

PART D OTHER MONITORING

This section addresses monitoring information that is not identified as a requirement in the Nez Perce National Forest Plan (Table V-1). The Forest feels this information is important to monitor as part of Forest Plan implementation.



NEZ PERCE NATIONAL FOREST ACCESSIBILITY FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

Discussion:

The Architectural Barriers Act (ABA) of 1968 requires that all public buildings, facilities, and programs funded in whole or part with federal funds be accessible to and usable by physically disabled person. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended in 1978, states, “No otherwise qualified handicapped individual in the United States, shall solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the participating in, be denied the benefits of, or be subject to discrimination under any program or activity conducted by federal financial assistance or by any Executive Agency.” The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 provides standards – even when no federal funds are involved – for addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities in employment, transportation, telecommunications, and services operated by private entities.

In 1991, the Nez Perce Forest Human Resources Team identified the need to evaluate accessibility of Forest facilities to people with disabilities. In June 1991, a survey was initiated using the newly developed Forest Service accessibility survey tool to determine the accessibility of Forest campgrounds/picnic areas. In addition, the need was identified to evaluate Forest Service facilities. A special emphasis program was created in 1992 to deal with issues concerning people with disabilities. During the initial monitoring stages of facilities we realized the need for TDD (Telecommunication Devices for the Deaf) to allow better communication with our publics. TDDs have been installed in five district offices and the Forest Headquarters. To access these phone lines, use the following phone numbers:

Forest Headquarters	(208) 983-2280
Salmon River Ranger District	(208) 839-2328
Clearwater Ranger District	(208) 983-0696
Moose Creek Ranger District	(208) 926-7725
Red River Ranger District	(208) 842-2233

**General Description of the Different Levels of Accessibility
(A Design Guide/Universal Access to Outdoor Recreation)**

Accessible/Easy	Moderate	Difficult
The general level of expected access to elements and spaces integrated into developed recreation sites or portions of sites. These are typically in: urban/rural settings; at sites managed to provide urban/rural recreation experiences; or at sites managed to provide an easy level of accessibility as defined by these guidelines.	The general level of expected access to elements and spaces integrated into moderately developed recreation sites or portions of sites. These are typically in: roaded natural settings; at sites managed to provide roaded natural recreation experiences; or at sites management to provide moderate level of accessibility as defined by these guidelines.	The general level of expected access to elements and spaces integrated into lesser developed recreation sites or potions of sites. These are typically in: semi-primitive settings; at sites managed to provide semi-primitive settings; at sites managed to provide semi-primitive recreation experiences; or at sites managed to provide difficult level of accessibility as defined by these guidelines.

Monitoring Results:

Mobility Accessibility by Accessibility Levels

Facility	Easy/Accessible	Moderate	Difficult
Fish Creek Pavilion 1994 100 People	Will accommodate 75 people	Will accommodate an additional 25 people	0
Fish Creek Campground Sites: 11 total	9 campsites	2 campsites	0
Blackerby Picnic Area Sites: 2 total	0	2 picnic sites	0
Castle Creek Campground Sites: 9 total	0	8 campsites	0
South Fork Campground Sites: 9 total	6 campsites	2 campsites	1 campsite
Slims Camp Campground	0	0	Accessible at this level*
Selway Falls Campground	0	0	Accessible at this level*
Selway Fish Pond	Accessible at this level		
O'Hara Bar Campground Sites: 32	0	5 campsites	10 campsites
Spring Bar Campground Sites: 17	0	6 campsites	3 campsites
Allison Creek Picnic Area Sites: 2 total	0	0	1 picnic site
Wildhorse Campground	0	0	Accessible at this level*
Florence Cemetery			Accessible at this level*
McAllister Picnic Area			Accessible at this level*
Johns Creek Trailhead			Accessible at this level*
Cougar Creek Trailhead			Accessible at this level*
Trapper Creek Trailhead			Accessible at this level*
14 Mile Tree Trailhead			Accessible at this level*
Rocky Bluff Campground			Accessible at this level*
Meadow Cr. Campground			Accessible at this level*
Nelson Creek Campground			Accessible at this level*
Red River Campground			Accessible at this level*
Wild Horse Campground			Accessible at this level*
Johnson Bar Campground			Accessible at this level*
CCC Campground			Accessible at this level*

