

**TABLE 2**

**Evaluation of Treatment for Grazing Land CMU's**

(1) CMU	(2) Original Resource Concerns/Objectives	(3) Original Conditions	(4) Applied Practices (Codes)	(5) Current Conditions (Evaluation Method/Tool)	(6) Objectives/ QC Met?
2a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pasture condition (PC)</li> <li>No Cross-fencing</li> <li>Water source is remote</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PC score = 45</li> <li>Observed</li> <li>Observed</li> </ul>	472, 382, 391, 647	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PC score = 90</li> <li>Fences observed</li> <li>No change</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>No</li> </ul>
2b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Silvopasture development (wood)</li> <li>Forage increase</li> <li>No in-field water source</li> <li>Cultural resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> <li>PC score = 30</li> <li>Observed</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	528A, 382, 490, 612, 660, 645	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Observed</li> <li>PC score = 90</li> <li>No change</li> <li>???</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>No</li> <li>Unresolved</li> </ul>
2c	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conifer health/management</li> <li>Low forage production</li> <li>No firebreaks</li> <li>Remote water source (south end)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>D+3</li> <li>Value=Mod.</li> <li>Observed</li> <li>Observed</li> </ul>	528A, 666, 660	Refer to Condition and Evaluation Notes for CMU's 1a, 2c, and 3c given below	
2d	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hardwood health/management</li> <li>Stream bank trampling by cattle</li> <li>Stream sediment/animal waste</li> <li>Wildlife habitat (WH)</li> <li>No access</li> <li>Agro forest development (ginseng)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>D+1; no regen.</li> <li>Observed</li> <li>Observed</li> <li>WHE=0.3</li> <li>Observed</li> <li>Noted</li> </ul>	382, 391, 666, 472, 612, 645	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>D+4, regen obs.</li> <li>Not observed</li> <li>Not observed</li> <li>WH Eval=0.7</li> <li>???</li> <li>Observed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>No</li> <li>Yes</li> </ul>

Column 1. CMU's are delineated on the "Planning unit."

Column 2. Concerns and objectives are documented in the module on Inventory Resources.

Column 3. Original conditions from module Analyze Resources Data including abbreviated results from analysis activities. "Observed" denotes that field planner observed the presence of direct evidence of the concern on-site. "Noted" indicates that the planner verified the concern by client interview which includes actions/treatments desired by the client. "T" denotes tolerable soil erosion loss. "WEQ" stands for Wind Erosion Equation; "RUSLE2" stands for Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation. "PC" refers to a pasture condition rating (scale of 0-100 with 100 being best condition). "WHE" is wildlife habitat score on a scale of 0 to 1 with 1 being highest value.

- Column 4. Planned practices from the module on Decision Support. In numerical order, the codes are: 311-Alley Cropping, 328-Conservation Crop Rotation, 342-Critical Area Planting, 380-Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment, 382-Fence, 391-Riparian Forest Buffer, 394-Firebreak, 395- Stream Habitat Improvement and Management, 396- Fish Passage, 472-Use Exclusion, 490-Forest Site Preparation, 528A-Prescribed Grazing, 560-Access Road, 580-Streambank and Shoreline Protection, 595-Pest Management, 601-Vegetative Barrier, 603-Herbaceous Wind Barrier, 612-Tree/Shrub Establishment, 645-Upland Wildlife Habitat Management, 647- Early Successional Habitat Development/Mgt, 655- Forest Trails and Landings, 660- Tree/Shrub Pruning, 666- Forest Stand Improvement.
- Column 5. Current conditions 10 years after planning date. Refer to Condition and Evaluation Notes for CMU's 1a, 2c, and 3c
- Column 6. Status of objectives and quality criteria.

### **Condition and Evaluation Notes for CMU's 1a, 2c, and 3c**

#### **CMU 1a Notes:**

- WEQ calculations indicate soil erosion by wind equals about 2 tons/acre/year.
- The client reports that crop seedling damage has been greatly reduced and is satisfied with crop production.
- The client reports that implementing the agro forestry (windbreak) has controlled soil erosion as indicated by absence of "blow out" areas, no pedestal formation associated with crop plants, and insignificant depositions downwind.
- The client reports that upland birds have increased from 10 years ago. The main activity is in and the along the edge of the windbreak. Some activity occurs in the herbaceous wind barriers. Some hunting was begun 2 years ago but has yet to develop into a fee hunting operation.

#### **CMU 2c Notes:**

- The conifer stand was thinned to D+8. Current measurements indicate an average diameter of 15" and an average spacing of 22 feet between trees.
- Forage condition has increased to a rating of \_\_\_\_
- Spacing of the conifers, herbaceous forage production, and the condition of adjacent units has lessened the risk of wildfire to acceptable levels.
- Livestock water has been available ever since the spring and water facility were developed.

#### **CMU 3c Notes:**

- The canopy of small conifers has not yet closed. Small, open patches of shrubs and herbaceous are scattered throughout the stand and amount to about 5 percent of the unit.
- Roads, skid trails and landings have been vegetated and water barred. No appreciable amounts of sediment are reaching ephemeral or intermittent water courses or Noname Creek.
- WHE has increased to .7 to .75.
- Roads, reduction of slash and debris flammability, and condition of young conifers has lessened the risk of wildfire to acceptable levels.