



File Code: 1900/2200

Date: July 23, 2001

Route To: Assistant Forest Supervisors: Richard J. Cook & Kimberley Johnson
District Rangers: Pat A. Kowalewycz, Kenneth L. Rago, Marlinton/WS District
Ranger, & Liz M. Schuppert

Subject: **Range Monitoring - Camp Bright Allotment**
Fiscal Year 2000 Review & Evaluation

To: Forest Supervisor

As part of the Forest's annual monitoring efforts, the following individuals participated in the monitoring of the Camp Bright Grazing Allotment on July 20, 2000:

Interdisciplinary Team

Terry Evans
Laura Hise
Harry Pawelczyk
Gary Willison

Title

Wildlife Biologist
Assistant Forest Planner
Forest Range Program Manager
Former Forest Planner

Location

Camp Bright is a 24-acre allotment located along Stuart Memorial Drive (FR 91), about seven miles from Elkins, WV, between Spruce Run and Western Run. It is in the Bear Heaven Opportunity Area (OA 13.011) and governed by Forest-wide and Management Prescription 3.0 direction (Forest Plan, pp. 51, 60-63, 82a-82b, 127-130, 136-138, Appendix P; pp. 56-57, 70-71, 79-80, 83-84, 87, 96-97, 100, 131, 140).

History

This allotment was under permit for grazing from 1983 to 1991. It was inactive between 1991 through 1993. From 1994 to 1998, Dr. Joseph Marshall had a five-year, term permit; and in 1999 and 2000, he has been issued a temporary, one-year permit to graze three to five horses from May 30th to October 1st.



Figure 1. View of the Camp Bright Grazing Allotment.

The last National Environmental Policy Act documentation completed in regards to the Camp Bright Allotment occurred during the analysis of the Bear Haven Opportunity Area in 1988. In the Bear Haven Decision Notice of September 26, 1988, authorization was given to continue grazing the allotment and to lime, fertilize, and control brush on the allotment.

In 1994, the allotment's condition was reassessed and a range allotment management plan (AMP) was completed (see Cheat District 2200 Files). During the development of this AMP, the NEPA process was initiated. Public scoping was conducted and the following items were assessed: (1) the allotment's history; (2) its existing condition as of Fall 1993; and (3) improvements that could be implemented to move the allotment towards its desired future condition. A summary of environmental effects and an official decision document were never completed to conclude the NEPA process.

Resources Monitored & Observations

The following pages list the questions the interdisciplinary team (ID Team) sought to answer and summarizes the ID Team's observations:

1. How often has the condition of the allotment been checked?

The last inspection of the Camp Bright Allotment was performed September 13, 1999, when information on the allotments fences, water trough, etc. was collected for the Forest's infrastructure database (Pawelczyk field notes). Although additional monitoring and compliance reviews of the allotment may have occurred, no documentation exists between June 27, 1996, and September 13, 1999.

As with other allotments on the Forest, compliance reviews were conducted and recorded on Inspection Report Forms at least one or more times in previous years (for Camp Bright -- 1994, 1995, and 1996). However, as range funding and personnel have been reduced or reorganized, inspections of allotments have declined, have not been documented, or have ceased altogether.

2. What is the vegetative condition of the allotment at the time of this monitoring as compared to the conditions described in the 1994 AMP? How have things changed over time?

Ground cover in the allotment is good, although some bare, or sparsely covered, areas exist, such as around the mineral feeders and mineral blocks. The Camp Bright pasture qualifies as a native



Figure 2. Vegetative condition of the Camp Bright Allotment on July 20, 2000.

bluegrass pasture, but it contains many other species of lesser forage value. The existing condition of the pasture is similar to that described in the 1994 AMP; but the vegetation condition within the riparian area has greatly improved since a fence was built around it (AMP, p. 3 and Attachment #1, Existing Vegetation in the Camp Bright Allotment).

Compared to other allotments on the Forest, this allotment is in good condition. This is most likely because the permit holder brush hogs the allotment to prevent maple, locust, hawthorn, autumn olive, multi-flora rose, and greenbrier and blackberry from spreading in the allotment. Records show the permit holder has also fertilized the allotment and constructed the corral with materials supplied by the Forest Service.