NEZ PERCE NATIONAL FOREST
14TH ANNUAL MONITORING AND EVALUATION REPORT

Facility	Easy/Accessible	Moderate	Difficult
Sing Lee Campground			Accessible at this level*
Iron Phone Junction			Accessible at this level*
Leggett Creek			Accessible at this level*
5-Mile Pond			Accessible at this level*
Slate Creek Ranger District Office	Accessible at this level		
Clearwater Ranger District Office	Accessible at this level		
Nez Perce National Forest Headquarters Office	Accessible at this level		
Red River Ranger District Office	Accessible at this level		
Moose Creek Ranger District Office	Not Accessible at this level	Not Accessible at this level	Not Accessible at this level
Elk City Ranger District Office	Accessible at this level		

*Depending on weather

Evaluation of Monitoring Results:

The Forest Headquarters and all district offices (except the Moose Creek Ranger District building at Fenn Ranger Station) are accessible to everyone. Moose Creek and Selway Ranger Districts have combined at the historic Fenn Ranger Station and are in the planning stages for providing accessible services there. A preliminary design was completed in 1996 for a new building at the site that would provide accessible offices and visitor services. That project is the number one priority for Capital Improvement funding on the Forest. It is anticipated that contract for construction will be awarded in FY 2002.

A triplex apartment building, our first fully accessible residences for employees, was completed at the Elk City Ranger Station in 1996. An accessible family housing duplex is also planned at the Elk City Ranger Station. It is the Forest's number three priority for Capital Improvement funding, and is scheduled for fiscal year 2003. Plans are on file for renovating a family residence at the Fenn Ranger Station for accessibility and work has begun on conceptual plans for renovating a bunkhouse and a family residence for accessibility at each ranger station. This work is prioritized on the Forest's NFFA work planning/funding list. Renovation will be undertaken when a need arises or as other funding becomes available; whichever comes first.



ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS RELATED TO TIMBER

Monitoring Results

The following table and discussion summarize **forest supervisor authority environmental analysis accomplishments** between FY 1988 and FY 2001. Beginning with FY 1993, **district ranger authority environmental analysis accomplishments** are also included.

NEZ PERCE NATIONAL FOREST
14TH ANNUAL MONITORING AND EVALUATION REPORT

Fiscal Year	Number of Decisions	Included Number of Sales	Total Acres Analyzed	Proposed Harvest Acres	Average Harvest Volume (MMBF) per Timber Sale	Proposed Harvest Volume (MMBF) ¹
1988	3	3	24,400	1,662	9.0	27.0
1989	8	15	164,480	5,908	6.8	102.1
1990	2	7	38,296	4,677	6.0	42.1
1991	3	11	81,964	6,164	8.0	88.5
1992	1	1	4,034	351	10.4	10.4
1993	5	5	25,716	2,461	4.1	20.5
1994	5	35	11,230	319	0.04	1.3
1995	9	11	6,730	386	0.4	4.1
1996	8	13	11,480	1,160	0.9	12.1
1997	4	6	45,775	4,509	3.26	22.3
1998	3	3	17,075	4,675	4.44	13.3
1999	2	2	4,553	362	1.3	2.6
2000	1	1	18,000	340	1.6	1.6
2001	1	1	9,750	1,055	9.5	9.5
14 year average	3.8	8.1	32,954	2,431	3.1	26.7
Total	53	114	461,361	34,029	--	356.9

Evaluation of Monitoring Results

Many National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents require more than one year to complete. This results in high variability from year to year with respect to the number of decisions and acres analyzed. During FY 2001, analysis was ongoing for two other timber output related documents.



