor road construction or decommissioning was planned and accomplished. ROS class eligibility changes are dependant, primarily, on changes in road density.

FY2001 recommended actions: Evaluate the feasibility of developing an automated GIS system that would periodically determine the ROS class eligibility of forest lands.

Objective 4–3: Develop, maintain, and protect existing and potential developed and dispersed recreation sites and trails consistent with public use and demand through construction, operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation activities.

How satisfied are our recreation customers? Are recreation resources managed in a manner that is responsive to public recreation needs yet as cost effective as possible, in accordance with the negotiated recreation program of work based on Meaningful Measures standards? (I)



FY2000 results: The Meaningful Measures summarizations were not made due to staffing limitations.

The Forest is in the process of completing the Meaningful Measures inventory, data entry and the documentation of funding needs to meet standards. Critical standards are being met. Full compliance with all Meaningful Measures standards is not possible at current funding level.

FY2001 recommended actions: Increased emphasis should be placed on the distribution of comment cards and the analysis of the results.

Continue management of the recreation program using the Meaningful Measures system.

2. Infrastructure

Objective 3–7: Manage the transportation system to ensure that any roads constructed are designed according to standards appropriate to the planned uses.

Is the transportation facility serviceable by the intended user? (E)

FY2000 results: There were 70.3 miles of reconstruction/construction in FY1999 and 15.5 miles in FY2000. There has been little or no use of the majority of roads reconstructed and constructed during FY1999 and

FY2000. Therefore, serviceability of these roads could not be meaningfully evaluated. In FY1998, 98.4 miles of local and collector roads were reconstructed or constructed. Of this total, 40.4 miles were reviewed. All roads reviewed were observed to be serviceable by the intended user and required no significant increase in the level or frequency of maintenance.



FY2001 recommended actions: Continue use of appropriate design standards for road reconstruction and construction. Continue monitoring road condition and use.

3. Human Influences

Objective 1–6: Manage national forest lands in an efficient manner to provide for the future needs of society by pursuing opportunities to make land ownership adjustments that improve management effectiveness and en-

hance public benefits through land consolidation; acquiring rights-of-way that facilitate efficient management; issuing land use authorizations necessary to meet public and private needs only when no viable alternative to long-term commitments on Forest land exists; and establishing and maintaining all landline boundaries.



Are non-federal lands being acquired to enhance public benefits and improve management effectiveness? Are acquired rights-of-way achieving better Forest management? Are land use authorizations being issued only after all other alternatives are explored to provide goods and services? How well are landline boundaries being established, maintained, and protected from obliteration? (I)

FY2000 results: Non-federal lands were acquired in the Drewry Land exchange.

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

Are newly acquired lands compatible with management practices in the Management Area where they are located? Are encroachments discouraged by well-defined property lines? (E)

FY2000 results: Insufficient time to evaluate.

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

Objective 3-1: Provide for long-term sustainable production of commodities for economies, local community stability, and people.

How does the flow of commodity outputs to local economies and people compare with the Forest Plan projections? (I)



FY2000 results: Harvest levels dropped from FY1999 (85,000 CCF) to FY2000 (54,000 CCF). An accompanying reduction in payments to the State of Louisiana was also felt. This volume is greater than 10% and may be considered substantial. When analyzing the payment, however, the reduction was from \$2,170,000 to \$1,839,000 for FY1999 to FY2000, respectively. This is a fifteen percent reduction. It should be noted that this difference is likely due to the higher value of product being harvested in FY2000. Future declines in harvest levels and accompanying dollar values will be substantial until the outputs outlined in the Forest Plan are achieved.

In FY2000, only 17,000 CCF were offered and sold as bona fide new timber sales. This small amount of volume in the pipeline and its effects will be felt in next year's report. The expectation is for a very substantial reduction in volume harvested and the accompanying value, which relates to returns to the parish and local jobs/income. This situation is the result of ongoing litigation in response to proposed timber sale plans and the implementation of the Forest Plan.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue to monitor the situation. Strive to implement sale and harvest levels consistent with Plan direction.

Objective 3-6: Assist local Forest communities in diversifying and enhancing existing economies with an empha-

sis on the conservation of natural, cultural, and recreational resources of the Forest and the State.

Are programs and opportunities for improving rural economies and social conditions being developed? (I)

FY2000 results: The Forest received Economic Recovery (ER) grant proposals from seven communities totaling \$39,000, which was less than the \$125,000 in requests for FY1999. Three proposals were funded for a total of almost \$17,000 in FY2000, which is greater than the \$10,000 available in FY1999. Three proposals in FY2000 came from communities which had never received ER funds in the past. One funded project assisted three new minority communities.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue outreach to new communities, emphasizing capacity-building or comprehensive Action Planning project proposals.

Are programs and opportunities improving sustainable local economies and social conditions? (E)

FY2000 results: FY2000 grants assisted three minority communities to successfully increase local economy through tourism, suggested opportunities for new recycling industries in north Louisiana, and contributed to community efforts to support conservation education.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue emphasis on new communities and capacity-building projects that result in increased local incomes or additional job opportunities.

4. Roadless Areas/Wilderness/Wild & Scenic Rivers

Objective 5–6: Manage each special interest area (SIA) as an integral part of the Forest, with emphasis on protecting, enhancing, or interpreting its unique values.

Is Forest Plan SIA direction being applied? (I)

FY2000 results: Comparisons of project plans and Environmental Assessments with SIA Forest Plan direction were not made due to staffing limitations.

FY2001 recommended actions: Dedicate additional resources to accomplishing this task in future years.

Objective 5–7: Manage the Kisatchie Hills Wilderness to enhance and perpetuate wilderness as a resource. Avoid resource damage resulting from over-use.

Is Kisatchie Hills Wilderness being managed to enhance and perpetuate wilderness values? Are natural pro-

cesses allowed to operate freely? Is Forest Plan direction that would ensure the above being applied? (I)

FY2000 results: National Meaningful Measures standards for wilderness management have not been completed. Management of Kisatchie Hills Wilderness is in compliance with Forest Plan standards and guidelines.

