

# Klamath National Forest Best Management Practices

REGION 5

EVALUATION PROGRAM

WATER QUALITY

MONITORING REPORT

2015 Fiscal Year

Evaluation of Forest Service administered projects including timber sales, roads, grazing, recreation sites, fuels reduction, and in-channel construction.

March 21, 2016

Natural Resources Staff

1711 South Main St.

Yreka, CA 96097

## Contents

Summary .....	3
2015 BMP MONITORING REPORT.....	6
Randomly Selected Sites and Follow-up Monitoring.....	6
Methods.....	6
Randomly Sampled Site Results for R5 BMPs .....	7
Randomly Sampled Site Results for National BMPs .....	11
Randomly Sampled Site Results for Retrospective BMPs .....	12
Results of Follow-up Evaluations .....	19
Adaptive Management Discussion .....	20
Practices That Are Working Well .....	20
Practices That Can Be Improved .....	20
BMP Sites from 2015 That Will be Rolled Over Into 2016.....	21
References .....	21
Appendix A. BMP Evaluation Procedure Names and Descriptions.....	22
Appendix B. Comparison of Evaluation Accomplishments with Target for KNF.....	24

## **KLAMATH NATIONAL FOREST**

**2015**

### **BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMP)**

#### **Summary**

Fiscal year 2015 was the twenty-fourth year of the Best Management Practices Evaluation Program (BMPEP) on the Klamath National Forest (Forest) and the Forest Service Pacific Southwest Region (Region). This program is designed to evaluate how well the Forest and the Region implement BMPs and how effectively the BMPs control water pollution from National Forest lands for activities including timber, engineering, range, recreation, minerals, and restoration.

In 2015 the Forest Service began the third year of implementation of the National BMP Program, which similar to the Region 5 program, integrates water resource protection into management activities occurring across the landscape but is conducted at the national level. The National Core BMPs are written in broad, non-prescriptive terms, focusing on “what to do”, not “how to do it”. Applicable State, and local requirements and BMP programs, FS regional guidance, and unit Land Management Plans provide the criteria for site-specific BMP prescriptions. National BMP monitoring began in 2013 as a part of a two-year phase-in process to full implementation. In 2015 the Klamath completed National BMP evaluations for Road Decommissioning, Prescribed Fire, Cable or Aerial Yarding Operations, Completed Aquatic Ecosystem Improvements, and Ground-based Skidding and Harvesting.

Also 2015 was the third year of performing retrospective evaluations which evaluate the effectiveness of BMP over a longer time span. Retrospective evaluations were performed at randomly selected sites where timber harvest, or engineering BMPEP evaluations were conducted in the past 3 to 5 years and where BMPs were rated effective.

The Forest’s BMPEP is composed of two sampling strategies. The first is the evaluation of randomly sampled sites, allocated by the Region. The second strategy is non-random monitoring, in which sites are selected based on management interest in specific ongoing projects. These sites are often evaluated concurrently (“real time”) and can be qualitative as well as quantitative. The Regional site evaluations followed protocols described in Investigating Water Quality in the Pacific Southwest Region: the BMPEP User’s Guide (USDA, Forest Service, 2002). National BMP monitoring evaluations followed National Core BMP Monitoring Technical Guide established by the Washington Office. Each protocol is designed to measure implementation and effectiveness of an activity category that includes from one to six related BMPs. Appendix A is a table that cross-walks each protocol/activity category alpha-numeric code with its name and the BMPs it is designed to monitor.

For the pool of fifty-one BMP evaluations allocated to the Klamath, twenty-one different protocols were used to evaluate a total of forty sites. There were eleven sites that were not completed. Five (one T02, one T03, one R22, one R30, and one Veg-A) were due to the person who was assigned the sites did not complete them due to this person leaving the FS in the middle of the field season. Six (E08, E13, E17,

M26, M27, and V29) were due to no projects to evaluate. There were four sites evaluated for R31-OHV Trails but in the R5 Database there is no data entry set up for this form. Thirty sites were evaluated as part of a randomly selected pool of Regional BMPs. Five sites were re-visits. Most randomly sampled site evaluations require that 1 to 2 winters have passed prior to completing the field assessment. Also selected randomly are five national BMP sites that have over-wintered and four retrospective sites that have between 3 to 5 years since being evaluated.

