



# Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Report Fiscal Year 2003

## Finger Lakes National Forest



**United States Department of Agriculture  
Forest Service**

## **ABSTRACT**

Implementation of the Finger Lakes National Forest (FLNF) Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) began in 1987. Since then, we have worked towards meeting the goals and objectives stated in the Plan. Each year we monitor and evaluate how well we are meeting these goals and objectives. This report presents the results of our monitoring and evaluations in fiscal year (FY) 2003 (October 1, 2002 to September 30, 2003).

The Forest Plan described the state of the FLNF in 1987 as well as the "ideal state" which the Forest Service and interested publics envisioned for the Forest's "desired future condition". The Forest Plan allocated land to different kinds of management and provided direction in the application of management practices.

Coordination of management projects to bring about the desired future conditions stated in the Forest Plan is a complex task. We want to ensure that the highest priority projects are located in the most suitable areas, and that management of all resources in a particular area is integrated to improve efficiency and works toward improvement of the natural and the social environment.

Forest Plan monitoring is required under the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Forest Management Act. These laws require that our monitoring efforts determine:

- How well the stated objectives of the Forest Plan have been met;
- How closely Management Standards and Guidelines in Chapter IV of the Forest Plan have been followed;
- If conditions or demands in the area covered by the Forest Plan have changed significantly enough to require any revision to the Forest Plan and;
- If budgets have significantly altered the long-term relationships between levels of multiple-use goods and services enough to create the need for a significant amendment.

A monitoring plan entitled, "Forest Plan Monitoring Program for the Green Mountain and Finger Lakes National Forests" was developed in 1987 to meet these objectives. This plan describes what, when, and how items will be monitored. Copies are available from the Forest Supervisor's office in Rutland, Vermont and the Hector Ranger District upon request.

The FY03 Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Report (M&E Report) implements this monitoring plan, documents the results of FY03 monitoring, and describes progress on the "Action Items" identified in the FY 2002 Monitoring

Report. The FY03 Monitoring Report also identifies needed modifications to the action items as well as new action items that have surfaced.

This report is divided into four sections. **Section 1** sets forth monitoring items that are required by NFMA. **Section 2** presents the results of monitoring required by the Forest monitoring program. **Section 3** includes recommendations for amending that program and, **Section 4** provides a follow-up to last year's Monitoring & Evaluation Report. Also included in this report is a table containing data collected from our monitoring program, and appendices which include our FY03 payments to counties, as well as the special status wildlife and plant species found on the FLNF.

All of the activities and outputs we monitor may be traced to one of three sources: those required by the National Forest Management Act Planning Regulations (36 CFR 219 (1982)) which outline specific activities and outputs to be monitored; those described in the Forest Plan (Chapter V and Appendix C) selected to facilitate comparison between actual conditions and the desired future condition; and, finally, those derived from public comments. These latter are particularly useful for monitoring public satisfaction with the resources and services the FLNF provides.

This monitoring information allows the Forest Service staff to determine how well the Forest Plan is being implemented and whether land management objectives are being met. If monitoring results indicate a significant difference between conditions expected by the Forest Plan and the actual conditions, we may recommend changes in how we perform our work, changes in the funding of activities necessary to meet Plan objectives, or changes to the Forest Plan itself.

## **APPROVAL**

Having reviewed the FLNF Monitoring and Evaluation Report, I am satisfied with its findings and intend to implement recommendations made therein, following appropriate public involvement. As always, we encourage public involvement during the process of developing individual project proposals.

/S/ Paul K. Brewster  
PAUL K. BREWSTER  
Forest Supervisor

September 27, 2004  
DATE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	ii
APPROVAL .....	iv
SECTION 1: NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT (NFMA) MONITORING REQUIREMENTS .....	9
COMPARED PLANNED AND ACTUAL OUTPUTS AND SERVICES (36 CFR 219.12(k)(1)). .....	9
TABLE 1. ....	10
DETERMINE HOW CLOSELY MANAGEMENT STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES HAVE BEEN APPLIED (36 CFR 219.12(k)(1)). .....	13
Air.....	13
Botany .....	13
Fisheries.....	13
Heritage.....	13
Land Acquisition.....	13
Minerals.....	14
Recreation .....	14
Soils .....	14
Special Uses .....	15
Vegetation Management .....	15
Visual Resources .....	15
Water.....	15
Wildlife.....	15
DOCUMENT PRESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTS (36 CFR 219.12(k)(2)). .....	15
COMPARE COSTS ESTIMATED IN PLAN WITH ACTUAL COSTS (NFMA 219.12(k)(3)). .....	16
Vegetation Management .....	16
DETERMINE IF LANDS ARE ADEQUATELY RESTOCKED (36 CFR 219.12(k)(5)). .....	17
BE SURE HARVEST AREAS DON'T EXCEED MAXIMUM IN EACH PRESCRIPTION (36 CFR 219.12 (k)(5)). .....	17
REEVALUATE THE SUITABILITY OF LANDS IDENTIFIED AS UNSUITABLE FOR TIMBER PRODUCTION (36 CFR 219.12(k)(5)). .....	17
DETERMINE THE EXTENT AND SEVERITY OF INSECT AND DISEASE OCCURRENCE (36 CFR 219.12(k)(5) (iv)). .....	17
DETERMINE POPULATION TRENDS OF INDICATOR SPECIES TO ESTIMATE VIABILITY (36 CFR 219.19(a)(6)). .....	18
DETERMINE EFFECTS OF ADJACENT PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT ON THE FLNF, AND OF FLNF ON ADJACENT LAND FOR BETTER COORDINATION (36 CFR 219.7(f)). .....	18
Air.....	18
Botany .....	18
Fisheries.....	18
Heritage.....	19

Land Acquisition .....	19
Law Enforcement .....	19
Minerals.....	19
Recreation .....	19
Soils .....	19
Special Uses .....	19
Vegetation Management .....	19
Visual Resources .....	19
Water.....	20
Wildlife.....	20
DETERMINE RESEARCH NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES (36 CFR 219.28). ..	20
Air.....	20
Botany .....	20
Fisheries.....	20
Heritage.....	20
Land Acquisition .....	20
Minerals.....	20
Recreation .....	21
Soils .....	21
Special Uses .....	21
Vegetation Management .....	21
Visual Resources .....	21
Water.....	21
Wildlife.....	21
DETERMINE WHETHER PUBLIC DEMANDS HAVE CHANGED	
SIGNIFICANTLY (36 CFR 219.10(g)).....	21
Air .....	21
Botany.....	22
Fisheries .....	22
Heritage .....	22
Land Acquisition.....	22
Minerals .....	22
Recreation .....	22
Soils .....	22
Special Uses.....	22
Vegetation Management.....	22
Visual Resources .....	22
Water .....	22
Wildlife .....	23
DETERMINE WHETHER LAND CONDITIONS OR OUR ABILITY TO MEET	
PUBLIC DEMANDS HAVE CHANGED SIGNIFICANTLY (36 CFR 219.10(g)). ..	23
SECTION 2: FOREST PLAN MONITORING REQUIREMENTS .....	23
Recreation .....	23
Describe your monitoring of All Terrain Vehicle (ATV) or Off-highway Vehicle	
(OHV) use on the Forest.....	23
Vegetation Management .....	24