FY2001 recommended actions: Evaluate the compliance of Kisatchie Hills Wilderness management with Meaningful Measures Standards when they are completed.

5. Timber

Objective 3–2: Offer for competitive bid an average of 9.7 million cubic feet of timber sale volume on an annual basis for the first decade of the Plan.

Is the Forest providing for competitive bid the average annual allowable sale quantity it projected for the first decade? (I)

FY2000 results: Due to ongoing litigation, the amount of volume offered in FY2000 dropped from FY1999 precipitously -- from 97,000 CCF to just under 8,000 CCF.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue to monitor the situation. Strive to implement sale and harvest levels consistent with Plan direction.

Objective 6–1: Manage the Forest to achieve a mixture of desired future conditions using even-aged, two-aged, and uneven-aged silvicultural systems and regeneration methods; and a variety of manual, mechanical, prescribed fire, and herbicide vegetation management treatments. Apply the uneven-aged silvicultural system on a minimum of 32,000 acres.



Are management practices designed to achieve a mixture of desired future conditions being applied? (I)

FY2000 results: Few project-level decision documents based on the new Forest Plan involving management practices designed to achieve a mixture of desired future conditions have been completed. Not enough intermediate thinning treatments are being applied to allow sunlight to reach the forest

floor which encourages the development of native herbaceous ground cover. Also, high basal area of pine stems creates high risk for the infestation of the SPB. Harvesting on existing timber sale contracts continue. The following list shows method of cut and acres completed in FY2000:

Clearcut	359 acres
Seed Tree Cut	31 acres
Thinning	5,817 acres

FY2001 recommended actions: Increase the amount of intermediate thinning acres being implemented to encourage the development of herbaceous ground cover and improve forest health. Complete NEPA documents for management practices necessary to achieve a mixture of desired future conditions in compartments 23 and 24 on the Kisatchie Ranger District and other compartments on the Forest. Assure Forest Plan compliance concerning uneven-aged management.

6. Forage

Objective 3–4: Maintain or improve forage resources for domestic livestock grazing on 86,000 acres within designated grazing allotments to meet the needs of local demand.

Are forage resources being maintained or improved on the designated allotments? (I)

FY2000 results: Local demand for range resources continued its gradual downward trend. Some permittees requested “nonuse” of grazing lands, resulting in fewer cattle being grazed on Forest Service lands in FY2000, compared to FY1999. While the immediate impact continues to be small, the long term gradual downward trend in the number of grazing animals has precipitated a drop of over 90 percent in the last 25 years.

The Forest botanist/ecologist (who also serves as Forest range conservationist) monitored the range program for Forest Plan and NEPA compliance in FY2000. This included supervising the documentation of the condition of all range improvements on the Forest, including fences, ponds, cattleguards, and corrals. Two thirds of the improvement condition data was entered into the INFRA database. No problems with Forest Plan for NEPA compliance were found.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue monitoring of Forest Plan and NEPA compliance.

Are active allotments meeting the needs of the local demand for forage resources? (E)

FY2000 results: Demand for range permits remains at a very low level. The Forest

received few inquires from the public requesting information on the availability and conditions of range permits. The costs and requirements for range permits limit public interest. Cost are at market value, but permittee find the range improvements usually need too much work to make it worthwhile to them to request a permit. As a result, no new permits were issued in FY2000.

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

7. Other Products

Objective 3–3: Make all U.S. minerals available for lease except in areas where consent has been legislatively or administratively withdrawn. Development of federal minerals will be allowed within the constraints of the lease and accompanying stipulations and restrictions. To the extent legally possible, manage surface occupancy to avoid or minimize environmental effects where reserved and outstanding mineral rights exist. As allowed by State and federal law and under the terms of the severance deed, ensure that surface resources will not be adversely affected to an unacceptable degree by the exercise of reserved and outstanding mineral rights.

Are parcels being made available for lease according to U.S. ownership and management restrictions? Are appli-

cations for minerals exploration and development being processed according to directions and in a timely manner? Are operating plans for exploration of private minerals being reviewed for compliance with existing State and federal laws? (I)



FY2000 results: Current litigations regarding the ownership of minerals, and the wildfire demand on personal hampered the leasing of available lease parcels. All available parcels, however, meet management restrictions.

Applications for minerals exploration

and development were processed according to directions and in a timely manner, respective of shrinking funds and other duties demands on mineral personnel.

Based on current rulings, lands were reviewed for availability. Mineral ownership status continued to be updated on GIS; the leases were not updated either at the SO or on Districts.

Applications were reviewed and were in compliance with state and federal laws, however, there is a need for additional training in conducting compliance inspections.

FY2001 recommended actions: Input updated mineral ownership and lease data into the Forest GIS.

Conduct a workshop on state and federal laws for all personnel with mineral duties.

Objective 3–5: Provide other forest products such as firewood and pinestraw as available, as long as their use does not impair ecosystem health or the achievement of other resource objectives.

How does management of these products compare with Forest Plan direction? (I)

FY2000 results: The interest in special wood products from the Forest continued to increase slightly. It should be noted that many items , such as firewood, demand exceeds

supply. The number of permits issued year to year is about the same, with slight variation. A few more permits were issued on those districts which had suffered storm damage and were in need of the removal of downed material.

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

Is the Forest providing opportunities for other specialty forest products without negatively impacting forest health or other resources? (V)

FY2000 results: Insufficient time to evaluate, however, demand on the Kisatchie National Forest is very low compared to other areas of the Region.

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

8. Heritage Resources

Objective 5–1: Manage the nonrenewable heritage resources of the Forest in a spirit of stewardship for the American public. Include the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and interested federally recognized tribes as primary partners in managing the Forest’s heritage resources.