BMP Implementation was evaluated to determine whether: (1) we did what we said we were going to do to protect water quality; and (2) project environmental documentation and/or contract/permit language was sufficient to ensure water quality protection. BMP effectiveness was evaluated to determine if water quality protection measures met objectives. The objective for meeting most evaluation criteria is keeping all sediment out of channels and near-channel areas. Sediment deposition presence, volume and proximity to the nearest watercourse were used to indicate level of effectiveness.

In 2015 randomly selected R5 BMPs were fully implemented at 83% and fully effective at 83% of sites evaluated. Four sites or approximately eleven percent were not rated. Three sites or approximately eight percent failed implementation. Two sites, approximately 6%, were rated “at-risk” and one site, approximately 3%, failed effectiveness. Table 1 summarizes the results of the BMP Random Site Evaluation Program for 1992 through 2015.

**Table 1. R5 BMP Random Site Evaluation Program from 1992 through 2015**

Monitoring Years	Total # of Sites Monitored	Sites Meeting BMP Evaluation Criteria			
		Implementation		Effectiveness	
		% Rated Minor departure*	% Rated Fully Successful	% Rated At-risk*	% Rated Fully Successful
1992	53	N/A	55%	N/A	81%
1993	77	N/A	79%	N/A	94%
1994	52	N/A	75%	N/A	89%
1995	77	N/A	83%	N/A	96%
1996	57	N/A	84%	N/A	98%
1997	60	N/A	100%	N/A	98%
1998	54	N/A	65%	N/A	98%
<b>Table 1 Cont'd. BMP Random Site Evaluation Program from 1992 through 2012</b>					

Klamath National Forest 2015 BMPEP Report

Monitoring Years	Total # of Sites Monitored	Sites Meeting BMP Evaluation Criteria			
		Implementation		Effectiveness	
		% Rated Minor departure*	% Rated Fully Successful	% Rated At-risk*	% Rated Fully Successful
1999	38	N/A	66%	N/A	89%
2000	45	N/A	89%	N/A	96%
2001	64	N/A	88%	N/A	95%
2002	53	N/A	92%	N/A	96%
2003	51	N/A	80%	N/A	90%
2004	53	N/A	94%	N/A	100%
2005	48	N/A	96%	N/A	98%
2006	45	N/A	93%	N/A	100%
2007	57	N/A	98%	N/A	96%
2008	50	N/A	78%	N/A	92%
2009	63	N/A	97%	N/A	98%
2010	59	0%	100%	5%	88%
2011	60	7%	85%	3%	92%
2012	61	5%	92%	8%	87%
2013	41	0%	90%	7%	88%
2014	36	0%	83%	6%	83%
2015	28	0%	89%	11%	82%

\*2010 was the first year the “Minor departure” and “At-risk” categories were added

## 2015 BMP MONITORING REPORT

### Randomly Selected Sites and Follow-up Monitoring

On-site evaluations are the core of the BMP Evaluation Program. Such evaluations are necessary to meet the requirements of a Management Agency Agreement between the Region and the State of California. There are 30 different evaluation procedures designed to assess a specific practice or set of closely related practices. Though the evaluation criteria vary based on the management activity, the evaluation process is similar amongst activities. The Regional Office annually assigns the type and number of management activities to be evaluated on each Forest. The specific sites for each evaluated management activity are randomly selected from Forest project pools. When BMP failures occur, corrective actions are taken and documented. Statistical analyses are periodically performed from the collective Regional data, and annual reports of Region wide BMP implementation and effectiveness are presented to the State and Regional water boards. The criteria for sample pool development are regionally standardized by activity type and described in the BMPEP User's Guide.

In 2015 the Forest Service began the third year of implementation of the National BMP Program, which similar to the Region 5 program, integrates water resource protection into management activities occurring across the landscape but is conducted at the national level. In 2015 the Klamath completed National BMP evaluations for Road Equipment Refueling or Servicing Areas, Prescribed Fire, Cable or Aerial Yarding Operations, Completed Aquatic Ecosystem Improvements, and Grazing Management. Also 2015 was the third year of performing retrospective evaluations which evaluate the effectiveness of BMP over a longer time span. In 2015 the Klamath completed retrospective evaluations where Skid Trails, and Landings BMPEP evaluations were conducted in the past 3 to 5 years and where BMPs were rated effective.

Follow-up monitoring is also conducted for any sites that were not rated as fully effective the previous year. This monitoring evaluates the success of corrective actions that were implemented the previous year.