Signs of deer, rabbit, and ground hog activity were observed in the allotment. Other species that use grassy openings and edge habitat (e.g. featured species in the Grey Squirrel and White-tailed Deer Associations) also are likely using and benefiting from this allotment's existing vegetative conditions (Forest Plan, L-2).

3. What is the season of grazing and grazing system being used? What is the grazing capacity?

A continuous grazing system is being used, generally from May 15 to October 1st of each year. The 1994 AMP estimated the allotment's grazing capacity at 18 Animal Unit Months (AUMs); however, up to 22 AUMs have been permitted in past years. Although it was difficult to fully assess the allotment's vegetative condition because grasses had recently been brush hogged, it appears the allotment is adequately supporting additional use. More AUMs may be authorized if growing conditions are favorable and especially if liming and fertilizing is implemented.



Figure 3. Horses graze the Camp Bright Allotment.

4. Are annual operating plans being implemented? Are they having the desired effect?

The ID Team found that four of the six items identified in the 2000-operating plan had not been fully implemented since the date of the last inspection (see Table A). However, the permit holder has until October 1st to accomplish some items, and they may be completed later in the grazing season.

Table A: Assessment of Compliance with the Camp Bright Calendar Year 2000 Operating Plan.

	<u>Operating Plan Requirements</u>	<u>Findings Regarding Compliance</u>	<u>Recommendations</u>
1.	Check and repair exterior fences and gates. Remove debris from fences. Place cut woody materials outside the allotment.	The fence is aging (e.g. some posts are rotting and wire is rusting), but it is still functioning properly because of the maintenance performed by the permit holder. Woody material has been placed both outside and inside the allotment.	Insure rotting posts are replaced; additional posts are added; and debris is removed from the allotment.
2.	Check water sources to determine that they are operating. Keep inlet and outlet lines open and trough clean.	The overflow line is plugged, and the water is mucky. Water flowing over the edge of the trough is washing soil and gravel away from the backside of the trough.	Have the line unplugged and trough cleaned. Have large stone placed on the backside of the trough to repair and prevent further erosion.
3.	Place 4 horses on the allotment May 30 th . Remove all livestock by October 1 st .	Five horses, rather than four, were on the allotment at the time of the July inspection. The existing vegetation would support additional horses during this grazing season. However, the permit holder has not been authorized to graze an additional horse, nor has he paid for the additional grazing fee.	Contact permit holder and make appropriate adjustments in billing or in the number of horses.
4.	Check and repair the holding/loading pen as needed.	The holding pen is in satisfactory condition.	No action needed.
5.	Check and repair mineral feeders as needed. Move as needed to prevent vegetation and soil loss from around the feeder. Place mineral feeders well away from water sources. Provide mineral supplements and in approved feeders only.	The permit holder is not using the existing mineral feeder. Rather, a mineral block is placed on the ground near the allotment entrance. Both the feeder and the mineral block are located well away from the water source, but they are not being moved frequently. Vegetation has been eradicated from these sites; soil is eroding locally.	Have permit holder place mineral block in the mineral feeder, move the feeder to a new location, and revegetate the disturbed soils and mulch. Ensure the permit holder moves the feeder regularly.
6.	Place gravel around the cement water trough to harden this area and to repair the undermining of the trough.	This has not been implemented so far. Soil movement is occurring around the tank.	As previously mentioned, large stone should be placed on the backside of the trough. Also, smaller rock should be placed around the rest of the trough.

5. Were the projects that were identified in the AMP implemented? Were implemented projects executed as planned? If not, what changes were made and why? Did implemented projects have the anticipated effects?

The ID Team found that less than 50% of the projects identified in the AMP had been implemented as of the July 2000 inspection (see Table B). Those that have been implemented were executed within the general framework that was planned, but not necessarily the year predicted. Implemented projects had the desired effects.

Table B: Assessment of AMP project implementation in the Camp Bright Allotment.