Are significant archeological and historical sites being identified, prior to project decisions, through inventories conducted in consultation with the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Of-

ficier (SHPO) according to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), 36 CFR 800, NEPA, and the Southern Regional Heritage Programmatic Agreements (PA)? (I)

FY2000 results: All compliance reviews and consultations pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) were completed prior to agency decisions. However, FY2000 was a year of transition as the Forest began working under the goals and objectives of the Revised Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. As a result, requests for inventory were much reduced from years past. In FY2000, a total of 2,239 acres were inventoried. Of these acres, 2,001 were in support of timber management, and 238 were for fire salvage projects. Eleven sites were recorded, and two were recommended for protection until final evaluation and consultation regarding their National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) status was determined.

In FY2000, the Forest entered into government-to-government relations with four federally recognized tribal nations, and began consulting with them, in addition to the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), on inventory findings and management recommendations. These are the Caddo Nation of Oklahoma, the Oklahoma Choctaw, Jena Band of Choctaw, and Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana. An additional four tribes have indicated some interest in nation-to-nation

relations, but have not yet formalized this relationship. These are the Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana, the Quapaw of Oklahoma, the Mississippi Band of Choctaw, and the Poarch Band of Creek in Alabama

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue the current course of pre-decisional inventories and consultations. Continue working with interested tribes to establish required government-to-government relations and partnerships.

Objective 5–2: Provide protection for heritage resource sites which preserves the integrity of scientific data that they contain, for the benefit of the public and scientific communities.

Is law enforcement and heritage support provided at sufficient levels to protect significant heritage sites from internal and/or external activities? (I)

FY2000 results: Over 75 sites were monitored and revisited to determine the extent of internal or externally-caused damage. No evidence of damage due to Forest activities was noted, but external damage (unauthorized site looting) was recorded in a number of instances. One formal Law Enforcement case report was generated, but LE investigation was unable to identify persons responsible. Site damage was estimated in excess of \$500 (felony-level).

There are insufficient funds for Law Enforcement Officers and Heritage Specialists to physically monitor all sites at risk.

In FY2000, the Forest entered into a Collection Agreement with the Louisiana Army National Guard to assist them with site protection on lands at Camp Beauregard. Since Camp Beauregard shares a common boundary with the Forest, our combined efforts provide mutual protection benefits.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue current course of physical site monitoring. The Forest needs to request and receive funding to increase monitoring efforts, with an eye towards using remote-sensing technology to supplement physical monitoring.

Are protection measures effective at preventing unacceptable damage? (E)

FY2000 results: No damage attributable to Forest activities was recorded, and no additional cultural evidence was observed in activity buffer zones surrounding sites.

FY2001 recommended actions: Current strategies for site and buffer zone delineation appear effective and should be continued.

Objective 5-3: Reduce the existing backlog of heritage sites needing formal evaluation so that the overall number decreases each year.

Are sufficient numbers of significant or potentially significant sites being

evaluated so that the number of backlogged properties decreases each year? (I)

FY2000 results: Only one site was evaluated for its eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places, and the number of backlogged sites needing evaluation grew to 419. Given current and projected funding and staffing levels, we are not able to satisfy compliance with Section 110 of the NHPA, requiring assessments of NRHP eligibility for all known cultural properties.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue to request additional funds needed to conduct cultural site evaluations for all sites in backlogged status.

Objective 5-4: Enhance and interpret appropriate sites and heritage values to the American public.

Are sites and heritage values being identified for public interpretation? (I)

FY2000 results: The Forest publicly interpreted two sites through Passport In Time (PIT) projects, and was a contributor to Louisiana Archaeology Week for the 11th year. Heritage Specialists visited primary and secondary level classrooms to make presentations on Louisiana history and archeological ethics.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue to offer PIT projects as possible given

funding constraints, and remain as a primary partner with the LA SHPO in Louisiana Archaeology Week.

Has interpretation enhanced awareness of heritage values among the general public? (E)



FY2000 results: Public responses from PIT projects and public presentations indicate a general increase in awareness and sensitivity about the nonrenewable cultural resource base.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue to offer PIT projects, classroom and civic organization presentations, and partner with the LA SHPO in Louisiana Archaeology Week.

Objective 5–5: Provide an ongoing interpretive services program that accurately and adequately develops an interest in and understanding for the natural and cultural environment of the Forest and the mission of the Forest Service in managing it.

Does the interpretive services program provide usable information to the public about the full scope of forest management practices and philosophy? (I)

FY2000 results: Yes. The full scope of forest management practices and philosophy



was incorporated in presentations to the public, schools, and media during FY2000.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue to provide funding for high-profile and effective interpretive programs such as Passport In Time.

Has interpretive services increased measurable public support of Forest Service resource management goals and objectives? (E)

FY2000 results: Insufficient time to evaluate.

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

C. ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

1. Economics (see *Appendix B*)

2. Evaluation of New Information

Objective 7–1: Monitor and document the annual progress towards accomplishment of Forest goals, objectives, and desired future conditions.

Is the Forest preparing and distributing a yearly monitoring and evaluation report to the public? (I)

FY2000 results: The Forest prepared the 1999 M&E Report and made it available to the general public through the Regional website at <http://www.r8web.com>.

FY2001 recommended actions: None.

Objective 7–2: Evaluate new information and monitoring results; adapt management accordingly.

Is the Forest Plan being kept current through timely changes as identified in the annual M&E Report? (I)

FY2000 results: The Forest Plan was revised in 1999. During FY2000, only minor changes occurred on the Forest from implementation of the revised Forest Plan due to

appeal and litigation requests and updating of project analyses that begun under the previous Plan. Several issues emerged pertaining to how MIS habitat and population trends should be analyzed in site-specific environmental analysis documents. This work was still in progress by the end of FY2000, but was subsequently completed in FY2001. During the next 5-Year Review (which should occur in 2004), the Forest will look at appropriate changes to Plan MIS selection and direction. It is anticipated that any needed changes in Plan direction can be incorporated by either amendment(s) or errata at that time.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue to assess effectiveness of the Plan's management direction through updates to this annual Monitoring and Evaluation Report. Complete work on MIS Population and Habitat Trends Report and incorporate latest findings into project level assessments. Continue to update field personnel as changes occur.