NOXIOUS WEED MANAGEMENT

Noxious weeds and invasive exotic plants are a rising concern on federal land across the western United States. Many invasive exotics can invade healthy ecosystems, displace native vegetation, and affect species diversity and wildlife habitat. Widespread infestations may lead to soil erosion, reduce quality of recreation for visitors, and threaten the long-term viability of rare plants. Invasive exotics have been identified as a major threat to our native biodiversity.

The Nez Perce National Forest continues to implement a proactive management program for noxious weeds. The program is an integrated approach to managing the weeds on the Forest and includes education/awareness; inventory; prevention/early detection; treatment, and monitoring. The program is integrated with Idaho County Weed control and is based on a strong prioritization process.

¹ Proposed harvest volume figures in this table are different than those exhibited on Table 1 because of rounding off of numbers.

Management priorities for the Forest are:

- Prevent the establishment of potential invaders;
- The eradication of new invading noxious weeds;
- The control of satellite infestations including the treatment of transportation corridors and areas of concentrated human activities; and
- The containment of large established infestations.

The noxious weeds of greatest concern on the Forest continue to be dyer's woad; rush skeletonweed; yellow starthistle; diffuse knapweed; Russian knapweed; toothed spurge; leafy spurge; sulfur cinquefoil; spotted knapweed; Scotch thistle; orange and yellow hawkweed; and common crupina.

In Idaho, the Forest Service restricted the use of hay and feed to only those products that were certified weed seed free or weed free, as part of a statewide prevention program. The Forest continued to work with Idaho County to ensure that a local supply of certified products were available. Machinery and equipment are washed as part of timber sale and equipment contracts in order to prevent the spread of weed seed.

During the FY 2001 season, district and Forest personnel worked with user groups and interested parties to identify and highlight the risks of invasive exotic plants. District personnel led field trips to review infestation and risk levels in sensitive areas such as wilderness and along Wild and Scenic rivers. Displays were set up at the Idaho County Fair to educate forest users of the risks of weed invasions. Road signs have been placed on main portals to alert users of the need for certified hay. Many user groups were contacted to discuss the risk of weed invasion to their interest areas.

Each district has a noxious weed coordinator who directs inventory, control, and monitoring activities. Noxious weeds were addressed in analyses for ground disturbing or habitat altering activities. Weed susceptibility was modeled in watershed and subbasin assessments.

The Forest used a variety of tools to treat areas during the FY 2001 field season. Weeds were treated by the release of biological control agents, manual pulling of isolated infestations, mowing, seeding of disturbed sites, and herbicides. Volunteer groups were active in manual control of spotted knapweed along the beaches of the Wild and Scenic sections of the Salmon River. Bio-control insects were released as treatment for yellow starthistle and spotted knapweed. The treatments are consistent with the estimated level outlined in the Forest Plan.

The Forest is involved in the implementation of the Salmon River Weed Management Area. The management area encompasses 500,000 acres in the lower Salmon River Canyon where a collaborative plan has been developed between Idaho County, private landowners, and federal/state land management agencies. The intent of the weed management area is to bring together those responsible for weed management within the Salmon River drainage, develop common management objectives, facilitate effective treatment, and coordinate efforts along logical geographic boundaries with similar land types, use patterns, and problem species. The result of this effort is the integration of the Forest weed program with the county and state efforts.

A similar effort is ongoing in the Clearwater River Basin. The Forest is part of a coordinating committee of county, federal, state, and private representatives. The committee was established to coordinate weed management activities across the entire Clearwater basin. The committee finalized the strategic weed management plan for the Clearwater basin. The plan will require the cooperators to realign their individual weed management priorities to accomplish basin priorities and to ensure that the work is coordinated across the watershed. The Forest program in the Clearwater drainage will become increasingly integrated with the county, state, and other federal agency efforts.

The Forest was involved in implementing weed treatments in the Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness. An environmental impact statement and weed treatment decision were completed in the summer of 1999, with treatment beginning in FY 2000.