BMP monitoring strives for an interdisciplinary evaluation of projects and actively involves project proponents and watershed personnel. This interdisciplinary effort provides direct feedback to the project proponent on how well the BMP was implemented and allows for adaptive management on future project designs. Hydrologist Verna Yin, Geologist Angie Bell, Range Conservationist Stephanie McMorris, and Fish Biologists Brian Thomas and Maija Meneks conducted the 2015 BMP evaluations.

### Methods

Data collection methods are specific for each BMP activity group and are described in the BMPEP User's Guide (USDA, Forest Service, 2002). National BMP monitoring evaluations followed National Core BMP Monitoring Technical Guide established by the Washington Office. Data gathered for each BMP are used to answer specific questions on BMP evaluation forms. Management activities (e.g. timber projects, roads, prescribed fire, tractor piling) to be evaluated must: 1) be implemented under a NEPA decision; 2) adhere to contract requirements; and 3) have been completed at least one but not more than 3

winters prior to evaluation. In-channel construction BMP evaluations (E-13) are conducted during the activity and immediately after completion.

The timber, silvicultural, and engineering project sample pools were developed from a list of timber sales, vegetation management, and storm-proofing projects completed the previous year. The prescribed fire sample pool was developed from a list of completed prescribed fire projects. The recreation sample pool included all known developed and dispersed recreation sites on the Forest. The grazing sample pool was a list of active grazing allotments on the Forest. OHV trails were selected from a list of Forest Service roads and trails open to OHV riding.

### Randomly Sampled Site Results for R5 BMPs

Twenty-eight sites were sampled from within nineteen 6th field watersheds on the Forest (Table 2). The following is a breakdown of the type of activities sampled on timber, engineering, range, recreation, minerals, and grazing projects:

**Table 2. Summary of 2015 Regional BMP Implementation and Effectiveness**

Form	Project/Site	Implementation	Effectiveness	6 <sup>th</sup> Field Watershed
T01	Trolley TS Unit 3	Implemented	Effective	Whaleback-Sheep Rock
T01	Primary TS Unit 1	Implemented	Effective	Grass Lake
T02	McBaldy Unit 117	Implemented	Effective	Indian Creek
T02	McBaldy Unit 51	Implemented	Effective	McAdam Creek
T03	Deep TS Unit 9	Implemented	Effective	Tompkins Creek-Scott River
T04	Beauty Flat Unit 94	Implemented	Effective	Boulder Creek-Scott River
T04	Black Rock TS Unit 1	Implemented	Effective	Bogus Creek
T05	Little Deer TS Unit 3	Implemented	Effective	Horsethief Creek
T07	Black Rock TS Unit 3	Implemented	Effective	Shovel Creek
E08	Horse Creek Road Rehab Road # 46N50	Implemented	At Risk	Horse Creek
E09	Seiad Creek Road Rehab Road # 48N20	Not Implemented	Not Effective	Seiad Creek
E09	2013 Klamath Road Decom 44N30Y MP 0.85	Implemented	Effective	Boulder Creek-Scott River
E10	2013 Klamath Road Decom 44N45F	Implemented	Effective	Kelsey Creek
E10	2013 Klamath Road Decom 44N56Y	Implemented	Effective	Kelsey Creek
E11	Seiad Creek Road Rehab M.P. 4.77	Not Implemented	At Risk	Seiad Creek

**Table 2 Cont'd. Summary of 2015 Regional BMP Implementation and Effectiveness**

<b>Form</b>	<b>Project/Site</b>	<b>Implementation</b>	<b>Effectiveness</b>	<b>6th Field Watershed</b>
E11	Horse Creek Rehab Road 46N50 MP 1.38	Not Implemented	Not Effective	Horse Creek
E16	McBaldy TS Road 45N49	Implemented	Effective	McAdam Creek
E16	Black Rock TS Road 46N05	Implemented	Effective	Shovel Creek
E20	Road 44N64	Implemented	At Risk	Badger Basin
F25	Seider Thin Unit 536	Implemented	Effective	Bittenbender Creek-Klamath River
F25	Seider Thin Unit 279	Implemented	Effective	Tompkins Creek-Scott River
F25	Seider Thin Unit 247	Implemented	Effective	Tompkins Creek-Scott River
G24	Little North Fork	Implemented	Effective	Little North Fork Salmon River
G24	East Fork	Implemented	Effective	Upper East Fork Scott River
G24	Big Meadows	Implemented	Effective	Shackleford Creek
R22	Jones Beach	Implemented	Effective	Boulder Creek-Scott River
R30	Sugar Creek Trailhead	Implemented	Effective	Suger Creek-Scott River
V28	A12 Fuel Reduction Project	Implemented	Effective	Whaleback-Sheep Rock and Juniper Flat

***Timber Activities***

Timber Activities that were sampled fell into the following activity groups:

Streamside Management Zones (T01), Skid Trails (T02), Suspended Yarding (T03), and Landings (T04), Timber Administration (T05), and Meadow Protection (T07). Nine sites were sampled on two districts and all passed implementation and effectiveness.