Determine Whether Actual Harvest Per Acre Matched Projections in Plan.	24
Determine Whether Actual Value of Timber Matches Projections in Plan. .	24
Determine the Effects of Delayed Shelterwood Cuts (by agreement).....	24
Determine if Fuelwood Cutting Becomes an Issue Again. ....	25
Assess Benefits and Costs of Land Acquisition (by agreement).....	25
Assess the Effects of FLNF Land Acquisitions on the Timber Industry (by agreement). ....	25
Determine Effects of Longer (up to 150 years) Timber Sale Rotations (by agreement). ....	25
Determine the Accuracy of Site Index Records. ....	25
Assess Visual Condition of Harvested Acres. ....	25
Determine Whether Costs and Values for Unevenaged Management Match the Project.....	26
Gauge Public Reaction to Unevenaged Management. ....	26
Wildlife Habitat .....	26
Determine Acres by Vegetative Age Class. ....	26
Assess Whether the Openings Maintenance Program is Meeting Objectives. ....	26
Special Areas .....	26
Determine if Uncommon and Outstanding Values are Protected.....	26
Minerals.....	26
Determine How Well Mineral Activities Comply with Stipulations. ....	26
Determine if Adequate Exploration Base is Maintained to Assure Most Major Mineral Deposits can be Discovered. ....	26
<b>SECTION 3: RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS TO THE FOREST PLAN</b>	
<b>MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROGRAM</b> .....	26
Air.....	26
Botany .....	26
Fisheries.....	27
Heritage.....	27
Land Acquisition.....	27
Minerals.....	27
Recreation .....	27
<i>Recreation Use</i> .....	27
<i>Recreation Facilities</i> .....	27
<i>Trail Maintenance</i> .....	27
<i>Trail Construction and Rehabilitation</i> .....	27
Soils .....	27
Special Uses .....	28
Vegetation Management .....	28
Visual Resources .....	28
Water.....	28
Wildlife.....	28
<b>SECTION 4: FY 02 MONITORING AND EVALUATION REPORT FOLLOW-UP</b>	
.....	28
Air.....	28

Botany .....	28
Fisheries .....	29
Heritage.....	29
Land Acquisition .....	29
Recreation .....	29
<i>Recreation Use</i> .....	29
<i>Recreation Facilities</i> .....	29
<i>Trail Maintenance</i> .....	29
<i>Trail Construction and Rehabilitation</i> .....	29
<i>Visuals Monitoring</i> .....	30
<i>Visual Enhancement</i> .....	30
Soils .....	30
Wildlife.....	30
APPENDIX A: FY03 Payments to Towns .....	31
APPENDIX B: List of Acronyms .....	33
APPENDIX C: FLNF Regional Forester Sensitive Species List .....	34

## **SECTION 1: NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT (NFMA) MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**

### **COMPARED PLANNED AND ACTUAL OUTPUTS AND SERVICES (36 CFR 219.12(k)(1)).**

Table 1 shows the outputs and services mandated by our Forest Plan, the outputs and services that the FLNF provided in FY03, and a sixteen-year average of those outputs and services. Not all items were monitored in FY03; our Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Program does not require annual monitoring of all outputs and services. Some such items may be monitored “periodically” or “every five years,” etc.

#### **General Recreation Visitor Days**

See Table 1, Public Use and Enjoyment and Recreation.

Recreation use numbers shown in Table 1 are the same as those reported in FY02. In FY99, the GMNF and the Finger Lakes National Forest (FLNF) became a “sample Forest” in a National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) project that has changed how recreational use is gathered for the U.S. Forest Service. The new sampling methods were implemented in FY00 and completed in FY01. We have no new information that is more accurate than the statistically valid survey completed for the NVUM. We will continue to use these numbers for Forest-level visitor use until the next sample is completed in FY05.

#### **Wilderness Recreation Visitor Days**

See Table 1, Public Use and Enjoyment, Public Information and Recreation.

#### **Acres Various Habitat**

See Table 1, Vegetative Management.

#### **Miles of Road**

See Table 1, Property Boundary.

#### **Timber Harvested**

See Table 1, Vegetative Management.

**TABLE 1.**

<b>OUTPUTS FROM ANNUAL PROGRAM OF WORK</b>					
<b>Activity</b>	<b>Units of Measure</b>	<b>Forest Plan Average Annual Projected</b>	<b>FY03 Actual Output</b>	<b>Percent Projected Output</b>	<b>Average Output from 1987-2003 (actual or % of Projected)</b>
<b>RESOURCE PROTECTION</b>					
<b>Heritage Resource Protection (Goal 3)</b>					
Acres Surveyed	acres	430	200	46%	538
New Sites	# of sites	None set	3	N/A	7
Sites Evaluated	# of sites	None set	1	N/A	0
Impacts Reported	# of sites	None set	0	N/A	0
<b>Threatened, Endangered &amp; Sensitive Species (Goal 2)</b>					
Rare Plant Inventory	acres	1,323/yr	3.03	0.02%	159
Rare Plant Protection	# of sites	None set	1	N/A	N/A
<b>Special Areas (Goal 2)</b>					
<i>8.1c Ravine Trail</i>					
Vegetative Condition	Amount of Change	None set	Site monitored in 2003; vegetation in good condition but with non-native invasive species adjacent.		
<i>8.1d Old Growth</i>					
Vegetative Condition	Composition and Structure	None set	No monitoring conducted in 2003.		
<b>Property Boundary (Goal 9)</b>					
New	miles	None set	2.3	3.6	N/A
Maintained	miles	None set	0	1.8	N/A
<b>Public Safety</b>					
Law Enforcement	# of agreements	2	2	2	100
<b>Public Use and Enjoyment (Goal 15)</b>					
Total Forest Visitors	RVDs	40,000	70,000	175	46,282

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Units of Measure</b>	<b>Forest Plan Average Annual Projected</b>	<b>FY03 Actual Output</b>	<b>Percent Projected Output</b>	<b>Average Output from 1987-2003 (actual or % of Projected)</b>
<b>Public Information (Goal 10)</b>					
Trail Guide	# Guides	2/decade	0	0	2
Recreation Opportunity Guide	# Guides	1/decade	0	0	2
Signs FLNF System Lands	# Signs	None set	0	N/A	28
Interpretive Signs	# Signs	2	0	0	10 total
Trips/Talks	# Trips/Talks	10	unknown	unknown	Less than 10
<b>Recreation (Goal 5) Trail Maintenance...Projected output of 35 miles includes 29 miles of existing trail and 6 miles of trail which have not yet been constructed.</b>					
Campground	# Maintained	3	3	3	3
Trail Maintenance	miles	3 of 35	16	46	26.3
Trail Construction	miles	10/decade	0	0	7
Trail Rehabilitation	miles	None set	0.5	0	2.85
New Parking Areas	# Parking Areas	1/decade	0	0	3
Access to Pasture	# Structures	5	0	0	11
Blueberry Management	acres	5	2	40	2
<b>Fisheries</b>					
Fish Stocking	# ponds	3/yr	3	100%	3
Fish Survey	# surveys	3 ponds/yr	3	100%	3
<b>Total Forage Production (Goal 15) reported by Calendar Year, not Fiscal Year.</b>					
Total Forage Production	AUM	10,000	9432	94%	8,100
<b>Education and Research</b>					
Education Field Trip	# Trips	3	0	0	0
University / College	# Contacts	3	5	N/A	Not tracked
Research	# Projects	None Set	1	N/A	N/A