Objective 8–1: Benefit from research information, technical assistance and technology development by maintaining a close, continuous working relationship with scientists at the Southern Research Station, academic institutions, and Forest Health Protection units.

Are cooperative relationships being developed and maintained? (I)



FY2000 results: A list of cooperative studies with the Southern Research Station Unit FMR-4111 follows:

- Pine Straw Study (#247)
- Longleaf Pine Establishment Study on Upland Pine Sites (#268)
- Longleaf Pine Establishment Study on Wet Pine Sites (#269)
- Comparison Study of Longleaf/Loblolly/Slash Pine Establishment on Upland Pine Sites (#270)
- Comparison Study of Longleaf/Loblolly/Slash Pine Establishment on Wet Pine Sites (#271)
- Study Comparing Management Intensity Levels Used in The Establishment of Longleaf on Upland Pine Sites (#272)
- Study Comparing Management Intensity Levels Used in The Establishment of Longleaf on Wet Pine Sites (#273)
- Delayed Prescribed Burn Study (#275)
- Croker Study Involving The Kisatchie National Forest and the Southern Research

Station Units 4111 and 4501 (#3.4)

- Natural Longleaf Pine Burning Study (#3.7)
- Season of Burning Monitoring (#411262)
- Monitoring of Demonstration Areas (#411262)
- Longleaf Pine Ecosystem Restoration Study (#411262)

A cooperative work-study with the Kisatchie National Forest, Southern Research Station Unit FMR-4111, the forest insect unit FIR-4501, and Louisiana State University involving insect attacks on severely burned longleaf pine trees is being conducted. Southern Research Station Unit FMR-4111 has established research plots in young longleaf and loblolly pine plantations to monitor changing management practices on growth and yield.

FY2001 recommended actions: All the above studies are ongoing. Continue studies.

Objective 8–2: Continue to identify research needs as the Forest implements the Plan.

Are research needs being identified in a timely manner? (I)

FY2000 results: Research needs to address the resource impacts and management of off road vehicles (ORV) use on the Kisatchie National Forest were identified and a project was developed with Louisiana State University (LSU) researchers.

Future research needs are listed below:

- Effects of prescribed burning on bark beetle populations
- Fire effects on the growth and yield of longleaf pine
- Effects of prescribed burning on forest sustainability
- Longleaf pine restoration techniques

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue to fund ORV research project with LSU. Identify other research needs.

The Kisatchie National Forest should continue to assist the Southern Research Station in ongoing studies. The Forest will help initiate additional studies when requested and as funding allows.

Objective 9–1: Continue coordination and cooperation efforts with other federal and State agencies, such as the U.S. Department of Interior, Fish & Wildlife Service, the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Louisiana Department of Agriculture and Forestry, and the Louisiana SHPO on issues of mutual concern.

Are coordination and cooperation efforts being conducted with federal and State agencies? (I)

FY2000 results: Yes. The Forest has full consultation with the LA State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and four Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPO). We continue our long-standing partnership with the SHPO to produce the annual Louisiana Archaeology Week.

Coordination meetings with US Fish & Wildlife Service and Louisiana Department of Wildlife & Fisheries personnel are conducted at least annually. Informal coordination sessions with these agencies are conducted on a much more frequent basis.

FY2001 recommended actions: Seek additional partnership opportunities with SHPO and THPOs.

Continue implementing the Kisatchie National Forest's Revised Land and Resource Management Plan.

Objective 9–2: Seek to increase the participation of other federal and State agencies, academic institutions, federally recognized Native American tribes, organizations and individuals in the accomplishment of Forest goals and objectives through the use of memorandums of understanding, cooperative agreements, partnerships, and challenge cost share agreements.

Are memorandums of understanding, cooperative agreements, partnerships, and challenge cost share agreements being developed? Are we increasing

the participation of groups and individuals in the accomplishment of Forest Plan goals and objectives? (I)

FY2000 results: The Forest Service and LSU established a challenge cost share agreement to help one another accomplish mutually beneficial objectives related to the impacts of off road vehicles (ORV) to soil, water and other resources of the Kisatchie National Forest. The current Kisatchie National Forest ratings will be refined and modified in order to classify the suitability of areas for ORV traffic. These data will be incorporated into the Forest Service's GIS database and should help the Forest Service determine how to best manage these areas.

The Kisatchie National Forest continued participation in the Non-point Source Interagency Committee with La. DEQ, NRCS, La. Dept. of Forestry and other agencies under the Forest's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the state of Louisiana on Clean Water Act, Non-Point Source Pollution Control. Louisiana Dept. of Environmental Quality Non-point Source Pollution Control program personnel participated in Kisatchie National Forest implementation monitoring reviews of water quality Best Management Practices.

The Kisatchie National Forest developed an interagency agreement with the Natural Resources Conservation Service to conduct Emergency Watershed Protection activities for the Caney Lakes tornado damage.

The Kisatchie National Forest continued to conduct water quality monitoring on 9 streams. The monitoring is being done by arrangement with LA DEQ under the Forest's Non-Point Pollution Control MOU with the state of Louisiana (Clean Water Act, Sect. 319)

The MOU between the Kisatchie National Forest and the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries is being revised to stress greater cooperation between the two agencies, especially in the setting of hunting seasons on Kisatchie National Forest. Additionally, the Forest has Challenge Cost Share Agreements with the Louisiana Chapter of The Wildlife Society to produce the "Proceedings of the Ninth American Woodcock Symposium" and with Louisiana State University to ascertain quail abundance and distribution on the Winn and Caney Districts.

