

Monitoring Schedule

INTRODUCTION

Monitoring and evaluating Forest Plan implementation is done to inform the decision maker and the public of progress toward achieving the goals, objectives, and standards and guidelines. A Monitoring Schedule is required by CFR 219.12(k) to determine how well objectives have been met and how closely management standards have been applied. The Monitoring Schedule highlights those items that are an existing part of the planned program as well as new items that are legally required.

Monitoring more specifically determines:

- if the management prescriptions are applied as directed;
- if standards are being followed;
- if the Forest is achieving the objectives of the Forest Plan;
- if the Issues are being resolved by the management prescriptions;
- if the effects of implementing the Forest Plan are occurring as predicted;
- if the costs of implementing the Forest Plan are as predicted and are acceptable;
- if management practices on adjacent or intermingled non-Forest lands are affecting Forest Plan goals and objectives.

A detailed annual monitoring schedule is prepared. The schedule includes what, where, and how many items are monitored and who is responsible for monitoring. Project reviews are held on each Ranger District semi-annually to ensure that the prescriptions are being applied.

The annual evaluation report documents an evaluation of the results of the monitoring schedule. A Forest Interdisciplinary Team analyzes and evaluates the significance of the results of these results every five years. If there are significant annual changes indicated, it may be necessary for the Forest Interdisciplinary Team to analyze and evaluate before the five-year interval.

The evaluation report is the basis for any recommendations to the Forest Supervisor on Forest Plan status. The recommendations can include:

- No action needed. Monitoring indicates goals, objectives, and standards are being reasonably achieved.
- Refer recommended action to the appropriate line officer to improve application of management prescriptions.
- Modify the management prescription as a Forest Plan amendment.

- Modify the assignment of a prescription as a Forest Plan amendment.
- Revise the projected schedule of outputs.
- Revise the Forest Plan.

A file of the Forest Supervisor's decisions resulting from conclusions drawn from the results of the monitoring schedule is maintained for future use in amending or revising the Forest Plan. An annual evaluation of these decisions will be prepared and sent to the Regional Forester for consideration.

There are two types of costs for accomplishing items in the Monitoring Schedule. The first one represents costs that are part of the planned program of work and are integral to project execution. Stand exams are an example of such an activity. Stand exams are required in preparing a timber sale but are also a part of the Monitoring Schedule. There are no monitoring costs specified for these phases of the Monitoring Schedule. Costs of overhead are not specified for coordinating and evaluating phases of the Monitoring Schedule. The second type of costs as shown in Table 13 are for compiling additional data reports that are not currently required.

Table 13 Costs per Year for Compiling Additional Data Reports by Items Monitored

| | <u>ITEMS MONITORED</u> | <u>COST/YEAR</u> |
|-------|---|-------------------------|
| A2 | Dispersed Area Condition | \$2,500 for Code-a-Site |
| B1 | Wilderness Condition | \$1,000 for Code-a-Site |
| C2/C3 | CINNAMON TEAL | |
| | Amount of Suitable Nesting Habitat | \$700 |
| | Nesting Success | \$700 |
| | MACROINVERTEBRATES | |
| | Species Diversity and Biomass | \$500/stream |
| | DIVERSITY | |
| | Successional Stages of Major Vegetation Types | \$500 |

The Forest Plan's monitoring requirements follow in Table 14. For each activity, practice, or effect to be monitored, one or more measurement techniques and the expected future condition to be met are specified. A frequency for measuring and reporting the monitored item is established, and the expected accuracy and precision of that measurement is stated. Precision refers to how close to each other repeated measurements of the same quantity are. Accuracy is a measure of how close a measurement is to the actual value of the variable being measured.