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Units of Measure</i>	<i>Forest Plan Average Annual Projected</i>	<i>FY03 Actual Output</i>	<i>Percent Projected Output</i>	<i>Average Output from 1987-2003 (actual or % of Projected)</i>
<b>VEGETATIVE MANAGEMENT</b>					
<b>Convert Forest (Goal 2)</b>					
Even to Uneven	acres	15	0	4	3.75
Old Growth	acres	350/decade	MA 8.1 in transition		
Non-native Softwoods to Hardwoods	acres	10	0	3	2.8
<b>Maintain Locust Stands (Goal 2)</b>					
Clearcut	acres	3	0	0	.84
<b>Maintain Aspen Stands (Goal 2)</b>					
Clearcut	acres	2	3	<1	.86
<b>Maintain Shrub Openings (Goal 2)</b>					
Mow or burn	acres	200	350	175%	350
<b>Promote Native Softwoods (Goal 2)</b>					
Convert Hardwoods	acres	None set	0	<1	N/A
<b>Maintain Pasture (Goal 2)</b>					
Mowing	acres	900	1711	190%	1575
Liming	acres	530	125	24%	186
<b>OTHER OBJECTIVES</b>					
<b>Consolidate Ownership Pattern (Goal 14)</b>					
Consolidate	acres	None set	0	N/A	181
<b>Equal Opportunity (Goal 11)</b>					
Discrimination	# Complaints	None Set	0	N/A	<1
Recruitment of Women & Minorities	# Permanent	None set	0	N/A	<3
<b>Demonstrate Sound Resource Management (Goal 13)</b>					
Management	acres	13,232	Not tracked	Not tracked	Not tracked
<b>Minimize Economic Disruptions (Goal 16)</b>					
Minimize Economic Disruptions	# Dislocations	0	0	N/A	0

## **DETERMINE HOW CLOSELY MANAGEMENT STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES HAVE BEEN APPLIED (36 CFR 219.12(k)(1)).**

(Program Reviews, project designs and field inspection reports should reveal how well management Standards and Guidelines [S&Gs] are being followed.)

### **Air**

S&Gs requiring compliance with state air quality regulations were met. Our S&Gs also require us to coordinate with regulatory agencies to seek emissions reductions as needed to protect NF resources. This S&G was met at a minimal level. The potential exists for us to work with other regulatory agencies to a much greater degree. We are currently taking actions in hopes of increasing our work with regulatory agencies by 2005.

No monitoring of air quality, or the effects of acid deposition on the forest ecosystem, was conducted in 2003. We have done no monitoring during the planning period due to the high costs of monitoring, and small acreage of the FLNF.

### **Botany**

In keeping with S&Gs, the Regional Forester's Sensitive Species (RFSS) list (see Appendix C) is updated as new information becomes available, and all projects that occur in potential rare plant habitat are reviewed prior to implementation. In FY03, only one project required field review, and no plants on the RFSS list were found. During Forest Plan revision, all species of viability concern on the FLNF, including those already on the RFSS list, have undergone species viability evaluations, including literature and expert panel reviews. This process has kept our information on these species current.

### **Fisheries**

Habitat and population monitoring in Sassafras, Brudick and Teeter ponds indicate that S&Gs for fisheries are being met at these ponds. Riparian habitat along the ponds shorelines continues to provide cover and shading for fish and other aquatic species as well as a natural vegetative filter (a.k.a. buffer strip) for collecting runoff and sediment from entering the ponds. Application of these S&Gs will continue to improve water quality and fish and wildlife habitat conditions as riparian forests age and more woody material is deposited into the ponds and shoreline.

### **Heritage**

All Forest undertakings included Heritage Resource review and input. Seneca and Cayuga tribal representatives were kept informed of our plans through the Schedule of Proposed Actions and personal contacts. All projects were implemented using the Forest's Heritage S&Gs to manage and protect Heritage Resource sites within or near them.

### **Land Acquisition**

There were no land acquisitions on the FLNF in FY 03.

## **Minerals**

There was no mineral activity on the FLNF in FY 03.

## **Range**

Actual grazing use in 2003 was 94% of that projected in the Forest Plan. No new pastures were added in 2003. A gradual increase in livestock numbers will continue as new range improvements (i.e., watering areas, fences, and corrals) are completed. New pond and fence construction is anticipated in 2004 which would allow for increased grazing to occur. Demand for forage exists and marketing by the Hector Grazing Association indicates the greatest limitation is availability of new grazing areas. Grazing fees increased by \$0.03 per AUM in FY03, reflecting an increase in regional hay prices, which are used to calculate federal grazing fees charged to the Hector Grazing Association.

In 2003, forage monitoring done in August on all 38 pastures determined that we did not achieve the desired forage utilization (less than 60% production) on four of the 38 pastures. We will continue to measure livestock utilization of forage annually to determine what the average annual production in each pasture is.

## **Recreation**

Adherence to S&Gs was strictly followed. In cases where there is sometimes confusing language and conflicting direction, we have made the best interpretation to protect the resources on the ground. As we revise the Forest Plan we are addressing areas with confusing language or conflicting direction. S&Gs are currently being rewritten to provide more clarity.

Though some of the specific reviews on the forest had to be curtailed due to plan revision work, past reviews indicates strict adherence to the standards. A sampling of projects, special areas, and facilities was made in the fall of 1998 through 2001. These reviews continued in FY 2002, but at a reduced rate due to limited staff and budgetary resources. These reviews indicate the Forest is making every effort to comply with standards and guidelines. As determined in the FLNF 1997 A Ten Year Retrospective Report and the 15 Year Retrospective Report most of the standards continue to work well, but there are continued problems with conflicting and outdated language. Many of these have been noted in past reports.

## **Soils**

Based on our observations, we fully complied with soil resource S&Gs in 2003. The purpose of these S&Gs is to prevent erosion and compaction, and maintain the long-term productivity of the soil.

Within the next few years we plan to begin monitoring soil quality in areas where management activities will result in soil disturbance. Soil quality is defined as the capacity of a soil to function within ecosystem boundaries to sustain biological productivity, maintain or enhance water and air quality, and support human health and habitation. The Forest Service has established procedures and soil quality standards by which to monitor soil quality. The standards need to be verified for the FLNF, and we must determine if additional standards are needed.

### **Special Uses**

All new special uses proposed on the FLNF are subjected to review and implementation of the appropriate S&Gs. All applicable special uses S&Gs were followed in FY03.

### **Vegetation Management**

All vegetation management, including timber harvesting, is subject to the application of Forest Plan S&Gs. Our project planning process ensures that these S&Gs are followed, and our field observations over the course of FY03 indicated that S&G compliance was exceptional this fiscal year.