To assist in the early detection and the long term monitoring of yellow starthistle, spotted knapweed, leafy and toothed spurges and rush skeletonweed, the Forest received a grant from the Regional Partnership Program to use hyperspectral images to detect small infestations of weeds with low canopy cover along the Salmon River Canyon. The project includes the University of Idaho, Idaho County, Idaho Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Land Management. New remote sensing technology offers the opportunity to greatly improve on the limited success of past remote sensing projects in the detection of weeds. Hyperspectral imaging uses detailed weed reflectance to identify species based on specific spectral signature files. Low-level flights with a fixed-wing aircraft gathered digital reflectance data with a "Probe" sensor along a five-mile wide flight line from the mouth of the Salmon River to the confluence of the South Fork of the Salmon River, covering approximately 400,000 acres along 125 river miles. The University of Idaho is completing image classification and accuracy assessment. The University would provide digital image files, mosaic maps, classification, and final report of the entire project area to the partners. Classification of the images is in progress and the project will be completed in the fall of 2001.

The Forest, working with the University of Idaho, Forest Health Protection Group, and the Nez Perce Tribe Bio-control Center, is monitoring bio-control agents for yellow starthistle in the Salmon and Clearwater basins. This work includes the distribution, release, and monitoring of five different insects that have been approved for release. It also incorporates vegetation monitoring as part of the management of the release sites.



RESEARCH NEEDS

The following research needs have been identified during implementation of the Forest Plan. They will be recommended to the Regional Forester for inclusion in the Regional research program proposal

1. **The Elk Guidelines Habitat Suitability Index** (HSI) model represents a composite of factors and variables affecting elk behavior from all over the west. There is a need for cooperative research to help refine the Northern Idaho Elk Guidelines H.S.I. Model so variables characteristic of Northern Idaho will be more properly represented and the model better tailored to local conditions.

Status: An interagency team of elk habitat technical specialist comprised of biologists from Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Nez Perce and Clearwater National Forests, and the Nez Perce Tribe, organized through the “Venture 20” effort, have completed a technical review and proposed edits/improvements to the existing Guidelines for Evaluating and Managing Summer elk habitat in Northern Idaho (Leege 1984). A draft of this updated proposal titled, “Interagency Guidelines for Evaluating and Managing Elk Habitats and Populations in Central Idaho” (Servheen, 1997; Wildlife Bulletin No. 11) was prepared. The 1997 draft proposal resulted in adjustments to the 1984 model, including: removal of the security area variable, incorporation of trails into access calculations, addition of elk vulnerability model, and other less significant changes. An on-forest interdisciplinary review of these draft 1997 updates to the 1984 model resulted in the preliminary conclusion that a significant Forest Plan amendment may be required prior to forest-wide application. Rationale behind this preliminary conclusion included the following:

- a. Replacing the Nez Perce Forest Plan’s Appendix B implies a change to Forest Plan direction.
- b. Cumulative effects of implementing the 1997 version have not been evaluated or publicly displayed.
- c. Elk and elk habitat management are significant public issues on the Forest.
- d. Public input from recreation, hunting, and motorized user publics relative to the 1997 changes have not been solicited or reviewed.
- e. The 1984 elk model in Appendix B of the Forest Plan did not address application of an elk vulnerability model. Site-specific incorporation and adoption of the 1997 adjustments to the 1984 elk model will be encouraged for application on a site-by-site basis following appropriate NEPA, but Forest-wide application of the 1997 version will require incorporation into the Forest Plan Revision Process. 2001 Update: The Forest Plan Revision process has not formally been initiated with a Notice of Intent to do the EIS as of this date.

2. Moose winter range questions that previously needed to be addressed have diminished in importance in recent years:

2001 Update: With dramatic changes in both the extent and methodologies of timber harvesting used on national forests throughout the U.S. in recent years, most of the questions and concerns pertaining to maintenance of moose/yew habitats have disappeared. Due to these dramatic changes, the driving need to answer these questions has fallen in priority and no research is currently pending to address these issues at this time.