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|--|---|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| A2 RECREATION | | | | | |
| Developed Site Use | Determine recreation use and demand | Recreation Information Management (RIM) system use reports/ RVD's | Annually | 80/80 | ±20% difference between projected and actual use, and when capacity exceeded by 25% |
| Developed Site Condition | Prevent damage and deterioration Meet health and safety requirements | RIM system facility condition reports, project reviews/ Facilities by RIM maintenance class | Annually | 80/80 | ≥10% of facilities at standard service level drop one condition class level |
| Implementation of ROS Guidelines | Ensure the protection of existing ROS classes | Review project work plans involving vegetative treatment, road/trail construction, or major development/ Acres by ROS class | Annually | 80/80 | Acreage of any ROS class is changed by more than ±15 over the entire decade |
| Off-Road Driving Compliance and Damage | Prevent unacceptable damage to resources and meet provisions of Forest Off-road Driving implementation plan | Area and project reviews, RIM system Area condition | Annually | 80/80 | ORV use or damage conflicts with management goals or lowers visual quality level below objective |
| Dispersed Area Use and Experience Levels | Determine recreation use and demand | RIM system/ RVD's | Annually | 80/80 | Use exceeds by 10% or more the ROS social setting criteria for the ROS class |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|---|---|---|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| A2 RECREATION (continued) | | | | | |
| Dispersed Area Condition | Prevent unacceptable resource damage reviews/ Area condition | RIM system, Code-a-Site inventories, project | Annually | 80/80 | Sites deteriorate to RIM Condition Class 3 on 15% of the sites Use or damage conflicts with management goals or lowers visual quality level below objective |
| Cultural Resource Compliance Project | Meet Federal regulation; ensure project compliance with guidelines | Approved cultural resource clearance for each ground- disturbing activity/ | Annually | 80/80 | R-3 direction is not met |
| Cultural Resource Property Protection | Protect significant properties Site condition | Patrol areas in conjunction with other duties/ | Annually | 90/90 | Properties being damaged/ destroyed by unauthorized uses and/or controllable natural agents |
| Trail Condition | Determine effectiveness of Forest Trails Program Miles | RIM system, project reviews, trail condition surveys/ | Sample 20% Annually | 90/90 level | ≥10% of system trails drop one condition class |
| Visual Quality Objective (VQO) Compliance | Ensure Forest standards and guidelines for visual management are met ment, road/trail construc- tion, or major development/ Acres by VQO | Review project work plans and conduct project reviews - involving vegetative treat - | Annually | 80/80 | A project reduces visual quality levels below objectives Tolerance standards are listed in the Forest-wide standards and guidelines |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|---|--|---|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| B1 WILDERNESS | | | | | |
| Wilderness Use | Determine wilderness use and demand | RIM system/ RVD's | Annually | 80/80 | Capacity is exceeded by 20% in any WOS class |
| Wilderness Condition | Minimize resource damage and changes of WOS classes, particularly primitive end Area condition | RIM system, Code-a-Site inventories, project reviews/ | Annually | 80/80 | Limits of acceptable change conditions exceed tolerances established for each wilderness as found in implementation plans |
| C2/C3 WILDLIFE | | | | | |
| Goshawk,Pygmy Nuthatch, And Spotted Owl | Applied management achieves desired stand characteristics for old-growth and indicator species do not significantly decrease | Old-growth inventory, compartment exams and habitat capability modeling/ Acres | Annually | 65/65 | Any 10K Block without 5% of the capable forested land meeting old-growth conditions or being managed to reach the conditions as soon as possible given the constraints of the timber offering schedule |
| Amount of Mature and Old-Growth Habitat | Maintain habitat capability Percent habitat capability | Habitat capability model/ | Annually | 65/65 | Habitat capability drops to 40% of potential |
| Turkey Habitat Capability | Maintain habitat capability habitat capability | Habitat capability model/ affected projects | Annually on 90% of | 65/65 | When habitat capability drops to 40% of potential |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| C2/C3 WILDLIFE (continued) | | | | | |