	<u>Project/Year to Complete</u>	<u>Findings Regarding Compliance</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
1.	Gravel/soil for around trough/1994	Completed at some point since AMP, but needed again.	Have permit holder add stone to prevent soil from washing away from trough.
2.	Gate replacement & ladder step repair/1994	Gate was replaced. A ladder step isn't needed because the corral provides passage gates.	No action needed.
3.	Corral construction/1994	Completed.	No action needed.
4.	Grazing allotment sign/1994	Completed.	No action needed.
5.	Remove debris and non-historical structures/1995	Not completed entirely.	Have the permit holder remove debris (including scrap metal, old gates near the salt box, etc.) that are unsightly and pose safety concerns. The structure previously serving the shooting range is not easily accessible due to multi-flora rose and brush, is not readily visible, and could be left in place to deteriorate on its own.
6.	Fence maintenance/yearly	Completed, however, some posts are deteriorating.	Work with permit holder to replace rotting posts and/or add additional posts for support.
7.	Fence replacement/as needed	Not completed because it hasn't been needed.	See above.
8.	Salt box purchase or construction/as needed	Completed.	As has been a problem in the past, soil displacement and compaction has occurred around the existing salt box (see 1994 AMP). The permit holder needs to revegetate disturbed soils and must move the box frequently to avoid soil impacts in the future.
9.	Maintenance of bird boxes/monitor/as needed	Not completed.	Have wildlife staff implement as funding allows.
10.	Brush hogging/1994, 1995, 1997	Completed.	Complete as needed.
11.	Liming/Optional as needed	Not completed.	Have permit holder test soils to determine if, or how much, lime is currently needed.
12.	Fertilizing/Optional as needed	Completed.	Have permit holder test soils to determine if, or how much fertilizer is currently needed.
13.	Hawthorn tree release/1995	Not clear if it has been done; hasn't been completed recently.	Coordinate with the WVDNR manager to complete.
14.	Seeding/1995 if needed	Not completed.	Have permit holder seed and mulch disturbed areas where saltbox has been located. As funding allows, work with holder to seed other bare or sparsely vegetated areas in the allotment.
15.	Soil analysis/as needed	Completed in 1994.	Have permit holder test soil to assess existing condition prior to liming/fertilizing.
16.	Pruning fruit trees/as needed	Not completed recently.	Ask WVDNR manager to complete.
17.	Control encroaching trees/vegetation/if needed.	Completed in areas accessible with a brush hog.	Have permit holder continue to brush hog the allotment.

Table B: Assessment of AMP project implementation in the Camp Bright Allotment.

	<u>Project/Year to Complete</u>	<u>Findings Regarding Compliance</u>	<u>Recommendation</u>
18.	Verify appropriate vegetation height of orchard grass in key areas before, during, and after grazing.	Not completed.	Have FS representative establish photo points of controlled and grazed areas. As funding allows, measure and document grass heights.
19.	Install animal escape ramps in the water trough.	Not needed.	Trough is made of rough concrete and animals can climb out.
20.	Slash created by removing/trimming cherry trees should be moved outside the boundary fence.	Some slash has been placed outside the allotment fence, while some (not necessarily cherry) has been piled inside the fence.	Have permit holder to pile slash outside the allotment fence.
21.	Develop annual operating plans.	Completed.	Improve FS enforcement of annual operating plans.
22.	Inspect allotments at least three times per year to measure vegetation height in key areas; monitor movement of salt boxes, livestock use and distribution, etc.	Not completed in recent years.	Have FS representative inspect allotments as funding allows.
23.	Use Allotment Inspection Report to document monitoring findings. Encourage permit holder to participate during the inspection.	Not completed in recent years.	Have FS representative implement as funding permits.
24.	Permit holder will notify FS when animals enter and are removed from the allotment.	Not completed on a regular basis.	Improve compliance.
25.	Permit holder will keep records of actual livestock use and dates of use, and submit to the Cheat Ranger District within 30 days after the end of the grazing season.	Not completed by permit holder and only occasionally by Forest Service.	If still appropriate, improve compliance; or drop as a requirement.
26.	Establish photo points. Photos should be taken every year to illustrate trends in range condition.	Not completed.	Have a FS representative implement as funding permits.
27.	FS biologist will monitor allotment's condition to assess how management and improvements are maintaining and enhancing the allotment.	Has occurred intermittently in the past, but not on a routine basis.	Implement as funding permits.