3. The consequences of repeated burning, and of maintenance of Forest ecosystems in prolonged seral brush stages, once needed to be evaluated.

2001 Update: Dramatic shifts in forest management philosophy and recognition of soil maintenance needs as well as the practices of managing to emulate “natural disturbance regimes” and “historical ranges of variability” have begun to replace outdated approaches aimed at maintaining seral brush stages on a given site indefinitely. For this reason, the practice of repeated intensive burning for such purposes is used less and as a result, levels of concern over this practice are declining. No research is pending at this time.

4. **Determining the relative effectiveness of fertilization compared to burning for improving wildlife habitat was previously needed.**

2001 Update: Fertilization costs versus those of prescription burning are comparatively high. Dramatic reductions in appropriated funds and other revenue sources in recent years have placed greater emphasis on cost-effectiveness of land treatments. For this reason, the practicality of using fertilization as an economical approach to habitat improvement has virtually been eliminated. No research is planned or pending at this time.

5. **Determine and define corridor attributes needed to link old growth stands.**

2001 Update: Dramatic changes in forest management philosophy and practices adopted in recent years have, for all practical purposes, eliminated the application of broad-scale clear-cut and burn treatments which tend to isolate forest stands and fragment overall landscape conditions. Current philosophy emphasizes consideration for maintaining and increasing late-seral forest conditions and arrangement of habitats including connectivity and habitat continuity, such that the need to link old growth stands is fast becoming a declining issue in forest issues of the future. For this reason, no research is planned or pending at the local scale at this time.

6. **Natural stand dynamics and disturbance regimes for riparian habitat types** are poorly described. Silviculturists need to be able to predict effects of timber management on stand regeneration, competition, future stand composition, and insect and disease patterns, as well as factors affecting riparian and stream function including shading, bank stability, and large woody debris inputs. Methods need to be developed to monitor the effects of timber harvest and other activities on riparian areas.

2001 update: These research needs are being addressed to some degree with local investigations of patterns of fire and modeled watershed response in the Selway River Subbasin. Work on the Bitterroot Ecosystem Management Project is being done that may also address these issues, but research findings may need local calibration.

7. **Habitat relationships and limiting factors for most sensitive and federally listed species** (plant and animal) are poorly understood. Research is needed to better define critical habitat components for these species and risk posed by Forest management activities.

Accomplishment Status: Minimal research on habitat relationships of sensitive and federally listed plants has occurred over the last few years. Progress is slow because the research must be conducted across multiple forests, agencies and dispersed across an ever-increasing number of sensitive and imperiled species. Idaho Conservation Data Center has begun modeling potential habitat for a few rare plants in Idaho. There is opportunity in the near future for National Forests to fund work on habitat relationships of rare plants.

8. **Watershed and reach response to natural fire disturbance and rates of recovery** are not well described in watershed models currently in use. Research is needed to describe debris torrent and water yield effects on channel attributes, and watershed recovery rates in terms of temperature, sediment and substrate condition, and channel morphology.

2001 update: These remain critical unmet research needs. Forest level studies have been in place since the 1988 fires and provide some information. Rocky Mountain Research Station has proposed studies for FY 2002-2003 to address this need.

9. **There is a lack of published data concerning the effects of operating a suction dredge in streams occupied by threatened, endangered, and sensitive aquatic species.**
10. **An accurate way of quantifying the short-term and long-term effects of road decommissioning on sediment production needs to be developed.**

2001 update: Research coordinated by the Rocky Mountain Research Station has been proposed in Horse Creek to evaluate the effects of road decommissioning on sediment production, channel morphology, water yield and stream macro invertebrate populations. NEPA analysis is scheduled for 2001 and decommissioning for 2002 or 2003, with sampling through 2005 or 2006. Other road decommissioning projects are being monitored at the forest level for changes in stream cross-sections and substrate above and below restored stream crossings.

Accomplishment of Research Needs

Riparian Disturbance Regimes: In 1995-1997 detailed fire history mapping and field sampling occurred in the wilderness portion of the Selway River basin. These data are being analyzed to characterize natural fire disturbance patterns in riparian areas at watershed and reach scales.