### **Visual Resources**

Adherence to S&Gs was strictly followed. In cases where there is sometimes confusing language and conflicting direction, we have made the best interpretation to protect the resources on the ground. As we revise the Forest Plan we are addressing areas with confusing language or conflicting direction. S&Gs are being rewritten to provide more clarity.

### **Water**

Based on our observations, the rate of compliance with water S&Gs on the FLNF was moderate. Further work on assuring good riparian vegetation continues to be a goal on the FLNF to assure good water quality on the Forest. In 2003 we conducted our 4th year of monitoring several streams and ponds in FLNF grazing areas. This monitoring provides us information on the effects of grazing on water quality and riparian areas. It is also used to determine if our S&Gs and Forest Plan goals for riparian areas are being met. The FY03 results indicate that water quality in our grazing areas, and some adjacent National Forest lands, does not fully meet Forest Plan goals. Turbidity levels, though, have improved over 2002 levels, probably due to improved riparian vegetation in the grazing areas.

### **Wildlife**

In FY 03 there were few opportunities to follow wildlife-related S&Gs due to the nature and scope of decisions; however, when there were opportunities, S&G's were followed.

## **DOCUMENT PRESCRIPTIONS AND EFFECTS (36 CFR 219.12(k)(2)).**

### **Fisheries**

In April 2003, three ponds (Ballard, Foster, and Potomac) were stocked with brook trout in cooperation with the NY State Department of Environmental Conservation. Each pond received approximately 500 trout ranging from 6-10 inches long. This is an annual project to maintain a popular recreational trout fishery on the Forest. Numerous individuals call weeks in advance for information about pond stocking dates and anxiously await the opening of fishing season. Also, Potomac pond was stocked with 125 brook and rainbow trout (sizes 8-16 inches long) for a youth fishing derby and environmental education event for our celebration of National Fishing Week.

In 2003, pond monitoring was conducted in Burdick, Sassafras, and Teeter Ponds by Forest and district staff. Monitoring was conducted to evaluate the health of the fishery resources, particularly those species that provide a recreational fishery sought by anglers such as largemouth (LM) bass, bluegill and brown bullhead. All ponds were sampled by using 125 ft. gill nets and/or seine nets at various locations for juvenile and adult fish.

Yellow perch, bluegill and brown bullhead were sampled in Burdick Pond. Sampling in Teeter Pond documented populations of golden shiners and brown bullhead. Largemouth bass were not found in either pond despite a supplemental stocking of bass fingerlings in each pond during Spring 2002. The presence of large numbers of shiners would lead us to believe that winterkill is not responsible for the lack of bass and that abundant food is available. It is possible the bass are present but we simply missed collecting them. Nets are set for only 1 hour during monitoring projects to minimize fish mortality. We will monitor both ponds again in 2004 or Spring 2005.

Sassafras Pond was also monitored with the previously mentioned netting techniques. In addition, a visual survey along the shoreline of the pond revealed the presence of young LM bass ranging in size from 2 inches to 10 inches in length. This range represents at least two distinct age-classes, and indicates that successful natural reproduction is occurring in the pond. Netting efforts resulted in the capture of both LM bass and golden shiner. Based on these data, we believe the pond is sustaining a productive fishery without the need for further stocking at this time.

### **Vegetation Management**

Funding for the FLNF timber sales program is a component of the Green Mountain & Finger Lakes National Forest's (GMFL NF) program. There has not been a timber sale sold on the FLNF since 1997.

In FY 2003 there were no acres of even-aged to uneven-aged treated. The Forest Plan projected 15 acres annually of selection harvesting that would be conducted to accomplish this objective. No aspen clear cutting was accomplished in 2003.

### **COMPARE COSTS ESTIMATED IN PLAN WITH ACTUAL COSTS (NFMA 219.12(k)(3)).**

### **Vegetation Management**

In the past, we have monitored the costs and benefits of timber harvest activities through the Timber Sale Program Information Reporting System (TSPIRS). The report was initiated in 1987 and reports were prepared until 1999. In 1998, while national forests submitted data for the National TSPIRS Report, the national report was not released by the Secretary of Agriculture. In 2001, the Secretary of Agriculture gave permission to release the national 1998 TSPIRS data. The timber sale data for the Finger Lakes NF was compiled with the Green Mountain data for TSPIRS. The GMFL NF's data showed that the 1998 timber sales program for the GMFL was above cost with a net gain of \$166,372. Stumpage returns from Finger

Lakes NF timber sales have been high due to the high quality hardwoods in New York.

Since 1998, there has been no direction to prepare a TSPIRS Report by the Washington Office. The Forest Service has implemented a new accounting system that tracks all resource areas. The National TSPIRS Report was developed at a time when the program's emphasis was on producing commercially valuable timber to meet the Nation's demand for wood. Today, the timber program's emphasis is using timber harvest and timber sales as cost-effective tools for improving resource conditions on the land and consequently the primary interest is on outcomes as opposed to outputs. This issue will be addressed in Forest Plan Revision.

**DETERMINE IF LANDS ARE ADEQUATELY RESTOCKED (36 CFR 219.12(k)(5)).**

**Vegetation Management**

The law requires that stands be adequately stocked within five years following regeneration. Stands are surveyed after three growing seasons after regeneration harvests for natural regeneration and after five years for areas planted. No stocking surveys were conducted in 2003.

**BE SURE HARVEST AREAS DON'T EXCEED MAXIMUM IN EACH PRESCRIPTION (36 CFR 219.12 (k)(5)).**

**Vegetation Management**

The Forest Plan assumed that commercial timber harvesting would occur annually on the FLNF. This did not occur in FY03, so this monitoring requirement was not an issue.

**REEVALUATE THE SUITABILITY OF LANDS IDENTIFIED AS UNSUITABLE FOR TIMBER PRODUCTION (36 CFR 219.12(k)(5)).**

**Vegetation Management**

Under NFMA, we are required to perform this reevaluation every ten years. We did not schedule the reevaluation for FY03. The current Forest Plan revision process is, in part, focused on this reevaluation.

**DETERMINE THE EXTENT AND SEVERITY OF INSECT AND DISEASE OCCURRENCE (36 CFR 219.12(k)(5)(iv)).**

**Vegetation Management**

Forest Health monitoring on National Forest lands is a joint responsibility of State and Private Forestry (S&PF) Branch and local National Forest staff. S&PF staff conducted the annual aerial survey of the FLNF in July 2003. No problems were detected.

## **DETERMINE POPULATION TRENDS OF INDICATOR SPECIES TO ESTIMATE VIABILITY (36 CFR 219.19(a)(6)).**

### **Wildlife**

FLNF Management Indicator Species (MIS) for the current Forest Plan are chestnut sided warbler, ruffed grouse, American woodcock, white-tailed deer, gray squirrel, eastern bluebird and northern goshawk. We have monitored occurrences of these 7 species on the FLNF since 1987. Due to sample size limitations, statistically significant trends are very difficult to detect for the FLNF. Observations from monitoring, however, can be made and are summarized as follows:

- A review conducted in 2000 found that occurrence of chestnut-sided warblers on the FLNF was nearly 6 times the densities found on nearby lands.
- In recent years, ruffed grouse populations are on a downward trend, contrasted to an apparent increase in American woodcock populations.
- The occurrences and populations of gray squirrel appear to remain constant.
- White-tailed deer populations seemed to increase in the late 1990's; however, that growth seems to have slowed in the past couple years.
- Eastern bluebird populations have continued to grow in the Finger Lakes region. The FLNF's increased number of bluebird nest boxes (growing from around 25 in the late 1980's to over 50 in 2003) supports the regional population growth of this bird.
- Finally, the FLNF has very limited occurrence of northern goshawk (1 to 2 breeding territories). The use of these territories has been constant in the recent past.