***Road and Engineering Activities***

The following activity groups were sampled: Road surfacing, drainage and protection (E08), Stream Crossings (E09), Road Decommissioning (E10), Control of Side cast Materials (E11), Water Source Development (E16), and Protection of Roads (E20). A total of 11 engineering sites were evaluated on three districts. Three sites failed implementation, and three sites fell into the “at-risk” category and two failed effectiveness.

**E08 – Road Surface, Drainage and Slope Protection: Implemented and At Risk**

**Horse Creek Road Rehab 46N50 MP 1.38**

The inboard ditch has filled in. The culvert only accomidates a small spring that was not flowing during the field visit (06/15/15). The design plans did not call for upgrade of the culvert and cleaning the culvert basin. The culvert basin could use a cleaning out. Recommendation to clean out the basin was made in 2014 BMPEP Report. This was not done at the time of visit.

**E09 – Stream Crossings: Not Implemented and Not Effective**

**Seiad Road Rehab 48N20 M.P. 4.77**

Activity generated materials were sidecasted on fillslopes; including sediement, rock, slash and old culverts.

The steepness of the road grade at the crossing results in a very shallow Type L rolling dip; if the 108” culvert fails the stream could flow over the dip and down road approximately 100’ to a deeper rolling dip that would divert stream back into channel. This has less than a 1% chance of occurring in a given year due to 100 year culvert and would be diverted back into the channel as noted above.

**E11-Control of sidecast material: Not Implemented and At Risk**

**Seiad Road Rehab - Road 48N20 MP 4.77**



The sidecast material is mainly vegetation, potential effects to water quality are minor. Engineering plans did not specifically prohibit sidecasting or disposal areas. This is a standard practice, but was not caught in inspection of contract. The 2014 BMPEP Report stated that is recommended that maintenance crews go out to this site and pull back the sidecast material. This was not completed at the time of visit.

**E11 – Control of Sidecast Material: Not Implemented and Not Effective**

**Horse Creek Road Rehab – Road 46N50**

Plans do not indicate no side casting. BMP not followed. Side casting restrictions were not included in contract.

**E14 – Temporary Roads: Not Rated**

**McBaldy Unit 107**

No temporary roads were constructed for this project.

## **E20 – Management of Roads During Wet Periods: Implemented and At Risk**

### **Road 44N64**

Although the road was treated for Wet Season Use, there was some rutting present, but this occurred on less than 10% of the road length.

Also more than 10% of the road surface length has rills >10' long which continue off of the road surface.

### *Recreation Activities*

Two activity groups were evaluated: Developed Recreation (R22), and Dispersed Recreation (R30). A total of two sites were sampled on one districts. Both recreation sites were evaluated as implemented and effective.

### *Grazing*

One Activity Group, Range Management (G24) was evaluated at three separate range allotments on two districts. All range allotments were rated as fully implemented and effective.

### *Fire and Fuels Activities*

Prescribed Fire (F25) and Vegetation Management (V28) were evaluated at four sites on three districts. All prescribed fire sites and the vegetation management site were rated as implemented and effective.

### **Randomly Sampled Site Results for National BMPs**

Six sites were evaluated for National BMPs in 2015. One Use of Prescribed Fire (Fire A), one Cable or Aerial Yarding (Veg B), two Completed Aquatic Ecosystem Improvements (AqEco B), one Grazing Management (Range A), and one Equipment Refueling or Servicing Areas (Road I) were evaluated. The Seider Thin Project Unit 281 was rated as fully implemented and fully effective. The Seider Thin Project Unit 254 was rated as fully implemented and effective. The O'Neil Creek Off-Channel Ponds Project was rated as fully implemented and effective. The Orr Lake Outlet Project was rated as fully implemented and effective. The Cow Creek Grazing Unit was rated as fully implemented and effective. The Little Deer Project was rated as fully implemented and effective.