2001 update: This research has described watershed scale patterns of fire disturbance and sediment and water yield response, but no long-term field sampling has been done. Analysis scheduled for 2001 will investigate reach level patterns of fire disturbance in reaches stratified by fish habitat potential and reach response units.



PLAN AMENDMENTS

Amending the Nez Perce National Forest Plan is a normal process of improving our ability to care for the land. The need to amend the Plan was anticipated at the outset. Twenty-five amendments and one revised amendment have been issued.

Following are summaries of those amendments made to date. No amendments were made to the Forest Plan in FY 2001. A copy of any amendment(s) can be obtained by contacting the Nez Perce National Forest's Supervisor's Office.

Amendment #1:

Clarifies our intent to protect potential Wild and Scenic Rivers upon their inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers system, by providing more detailed forest-wide standards.

Proposed changes in the management standards were developed following guidance contained in the Wild and Scenic River Evaluation section of the Forest Service Land and Resource Management Planning Handbook (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 8). [10/88]

Amendment #1 (Revised):

Revised Forest Plan Amendment #1 is exactly the same as the original amendment except that the following statement has been removed. The amendment was necessary to settle and appeal of Amendment #1. [1/91]

“Boundaries may include adjacent areas needed to protect the resources or facilitate management of the river corridor.”

Amendment #2:

Clarifies the Forest’s definition and management of motorized recreation on the Nez Perce National Forest. [10/88]

Amendment #3:

Modifies standards listed in Chapter II (Forest-wide Management Direction) and Chapter III (Management Area Direction). Clarification is provided in changes to the minerals section of Chapter VI (Summary of the Analysis of the Management Situation) and the glossary and monitoring items.

The specific standards modified are those relating to minerals, wildlife, fish, and riparian area management; and to provide clarification that will not alter the multiple use goals and objectives as identified in the Forest Plan.

The need for changes and clarification in management standards was the result of negotiations with the Independent Miners Association’s appeal of the Nez Perce National Forest Plan. An interdisciplinary team developed the settlement agreement that addressed then appellant’s concerns and a proposal for correcting the Plan. [3/89]

Amendment #4:

Modifies standards listed in Chapter II (Forest-wide Management Direction), modifies the visual resource standards in Chapter III (Management Area Direction), and modifies specific monitoring requirements in Forest Plan Appendix O dealing with visual resource management.

The need for changes and clarification in management standards was the result of environmental analysis of proposed timber sales and road construction in the Wing Creek-Twentymile area. During the comment period of the Wing Creek-Twentymile Draft Environmental Impact Statement, concern was expressed on conflicting Forest Plan language pertaining to visual resource management. An interdisciplinary team was used to analyze the concerns and develop a proposal for correcting the Forest Plan. [3/89]

Amendment #5:

Corrects errors displayed in the Nez Perce National Forest Plan Appendix A, Forest Fishery/Water Quality Direction by Prescription Watershed. These objectives provide management direction in terms of the maximum estimated increase in sediment over baseline conditions that can be approached or equaled for a specific number of years per decade.

Some of the changes are planning errors made in identifying sediment yield and entry frequency guidelines. Site-specific analysis and stream surveys have also revealed that some streams were incorrectly identified as not supporting anadromous fish. The errors were identified through environmental analysis of proposed timber sales and road construction. An interdisciplinary team was used in identifying the needed changes and proposing the corrections. [3/89]

Amendment #6:

Corrects errors in Forest Plan Chapter II (Forest-wide Management Direction), Chapter III (Management Area Direction), Chapter V (Implementation), Chapter VII (Glossary), and Appendix A (Fishery/Water Quality Direction).

The corrections made in this Forest Plan amendment provide clarification that will not alter the multiple use goals and objectives as identified in the Forest Plan.