These and future data collected about current wildlife population trends and habitat relationships, combined with information about conservation concerns and local citizenry interest, will provide guidance for improving our wildlife-monitoring program as we revise our Forest Plan.

## **DETERMINE EFFECTS OF ADJACENT PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT ON THE FLNF, AND OF FLNF ON ADJACENT LAND FOR BETTER COORDINATION (36 CFR 219.7(f)).**

### **Air**

Landowners adjacent to the NF rarely comment on air quality issues. We are not engaged in any air resource partnerships on the Forest. Thus, there are no established partnerships.

### **Botany**

Currently, no projects involved adjacent landowners. However, volunteers have helped with NNIS surveys, and a volunteer-led garlic mustard control project is planned for FY04.

### **Fisheries**

Not applicable.

**Heritage**

The Friends of the Finger Lakes National Forest have expressed a strong desire to use Heritage sites for educational and interpretive programming. We are encouraging this enthusiasm, and hope to have tangible projects and activities in place in 2004-2005.

**Land Acquisition**

There were no land acquisitions on the FLNF in FY 03.

**Law Enforcement**

Cooperative agreements are being maintained with the Seneca and Schuyler County Sheriffs.

**Minerals**

There was no mineral activity on the FLNF in FY 03.

**Recreation**

Several key partners have assisted with regular operations and maintenance of key trails. The Finger Lakes Trail Conference, the Cayuga Trails Club and the North Country Trail Association have been longstanding partners on the Finger Lakes Trail/North Country Trail. The Cayuga Trails Club also assists on other trails, such as the Interloken Trail. The relatively new "Friends of the Forest" is developing as a strong advocate for trails on the FLNF. In FY 2003, a new partner emerged to assist with snowmobile trail maintenance. The Twin Lakes Snowmobile Club, from Trumansburg, began maintenance and grooming of a portion of the trail system.

**Soils**

Landowners adjacent to the NF rarely comment on soil resource issues. In 2003, we were engaged in no soil resource partnerships on the Forest.

**Special Uses**

Special Use Permits authorize use of National Forest System lands for a variety of uses. Recreation Special Use Permits can be for the benefit of neighboring landowners and the surrounding communities, but more commonly they are for the benefit of a larger, more general, public. Non-recreation Permits for such things as roads to private land, water systems, and other utilities are for the benefit of adjoining landowners and their communities.

**Vegetation Management**

Public comments provided in response to our timber sale proposals and subsequent environmental analyses have helped to shape our management decisions.

**Visual Resources**

Though no specific monitoring was completed, past adherence to S&Gs has prevented any significant visual effects on adjacent lands.

## **Water**

There is a variety of land-use practices on private land adjacent to the FLNF. The FLNF water quality monitoring of the grazing land has shown some evidence of elevated nutrients flowing into FLNF pasture land from adjacent private land. This could be due to agricultural practices. The National Forest will continue to monitor water quality on the FLNF to better characterize the water quality on the forest and to verify the sources of water quality problems on the FLNF.

By fully implementing S&Gs designed to provide clean water and healthy riparian areas, the FLNF will provide to adjacent landowners a good example of the value of riparian vegetation on maintaining water quality.

## **Wildlife**

The local chapter of The National Wild Turkey Federation and the Seneca/Schuyler Wildlife Management group are participants in our shrubland maintenance work.

## **DETERMINE RESEARCH NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES (36 CFR 219.28).**

### **Air**

Characterization of the effects of acid deposition on forest ecosystems on the FLNF would be beneficial. However, since this monitoring would be expensive, it is unlikely we will initiate monitoring in the foreseeable future. We will continue to stay informed on this issue by reviewing scientific literature from major universities in the Finger Lakes region, and Forest Service Research.

### **Botany**

One research need that will be addressed beginning in FY04 is the effect of timber stand improvement activities on the spread of multiflora rose (NNIS). Another need is to determine the best way to manage grazing allotments so that infestation and spread of NNIS are minimized; a literature review on this topic was completed in FY03.

### **Fisheries**

No new research needs identified.

### **Heritage**

No new research needs identified.

### **Land Acquisition**

No new research needs identified.

### **Minerals**

No new research needs identified.

## **Recreation**

As we work to revise the Forest Plan, we are examining research needs and exploring possible means to complete the work. Unfortunately, there are limited funds available for completion of this work, so opportunities for real data gathering continue to be very restricted.

## **Soils**

Public concern is growing over the effects of acid deposition on the forest ecosystem. Forest Service Research and several other entities in the northeast are working to address this broad and complex research question. A large body of research already exists on these topics, but many more years of work is needed before all the key questions related to the effects of acid deposition are answered. We share public concerns regarding acid deposition effect. We also acknowledge that much uncertainty exists over the magnitude of impacts related to forest health. Characterization of the effects of acid deposition on forest ecosystems on the FLNF would be beneficial. However, since this monitoring would be expensive, it is unlikely we will initiate monitoring in the foreseeable future. We will continue to stay informed on this issue by reviewing scientific literature from major universities in the Finger Lakes region, and Forest Service Research.

## **Special Uses**

Special Use Permits are issued occasionally to authorize research projects on National Forest system land. This will continue into the future.

## **Vegetation Management**

No new research needs identified.

## **Visual Resources**

No new research needs identified.

## **Water**

A possible research need and opportunity related to water resource on the FLNF that may be pursued in the future would involve a study of the source of phosphorus that impacts the water bodies on the Forest.

## **Wildlife**

No needed research identified.

## **DETERMINE WHETHER PUBLIC DEMANDS HAVE CHANGED SIGNIFICANTLY (36 CFR 219.10(g)).**

## **Air**

We have not identified any changes in public demands, or our ability to meet public demands in regards to air resource management. Public concern is growing over the effects of acid deposition on the forest ecosystem. Forest Service Research and several other entities in the northeast are working to address this broad and complex research question. A large body of research already exists on these topics, but many more years of work is needed before all the key questions related to the

effects of acid deposition are answered. We share public concerns regarding acid deposition effect. We also acknowledge that much uncertainty exists over the magnitude of impacts related to forest health.

### **Botany**

The public is becoming increasingly concerned about the spread of NNIS during project implementation.

### **Fisheries**

No changes have been identified.

### **Heritage**

No changes have been identified.

### **Land Acquisition**

No changes have been identified.

### **Minerals**

No changes have been identified.

### **Recreation**

Over the last two years, the forest has conducted extensive public involvement for the revision of the Forest Plan. While a significant amount of information has been received, there has been little new information that identifies any major changes in demands or trends. Much of the information has only validated previous assumptions. Recreation trends analysis being completed for the revision is also examining this issue. Preliminary analysis shows that the trend information is also consistent in that there is no startling new information.