FY2001 recommended actions: Continue to participate in existing agreements. Amend Challenge Cost Share agreement with Louisiana State University to continue ORV study described above. Continue to seek interested partners who wish to participate in implementing the revised Forest Plan.

2000

III. Evaluation of Outcomes on the Land

This section of the Report evaluates information taken from all monitoring items for this reporting fiscal year (FY2000). However, because implementation of the Revised Plan began November 29, 1999, it is still too early to make meaningful evaluations for many items. The effectiveness of Plan direction and validation of Plan assumptions need a few more years of data before changes to the Plan direction would be considered. Implementation monitoring, although limited because of the relatively few number of projects implemented during FY2000, make up the bulk of this Report.

Several monitoring items, however, can be evaluated with some certainty. A few observations follow:

- √ Progress in implementing the direction of the Revised Plan began slowly, with very few implementation decisions being made. Much time was spent revisiting old decisions not yet implemented to assure compliance with new or changed planning direction. The Forest needs to increase the number of acres restored to longleaf pine each year if long range goals are to be met.
- √ Soil and water resource effectiveness monitoring for the 1986 Plan found mitigative measures to be effective. The revised Plan provides a slightly wider minimum protection zone (50' instead of 33') along stream channels and therefore provide as much or more protection for streamside areas.
- √ Restoration of native ecosystems has begun on several of the districts. Areas containing older stands of off-site slash or loblolly pine are being identified as first choices for restoration. Restoration harvesting occurs only after requirements for RCW habitat have been evaluated and its needs can be maintained.
- √ Prescribed burning, including growing-season burns, are being used to achieve Plan direction of restoring and maintaining native understory plant communities and sensitive plant habitats. This year's monitoring indicated that there is a need to increase the number of growing season burn acres on longleaf pine landscapes.
- √ A wide variety of cooperative efforts with the Southern Research Station, Forest Health Protection, academic institutions, other federal and State agencies, and individuals were used to provide baseline data on the components of the Forest's ecosystems. State of the art technology is being used in the restoration and maintenance of native ecosystems, including geographical information and global positioning systems.
- √ This year's monitoring indicated that there was a need, on longleaf pine landscapes, to change the method of site preparation from chop and burn to herbicide and burn when the native ground cover has not been established prior to a final harvest cut.
- √ Monitoring to date indicates little change in the Forest's prairie condition from 1996 to 1999 (Hyatt 1999); this trend continues, based on field observations. Classification and monitoring of other habitats continued. The monitoring purpose is being achieved, and further monitoring is required.

2000

IV. Summary of M&E Recommendations Planned for FY2001

This section of the Report provides information on all monitoring items that need action during this fiscal year (FY2001). However, because implementation of the Revised Plan began November 29, 1999, it is still too early to make many recommendations for specific changes on the effectiveness of Plan direction or validation of Plan assumptions for most monitoring items. In addition to the specific recommended actions listed below, the general recommendation for FY2001 is to continue implementing the revised Plan using guidance provided in Chapters 2 and 3 of the Plan in order to reach the objectives stated. Long-term goals for the Forest are to reach the Desired Future Conditions (DFC) stated for the Forest and the DFC stated for individual management and sub-management areas. In order to reach our planned goals and objectives, individual project proposals should consider the guidance provided for each management area, use appropriate NEPA procedures to evaluate the site-specific effects of the proposal and alternatives, and reach a decision consistent with Plan direction.

Several monitoring items, however, could be evaluated. Recommendations for those items that need attention follow:

- √ Develop procedures for assessing implementation of standards and guidelines for protection of water quality (Best Management Practices) required by the revised Forest Plan. Begin reviewing and evaluating silvicultural activities using these procedures. Include participation by staff from the Louisiana Dept. of Environmental Quality Non-point Source Pollution Control Program in reviews.

- √ Prepare documents addressing management needs on approximately 10 percent of the Kisatchie National Forest ownership. Strive to implement harvesting levels consistent with Plan level. Increase the number of prescribed burn acres to allow the completion of 125,000 to 150,000 acres in FY2001. Continue to increase the number of growing season burn acres. Identify by calendar date when growing season burns begin in the spring and end in the summer. Publish these dates in the fire management handbook.

On longleaf pine landscapes change method of site preparation from chop and burn to herbicide and burn when the native ground cover has not been established prior

to a final harvest cut. Establish native ground cover by implementing growing season burns prior to harvest. Apply growing season burns on the stocked sites. If competing hardwood stems are not controlled with the burns then apply herbicide treatment with a follow-up burn. Continue to monitor sites for additional treatment needs. Conduct growing season burn training sessions in cooperation with the Southern Research Unit for all Forest personnel involved with the prescribed burning program. Increase the number of acres burned during the growing season. Increase the number of acres planted to longleaf pine.

- √ Include development of a classification system for all plant habitats by the end of FY2002, and the continued monitoring of individual sites as time permits.

- √ Continue plant MIS monitoring, and reevaluate procedure for collecting that data for 2001.

- √ Survey known mussel beds on the Evangeline Unit of the Calcasieu Ranger District in Rapides Parish during the summer of 2001.

√ Complete NEPA documents for management practices necessary to achieve the desired future conditions in compartments 23 and 24 on the Kisatchie Ranger District and other compartments on the Forest.

Review documents for Forest Plan compliance concerning old-growth patches. Begin field visits to old-growth patches and rank for quality.

√ Establish and assign condition rankings for streamside zone habitats for rare plant species.

√ Implement final harvest treatments at the Forest Plan level. Increase thinning treatments to at least 25,000 acres per year.

√ Develop more accurate procedures to evaluate soil loss. Develop procedures to evaluate impacts from user-created ORV trails. Monitor completed projects and perform maintenance and revegetation as needed. Continue restoration and revegetation activities.

√ Work with Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries to identify factors contributing to low deer populations. Identify any needed changes in hunting regulations on National Forest lands

√ Evaluate the feasibility of developing an automated GIS system that would periodically determine the ROS class eligibility of forestlands.