An error was identified through environmental analysis of a proposed timber sale and associated road construction and habitat improvement project. Forest Plan Appendix A describes current fishery habitat quality in the West Fork of Red River (Prescription Watershed 17060305-04-18) as 50 percent of potential habitat quality. The West Fork of Red River is in a pristine natural condition. This watershed is roadless and no management activities are known to have occurred in either the watershed or the stream. The stream is, therefore, in a pristine, natural condition and it is appropriate to display it at 100 percent of potential habitat quality.

The Forest Interdisciplinary Monitoring Team identified additional typographical errors in the Forest Plan. This Forest Plan amendment includes the correction of those errors. [7/89]

Amendment #7:

Clarifies language founding the following sections:

- Chapter II (Forest-wide Management Direction)
- Chapter V (Implementation)
- Chapter VI (Summary of the Analysis of the Management Situation)
- Appendix O (Forest Plan Monitoring)

The specific items modified provide clarification that will not alter the multiple use goals and objectives as identified in the Forest Plan.

The need for changes and clarification in management standards was the result of negotiations with the Nez Perce Indian Tribe on their appeal of the Nez Perce National Forest Plan. An interdisciplinary team was used in developing the settlement agreement that addressed the appellant's concerns and developed a proposal for correcting the Forest Plan. [1/90]

Amendment #8:

The purpose of the Forest Plan Amendment #8 is to clarify language in Appendix O (Forest Plan Monitoring Requirements).

During this past year the Forest Interdisciplinary Monitoring and Evaluation Team identified some items in the Forest Plan Monitoring Requirements Appendix that need correction or clarification.

These items focus on fish and wildlife monitoring. Specifically, the changes relate to forage production, wildlife population trends, and fisheries/watershed monitoring station costs.

The corrections made in this Forest Plan amendment provide clarification that will not alter the multiple use goals and objectives as identified in the Forest Plan. [1/89]

Amendments #9 and #10:

These amendments deal with management practices specific to the Cove and Mallard Timber sales as described in the Final Environmental Impact Statements for those sales. Amendment No. 9 was formally adopted in the Mallard Record of Decision, and Amendment No. 10 was formally adopted in the Cove Record of Decision. Both of these amendments correct oversights in the Forest Plan.

These two amendments apply only to the timber sales analyzed in the Cove and Mallard Environmental Impact Statements. They do not apply to other timber sales on the Forest.

The two amendments will allow clear-cutting and sanitation/salvage harvesting within Management Areas 12 and 17. (11/90)

Amendment #11:

Forest Plan Amendment No. 11 makes adjustments in the Forest-wide monitoring program and updates the fish/water quality objectives in Appendix A to the Plan. The Forest Interdisciplinary Monitoring Team in the Nez Perce National Forest Monitoring and Evaluation Report recommended the changes in the monitoring program for Fiscal Year 1989; the objective was to make the program more comprehensive. The revised fish/water quality objectives are based on recent stream surveys. Specific changes in both the monitoring program and the fish/water quality objectives are listed in the Decision Memo for Amendment No 11. (1/91)

Amendment #12:

Amendment 12 makes minor changes to the Wall Creek Municipal Watershed direction (Management Area 22) contained in the Nez Perce Forest Plan. These changes relate to improving the range of management practices identified in the Forest Plan, and specifically to items such as notifying the water district if a fire occurs in the watershed and taking special precautions with machinery and chemicals. (2/91)

Amendment #13:

Amendment 13 brings the Plan into compliance with legal requirements and Forest Service directives dealing with animal damage control. It should be noted that the amendment does not authorize any specific projects. (4/91)

Amendment #14:

This (3/91) amendment would partition the allowable sale quantity (ASQ) by separately showing the ASQ that came from inventoried Roadless areas and roaded areas. Thirteen Forest Plans in the Northern Region were amended. The decision was appealed to the Chief of the Forest Service who affirmed the decision. The Secretary of Agriculture opted to review the Chief's appeal decision and reversed the decision in October 1991, thereby vacating and voiding Amendment 14 of the Nez Perce Forest Plan.