### **Soils**

We know of no changes in public demands, our ability to meet public demands, or emerging issues or concerns.

### **Special Uses**

The public continues to expect more timely service on their Special Use Permit applications. We will continue to provide prompt, quality service to all users on the FLNF.

### **Vegetation Management**

There is currently a weak market demand for pulpwood or firewood in central New York.

### **Visual Resources**

No changes have been identified.

### **Water**

No changes have been identified.

## **Wildlife**

Several issues have been raised with regard to wildlife. The balancing of recreational pursuits with habitat requirements for some of the FLNF's wildlife is becoming more of an issue. Of particular concern are the effects of various recreational pursuits (e.g., expansion of FLNF's trail system) on nesting habitat for more reclusive species, such as the northern goshawk.

Other issues include effects of non-native invasive species (i.e., garlic mustard, multi-flora rose and knapweed) on wildlife habitat, as well as landscape change (of the Finger Lakes regions) to some of the species' habitat living on the FLNF, such as birds of early successional habitats.

## **DETERMINE WHETHER LAND CONDITIONS OR OUR ABILITY TO MEET PUBLIC DEMANDS HAVE CHANGED SIGNIFICANTLY (36 CFR 219.10(g)).**

Much discussion over Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV) is currently taking place and is being addressed through Forest Plan Revision. The Forest Service is working to address this issue with the goal of developing a new national OHV policy for field use in deciding which roads, trails and areas will be designated for OHV use. The initiative will involve policy changes to federal regulations with a draft rule scheduled for publication in the federal register by early 2004, followed by a public comment period.

## **SECTION 2: FOREST PLAN MONITORING REQUIREMENTS**

In addition to the monitoring and evaluation requirements set forth in NFMA, the FLNF Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Program sets forth additional monitoring items. Some of those were established in order to address issues that our experience has shown to be important on this Forest, while others were established in response to specific concerns for the public.

## **Recreation**

### **Describe your monitoring of All Terrain Vehicle (ATV) or Off-highway Vehicle (OHV) use on the Forest.**

Except for snowmobiles, we continue to provide limited opportunities for ATV or OHV use. We are still receiving concerns from individuals and groups about "illegal" OHV use. Many of these concerns cited specific violations, but a number came as a response to comments for the Forest Plan Revision. Despite funding limitations and the press of other priorities, we did make some progress on the issue, but more needs to be done. We continue to improve internal processes for approval of legitimate ATV use by partners, camp owners and other people with a legitimate need for motorized access. This has helped to differentiate what portion of the overall use is illegal. Despite limited funding and staffing, law enforcement patrols were increased in specific areas, which resulted in a number of violation notices being issued. It is recognized that much more work will be needed. We continue to pursue additional funding and staffing to help address this issue.

## **Vegetation Management**

### **Determine Whether Actual Harvest Per Acre Matched Projections in Plan.**

No timber harvests occurred in FY03. The Forest Plan projected an annual average timber sales program of about 400 MBF. This corresponds to offering 1 timber sale annually. This was occurring during the period of 1987 to 1993 except for 2 years when there was severe gypsy moth defoliation. In 1994, there was a change in personnel, expertise and program emphasis. While priorities switched to other resource areas, there was less emphasis in implementing the vegetation management program through timber sales.

### **Determine Whether Actual Value of Timber Matches Projections in Plan.**

No timber harvests occurred in FY03. In the past, we have monitored the costs and benefits of timber harvest activities through the Timber Sale Program Information Reporting System (TSPIRS). The report was initiated in 1987 and reports were prepared until 1999 when TSPIRS was phased out. The Forest Service has implemented a new accounting system that tracks all resource areas. Today, the timber program's emphasis is using timber harvest and timber sales as cost-effective tools for improving resource conditions on the land and consequently the primary interest is on outcomes as opposed to outputs. We have no current data to readily make the comparison to Forest Plan projections. This issue will be addressed in Forest Plan Revision.

### **Determine the Effects of Delayed Shelterwood Cuts (by agreement).**

We have used the delayed shelterwood cutting technique on a limited basis. Only one stand has been treated with the delayed shelterwood technique on the FLNF. The stand is adjacent to the Potomac Campground and it is being monitored to determine if it yields the desired benefits of protecting visual quality along a well-traveled road (e.g., the remaining overstory trees remaining healthy and oak seedlings/saplings growing well.)

The administrative study was initiated in 1993 on the Kelly Timber Sale. Researchers from the Northeastern Experimental Forest reviewed the study plan. Forty-two overstory trees were permanently tagged and measured for continued monitoring. In addition, ten regeneration plots with oak seedlings in the understory, and four permanent photo points were established. Re-measurements were conducted in 1995, 1997, 1998, 2000, 2001 and 2002.

Visual quality objectives were met with this cutting method. Healthy overstory trees continued to grow over the nine-year period. However, in 1995, many of the unhealthy trees that had been weakened by the 1992 gypsy moth defoliation did not survive. Perhaps because too many overstory trees had been retained. Although visual quality objectives had been met, the shade produced by the abundance of overstory trees appeared to prevent the understory oak seedlings from growing effectively. The monitoring has shown us that for future delayed shelterwood harvests, less overstory trees should be retained or oak regeneration cannot be assured.

**Determine if Fuelwood Cutting Becomes an Issue Again.**

In 2003, there were less than 15 cords of personal use firewood sold on the FLNF. There is currently a weak market demand for pulpwood or firewood in central New York.

**Assess Benefits and Costs of Land Acquisition (by agreement).**

No attempt was made to determine costs/benefits of land acquisition because of subjective values associated with such items as recreation experience, wildlife habitat, scenery, etc.

**Assess the Effects of FLNF Land Acquisitions on the Timber Industry (by agreement).**

There were no land acquisitions on the FLNF in FY 03.

**Determine if Maximum Harvest Area Size Should be Continued.**

No issues pertaining to harvest area size have been identified through public involvement related to project proposals and environmental analyses that indicate the maximum size should be changed at this time.

**Determine Effects of Longer (up to 150 years) Timber Sale Rotations (by agreement).**

We determined that it is not possible to monitor this issue within a 10-15 year timeframe. This is a potential issue specific to the Green Mountain National Forest and the item was not monitored in FY03 on the FLNF.

**Determine the Accuracy of Site Index Records.**

The Forest Plan assumed that silvicultural examination and inventory would be conducted annually on 10% of the FLNF. The Forest Plan also assumed that timber sales planning would be conducted annually. Verification of site index records is an activity associated with silvicultural examination.

The Forest Plan estimated that 1,400 to 2,000 acres of silvicultural inventory would be conducted annually. From 1987 to 1999 a total of 8,192 acres of forest inventory was completed. This corresponds to an average of 630 acres of forest inventory. A majority of the inventory was conducted on newly acquired lands, which were eventually allocated for range management. Most of the silvicultural inventory data for the FLNF was conducted prior to 1977. Furthermore, since timber sales were not being planned, accurate silviculture and inventory data was not a high priority.

The lack of accurate and current silvicultural inventory data for Forest Plan revision became a concern in 2001. As a result, a forester was hired for the summer to conduct silvicultural examination and inventory data for the FLNF except range management lands. Over 10,000 acres of land were inventoried. During this inventory, the forester verified existing site index information or new site index was collected.