| Population Trend | Meet population goal Department surveys/habitat capability modeling | Arizona Game and Fish | Annually | 65/65 | Comprehensive Plan goal not met, 25% decrease in population over 5-year period |
| Nesting Habitat | Maintain nesting habitat | On-the-ground evaluation year trend review | Annually and 5 | 65/65 | If nesting habitat drops |
| Red Squirrel Habitat Capability | Maintain habitat capability habitat capability | Habitat capability model/ affected projects | Annually on 90% of | 65/65 | When habitat capability drops to 40% of potential |
| Elk & Mule Deer Habitat Capability | Maintain habitat capability habitat capability | Habitat capability model/ | Annually | 65/65 | When habitat capability drops to 40% of potential |
| Population Trends and Distribution | Meet population goal Department surveys/habitat capability model | Arizona Game and Fish | Annually | 65/65 | Comprehensive Plan goals not met by -5% or +10% for elk, by -5% for deer |
| Abert Squirrel Habitat Capability | Maintain habitat capability habitat capability | Habitat capability model/ | Annually | 65/65 | When habitat capability drops to 40% of potential |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|--|--|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| C2/C3 WILDLIFE (continued) | | | | | |
| Hairy Woodpecker, Pygmy Nuthatch, & Yellow-Bellied Sapsucker | | | | | |
| Snag Densities, Sizes, and Species (Existing and Future) | Maintain habitat capability inventories, project recon- naissance and habitat capability modeling/acres | Compartment exams, snag | Annually | 65/65 | When prescribed snag densities and sizes are not met on at least 75% of area evaluated over 5-year period |
| Plain Titmouse Amount of Mature and Old-Growth Pinyon-Juniper | Maintain habitat capability habitat capability | Habitat capability model/ | Annually | 65/65 | Any 10K Block without 5% of the capable forested land meeting old-growth conditions or being managed to reach the conditions as soon as possible |
| Snag Densities and Sizes of Pinyon-Juniper | Maintain habitat capability inventories, and project reconnaissance/acres | Compartment exams, snag | Annually | 65/65 | When prescribed snag densities and sizes not met on at least 75% of area evaluated over 5-year period |
| Antelope Forage Availability | Maintain habitat capability surveys, habitat capability model/habitat capability | Production-Utilization years on each graz- ing allotment | Annually and 9-13 | 65/65 | Habitat capability drops to 40% of potential |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|--|--|---|------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| C2/C3 WILDLIFE (continued) | | | | | |
| Antelope (continued) | | | | | |
| Population Trends | Meet population goal Department surveys/ Numbers | Arizona Game and Fish | Annually | 65/65 | Comprehensive Plan goals not met by 5% below goal |
| Cinnamon Teal Amount of Suitable Nesting Habitat | Maintain habitat capability density method) or score- cards/acres | Field surveys (height selected wetlands | Every 5 years on | 65/65 | 25% decrease in suitable habitat from previous 5 years |
| Nesting Success | Maintain habitat capability cooperative survey with Arizona Game and Fish Department/ Numbers | Systematic field sampling, selected wetlands | Every 5 years on | 65/65 5 years | 25% decrease from previous |
| Riparian Areas Lincoln's Sparrow, Lucy's Warbler, & Yellow-Breasted Chat | | | | | |
| Habitat Condition | Maintain habitat capability and systematic field sampl- ing using riparian scorecard analyses/acres | Habitat capability modeling annually | 5% of stream miles | 65/65 | 10% of acres decrease in condition rating |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| C2/C3 WILDLIFE (continued) | | | | | |
| Aquatic-Macro Invertebrates | | | | | |
| Species Diversity and Biomass | Maintain aquatic habitat effectiveness | Systematic field sampling (modified surber sampling)/ | Every 5 years on selected streams | 65/65 | BCI index falls below 80 (Good) |
| Threatened And Endangered Species | | | | | |
| Amount of Suitable Habitat | Meet Federal regulation Acres | Field surveys/ | Annually | 65/65 | Any potential impact on occupied habitat |
| Population | Meet recovery plan goals Wildlife Service surveys/ Numbers | Field surveys, U S Fish and | Annually | 65/65 | 5% decrease in local populations |
| Sensitive Species* | | | | | |
| Amount of Suitable Habitat and Population Trends | Manage at appropriate levels to prevent listing as threatened or endangered species | Field surveys/ Acres | 5 years | 65/65 | 10% decrease in local populations |

