

## **APPENDIX M Inventory and Monitoring Plan Framework**

It is assumed every Forest in Region Six has an invasive plants coordinator and is maintaining an up-to-date invasive plant inventory using NRIS/Terra, the nationally accepted protocol. The inventory will be the primary means to plan and prioritize treatments. The inventory will be used as the main vehicle for tracking treatment effectiveness both regionally and on a site-specific basis.

In addition to the monitoring that is already required under various Forest Plans, this inventory and monitoring plan framework is part of all action alternatives in this Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The framework would guide the development of detailed monitoring plans at the site-specific project scale. Invasive plant treatment and restoration actions are likely to be complex, involve multiple land ownerships and will take years to implement, due to the nature of invasive plant problems. It is likely that a site will be treated multiple times over the years. Tracking these efforts and subsequent progress will be crucial to determining success.

A good monitoring program will be well thought out and have a high probability of detecting change in the resource being monitored (NPS, 2002). The Field Guide to Invasive Plant Inventory, Monitoring and Mapping (USDA FS, 2002) has been developed to guide monitoring efforts in conjunction with NRIS/Terra. It suggests a monitoring regime may start with annual monitoring for the first 3-5 years, decreasing in frequency to every other year for the next 5-10 years and further decreasing monitoring frequency to every 3 years for the next ten years until the seed source has been exhausted (i.e. no new germination taking place).

Monitoring regimes may vary in time and space depending on the species; for example, those that reproduce vegetatively may require a longer span of annual monitoring. The monitoring categories described in this framework (implementation/compliance, and effectiveness (of treatments in meeting project objectives, and effectiveness of protection measures) can be used to implement a long-term adaptive management strategy. By implementing an adaptive management approach, managers will identify and respond to changing conditions and new information on an ongoing basis, and assess the need to make changes to treatment and restoration strategies.

### **Implementation/Compliance Monitoring**

Implementation/compliance monitoring answers the question, “Did we do what we said we would do?” This question needs to be answered on a Regional scale, because adaptive management strategies require determination that actions are taking place as described in the Invasive Plants EIS.

If an action alternative is selected, each Forest Supervisor will be directed to assess compliance with the Invasive Plant Program EIS Record of Decision as a part of Forest Plan Implementation monitoring. Regional Office staff will periodically aggregate this information as a part of program oversight.

An implementation/compliance checklist database, such as the Pacfish/Infish Biological Opinion Implementation Monitoring module database for the eastside, could be used as a template to input and analyze implementation/compliance monitoring data. The use of a consistent reporting format will allow for aggregation of information at various scales. Such as system will be used to determine patterns of compliance.

**Listed Species** -- An implementation/compliance monitoring database would track invasive plant treatment projects that are the subject of Section 7 consultations under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), generate annual reporting of compliance for use by the Services (NOAA Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife) and Forest Service (FS), and allow for common reporting of data on individual projects. As a minimum, on each project requiring consultation, reporting will be required on compliance with Standards 16, 18, 19, and 20 in the Invasive Plant EIS. Additional standards could be included, as appropriate, for the individual ecoregions, Forests, or projects. For example, Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP) riparian standards relevant to herbicide use or invasive plant control projects could be included in the database for those Forests in the NWFP-covered areas.

### **Effectiveness Monitoring**

Effectiveness monitoring, relative to project objectives, answers the question, “Were treatment and restoration projects effective?” This question could be answered on either a regional or a project-level scale. Invasive plant infestations require pre-project inventories to determine how, when, and where treatments are to be applied, and post-treatment monitoring to assess the effectiveness (treatment) in meeting project objectives (e.g. restoring structure and composition of native vegetation).

A goal of the Effectiveness Monitoring component in the Regional Invasive Plant Program is to answer the following questions:

Have the number of new invasive plant infestations increased or decreased in the Region or at the project level?

What changes in distribution, amount and proportion of invasive plant infestations have resulted due to treatment activities in the region or at the project level?

Has the infestation size for a targeted invasive plant species been reduced regionally or at the project level?

Which treatment methods, separate or in combination, are most successful for specific invasive species?

Which treatment methods have not been successful for specific invasive species?

The nation-wide NRIS/Terra database, and the upcoming FACTS database, provide common reporting formats to input information and provide a mechanism for addressing the above questions. In addition, current long-term ecological monitoring networks will assist the FS in determining trends of invasive plant infestations at the Regional level.

The NRIS/Terra database could be sorted to answer the above questions because it tracks size and species of infestations as well as treatment methods. The Forest Inventory and Analysis Network (FIA) or the Forest Health Monitoring plots associated with the FIA network could be used to follow invasion trends. Such networks could be used to track trends in the spread or reduction in spread of the more dominant invasive plants in the region. Monitoring programs developed at the Forest level would answer more project specific questions.