**Assess Visual Condition of Harvested Acres.**

This was not monitored since no commercial harvest occurred in FY03.

**Determine Whether Costs and Values for Unevenaged Management Match the Project.**

This was not monitored since no commercial harvest occurred in FY03.

**Gauge Public Reaction to Unevenaged Management.**

This was not formally monitored in FY03.

**Wildlife Habitat**

**Determine Acres by Vegetative Age Class.**

The purpose of this determination is to facilitate an evaluation of how well the vegetative composition objectives set forth in the Forest Plan are being met. Our monitoring has shown that these objectives are not being met (see Table 1, Vegetative Management) and must be addressed during Forest Plan revision.

**Assess Whether the Openings Maintenance Program is Meeting Objectives.**

Wildlife issues that were raised during Forest Plan revision meetings focus on the availability, distribution and quality of various habitats resulting from various management alternatives. These issues will be addressed in Forest Plan revision.

**Special Areas**

**Determine if Uncommon and Outstanding Values are Protected.**

Our monitoring in FY03 indicated that our adherence to Forest Plan S&Gs and our continued vigilance toward protecting uncommon and outstanding values on the FLNF have been entirely successful. No such values suffered adverse effects in FY03.

**Minerals**

**Determine How Well Mineral Activities Comply with Stipulations.**

There was no mineral activity on the FLNF in FY03.

**Determine if Adequate Exploration Base is Maintained to Assure Most Major Mineral Deposits can be Discovered.**

There was no mineral activity on the FLNF in FY 03.

**SECTION 3: RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS TO THE FOREST PLAN MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROGRAM**

**Air**

The current Forest Plan M&E Program meets regulatory needs and Forest Service Manual direction. Whether or not the program needs improvement is being investigated as we revise the Forest Plan.

**Botany**

No changes are recommended at this time.

**Fisheries**

Current monitoring methods for fish populations and habitat are effective in documenting specific changes in conditions and determining trends over time and no changes are needed at this time.

**Heritage**

No specific recommendations are made at this time.

**Land Acquisition**

No changes are recommended at this time.

**Minerals**

No changes are recommended at this time.

**Recreation**

A number of recommended modifications were mentioned in earlier monitoring reports but are repeated here to provide a comprehensive list that can be used during and after Forest Plan revision. It is recommended these be carried forward until issues are resolved during Forest Plan revision.

*Recreation Use*

Reporting for the Forest Plan and Monitoring Plan should be reviewed and amended in conjunction with the development of revised national systems. The system should be relatively cost effective, easy to use and consistent with national procedures.

*Recreation Facilities*

Output tables for recreation facilities in the Forest Plan and Monitoring Plan need to be reviewed and amended. New Forest Service definitions for maintenance and rehabilitation should be used whenever feasible. A new method of setting objectives needs to be assessed and a different method of reporting partial site rehabilitation should be developed.

*Trail Maintenance*

As physical inventory and entry into national databases is completed, outputs for trail maintenance should be updated in the Forest Plan and Monitoring Plan. Outputs that are developed should conform to national standards, as they are implemented.

*Trail Construction and Rehabilitation*

Outputs and terminology for this item should be updated in conjunction with revision of outputs for trail maintenance (see item above). If a plan amendment or update is completed, the monitoring program should be adjusted to include trail rehabilitation as a valid need and activity for plan implementation.

**Soils**

As we revise the Forest Plan, we will revise the monitoring plan for the soil resource. Most importantly, within the next few years we plan to begin monitoring soil quality in

areas where management activities will result in soil disturbance. Soil quality is defined as the capacity of a soil to function within ecosystem boundaries to sustain biological productivity, maintain or enhance water and air quality, and support human health and habitation. The Forest Service has established procedures and soil quality standards by which to monitor soil quality. The standards need to be verified for the FLNF, and we must determine if additional standards are needed.

### **Special Uses**

In the ongoing Forest Plan revision effort, we are working to strengthen all levels of guidance and oversight for the Special Use Permit program. The current Forest Plan requires little in terms of monitoring and evaluation.

### **Vegetation Management**

No changes are recommended at this time.

### **Visual Resources**

The monitoring program for the visual resource will be assessed and adjusted as needed during Forest Plan revision.

### **Water**

As we revise the Forest Plan, we will revise the monitoring plan for the water resource.

### **Wildlife**

It is likely that the revised Forest Plan will have a somewhat different wildlife M&E program, although no glaring weaknesses in the current program have been identified. It appears that most of our citizenry are comfortable with how GMNF approaches wildlife M&E.

## **SECTION 4: FY 02 MONITORING AND EVALUATION REPORT FOLLOW-UP**

### **Air**

No follow up items were identified.

### **Botany**

Two action items regarding NNIS were identified in the FY02 report: one was to develop a strategy for minimizing the spread of NNIS during implementation of ground-disturbing projects, and the other was to eradicate localized populations of brown knapweed. In FY03, equipment was cleaned between sites when prescribed fire was used to maintain openings. Additional work is needed to find a feasible way of cleaning equipment that accesses grazing allotments. While no brown knapweed populations have been eradicated, more than half of the grazing allotments have been surveyed, which was the first step in knowing where to focus time and money. In addition, a literature review of prevention and treatment methods was completed. In FY04, a preliminary strategy will be developed for controlling the smallest infestations, and the remaining pastures will be surveyed. In addition, prevention strategies will be investigated.

Two action items regarding rare plants were identified in the FY02 report: one was to incorporate recommendations (from the Biological Evaluation of the existing Land and Resource Management Plan) regarding threatened, endangered, and sensitive species into the new Plan, and the other was to obtain funding to survey any wetlands not yet surveyed for rare plants. The new Land and Resource Management Plan is expected to be completed in FY05, and will incorporate recommendations from the Biological Evaluation. Funding has not yet been obtained for wetland surveys, and wetland surveys have not yet occurred.

### **Fisheries**

No follow up items were identified.

### **Heritage**

No follow up items were identified.

### **Land Acquisition**

No follow up items were identified.

### **Recreation**

It is recommended these be carried forward until issues are resolved in the plan revision effort.

#### *Recreation Use*

More work is needed on this item, but this is still a valid need and should be carried forward.

#### *Recreation Facilities*

Update Recreation Facilities Output Tables. Response to nationally mandated information requests impacted time needed to work on this item. There is still a need to complete this task.

#### *Trail Maintenance*

Trail maintenance appears to be low and the system may not totally account for new trails that were acquired. The trail system has been inventoried through Global Positioning System, and condition surveys were completed for Deferred Maintenance, but further analysis is needed to update the entire system. This should be completed in FY 2004 and beyond in conjunction with a comprehensive resource inventory system that is being implemented. Continue as an Action Item for future fiscal years.

#### *Trail Construction and Rehabilitation*

Continue work on resolving conflicting trail uses. Significant progress was made on this item. Update trail maintenance outputs. Preliminary reviews of this item were initiated and indications are that the trail system may be larger than the 32 miles currently shown on our system. Update outputs and terminology for trail construction and rehabilitation. This effort was initiated, but was disrupted by other priorities. More work is needed to refine categories and this should be finalized when practical.