6. What was the condition of the road in 1994? What is the condition of the road now?

One unclassified road exists in the allotment. The 1994 AMP didn't discuss road conditions in detail. Currently, the road is unimproved, partially vegetated, and has some ruts with exposed soil. Some local soil movement and erosion has occurred, but has not impacted riparian areas. The ID Team recommends that the following work be done to the road and to the area above the water trough to prevent soil movement--

- (a) Add gravel to ruts in the road, as needed;
- (b) Create water bars on livestock trails near the water trough to prevent sediment impacts to the nearby stream.

7. Has the allotment been managed according to forest-wide standards and guidelines? Are changes in standards/guidelines needed?

Table C identifies the applicable standards and guidelines and describes the ID Teams' observations and recommendations.

Table C: Assessment of Forest Plan Standards/Guidelines Compliance.

Forest Plan Page #/FSM Reference	General Direction	Forest-wide Standard/Guideline	Status	Need for Change in Standard?	Recommendation for Management
p. 51/1560	H. Cooperate in range management.	1. The Forest Service will coordinate with Forest Service State and Private Forestry, Forest Service Research, the Soil Conservation Service, the Extension Service, West Virginia Department of Natural Resources, West Virginia Department of Agriculture, West Virginia University, and other interested agencies, organizations, institutions and individuals to pool management expertise, promote sound practices, and coordinate management efforts in range resource management.	Cooperation occurred during the development of the 1994 AMP and as needed since then. This S&G is commonly implemented for range management across the Forest. For example (1) Tygart Valley Soil & Water Conservation District work in Coberly Sods; (2) WVU expertise provided for Tingler Allotments' management; (3) Ruffed Grouse Society and DNR helped release Hawthorn on Fornash Allotment; (4) WVU graduate student study of forage production & bird use of various densities of hawthorn on allotments).	Yes. Change SCS to NRCS.	Continue coordination as needed.
p. 56/1950	A. A decision to implement any action that could affect resources, land uses, and environmental quality shall be preceded by an Environmental Analysis...	3. Projects...will receive Environmental Analysis consideration appropriate to their magnitude and complexity. Also see S&Gs #4-6.	NEPA decisions are needed to accomplish improvements on this, and many other allotments on the Forest. Scoping was conducted during the development of the Camp Bright	No.	(1) Establish criteria to prioritize the range NEPA workload. (2) Seek funds to prepare or revise AMPs and NEPA. (3) Streamline the NEPA process (e.g. use categorical exclusions for projects that are routinely

Table C: Assessment of Forest Plan Standards/Guidelines Compliance.

Forest Plan Page #/FSM Reference	General Direction	Forest-wide Standard/Guideline	Status	Need for Change in Standard?	Recommendation for Management
			of the Camp Bright AMP; but as is the case with many other allotment plans, the NEPA process was never finalized.		implemented and don't result in adverse effects; conduct one NEPA analysis for multiple allotments--lump them by LTA, ELT, or another means).
p. 60-61/2210	A. Open areas will be maintained for visual, wildlife, and forage purposes. Grazing shall be one means of accomplishing this purpose and shall be used where practical and efficient.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allotment management plans will be prepared and maintained on all grazing allotments commensurate with the planned intensity of management. The objectives of such allotment management plans are to foster maintenance and improvement of the basic soil, water, and forage resources. Lands will be coordinated with livestock production systems in use on associated lands to achieve balanced and sound management. Involvement of the permittees in the preparation of allotment plans is desirable. 2. Establish grazing capacities based on sound range inventory and analysis processes, establish forage utilization guidelines for various grazing management systems, land capabilities, and the objectives of the appropriate Management Prescription. 3. The amount of forage to be utilized annually for livestock will not exceed the total available forage less the annual forage needs of wildlife. 	Range funding limits the Forest's ability to comply with these guidelines. Most allotments have AMPs; but most need to be updated. Those AMPs (such as the Camp Bright AMP) that have been completed comply with these guidelines.	No.	<p>Seek funding and personnel to conduct necessary NEPA analyses and complete AMPs.</p> <p>Efficiently use funds by concentrating them on those allotments that contain the most productive soil types and have the most potential to provide forage for cattle and wildlife.</p>

Table C: Assessment of Forest Plan Standards/Guidelines Compliance.