**Listed Species** - Monitoring that addresses the effectiveness of various measures designed to reduce potential adverse effects from the project, including standards in the EIS, “project design criteria”, “design features”, and “protection measures” may also need to be conducted. This type of monitoring **will only be required** for invasive plant treatment projects that pose a “high risk” to federally listed species. “High risk” projects are defined as:

- Any project involving aerial application of herbicide.
- Projects involving the use of heavy equipment or broadcast application of herbicide (e.g. boom spray or backpack spraying that is not limited to spot sprays) that occur in 1) riparian areas (as defined in NWFP, Pacfish, or Infish, as applicable), ditches

or water corridors connected to habitat for listed fish; or, 2) proximity to federally listed plants or butterfly habitat.

For the purposes of determining the need for protection measure effectiveness monitoring, invasive plant treatment methods that are **not** considered “high risk” can include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Broadcast application of herbicide and use of heavy equipment that occurs **outside** of, 1) riparian areas, ditches or water corridors connected to water bodies, or, 2) areas in proximity to federally listed plants or butterfly habitat.
- Manual methods including hand-pulling, grubbing, stabbing, pruning, cutting, etc.
- Mechanical methods using small equipment like chainsaws, or equipment rarely used and not often in proximity to listed fish habitat, like flamers, foamers, hot steam, etc.
- Prescribed fire used expressly for invasive plant control and which occurs outside of riparian areas or habitat for federally listed plants or butterflies.
- Herbicide applications using spot spray (used with a shield near listed plant locations) with a backpack sprayer, cut stump, injection, wicking wiping, basal bark applications, or other highly selective methods.
- Minor uses of fertilizer to encourage native plant competition or growth.
- Biological controls used in habitat areas for terrestrial wildlife or fish. Use in proximity to listed plants or butterflies should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
- Broadcast applications (except aerial) using clopyralid, imazapic, and metsulfuron methyl in proximity to habitat for listed fish or listed terrestrial wildlife.

A collection of several of these low risk projects in close proximity to each other and in proximity to habitat for listed species may constitute a “high risk” project, but this should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Monitoring for “high risk” invasive plant treatments that may affect ESA-listed species or designated critical habitat should determine if standards and/or protection measures were effective at reducing potential effect pathways (e.g. disturbance, sedimentation, exposure to herbicides) and results should be applicable elsewhere. Unique, individual monitoring efforts and protocols have not provided information that is applicable to other areas or projects. Therefore, a Regional, interagency approach is outlined in this framework that will help address the needs for protection measure effectiveness at a broader scale. For example,

Japanese knotweed is a serious invader of riparian areas and has the potential to alter ecosystems upon which listed salmon depend. The Region may have several Japanese knotweed treatment projects over the next several years and each one may have the potential to adversely affect listed salmon or designated critical habitat if adequate measures are not part of the treatment plan or are not complied with during implementation. Designing consistent monitoring protocol will allow a more efficient and effective evaluation of the project protection measures.

To meet the objective of being able to evaluate standards and measures applied at the Regional, sub-Regional, and project level for protection of ESA-listed species and/or designated critical habitat in “high risk” projects, an interagency monitoring protocol will be developed by 2007. The expectation being that this protocol would be applied to high risk projects to determine the effectiveness of Regional EIS standards, and additional standards or protection measures applied at finer scales, in reducing potential effect pathways (e.g. disturbance, sedimentation, exposure to herbicides, etc.) for listed species.

In the interim, information obtained from implementation/compliance monitoring reports for “high risk” projects will be reviewed in 2005 and 2006 to inform the development of a consistent monitoring protocol for ensuring that standards and protection measures were effective. This 2-3 year lag time before protocol are developed and effectiveness monitoring is implemented does not apply to aerial application of herbicides. All projects with aerial applied herbicide will include a monitoring plan to assess the effectiveness of measures in protecting ESA-listed species and/or designated critical habitat.

Until a Regional, interagency effectiveness monitoring protocol for ESA-listed species and/or designated critical habitat is developed (2007), the need for effectiveness monitoring on “high risk” projects will be evaluated by Level 1 or other interagency technical teams during Section 7 consultation. Recommendations for additional effectiveness monitoring beyond that described in this framework will require that Level 2 or other appropriate interagency management team agree to the recommendations of the technical or Level 1 team for the project. This process will help lead the Region toward efficient and reliable data collection and allow statistical analysis of the data gathered.

**References**

USFS (U.S. Forest Service). 2001. Invasive Plant Management Decisions and Environmental Analysis. USDA Forest Service

USFS (U.S. Forest Service). 2002. Field Guide – Invasive Plant Inventory, Monitoring and Mapping Protocol. USDA Forest Service.

NPS (National Park Service). 2002. Invasive Plants Inventory and Monitoring Guidelines, National Park Service.