√ Increased emphasis should be placed on the distribution of comment cards and the analysis of the results.

√ Evaluate the compliance of Kisatchie Hills Wilderness management with Meaningful Measures Standards when they are completed.

√ Increase the amount of intermediate thinning acres being implemented to encourage the development of herbaceous ground cover and improve forest health. Complete NEPA documents for management practices necessary to achieve a mixture of desired future conditions in compartments 23 and 24 on the Kisatchie Ranger District and other compartments on the Forest. Assure Forest Plan compliance concerning uneven-aged management.

√ Input updated mineral ownership and lease data into the Forest GIS.

Conduct a workshop on state and federal laws for all personnel with mineral duties.

√ Complete work on MIS Population and Habitat Trends Report and incorporate latest findings into project level assessments.

√ Seek additional partnership opportunities with SHPO and THPOs.

√ Amend Challenge Cost Share agreement with Louisiana State University to continue ORV study.

2000

Status of FY1999 Monitoring & Evaluation Report Recommendations

This section of the Report provides information on actions recommended in the 1999 M&E Report that were taken during 2000. The ROD for the Revised Plan was signed on August 24, 1999, implementation began November 29, 1999, and the appeal period ended in February 2000.

1. ACTIONS NOT REQUIRING FOREST PLAN AMENDMENT OR REVISION

√ Develop procedures for assessing implementation of standards and guidelines for protection of water quality (Best Management Practices) required by the revised Forest Plan. Begin reviewing and evaluating silvicultural activities using these procedures. Include participation by staff from the Louisiana Dept. of Environmental Quality Non-point Source Pollution Control Program in reviews.

Status: Procedures were developed and monitoring was conducted using these procedures. Louisiana DEQ Non-point Source Pollution Control staff were included in monitoring reviews.

√ Once Kisatchie National Forest Landbird data has been entered by Region 8, query database for analysis and evaluation of population trends.

Status: This was done after data from Region 8 was moved to the Kisatchie's database and erroneous or duplicate records were deleted. FY2000 Landbird data were entered into the Forest's database.

√ Develop a formal field review process for TESC wildlife species that will more adequately assess implementation of Forest Plan direction.

Status: This was begun and is still in progress in FY2001.

√ Closely monitor Vernon RCW population for signs of stability or continued decline. Continue consultations with U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, and, if decline continues, initiate formal consultation.

Status: Monitoring continued to take place on the Vernon RCW population, as well as on the other Forest RCW populations.

√ Improve Forest health by increasing restoration harvest cuts to the desired Plan level. Improve stocking levels within immature

stands by applying additional commercial thinning.

Status: Restoration and intermediate harvest cuts continue to decline.

√ Develop a formal field review process that will more adequately address how management practices are protecting, restoring, maintaining, and improving waterfowl and wetland wildlife habitat.

Status: This was begun and is still in progress in FY2001.

√ In fiscal year 1999, the Forest received over \$140,000 in grant requests, but was able to fund less than \$10,000. This is a clear indication of need among Louisiana's forest-dependent communities. The Forest and Region need to seek additional funds to continue and increase Economic Recovery presence in local communities.

Status: Funding remained unchanged.

√ Increase mineral staffing and training for current mineral personnel.

Status: Increased mineral staffing and training did not occur in FY2000.

- √ Add personnel and/or contracting with private sector archeologists should timber harvest levels increase significantly.
Status: Timber harvesting levels did not increase, therefore little change occurred in FY2000.
- √ Funding is needed to provide weekend site monitoring of protected heritage resources by district Forest Protection Officers and/or electronic monitoring equipment.
Status: Funding remained unchanged.
- √ Increased funding and additional personnel are necessary to decrease the number of backlogged, potentially significant heritage properties and fully satisfy our obligations under the NHPA.
Status: Funding remained unchanged.
- √ Increased funding is needed to fully implement the heritage interpretative program.
Status: Funding remained unchanged.
- √ Initiate, with the Southern Research Station Forest Products Unit 4701, the collection of data needed for the development of a growth and yield model.
Status: Research plots have been established to monitor growths and yield in longleaf and loblolly pine stands.
- √ Seek additional partnership opportunities with SHPO and THPOs.
- Status: SHPO partnership continued. Tribal partnerships are continuing to be developed.
- √ Continue participation by soil and water staff in the Non-Point Source Interagency Committee. Include participation by staff from the Louisiana Dept. of Environmental Quality Non-point Source Pollution Control program in Forest implementation monitoring reviews of water quality Best Management Practices. Participate in the state Best Management Practices effectiveness monitoring task force. Enter into discussions with Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries to update the existing MOU. Continue to look for opportunities to partner with others in implementing the Forest Plan.
Status: Participation continued in the Non-Point Source Interagency Committee and Louisiana Dept. of Environmental Quality staff participated in monitoring reviews. A Challenge Cost Share project with Louisiana State University was developed to manage impacts to resources from ORV use. An interagency agreement with NRCS was developed to implement Emergency Watershed Protection activities for the Caney Lake tornado damage.

2000 *Appendix A-* Streamsides Embedded Communities (Baseline)