Forest Plan Page #/FSM Reference	General Direction	Forest-wide Standard/Guideline	Status	Need for Change in Standard?	Recommendation for Management
p. 61/2210	A. Provide grazing opportunities.	1. Preference for grazing opportunities will be given to local, resident landowners. A lottery will be used to select between equally qualified applicants.	<p>Existing permit holders have priority to have expired permits reissued, unless they violate permit terms.</p> <p>For allotments that have been vacated, the Forest has used a competitive bid process like that described on page 15, #4 of FSM 2200-95-1, which states: "Grazing fees are set by competitive bid for new grazing allotments, including ...permits vacated or terminated by an existing permittee. The highest bid received must establish the base grazing value in the initial year of the grazing permit."</p> <p>Under this process, local residents are still likely to obtain the permit (the Forest rarely receives bids from non-residents), but grazing fees are greater. When a term permit is issued, grazing fees can be combined (using fee credits) with appropriated dollars to fund improvements.</p>	Optional.	S&G A (1) does not have to be changed, but could be reworded to recognize the use of competitively bid fee systems.

Table C: Assessment of Forest Plan Standards/Guidelines Compliance.

Forest Plan Page #/FSM Reference	General Direction	Forest-wide Standard/Guideline	Status	Need for Change in Standard?	Recommendation for Management
		2. Convert existing special use pasture permits to grazing permits where the land area can logically be managed as a grazing allotment.	All special use permit pastures have been converted except one.	Optional	It could be deleted entirely.
		3. Range permits should be issued for a ten-year term.	Most permits aren't issued for ten years because the Forest has been reluctant to issue term permits without completing necessary NEPA process.	No.	Obtain funding and personnel to conduct necessary analyses and issue term permits.
		4. Grazing areas under permit are available for dispersed type recreation.	Although motorized vehicle use may be restricted on some allotments, all allotments are available for dispersed recreation.	No.	None.
		5. Where appropriate in Management Prescriptions, develop additional areas for livestock production based on land capability, cost effectiveness, resource condition, the needs of other resources, and expected demand.	Although some allotments have been expanded (e.g. Elk Mtn), few new allotments have been established for livestock production because the Forest can't fund management of existing allotments.	No.	This S&G is permissive; it doesn't require the development of additional areas if conditions are not appropriate. However, given known funding, it isn't likely to be implemented often.
p. 62-63/2240	A. Where appropriate in Management Prescriptions, improve existing range allotments by instituting more refined grazing systems, applying lime and fertilizer where needed, seeding to improve vegetation	<p>1. Introduction of legumes into pastures will be emphasized over application of nitrogen fertilizer, and revegetation activities will encourage vegetative diversity where practical.</p> <p>2. Soil supplements will be added to grazing areas only after soil analysis, and activities causing changes in vegetative patterns will consider sound principles of landscape management</p>	As is true with management of other allotments--funding is lacking to (1) introduce legumes; (2) add soil supplements; (3) manage brush invasion; and (4) balance warm and cool season grasses on the Camp Bright	No.	Funding is needed to implement these guidelines.

Table C: Assessment of Forest Plan Standards/Guidelines Compliance.