* Due to limited funds and work priorities, not all known sensitive species will be monitored during the Plan's life. Species management plans, which will include monitoring, will be prepared on a priority basis. Priority will be determined based on factors such as status with the USDI Fish and Wildlife Service and impacts from land use activities.

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| C2/C3 WILDLIFE (continued) | | | | | |
| Diversity Successional Stages of Major Vegetation Types | Meet Federal regulation (NFMA) habitat diversity model/ acres | Compartment exams, field surveys, timber inventory, | Every 5 years | 65/65 | 25% change from predicted levels |
| Habitat Improvements Condition of Structural Improvements | Identify those structures which must be reconstructed | Inspections/structure | 50% of structures per | 95/95 | 30% of structures have reached their 50-year life span or have deteriorated to that condition sooner despite maintenance |
| Stream temper- ature of cold water fisheries | Monitor current conditions and effects of management practices on stream temperature to assure compliance with State water quality standards and tolerance levels for cold water fish | Maximum temperature thermometers | All perennial cold water streams in the first decade Five projects annually | 95/95 | Not meeting State Standards Exceeding tolerance levels for cold water fish as a result of management activity |
| D2 RANGE O&M Permitted Use | Meet Federal regulation, check for term grazing permit and Plan compliance | Annual Grazing Statistical Report/ AUM's Forest-wide | Annually | 100/98 | +10% or -30% of target output |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| D2 RANGE O&M (continued) | | | | | |
| Actual Use | Check compliance with term grazing permit, Allotment Management Plan (AMP), and Forest Plan | Grazing actual use record, permittee reports, and actual range counts/ AUM's Forest-wide | Annually | 85/80 | ±10% of Permitted Use levels |
| Capacity | Meet Federal regulation, determine sustained livestock stocking levels | Production and utilization surveys, range inspections/ AUM's Forest-wide | 50% of Forest acres per decade | 85/70 | ±15% of most recent Forest-wide studies |
| Range Condition and Trend | Meet Federal regulation, identify changes in range condition and trend, recommend changes in management, and determine shifts away from grass aspect due to overstory | Range analysis, transect data, photo plots, inspection records/ Acres | 50% of Forest acres per decade | 75/60 | +10% change in unsatisfactory range acres over previous study |
| Allotment Management Plan Status | Meet Federal regulation, determine if permittee is compliance, and if AMP reflects current needs of resource Plan | Actual use, permitted use, in capacity records, range analysis, production and utilization studies, and allotment inspections/ Plan | Yearly to once every 10 years per allotment | 95/95 | 30% of the AMP's will expire or do not reflect current status of allotment's resources |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| D3 RANGE IMPROVEMENTS | | | | | |
| Condition of Structural Improvements | Meet Federal regulation, and identify those structures which must be reconstructed | Range inspections, range analysis, permittee reports Structure | 50% of range structures per decade | 95/95 | 30% of range structures have reached their 50-year life span or have deteriorated to that condition sooner despite maintenance |
| Condition of Nonstructural Improvements | Meet Federal regulation, and identify those vegetative improvements that require retreatment Acre | Range inspections, range analysis, production and utilization surveys, and permittee reports/ | 50% of treated acres per decade | 90/90 over 15% | 40% of range nonstructural rovements are deteriorating and undesirable plants are invading site, canopy cover is |
| Forage Condition in Transitory Range | Determine and monitor added capacity created behind timber and firewood cuts | Range inspections, pre-sale review, compartment exams/ Acre | 5-10 years on 50% of transitory acres | 85/80 | -25% change in available forage on transitory range |
| E4 TIMBER REFORESTATION | | | | | |