**Table 3. Summary of 2015 National BMP Implementation and Effectiveness**

Form	Project/Site	Implementation	Effectiveness	6 <sup>th</sup> Field Watershed
Fire A	Seider Thin Unit 281	Implemented	Effective	Seiad Creek
Veg B	Seider Thin Unit 254	Implemented	Effective	Bittenbender Creek-Klamath River
AqEco B	Oneil Creek Off-Channel Rearing Ponds	Implemented	Effective	Bittenbender Creek-Klamath River
AqEco B	Orr Lake Outlet Project	Implemented	Effective	Lower Butte Creek
Range A	Cow Creek	Implemented	Effective	Cow Creek-Grouse Creek
Road I	Little Dear Project	Implemented	Effective	Horsethief Creek

**Randomly Sampled Site Results for Retrospective BMPs**

Three sites were evaluated for long-term BMP effectiveness after four or five years since BMPs were rated effective. Two sites were still rated as effective. One site was not rated. These results shown the long term effectiveness of BMPs for a variety of activity groups.

**Table 4. Summary of 2015 Retrospective BMP Effectiveness**

Form	Project/Site	Year of First Evaluation	Effectiveness	6 <sup>th</sup> Field Watershed
T03	Deep TS Unit 9	2009	Effective	Tompkins Creek-Scott River
T04	Beauty Flat Unit 94	2008	Effective	Boulder Creek-Scott River
E10	Road 38N40B	2002	Not Rated	Upper Indian Creek

**E10 – Road Decommissioning: Not Rated**

**Road 38N40B**

This road is no longer in decom status. It is in active (or recent) use for a thinning project. The road currently has no blockage and appears to have been recently used (see Photo 1). The vegetation noted in the 2010 follow up is gone. Additional features such as rolling dips for water control are gone. There is no closure/traffic control obstruction at take-off. Only way to access is from locked gate on 38N40 road.

**Photo 1: Rd 38N40B.** 07/22/15. Take-off from road 38N40. Although this road is supposed to have been officially decommissioned, it has no blockage and looks to have been very recently bladed.



**Photo 2: Rd 38N40B.** 07/22/15. Further evidence of recent blading, including into hillslope.



**Photo 3: Rd 38N40B.** 07/22/15. One of the three waterbars on the road. If any others were present, they were bladed out of existence.



**Photo 4: Rd 38N40B.** 07/22/15. One of many debris piles at the edge of the road.



### **Results of Follow-up Evaluations**

Follow-up monitoring was conducted in 2015 at four sites that were not rated as fully effective in 2014. The table below lists the sites with less than fully effective rating in 2014 and corrective actions or recommendations.

**Table 5. Summary of follow-up monitoring in 2015**

Form	Project/Site	Corrective Actions Taken in 2015	Notes from 2015 Evaluations	2014 Effectiveness
E08	Horse Creek Road Rehab 46N50 MP 1.38	None	The culvert basin could use a cleaning out. Recommendation to clean out the basin was made in 2014 BMPEP Report. This was not done at the time of visit.	At Risk
E09	Seiad Road Rehab 48N20 M.P. 4.77	None	The steepness of the road grade at the crossing results in a very shallow Type L rolling dip; if the 108" culvert fails the stream could flow over the dip and down road approximately 100' to a deeper rolling dip that would divert stream back into channel. This has less than a 1% chance of occurring in a given year due to 100 year culvert and would be diverted back into the channel as noted above.	Not Effective
E11	Horse Creek Road Rehab 46N50 MP 1.38	None	Plans do not indicate no side casting. BMP not followed. Side casting restrictions were not included in contract.	Not Effective
E11	Seiad Creek Road Rehab 48N30 MP 4.77	None	The 2014 BMPEP Report stated that is recommended that maintenance crews go out to this site and pull back the sidecast material. This was not completed at the time of visit.	At Risk

## Adaptive Management Discussion

### Practices That Are Working Well

Most of the activities evaluated in 2015 met BMP compliance and were effective at controlling nonpoint pollution. These included all timber sale activities; range management activities, fire and fuels activities, and recreation sites. For activities where Best Management Practices were fully implemented and effective, no modifications are recommend for future projects.

BMP issues remain at other sites evaluated in 2015 but Information collected through BMP monitoring is being used to design current projects including the Hotelling Gulch Restoration/Fish Passage Project.

### Practices That Can Be Improved

Storm proofing projects, and erosion control on temporary roads can be improved through adaptive management and implementation of NEPA projects. In all cases where sites were rated as less than full effective, corrective actions were taken if necessary, and follow-up monitoring will occur in 2016. Table 6 lists the evaluations with less than fully effective rating in 2015, corrective actions to be taken, and notes for 2016 follow-up monitoring.