Forest Plan Page #/FSM Reference	General Direction	Forest-wide Standard/Guideline	Status	Need for Change in Standard?	Recommendation for Management
	quality and selectively controlling undesirable vegetation.	<p>principles of landscape management.</p> <p>3. Hawthorn should not dominate productive grazing soil, but does have a place in the management scheme. See Hawthorn Management Standards, Appendix P, for details.</p> <p>4. When there is a seeding opportunity, try to obtain a balance of warm season and cool season grasses to provide a rotation opportunity and prevent monoculture conditions.</p> <hr/> <p>5. Most spring developments will be protected either by head-boxes and/or fencing of bog and seep areas. Corrals, loading chutes, watering troughs, and other similar livestock handling facilities will be located on well-drained ground and on soils that will withstand the degree of use planned. Structural range improvements will be maintained to an established standard.</p> <hr/> <p>6. Walk-through gates, stiles, or other devices, will be installed in fences that bisect system trails.</p> <hr/> <p>7. Improvements that invite concentrated livestock use such as corrals, saltboxes, and creep feeders will be located at least 100 feet from live streams.</p>	<p>Allotment.</p> <p>However, for some allotments, such as Camp Bright, the permit holder is accomplishing some of this type of work.</p> <hr/> <p>S&G #5 is being applied on the Camp Bright Allotment and other allotments as range funding allows. Structural range improvements are being maintained fairly well in the Camp Bright Allotment, but this isn't true for all allotments on the Forest.</p> <hr/> <p>Item #6 doesn't apply to the Camp Bright, but is met on other allotments, as applicable.</p> <hr/> <p>Item #7 is being adhered to on Camp Bright and most other allotments.</p>	<p></p> <hr/> <p>No.</p> <hr/> <p>No.</p> <hr/> <p>No.</p>	<p></p> <hr/> <p>Seek funding to do more to correct existing soil or riparian concerns. Seek funding and personnel for compliance checks to ensure structural improvements are maintained properly.</p> <p>The past reorganization and establishment of biological technician positions likely will help improve compliance.</p> <hr/> <p>None.</p> <hr/> <p>None.</p>

Table C: Assessment of Forest Plan Standards/Guidelines Compliance.

Forest Plan Page #/FSM Reference	General Direction	Forest-wide Standard/Guideline	Status	Need for Change in Standard?	Recommendation for Management
		8. Streams will be fenced from cattle except for selected access points, when a streamside zone condition survey indicates unacceptable resource damage will occur. Stream access points will be selected for stream bank and channel stability and further stabilization of the access point will be accomplished if needed.	In regards to #8, the riparian area of Camp Bright was fenced some time ago and vegetation is responding well. As funding becomes available, noticeable progress is being made in regards to this standard.	No.	Obtain funding to do more fencing and harden access points.
		9. A minimum 25-foot filter strip will be maintained between applications of lime and fertilizer and watercourses, both permanent and intermittent.	If lime and fertilizer has been applied, it has not been well documented. If it is applied, this would be followed.	No.	None.
		10. Rotational grazing will be encouraged as the dominant grazing system to assure balancing of use over the allotment, avoiding overuse of the most desirable areas, and to allow regrowth of the most desirable forage species.	Because of its small size and single water source, continuous grazing is the most practical for Camp Bright. Although rotational grazing has been encouraged, it hasn't been implemented on every allotment because of few funds to build interior fences and lack of well-distributed water sources.	Optional.	This standard is permissive in that it doesn't require rotational grazing. However, it could be reworded to de-emphasize the use of rotational grazing--given what we've learned since the plan was approved, rotational grazing isn't necessarily appropriate as the dominant method on every allotment.
p. 63/2240	B. Provide leadership in range resource management by demonstrating proper procedures, techniques, and emphasis.		Lack of funding and personnel restricts the Forest's ability to be a leader in range management, to establish strong relationships with permit holders or	No.	Obtain funding. Do the best feasible given limited time and funds.

Table C: Assessment of Forest Plan Standards/Guidelines Compliance.