Amendment #15:

Amendment 15 amends the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness Management Plan and the Forest and Land Management Plans for the Bitterroot, Boise, Challis, Payette, Nez Perce, and Salmon National Forests.

The amendment changes wording in the Wilderness Management Plan related to reducing the storage of items and removal of plumbing fixtures from the wilderness. The amendment only modifies the schedule of implementation. (6/91)

Amendment #16:

Amendment 16 adopts programmatic changes in management direction for the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness. These changes should enable wilderness managers to better meet both the letter and the intent of the Wilderness Act. (2/92)

Amendment #17:

Amendment 17 allows salvage timber harvest within Management Area 20 (old growth wildlife habitat) following the Scott Fire. Analysis showed that salvage harvest would help to speed up the achievement of old-growth vegetative characteristics in the burned area. This amendment is specific to the Scott Fire salvage sale and will not apply to other areas on the Forest. (4/93)

Amendment #18:

Amendment 18 brings the Forest Plan into compliance with a court order that addresses outfitter and guide operations in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness. (7/94)

Amendment #19:

Amendment 19 adds more specific management direction for vegetation in the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness General Management Direction. It establishes goals, objectives, standards and guides, and monitoring elements for vegetation within ecosystem management principles. It addresses such issues as: noxious weeds, rare plant protection, vegetative diversity, and management of pack and saddle stock. (2/95) [Note: Based on negotiations with appellants, the decision was rescinded in May 1995. A new amendment/decision, which provides additional clarification, is expected in FY 95.]

Amendment #20:

The Nez Perce Forest Plan was amended by the Chief of the Forest Service to incorporate an interim strategy for managing anadromous fish producing watersheds (PACFISH). (2/95)

Amendment #21:

This was a project specific amendment based on the analysis contained in the Hungry-Mill Final Environmental Impact Statement. The amendment changed the summer elk habitat potential objective from 50 percent to 25 percent on 2,838 acres within the Hungry-Mill analysis area. (3/97)

Amendment #22:

This was a project specific amendment based on the analysis contained in the Berg Timber Sale Environmental Analysis. The amendment allows timber harvest within Management Area 20 (old-growth wildlife habitat) in order to improve and maintain the long-term sustainability of the ponderosa pine communities in designated areas of the Berg Timber Sale. The amendment is only valid for the contract life of the timber sale and does not apply to future actions in this area or elsewhere on the Forest. (1/97)

Amendment #23:

This amendment corrects summer elk analysis units and objectives that were mismatched in the original Forest Plan. (7/97)

Amendment #24:

This was a project specific amendment based on the analysis contained in the Hungry-Mill Final Environmental Impact Statement. The amendment updated Forest Plan Appendix A information for several watersheds in the Hungry-Mill analysis area to account for new information on the species of fish that exist in these watersheds. (8/97) **The amendment was challenged in court and subsequently withdrawn in (5/98)**

Amendment #25:

This was a project specific amendment based on the analysis contained in the Middle Fork Final Environmental Impact statement. The amendment updated forest Plan Appendix A information for three watersheds in the Middle Fork analysis area to account for new information on the species of fish that exist in these watersheds. (10/97)

Amendment #26:

This was a project specific amendment based on the analysis contained in the Middle Fork Final Environmental Impact Statement. The amendment allows timber harvest within Management Area 20 (old-growth wildlife habitat) in order to improve and maintain the long-term sustainability of the ponderosa pine communities in unit F Middle Fork Timber Sale. The amendment is only valid for the contract life of the timber sale and does not apply to future actions in this area or elsewhere on the Forest. (10/97)

Amendment #27:

This was a project specific amendment based on the analysis done for the East Meadow Creek Prescribed Fire Project. The analysis identified the need to allow short term, human-caused, fire related sediment increases that approximate natural variations in the stream. The amendment changes fish habitat and water quality objectives listed in Appendix A for 8 watersheds. The amendment is only valid for the life of the prescribed fire project and does not apply to future actions in this area or elsewhere on the Forest. (2/99)