<u>Site Name</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Species</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Data Source</u>
Caney Mtn. Bike Trail	Caney	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	7.8	Shapefile
Black Creek	Catahoula	Louisiana Bluestar	1.1	GPS
Iatt Creek (including four colonies)	Catahoula	Louisiana Bluestar	13.5	GPS
Liberty Church	Catahoula	Louisiana Bluestar	4.2	GPS
Indian Creek	Catahoula	Kentucky Ladyslipper	15.0*	GPS
Ben Martin Site	Evangeline**	Bog Moss	42.7	Shapefile
Boggy Bayou	Evangeline**	Bog Moss	5.3	GPS
Boggy Bayou Tributary	Evangeline**	Bog Moss	5.9	GPS
Brushy Creek Riparian	Evangeline**	Kentucky Ladyslipper	26.3	GPS
Cypress Branch	Evangeline**	Bog Moss	4.7	Shapefile
Lamotte Creek	Evangeline**	Bog Moss	2.8	GPS
Magnolia Walk	Evangeline**	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	3.3	GPS
Wild Azalea Seep (unnamed site)	Evangeline**	Bog Moss	43.1	Shapefile
Bayou L'Ivrogne Flatwood	Evangeline**	Bog Moss	5.9	GPS
Flatwood	Kisatchie	Louisiana Bluestar	14.9	Shapefile
Devil's Swamp	Kisatchie	Louisiana Bluestar	3.1	Shapefile
Goose Bog	Kisatchie	Louisiana Bluestar	7.3	Shapefile
Hwy. 118 SE of Kisatchie	Kisatchie	Louisiana Bluestar	2.9	Shapefile
Little Kisatchie Bayou	Kisatchie	Louisiana Bluestar	2.7	Shapefile
Mink	Kisatchie	Louisiana Bluestar	2.1	Shapefile
Pine Grove Church	Kisatchie	Louisiana Bluestar	3.9	Shapefile
Red Dirt Area	Kisatchie	Louisiana Bluestar	2.7	Shapefile
Comp. 23 Riparian Cypress Creek/ Rd. 506E	Winn	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	4.4	Shapefile
Rd. 506E	Winn	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	11.8	Shapefile

<u>Site Name</u>	<u>District</u>	<u>Species</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Data Source</u>
Cypress Creek/ Rd. 506W	Winn	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	10.7	Shapefile
Cypress Creek/ Rd. 126	Winn	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	1.7	Shapefile
Cypress Creek/ Pine Ridge	Winn	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	18.5	Shapefile
Cypress Creek/ Rd. 506N	Winn	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	29.9	Shapefile
Dry Choctaw Creek	Winn	Louisiana Bluestar	0.3	Shapefile
Cypress Creek/ Rd. 506SW	Winn	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	37.4	Shapefile
Cypress Creek SW	Winn	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	61.9	Shapefile
Fourmile Branch	Winn	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	13.3	GPS
FS Road W021B	Winn	Louisiana Bluestar	2.6	Shapefile
Iatt Creek Forest	Winn	Louisiana Bluestar	10.5	GPS
Ragan Creek	Winn	Louisiana Bluestar	25.9	Shapefile
Saline Bayou Tributary	Winn	Louisiana Bluestar	0.4	Shapefile
Southern Red Oak Woods	Winn	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	6.7	GPS
Streamside Zone	Winn	Louisiana Bluestar	6.2	Shapefile
Streamside Zone East	Winn	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	11.2	Shapefile
(unnamed site)	Winn	Barbed Rattlesnake Root	14.3	GPS

* includes a 400 foot buffer zone around identified habitat

** Evangeline Unit of the Calcasieu District

2000

Appendix B- Comparison of FY2000 Budget with Revised Plan Annual Budget

<u>Budget Line Item (BLI)</u>	<u>Plan EBLI</u>	<u>Plan Budget Estimate</u>	<u>FY2000 EBLI</u>	<u>FY2000 Budget</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Ecosystem planning, inventory, monitoring					\$4,948
Ecosystem management	NFEM	\$624,000	N/A		
Inventory and Monitoring	***		NFIM	\$550,949	
Land Management Planning	***		NFPN	\$77,999	
Recreation use					(\$171,346)
Recreation management	NFRM	\$859,040	NFRM	\$444,270	
Wilderness management	NFWM	\$47,840	NFWM	\$30,397	
Heritage resources	NFHR	\$208,000	NFHR	\$89,456	
Cooperative work - other	CWFS	\$31,200	CWFS	\$0	
Trail maintenance	***		PAMT	\$100,544	
Recreation fee collection	***		FEFR	\$6,500	
Fee Demo - collection	***		FDCL	\$23,000	
Fee Demo - projects	***		FDDS	\$120,000	
New World fund backlog maintenance	***		NWBM	\$160,567	
Rangeland management					(\$224,234)
Range management	NFRG	\$62,400	NFRG	\$53,000	
Range vegetation management	NFRV	\$145,600	NFRV	\$63,589	
Cooperative work - KV	CWKV	\$208,000	CWKV	\$75,177	
Wildlife and fish management					(\$431,122)
Wildlife habitat operations and improvement	NFWL	\$227,760	NFWL	\$167,516	
Anadromous fish operations	***		NFAF	\$17,000	
Inland fish operations and improvement	NFIF	\$93,600	NFIF	\$173,590	
T&E species operations and improvement	NFTE	\$550,160	NFTE	\$593,785	
Cooperative work - KV	CWKV	\$1,848,080	CWKV	\$1,325,054	
Cooperative work - other	CWFS	\$26,000	CWFS	\$37,533	
Forestland management					(\$2,574,707)
Timber management	NFTM	\$2,496,000	NFTM	\$1,674,137	
Forest vegetation management	NFFV	\$443,040	NFFV	\$382,912	
Reforestation trust fund	RTRT	\$114,400	RTRT	\$217,712	
Cooperative work - KV	CWKV	\$1,456,000	CWKV	\$903,175	
Timber roads - purchaser election	PEPE	\$55,120	PEPE	\$71,714	
Timber roads - purchaser construction	PUCR	\$1,248,000	N/A	\$0	