### *Visuals Monitoring*

Review of visual effects on past and current timber sales should be continued as an Action Item and carried forward to FY 2004. This will allow us to determine effects of a current timber sale on the unit. Prescribed fire visual effects field monitoring was completed in FY 1999.

### *Visual Enhancement*

This review has led to further recommended actions on more comprehensive work for vista management that will continue into FY 2004 and beyond. Work was continued on a vista inventory and the district continued the mechanical opening of critical vistas near the Trail Shelter and the Blueberry Patch Campground. More work is needed into future years to complete a more comprehensive plan.

### **Soils**

No follow up items were identified.

### **Wildlife**

Section IV.A.11 - Shrub & Grassland Management & Selection of Management Indicator Species [appearing on page 64 of FY02 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Report] stated:

“The FLNF 1999 M&E Report identified the need to continue to improve our management techniques as well as refine the list of wildlife species we monitor to detect changes caused by our management. The FLNF has yet to begin a formal review and analysis. In response to up-dated planning regulations for the U.S. Forest Service, the FLNF staff will soon initiate a process for population viability reviews (this is planned for FY03). This viability analysis will provide a basis for monitoring programs.”

These population viability reviews have been completed. We utilized all available published literature and expertise from a panel of local experts to identify species of viability concern – both in the Finger Lakes region, and on the FLNF. Our Forest Plan revision work will discuss the consequences of alternative management options, to these species of viability concern.

In addition, on page 66 of the FY02 M&E Report, we display TES species as of 10/01. As of 10/02, there are no changes to the animals on that list. The list was updated 10/20/03. As shown in Appendix C of this FY03 Report, a mollusk (*Lasmigona subviridis* – green floater) and a butterfly (*Pieris virginiensis* – West Virginia White) – have been added as Regional Forester’s Sensitive Species.

## **APPENDIX A: FY03 Payments to Towns**

### **FLNF Payments in New York**

There are three types of federal payments reaching municipalities that have U.S. Forest Service land: 1) Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT); and Public Law 106-393 – **Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2001**, comprised of the 2) 25-Percent and 3) Full Payment Funds. PILT funds are directed to towns, and the Public Law 106-393 funds (either the 25-Percent or the Full Payment Funds) are directed to school districts. In New York, payments are made to counties.

### **Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT)**

The PILT, made in or around October, is based upon the acreage of Forest Service land within the subject counties during the preceding fiscal year. The payment, indexed by the inflation rate, is set by federal law at \$1.92 per acre, subject to a maximum town population figure, or cap. Congress, however, rarely appropriates the full amount of the PILT. The FY03 payments were \$1.16/ acre to Schuyler County and \$1.20/ acre to Seneca County.

### **Secure Schools Act**

The **Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2001** (Secure Schools Act) was promulgated by Congress to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to states and counties containing National Forest System lands for the benefit of schools, roads, and other purposes. Prior to the passage of the Secure Schools Act, these payments were based upon income generated by the U.S. Forest Service, typically through timber sales. As this timber sale-related income fluctuated and generally waned, communities that relied on the annual payments for the support of their schools suffered from a lack of funding stability and predictability, to the detriment of their educational systems. The Secure Schools Act severs the tie between rural school funding and timber sale income so as to offer rural school systems continual, level funding.

Current law mandates a floor for payment levels of 25 percent of forest product receipts. The law also provides for the distribution of funds above the floor based on the average of the three highest years of 25 percent payments.

**Table 2. PILT Acres by Agency**

<b>Payment In Lieu of Taxes                      Entitlement Acreage by County and Agency                      Fiscal Year 2003                      NEW YORK</b>	
County	Forest Service Acres
SCHUYLER COUNTY	10,887
SENECA COUNTY	5,225

**Table 3. Total Payments and Total Acres by State/County**

<b>Summary by State and County                      Fiscal Year 2003                      NEW YORK</b>		
County	Payment	Forest Service Acres
SCHUYLER COUNTY	\$12,643.00	10,887
SENECA COUNTY	\$6,270.00	5,225

## APPENDIX B: List of Acronyms

ATV	All-terrain vehicle
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FIA	Forest Inventory and Analysis
FLNF	Finger Lakes National Forest
FR	Forest Road
FS	Forest Service
FWS	Fish & Wildlife Service
FY	Fiscal Year
GMNF	Green Mountain National Forest
GPS	Global Positioning System
IMPROVE	Interagency Monitoring of Protected Visual Environments
LWD	Large woody debris
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MIS	Management Indicator Species
NEFES	Northeastern Forest Experimental Station
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFMA	National Forest Management Act
NNIS	Non-native invasive species
NRA	National Recreation Area
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NVUM	National Visitor Use Monitoring
OHV	Off-highway vehicle
POW	Program of work
RFSS	Regional Forester's Sensitive Species
ROS	Recreation opportunity spectrum
RVD	Recreation visitor day
S&Gs	Standards & Guidelines
SCAN	Soil Climate Analysis Network
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
TSPIRS	Timber Sale Program Information Reporting System
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
VQO	Visual Quality Objective

## APPENDIX C: FLNF Regional Forester Sensitive Species List

Federal endangered, threatened, proposed, and Regional Forester's Sensitive Species for the FLNF, October 2003.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Federal Status 2003
<i>FEDERAL ENDANGERED, THREATENED, AND PROPOSED</i>		
MAMMALS		
<i>Canis lupus</i>	Gray wolf	LT <sup>b</sup>
<i>Felis concolor cougar</i>	Eastern cougar	LE
<i>Myotis sodalis</i>	Indiana bat	LE
BIRDS		
<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	Bald eagle	LT <sup>b</sup>
REPTILES		
<i>Clemmys muhlenbergii</i>	Bog turtle	LT <sup>b</sup>
<i>REGIONAL FORESTER'S SENSITIVE SPECIES</i>		
MAMMALS		
<i>Myotis leibii</i>	Eastern small-footed myotis	S <sup>c</sup>
BIRDS		
<i>Accipiter gentilis</i>	Northern goshawk	S
<i>Ammodramus henslowii</i>	Henslow's sparrow	S
<i>Bartramia longicauda</i>	Upland sandpiper	S
<i>Circus cyaneus</i>	Northern harrier	S
MOLLUSKS		
<i>Lasmigona subviridis</i>	Green floater	S
INSECTS		
<i>Pieris virginiensis</i>	West Virginia white	S
PLANTS		
<i>Allium cernuum</i>	Wild onion	S
<i>Baptisia tinctoria</i>	Wild indigo	S
<i>Juglans cinerea</i>	Butternut	S
<i>Megalodonta beckii</i> var. <i>beckii</i>	Water-marigold	S
<i>Phegopteris hexagonoptera</i>	Broad beech fern	S
<i>Piptatherum racemosum</i>	Black-fruit mountain-ricegrass	S
<i>Veronicastrum virginicum</i>	Culver's-root	S

<sup>a</sup>Species is federally listed as endangered under the ESA.

<sup>b</sup>Species is federally listed as threatened under the ESA.

<sup>c</sup>Species is listed on the USDA Forest Service Region 9 RFSS list for FLNF.