Forest Plan Page #/FSM Reference	General Direction	Forest-wide Standard/Guideline	Status	Need for Change in Standard?	Recommendation for Management
			to develop cooperative agreements or partnerships with interested parties.		
p.79/2500	A. Protect water and soil resources...Minimize non-point pollution to the maximum extent, technically and economically feasible...	2. To maintain surface water temperature within the habitat range for fish species and protect the aquatic habitat, shade strips will be required on perennial streams in forested areas. 5. Erosion prevention and control measures will be considered in all program and project plans which may reduce soil productivity or cause erosion.	This guideline is being followed. See other responses.	No.	See previous recommendations in regards to riparian and soil improvements.
p. 84/2670	Management will protect or enhance habitat for threatened and endangered species and consider the needs of species identified as special or unique.	1. Management of habitat critical to endangered and threatened wildlife and fish species is considered the first priority management activity... 3. Sensitive, unique, or special plants or animals will be considered in the design of projects...	See page 9 of the Camp Bright AMP. A District Biologist surveyed the allotment and no threatened, endangered, or sensitive species were identified. Also, see the Biological Evaluation of 12-27-93.	No.	None.
p. 87/2670	Sensitive wildlife species will be afforded the highest possible protection commensurate with other appropriate uses/benefits.	1. A survey for sensitive species will be done during and as part of normal project reconnaissance and design.	See above response regarding threatened and endangered species.	No.	None.
p. 87/2670	C. Riparian Management will protect and enhance habitat for wildlife species and consider the needs for species identified as Threatened, Endangered, Special, Unique.	1. Endangered bat foraging habitat includes riparian land and vegetation approximately 100 feet wide along both sides of streams, which are at least 30 feet wide as of June 15. Included are aquatic ecosystems, floodplains, riparian ecosystems, and wetlands.	Riparian habitat in the Camp Bright Allotment has been fenced out and is recovering.	No.	None.

8. Has the allotment been managed according to MP 3.0 guidelines? Are changes in standards/guidelines needed?

Table D identifies the applicable standards and guidelines and describes the ID Teams' observations and recommendations.

Table D: Assessment of Management Prescription 3.0 Standards/Guidelines Compliance.					
FSM Ref.	General Direction	MP 3.0 Standard/Guideline	Status	Need for Change in Standard?	Recommendation
p. 130/2200	A. Management of open areas will be for livestock grazing and only secondary consideration will be given to other uses. Intensive management for livestock grazing may occur.	NA	This standard is being implemented on the Camp Bright Allotment and other MP 3.0 areas. The intensity of grazing is restricted because funds are not available to make improvements (e.g. liming, fertilizing, fence for rotational grazing, etc.).	No.	None.
p. 136/2620	A. Squirrel and associated species will be emphasized in oak-hickory stands assigned to this MP. Deer and associated species will benefit in other types.		See page 1 of this report. Species associated with the Grey Squirrel and White-tailed Deer Associations are benefiting from the condition of the Camp Bright Allotment.	No.	None.
p. 136/2630	A. Wildlife habitat will be managed in cooperation with Department of Natural Resources.	1. Permanent openings will be created and maintained in coordination with other resources projects, to provide an element of vegetation diversity...grazing may be used for the maintenance of permanent openings.	See previous response to the Forest-wide guideline for cooperation (p. 51/1560).	No.	None.
		3. Trees and shrubs with a high value for wildlife habitat (e.g., fruit trees) may be maintained by planting, release, and pruning.	This has not been done on Camp Bright in recent years.	No.	Ask WVDNR area manager to check and prune fruit trees and hawthorn as needed.

9. Did any barriers exist that prevented implementation of some approved projects?

The two primary barriers that have prevented improvements from being made in the Camp Bright Allotment are the same two that also have prevented improvements from being implemented on other allotments across the Forest—

- (1) Lack of funding to accomplish the Forest's range program;
- (2) The way range duties used to be distributed among various District employees (who had other major programs to accomplish).

In the past, the Assistant District Rangers or District Wildlife Biologist (and in some cases, technicians) was responsible for managing the range program on their respective Districts. This distribution of responsibilities made it difficult to fund District personnel for enough days to properly administer the range program of work; and resulted in inconsistent management across District boundaries in regards to addressing range issues and implementing approved projects.