Budget Line Item (BLI)	Plan EBLI	Plan Budget Estimate	FY2000 EBLI	FY2000 Budget	Difference
Timber salvage sales	SSSS	\$280,800	SSSS	\$150,299	
Forest health protection	***		SPFH	\$21,796	
Timber pipeline - Rec. backlog	***		TPCD	\$50,000	
Timber pipeline - Sale prep.	***		TPPS	\$46,908	
Soil, water and air management					(\$83,136)
Soil, water, air operations	NFSO	\$67,600	NFSO	\$51,557	
Soil and water improvement	NFSI	\$94,640	NFSI	\$110,887	
Cooperative work - KV	CWKV	\$48,880	CWKV	\$22,229	
Cooperative work - other	CWFS	\$208,000	CWFS	\$146,311	
Hazardous waste management	***		HWHW	\$5,000	
Minerals and geology management					\$123,941
Minerals	NFMG	\$332,800	NFMG	\$456,741	
Land ownership management					(\$34,018)
Lands - real estate management	NFLA	\$192,400	NFLA	\$168,992	
Landline location	NFLL	\$145,600	NFLL	\$134,990	
Rural development					\$21,000
Resource conservation and development	***		RCRC	\$5,000	
Economic recovery program	***		SPEA	\$5,000	
State fire assistance	***		SPCH	\$6,440	
Coop. lands forest health mgt.	***		SPCH	\$780	
Urban community forestry	***		SPUH	\$1,620	
Forest stewardship	***		SPST	\$2,160	
Construction					\$294,634
Recreation construction	CNRF	\$1,211,600	PAFC	\$1,697,097	
Trail construction	CNTR	\$55,120	PATC	\$87,657	
Roads reconstruction and construction	CNRD	\$977,600	PARD	\$754,200	
Land acquisition					(\$16,207)
Land acquisition - L&W Cons. Fund	LALW	\$52,000	LALW	\$35,793	
Forest Service fire protection					\$178,099
Forest fire pre-suppression	WFPR	\$910,000	WFPR	\$918,499	
Forest fuel reduction	WFHF	\$520,000	WFHF	\$689,600	
Infrastructure management					\$555,903
Road maintenance and decommissioning	CNRM	\$843,440	PAMR	\$757,160	
Maintenance of facilities	NFFA	\$212,160	PAMF	\$394,714	
Cooperative work - other	CWFS	\$364,000	CWFS	\$220,000	
Federal highway program	***		HTAE	\$6,400	
Operations & maintenance - FS quarters	***		QMOM	\$21,000	
Reforestation of forest lands			RIRI	\$2,200	
Roads and trails for states (10% Fund)	***		TRTR	\$574,029	

Budget Line Item (BLI)	Plan EBLI	Plan Budget Estimate	FY2000 EBLI	FY2000 Budget	Difference
General administration					(\$445,256)
General administration	NFGA	\$1,304,160	NFGA	\$804,599	
Cooperative work - KV	CWKV	\$790,400	CWKV	\$233,080	
Cooperative work - other	CWFS	\$102,960	CWFS	\$60,500	
Timber - salvage sales	SSSS	\$49,920	SSSS	\$49,701	
Operation & maintenance - FS quarters	QMQM	\$20,800	QMQM	\$0	
Roads and trails for states (10% Fund)	***		TRTR	\$21,285	
Reforestation trust fund	***		RTRT	\$25,732	
Law enforcement	***		NFLE	\$81,441	
Senior citizens employment program	***		NFSD	\$546,646	
External agreements					\$643,000
External agents	***		NFEX	\$643,000	
Total (in FY2000 dollars)		\$19,529,120		\$17,370,619	(\$2,158,501)

*** Note: These items are not found in the 1999 revised Forest Plan, Appendix C. They are either changed budget items resulting from a restructuring of the budget codes, or additions to the list displayed in Table C-1 of the Forest Plan.

2000

Appendix C- List of Preparers

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Cynthia Dancak	Team Leader - Ecosystem Assessment/Planning
Thomas M. Webb	Team Leader - Public Uses & Services
Cal Baker	Team Leader - Ecosystem Conservation Management
Carl Brevelle	Forester/Resource Planner
Mary Jane Close	Financial Manager
Alan Dorian	Forest Archeologist
Michael Miller	Forest Landscape Architect
Mike Dawson	Forester/Timber Sales Specialist
Jim Dukes	Forester/Fire Management Officer
Michael Esters	Forester/Caney Ranger District
Ken Dancak	Forest Wildlife Biologist
John Novosad	Forest Soil Scientist & Hydrologist
Finis Harris	Forest Silviculturist
Philip Hyatt	Forest Botanist
David Byrd	Forest Fisheries Biologist
Gretchen Hunt Moore	Zone Geologist
Don Ranne	Forester/Lands & Special Uses

2000

Appendix D- Avian Population Trends

Estimated trend in number of birds observed for Kisatchie National Forest Management Indicator Species at three spatial scales: physiographic stratum and state (1990-1998), and Forest (1990-1999). A “+” indicates a statistically significant increasing trend; “-“ a statistically significant decreasing trend; “= =” a statistically significant trend was not detected; “=” a statistically significant trend was not detected and the number of routes in the analysis was < 14 (stratum and state trends) or species was observed on < 5% of points (Kisatchie National Forest trends); “NA” indicates data insufficient to calculate trend estimate (statistical significance set at $\alpha \leq 0.10$) [Source: Table 22 of the Forest’s MIS Population and Habitat Trends report, May 2001].

Common Name	Upper Coastal Plain	State - Louisiana	Kisatchie National Forest
Acadian Flycatcher	+	+	=
Bachman’s Sparrow	= =	=	= =
Cooper’s Hawk	=	NA	NA
Eastern wood-peewee	= =	= =	= =
Hooded Warbler	= =	+	= =
Kentucky Warbler	= =	= =	= =
Louisiana Waterthrush	= =	=	NA
Northern Bobwhite Quail	-	= =	-
Northern Parula	= =	-	=
Pileated Woodpecker	= =	= =	= =
Prairie Warbler	= =	=	NA
Red-Cockaded Woodpecker	-	NA	NA
Red-headed Woodpecker	= =	= =	=
Summer Tanager	+	= =	= =
Warbling Vireo	+	NA	NA
White-breasted Nuthatch	= =	NA	NA
White-eyed Vireo	= =	= =	+
Wood Thrush	-	= =	= =
Worm-eating Warbler	+	-	NA
Yellow-billed Cuckoo	-	-	+