**Table 6. Corrective Actions To Be Taken and Follow-up Monitoring for 2015 BMPEP Report**

<b>Form</b>	<b>Project/Site</b>	<b>Implementation</b>	<b>Effectiveness</b>	<b>Corrective Actions To Be Taken in 2016</b>	<b>Notes for 2016 Evaluations</b>
E20	Road 44N64	Implemented	At Risk	Address rutting issues.	Check on maintenance work

**BMP Sites from 2015 that will be rolled over into 2016**

Eleven sites that were scheduled to be completed in 2015 but were not, will be rolled over into 2016. These include: one T02, one T03, one R22, one R30, and one Veg-A. These sites were not completed because the person who was assigned the sites left the FS in the middle of the field season and did not complete them. The other six sites include: one E08, one E13, one E17, one M26, one M27, and one V29. These were not completed due to no projects to evaluate.

**References**

USDA, Forest Service, 2002, Investigating Water Quality in the Pacific Southwest Region: the Best Management Practice Evaluation Program (BMPEP) User’s Guide, USDA, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region.

## Appendix A. BMP Evaluation Procedure Names and Descriptions

<i>Procedure #</i>	<i>Region 5 Procedure Name (BMPs Monitored)</i>
T01	Streamside Management Zones (BMP 1.8, 1.19, 1.22)
T02	Skid trails (BMP 1.10, 1.17)
T03	Suspended yarding (BMP 1.11)
T04	Landings (BMP 1.12, 1.16)
T05	Timber sale administration (BMP 1.13, 1.20, 1.25)
T07	Meadow protection (BMP 1.18, 1.22, 5.3)
E08	Road surface, drainage and slope protection (BMP 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.13)
E09	Stream crossings (BMP 2.8, 2.13)
E10	Road Decommissioning (BMP 2.7, 2.13)
E11	Control of side cast material (BMP 2.3, 2.4, 2.13)
E14	Temporary roads (BMP 2.1, 2.7, 2.8)
E16	Water source development (BMP 2.5)
E20	Management of roads during wet periods (BMP 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.9, 2.13)
R22	Developed recreation sites (BMP 4.3, 4, 5, 6,9, 10)
G24	Range management (BMP 8.1, 8.2, 8.3)
F25	Prescribed fire (BMP 6.3)
V28	Vegetation manipulation (BMP 5.1, 5.2, 5.5, 5.7)
R30	Dispersed Recreation Sites (BMP 4.5, 4.6, 4.10)
R31	OHV Trails (BMP 4.7.1 to 4.7.9)

**Appendix A - Continued**

<i>Procedure #</i>	<i>National Procedure Name (BMPs Monitored)</i>
Range A	Grazing Management (BMPs Range-1, Range-2, and Range-3)
Vegetation B	Cable or Aerial Yarding (BMPs Veg-1, Veg-2, Veg-5, Veg-6, Veg-7, Fac-6)
Road I	Equipment Refueling or Servicing Areas (BMPs Road-1, Road-2, Road-10, Fac-2, and Fac-8)
Fire A	Use of Prescribed Fire (BMPs Fire-1, Fire-2)
AqEco B	Completed Aquatic Ecosystem Improvements (BMPs AqEco-1, AqEco-2, AqEco-3, AqEco-4)

## Appendix B. Comparison of Evaluation Accomplishments with Target for KNF

Evaluations were accomplished for a total of 40 sites, using 25 protocols to assess timber, engineering, recreation, grazing, and minerals management. The Regional Office set the Klamath’s target at 51 sites using 29 protocols.

Activity	KNF Targets	KNF Accomplishments
T01	2	2
T02	2	2
T03	1	0
T04	1	1
T05	1	1
T06	0	0
T07	1	1
E08	2	1*
E09	2	2*
E10	2	2
E11	2	2*
E12	0	0
E13	1	0
E14	1	1
E15	0	0
E16	2	2
E17	1	0
E18	0	0
E19	0	0
E20	1	1
R22	2	1
R23	0	0
R30	2	1
G24	3	3
F25	3	3
M26	1	0
M27	1	0
V28	1	1
V29	1	0
R31	4	4
Retrospective	4	3
National BMP	7	6
<b>Totals</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>40</b>

\*Included in the total are 2014 sites re-visited in 2015 for follow-up effectiveness monitoring