| Practices and Assumptions | Ensure that: -Regeneration is obtained within 5 years after final harvest cut and scheduled planting is accomplished or prior to final harvest cut when natural regeneration is planned. Data Base/ Acres | Annual Reforestation/TSI Needs Report, plantation survival surveys, stand certification , silvicultural prescriptions, post-sale administrative review, Timber Management Information System (TMIS), Stand 10th years). | Annually (plantation survival surveys are 1st, 3rd & 5th growing seasons) or as scheduled. Annual stand certification for natural regeneration stands (5th & 10th years). | 95/90 | If planned accomplishment varies 25% from schedule at 8-year intervals, ID Team evaluates. |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|--|---|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| E5 TIMBER STAND IMPROVEMENT | | | | | |
| Timber Stand Improvement Acres and Assumptions | Ensure that: -- Scheduled TSI projects are accomplished Reduce insect and disease risk. Acres | Silvicultural prescriptions, accomplishment reports, certified projects, Reforestation/TSI Needs Report, Stand Data Base/ Acres | Annually | 90/90 | If cumulative deviation for 8 years falls 33% below planned program, ID Team evaluates |
| E8 TIMBER | | | | | |
| Silvicultural Assumptions and Practices | Ensure that: -- Appropriate management is applied to Retention and Partial Retention zones and riparian areas, -- Rotation age and CMAI assumptions are correct, -- Silvicultural prescriptions follow management area standards, -- Silvicultural prescriptions precede vegetative treatments, -- Silvicultural prescriptions are practical and achieve desired results | Silvicultural prescriptions, EA's, project reviews | Annually | 90/90 | Silvicultural review of assumption validity, $\pm 15\%$ of Forest averages |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|--|--|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| E8 TIMBER (continued) | | | | | |
| Timber Assumptions: Volume, Productivity, Condition Class, Acres Harvested | Ensure that: -- Board foot/cubic foot ratios are correct, -- Volume/acre yield is correct, -- Condition class assignments are correct, -- Schedule of acres harvested is correct | Sale review, EA's, cruise summaries, TMIS, compartment exams, stand data base Use the same conversion ratios as used in Plan calculations/ As appropriate | Annually | 80/80 | Sale review of assumption validity, +15% of Forest averages |
| Size of Openings | Ensure that: -- Openings comply with size limits and are periodically evaluated for appropriateness | EA's, presale and administrative reviews, and post-sale reviews/ Project area | Annually | 90/90 | Unacceptable results of an ID Team or administrative review |
| Acres of Overstory and Final Removal Harvest | Meet Federal regulation, measure prescriptions and effects | TMIS, Staff review of 5% of treatment projects (at least 2 projects) /Acres | Annually | 90/90 evaluates | Planned treatment varies ± 25 percent from schedule at 5-year intervals, ID Team |
| Acres of Intermediate Harvest | Meet Federal regulation, measure prescriptions and effects | TMIS, Staff review of 5% of treatment projects (at least 2 projects) /Acres | Annually | 90/90 | Planned treatment varies $\pm 25\%$ from schedule at 5-year intervals, ID Team evaluates |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|---|---|---|------------------------|---|---|
| E8 TIMBER (continued) | | | | | |
| Board Feet of Net Sawtimber Offered, sold, and harvested | Meet Federal regulation, measure output, assure timber offered or available for offer meets, but does not exceed, the allowable sale quantity. | PAMARS (annual reporting system), programmed harvest reports/ MBF | Annually | 90/90 | $\pm 20\%$ annually or $\pm 20\%$ over 5-year period |
| Cords of Firewood Available | Ensure that: -- Green firewood is made available, -- Potential firewood from timber sales and road building is made reasonably available to the general public before slash disposal | Review annual total of firewood sale reports, firewood advertised but not sold, and free use/ Cords | Annually | 70/70 | Firewood use increases by more than 10% per year; evaluated at 5th year |
| Yield Projections | Establish GSL studies in -- Permanent plots in regener- Ensure that: Yield projections are correct | First decade cooperation with RMFRES/ ated stands/ MBF/acre and/ or trees/acre | 90/95 | Less than $\pm 10\%$ accomplishment of scheduled permanent plots at the end of Decade 1 | |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| E8 TIMBER (continued) | | | | | |