To address these barriers, the Forest recently placed all of the range program responsibilities under one position—the Forest Range Program Manager. This change is expected to improve accountability and strengthen program continuity and leadership. However, funding is still inadequate to—

- (1) Complete the backlog of needed projects;
- (2) Prepare the AMPs and NEPA analyses for all allotments;
- (3) Strengthen relationships with permit holders to ensure compliance with permit and operating plan terms; and
- (4) Establish partnerships with interested parties to supplement appropriated range dollars. For example, the permit holder for Camp Bright has asked to receive fee credits for liming and fertilizing the allotment. However, there's not enough of a grazing fee generated from 5 horses, 4.5 months/year, to give fee credits for these projects, and fee credits are normally used for structural improvements.

10. What are the ramifications of inadequate range funding?

The following are ramifications of not adequately funding the Forest's range program:

- Little movement towards the desired future conditions identified in the Forest Plan. At best, existing conditions (not improvement) are being maintained; but most often, forage conditions have declined across the Forest.
- Continued loss of non-forested, herbaceous habitat for early seral wildlife species.
- Spiraling decline in range funding due to gradual decrease in AUMs produced annually.

Summary of Recommendations

Based on their knowledge of management on the Camp Bright Allotment (as well as other Forest allotments) the ID Team recommends the following items to improve range allotment conditions across the Forest:

- * Increase efforts to conduct and document allotment inspections. Diligently report permit compliance or non-compliance and take any necessary actions to sustain permit compliance.
- * Increase efforts to monitor vegetation trends. This information is needed to determine if Forest Plan objectives are being achieved and standards are being met.
- * Encourage permit holders to brush hog. Brush hogging appears to be a key to maintaining, or possibly improving, allotments' desirable forage vegetation.
- * Encourage permit holders (or seek funding) to lime, fertilize, and re-seed allotments (as necessary) to help move allotments towards desired future vegetative condition.
- * Seek additional money to fund the projects and personnel needed to administer permits and improve allotment conditions: either through appropriated dollars, Knutson-Vandenberg dollars, fee credits, or partnerships with non-profit organizations, communities, permit holders, etc.
- * Invest energy to complete the appropriate level of environmental analyses and AMPs for all allotments lacking up-to-date documentation. This would result in multiple benefits: the ability to (1) issue term permits; (2) implement improvement projects; (3) allow the use of fee credits to make improvements; (4) gain efficiencies in annual program administration (e.g. fewer permits to issue each year since ten year permits could be used).
- * Consider creating a standard/guideline that addresses exotic, invasive, non-native, and/or noxious weed species management. Given the increased knowledge about the adverse effects of exotic plant species, such a standard may be helpful for allotment management.

/s/ Laura Hise

Laura Hise
Forest Integrated Resource Analyst

/s/ Harry Pawelczyk

Harry Pawelczyk
Forest Range Program Manager



Figure 4. Campbright Allotment in July 2000.

Attachment 1

Existing Vegetation in the Camp Bright Allotment*

Desirable Forage	Lesser Forage Value
Orchard grass	Stinging nettle
Red clover	Multi-flora rose
White clover	Autumn olive
Creeping red fescue	Nightshade
Wild oat grass	Violets
Foxtail	Black-eyed Susan
Crabgrass	Sweet vernal grass
	Queen Anne's lace
	Goldenrod
	Mullen
	Canadian thistle
	Daisies
	Plantain
	Yarrow
	Moss
	Wild strawberry
	Blackberry
	Aster
	Mint
	Wood sorrel
	Wild rose
	Cinquefoil
	Greenbrier
	Buckthorn

* Note: This is not a complete listing of all the species on the allotment. Other species were present during the July 2000 inspection; however, recent brush hogging and lack of expertise prevented the ID Team from identifying them all.

Maple, locust, hawthorn, and apple trees exist inside the fenced riparian area, along the allotment's perimeter fence, and in other areas not accessible by a brush hog. Brush hogging has been completed in recent years and appears to be controlling dense greenbrier and blackberry patches, which were observed throughout the allotment in 1993 (see AMP, p. 3). The allotment continues to have about 20 acres of pasture and 4 acres of forested area.