Attachment J
California Regional Water Quality Control Board
Lahontan Region

Effectiveness Monitoring Form

Categories 5 and 6
This form and associated monitoring must be completed soon after the winter period, between March 15 and June 15, and submitted to Water Board by July 15
Please type or print clearly in ink

Effectiveness monitoring: is a visual evaluation of management measures (e.g., erosion control structures) and infrastructure (e.g., roads and watercourse crossings) within the activity area following the winter period, typically between March 15 and June 15, to determine the effectiveness of implemented management measures in preventing sediment discharge to surface waters and protecting water quality, and to identify any points of sediment delivery that may have developed during the winter. Effectiveness monitoring and reporting is required annually for the duration of the timber harvest and vegetation management activities and one spring season following completion of timber harvest and vegetation management activities.

As soon as possible, following the winter period, inspect the activity area and complete this form or report containing equivalent information. However, do not access the site if soils are saturated, if significant environmental impacts would result from road system use, or if worker safety would be compromised.

Management measures are considered to be effective if they result in compliance with the provisions and conditions contained in the Timber Waiver. The landowner should focus on the following areas and inspect them for signs of sediment delivery to watercourses.

1. **Activity/Plan Name:** _____

   WDID Number: _____

2. **Inspector's name and title:** _____

   Date of inspection: _____

3. **Weather Observations and Precipitation Levels:** Complete the following based on site-specific observations and/or local weather data.

Accumulated precipitation this season: _____inches of ☐ Rain ☐ Snow (This information may be obtained at the following webpage: http://water.weather.gov/)
Additional notes on weather and precipitation:

Inspect all the following areas and infrastructure within the activity area once conditions allow.

Use the box spaces following each area listed below to indicate whether such areas exist within the activity area, if they were inspected, if they were not accessible for inspection, and to indicate if evidence of erosion or delivery to a waterbody is observed. During your inspection, look for signs of erosion and transport of sediment to a waterbody. These signs may include:

- Landslides
- Erosion voids
- Tension cracking or settling of road fill or sidecast
- Rilling or gullying of road surfaces, road fills, landings, cutbanks, etc.
- Increased levels of sediment in waterbodies immediately downstream of operations

If evidence of sediment erosion and delivery of waste to waterbodies are observed:

- ☐ Submit a map indicating where this occurred.
- ☐ Photograph the source of sediment and point of delivery to the waterbody and record photo monitoring using the Photo-Point Monitoring Form (Attachment L).
- ☐ Submit a narrative description of what occurred, and how and when corrective measures will be taken to stop sediment delivery and protect water quality.

If any evidence of failed management measure is observed:

- ☐ Submit a map and narrative that show and describe what management practice failed and its location within the activity area.
- ☐ Submit a description of what and when corrective measures will be taken to stop and/or prevent sediment delivery and protect water quality.

4. Constructed or re-constructed watercourse crossings. None exist ☐

(attach additional pages if necessary)

5. WBBZ and SEZ landing management measures and equipment operation areas. None exist ☐

(attach additional pages if necessary)

6. Areas of in-lieu practices that have the potential to impact water quality. None exist ☐

(attach additional pages if necessary)

7. Equipment operations on steep slopes or unstable areas. None exist ☐

(attach additional pages if necessary)

8. Pile placement and burning within WBBZs and/or SEZs None exist ☐

A) Pre-Burn Information:
   i. Date(s) piles created: _____
   ii. Type and relative abundance of vegetation observed in WBBZ/SEZ prior to burning is:

B) Date(s) piles burned_____. If piles have been burned, complete C) below.

C) Were all burn scars raked to 85% coverage with native duff or organic mulch and seed post-burning? ☐ (Y / N):☐
If Yes, provide date(s) raked: _____, if No, complete D) below.

D) If C) is No, then state date(s) of burn scar inspection: _____, and complete E), F), and G) during the second growing season following the burn.

E) Report on the status of vegetative recovery throughout the burn scars in terms of type and relative abundance of vegetation, compared to adjacent unburned areas. If using a representative sample rather than assessing all burn scars, provide additional details on the number of scars assessed and how the sample size was determined (attach more pages if necessary):

   i. Type and relative abundance of vegetation observed in project adjacent to burn scars after burning is:

   ii. Type and relative abundance of vegetative recovery in burn scars after burning is:

   iii. The approximate % of burns scars within the representative sample without vegetative recovery after the second growing season is:

   iv. Date(s) all burns scars not in a state of vegetative recovery after two growing seasons were raked to 85% coverage with either native duff or organic mulch and seed: _____.

v. Additional Information (if needed):

F) Are invasive species present in any burn scars? (Y / N)
If F) is Yes, attach a corrective action plan and schedule for implementation of the corrective action plan.

G) Is there evidence of ash, charred material, or sediment movement off of any burn scars? (Y / N)
If G) is Yes, describe where material moved, potential for delivery to surface water, and attach a corrective action plan and an implementation schedule for the plan if necessary.

(attach additional pages if necessary)

9. For Category 5 Projects only: If the enrollee has suspended effectiveness monitoring during an interim period per Timber Waiver Category 5 Condition #10 and the directions at the bottom of the Timber Waiver Category 5 Application Form, please note these periods of inactivity and include an explanation for the temporary suspension in the box below.

(attach additional pages if necessary)

I, the Landowner, agent thereof, or Land Manager, hereby certify under penalty of perjury that all information contained in this monitoring report is true, accurately represents site conditions, and is complete. I also certify that all timber harvest and vegetation management activities conducted have been in conformance with all the general conditions of the Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges Resulting from Timber Harvest and Vegetation Management Activities in the Lahontan Region (Timber Waiver), Resolution R6T-2014-00XX, and all eligibility criteria and conditions for Category 5 or 6 of the Timber Waiver. If any deviation from the approved plan, and/or the Timber Waiver eligibility criteria and conditions has been identified I have disclosed such deviations in this form along with corrective actions that will be taken to resolve the problem.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name and Title: _____

Phone/Fax/E-Mail: _____

Invitation for feedback: Water Board staff respectfully request any constructive feedback regarding the monitoring program with regard to your timber harvest and vegetation management activities. Completing this section is not a requirement. Water Board staff may use your comments and suggestions to improve this program for future activities. Comments may include:

- perceived effectiveness of the program in protecting water quality
- recommendations on how to make the monitoring program more efficient, reliable, or effective
- impressions of recommendations made by Water Board staff regarding your activities (e.g., do they appear to be effective, is there a practice or a performance standard that would have been more cost-effective at protecting water quality?)