| Re-evaluation of Unsuitable Timber Lands | Evaluate the accuracy of suitable timberlands classification, periodically re-examine lands identified as not suitable for timber production to determine if they have become suited and could be returned to timber production | Review new or updated soil survey data, compartment exam, project plans, timber planning process/ Acre | Cover entire Forest in 1st decade (1/10 of Forest annually) | 90/80 | Re-evaluate at time of Plan Plan revision |
| F2/F3 WATERSHED/SOIL/AIR | | | | | |
| Watershed Condition of Forest Lands | Meet Federal regulation, ensure that Forest watersheds in satisfactory condition by 2020, assure productivity of the land is maintained | Standard Watershed Condition Inventory according to R-3 Hydrology Note 14 Photo points, ocular estimates to determine trends/acres | 10% annually | 80/80 | 5% decrease in ground cover |
| Watershed/Soils Prescriptions | Monitor projects to determine 1) compliance with recommendations and suitability of recommendations and Best Management practices, and 2) to ensure water quality standards are met | Review soil disturbing projects for compliance with Best Management Practices and water quality standards | Minimum of 1 project per District per year | N/A | Deviation from use of Best Management Practices and Standards and Guidelines Ineffective Best Management Practices |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| F2/F3 WATERSHED/SOIL/AIR (continued) | | | | | |
| | Monitor watershed condition in project areas Note 14)/Project | Standard watershed condition transects (per Hydro | 1 Project/year Forest-wide | 95/95 | |
| Riparian Improvement Projects | Resolve Issues at Forest level and meet Federal regulation; review riparian improvement projects for changes in ground cover, species composition, bank stability, stream flow and water quality changes, effectiveness of and compliance with recommendations | Standard watershed condition transects, ocular, estimates and professional judgment/ Project | 1 Project/year Forest-wide | 90/90 | Not meet MMR's |
| Riparian Areas | Monitor condition and trend of riparian areas photo points | Standard watershed condition transects, ocular, estimates, photo points | 5 percent annually | 90/90 | Not meet MMR's |
| Road Obliteration | Ensure compliance with Standards and Guidelines Miles concerning road densities Forest Issue related | Work accomplishment reports/ years 3, 6, 9) | Annually (Report in | 90/90 | +25% of planned |
| Water Quality | Ensure compliance with Standards and Guidelines, State and Federal Water Quality Standards | Fecal coliform sampling at sites designated for full body contact | 3 Sites Annually | 80/80 | Not meet Standards and Guidelines, State and Federal laws, for full body contact waters |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|---|--|---|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| G1 MINERALS | | | | | |
| Compliance with Terms of Minerals Operating Plans | Meet legislative mandate and Agency guidelines | Field checks/ Plans | Annually | 90/90 | Non-compliance |
| Non-patented Mining Claim Compliance | Minimize illegal mining activity | Field checks, BLM file checks | Annually | 80/80 | Non-compliance |
| J3 SPECIAL USES | | | | | |
| Special Use Permits | Process and administer special use permits in accordance with established guidelines | Land Uses Report (LUR), field inspections/ Permits | Annually | 80/80 | Forest is unable to meet minimum standards |
| Land Purchase, Acquisition, and Exchange | Consolidate Forest lands and meet public needs Cases | Forest Land Adjustment Plan ,MAR target/ | Annually | 80/80 | Accomplishments are 10% or more below targets |
| Occupancy Trespass | Minimize Forest trespass problems Cases resolved vs new cases | Field checks, landline location/ | Annually | 80/80 | Number of new cases exceeds cases resolved, resulting in net increase in total number of cases |
| Landline Location | Maintain Forest boundary target/ Miles | Landline location, MAR | Annually | 98/98 | -10% of planned |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|--|--|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| L3 ROADS | | | | | |
| Arterial/ Collector, | Ensure compliance with identified needs for Miles | Work accomplishment reports/ | Annually | 95/95 | ±20% of planned |
| Construction/ Reconstruction | arterial/collector recon- struction Forest Issue related | | | | |
| Purchaser Credit Roads | Ensure compliance with identified needs for P/C construction/reconstruction | Work accomplishment reports/ Miles | Annually | 95/95 | ±20% of planned |
| P2 PROTECTION | | | | | |
| Growth Reduction and Mortality Caused by Insect and Disease Infestations | Ensure endemic and introduced infestations do not become epidemic Reduce adverse effects of dwarf mistletoe and reviews/ Acres, Forest-wide | Integrated Pest Management aerial observation by R O entomologists, compartment exam, project inspections | Annually | 90/85 | Introduction of new insect or disease or spread of an existing insect or disease beyond endemic levels Dwarf mistletoe infections are not reduced where treatments have been applied |
| Air Quality | Ensure prescribed fire does not cause violations of State and Federal air quality standards in sensitive areas | Project reports, field monitoring | Annually | 85/85 | Do not meet legal standards |
| Fuel Treatment Outputs | Ensure balanced fuel treat- ment outputs, emphasizing utilization | Accomplishment reports/ Acres | Annually | 95/95 | ±25% of programmed targets |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|---|--|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| P2 PROTECTION (continued) | | | | | |
| Wildfire Acre PAR's | Ensure wildfire acres are within projected annual burned acres period and by Fire Management Zone where acres are not specific to MA's | Reports/ Acres | Annually | 95/95 | 25% above projected average annual wildfire burned acres Forest-wide over a 5-year |
| Cost of Suppression, Protection, Organization, and Net Value Change | Keep fire management program cost effective | PAMARS/ Dollars | Annually | 95/95 | 5% increase in real costs |
| Fire Suppression Effectiveness | Meet Federal regulation and measure prescriptions and effects effective in controlling fire losses within prescription; the use of the fire budget analysis process to determine fire management efficiency; and reviews of selected fires Annual inspections, periodic reviews, and use of fire budget analysis process as needed | Periodic inspections and reviews to determine if fire management organization is | Annually | 90/90 | 5% of wildfires do not comply with standards and guidelines |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|---|---|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| P2 Protection (continued) | | | | | |
| Law Enforcement Person Hours | Improve law enforcement Forest Issue related case loads, solution rates and public complaints Based on: protection of cultural resources, Off-road Driving damage, firewood theft, dollar cost of vand- alism and trends in user protection Update monthly using LEMARS | Professional evaluation of trend based on a review of | Annually | 95/95 | Program effectiveness evaluated by ID Team every 3 years Determine effective- ness by degree of resolving identified Forest issue |
| T1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION | | | | | |
| Citizen Partici- pation Plans Public Affairs Standards | Measure responsiveness to potentially affected interests Completed contacts and actions | Citizen Participation Plan and Public Affairs Plan review/ | Quarterly | 80/95 | A significant Issue is identified |
| Verification of Unit Cost Used in Plan Compared to On-the-Ground Cost | Acquire accurate cost data sentative sample of projects and programs including both force account and contract Discount to 1982 dollars for comparison to Plan costs/ Dollars | Actual costs from a repre- | Annually | 80/80 | In general, $\pm 25\%$ However, large cost items such as road constructions and logging cost would have a smaller degree of acceptable variability, of $\pm 10\%$ |

Table 14 - Monitoring Plan

| Items Monitored | Intent | Monitoring Method Unit of Measure | Measuring Frequency | Percent Accuracy/ Precision | Variability that would initiate Re-evaluation |
|---|--|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| T1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (continued) Effects of Management on Adjacent Lands on National Forest Goals and Objectives | Determine effects of manage- ment of other ownership on Forest Plan plans, new issues | Reports from appropriate resource monitoring items, review of other Agency | Every 5 years | N/A | Unacceptable results of an ID Team Review |

