

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
HOW PUBLIC COMMENTS WILL BE USED	1
OBJECTIVES OF PLAN MONITORING	1
REQUIRED 2012 PLANNING RULE MONITORING ITEMS.....	2
BEAVERHEAD-DEERLODGE NATIONAL FOREST PLAN MONITORING PROGRAM – INCLUDING PROPOSED CHANGES.....	3
Table 1. PROPOSED PLAN MONITORING PROGRAM.....	5

BEAVERHEAD-DEERLODGE NATIONAL FOREST FOREST PLAN MONITORING PROGRAM TRANSITION

INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes how the Beaverhead-Deerlodge NF (BDNF) is proposing to modify their Forest Plan's monitoring program to transition to the requirements of the 2012 Planning Rule (the Rule) (36 CFR 219.12). The Rule requires that an existing plan's monitoring program be updated for consistency with the new Rule within 4 years of the Rule's May 9, 2012 effective date or as soon as practicable.

The BDNF monitoring current monitoring program has been reviewed; proposed modifications address information that is critical for informed management of resources in the plan area and within the financial and technical capabilities of the Forest.

HOW PUBLIC COMMENTS WILL BE USED

This adjustment to the monitoring program should not be interpreted as an amendment or revision to other parts of the existing plans. Because a plan monitoring program is not a plan component¹, it may be modified by an administrative change (see 36 CFR 219.7 (f) and 219.13 (c)). Therefore, this transition will not result in a decision and is not subject to NEPA. Public comment is being solicited because an administrative change to modify a plan monitoring program may be made only after public notice and an opportunity for public comment is provided (36 CFR 219.13 (c)). We are providing this transition information to initiate a 30-day comment period on the proposed changes described in this document.

Adjustments to the monitoring plan will be iterative in nature. Public comments received on these proposed modifications will be used to further adjust the monitoring programs and inform future revision of the Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest plan. Public comment will help to: 1) develop a common understanding of and support for the new monitoring questions and associated indicators, 2) provide opportunities to design and carry out multi-party monitoring, 3) learn of other monitoring information available, and 4) improve the plan monitoring program.

OBJECTIVES OF PLAN MONITORING

Effective land and resource management plan monitoring and evaluation fosters adaptive management and more informed decisions. It helps identify the need to adjust desired conditions, goals, objectives, standards and guidelines as conditions change. Monitoring and evaluation helps forests, grasslands, the agency and the public determine how a land and resource

¹ Plan components include: desired conditions, objectives, standards, guidelines, suitability of lands (36 CFR 219.7(e)). Plans may also include "goals" as an optional plan component. (36 CFR 219.7(e)).

management plan is being implemented, whether plan implementation is achieving desired outcomes, and whether assumptions made in the planning process are valid.

Monitoring and evaluation are conducted at several scales and for many purposes, each of which has different objectives and requirements. Monitoring requirements and tasks are developed to be responsive to the objectives and scale of the plan, program, or project to be monitored.

Monitoring and evaluation are separate, sequential activities required by NFMA regulations to determine how well objectives have been met and how closely management standards and guidelines have been applied. Monitoring generally includes the collection of data and information, either by observation or measurement. Evaluation is the analysis of the data and information collected during the monitoring phase. The evaluation results are used to answer the monitoring questions, determine the need to revise management plans, change how the plans are implemented, and form a basis for adaptively managing the national grasslands. Monitoring and evaluation keep the Revised Land and Resource Management Plan up-to-date and responsive to changing issues by verifying the effectiveness of management plan standards and guidelines and anticipated program and project effects on resources, and providing information for amendments to the management plan.

Monitoring provides the information necessary to determine whether the Forest Plan is sufficient to guide management of the BDNF for the subsequent year or whether modification of the plan is needed.

Monitoring is continuous and provides feedback by testing relevant assumptions, tracking relevant conditions over time, and measuring management effectiveness (36 CFR 219.12).

Biennial monitoring evaluation reports help determine if and where changes are needed in plan components, other plan content, and project activities. (36 CFR 219.5). Monitoring also provides feedback to prioritize and improve the plan monitoring program and broader-scale monitoring strategy. The status of all monitoring items will be reported every two years (as required by the 2012 planning rule). Those monitoring items with greater than two year measurement intervals will be evaluated when new measurements are conducted, as scheduled by the modified Monitoring Plan. The first biennial monitoring evaluation report is scheduled to be released in the summer of 2018.

REQUIRED 2012 PLANNING RULE MONITORING ITEMS

The Forest Service has discretion to set the scope, scale, and priorities for plan monitoring within the financial and technical capabilities of the administrative unit. However, they are required to include one or more monitoring question(s) and associated indicator(s) for the eight items set out in the Planning Rule at 36 CFR 219.12(a)(5) as follows:

- i. *The status of select watershed conditions.*
- ii. *The status of select ecological conditions including key characteristics of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems.*

- iii. *The status of focal species to assess the ecological conditions required under 36 CFR 219.9.*
- iv. *The status of a select set of the ecological conditions required under 36 CFR 219.9 to contribute to the recovery of federally listed threatened and endangered species, conserve proposed and candidate species, and maintain a viable population of each species of conservation concern.*
- v. *The status of visitor use, visitor satisfaction, and progress toward meeting recreation objectives.*
- vi. *Measurable changes on the plan area related to climate change and other stressors that may be affecting the plan area.*
- vii. *Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including providing for multiple use opportunities.*
- viii. *The effects of each management system to determine that they do not substantially and permanently impair the productivity of the land (16 U.S.C. 1604(g)(3)(C)). (36 CFR 219.12(a)).*

Social, economic, and cultural sustainability (Forest Service Handbook 1909.12 (32.1)) must also be addressed in the monitoring program.

As part of this transition, the BDNF has reviewed the monitoring items of the 2009 monitoring program to determine whether the above questions have been considered. Table 1 displays how the updated monitoring program address these questions.

BEAVERHEAD-DEERLODGE NATIONAL FOREST PLAN MONITORING PROGRAM – INCLUDING PROPOSED CHANGES

To meet the requirements of the 2012 Planning Rule, the following updates to plan monitoring program are proposed in Table 1. *Many items are carried forward from the 2009 monitoring program with minor wording changes to the monitoring question or indicators, or without change, except to identify which of the 2012 required monitoring questions they address.* In other cases, monitoring items have been modified, added, combined or dropped where they were determined to be: 1) ineffective for addressing plan components, 2) duplicative in nature, 3) economically infeasible, 4) needed to address a plan component, or 5) new science or technology supports monitoring with a different tool or scale.

As described above, 36 CFR 219.12 (a)(5)(iii) requires monitoring of focal species to assess ecological conditions. Focal species are defined as “a small subset of species whose status provides an indicator of ecological integrity and ecosystem diversity. They provide insight into the effectiveness of a plan in maintaining or restoring the ecological conditions to maintain the diversity of plant and animal communities in the plan area. Focal species would be commonly selected on the basis of their functional role in ecosystems.” (36 CFR 219.19 Definitions).

The 2009 Forest Plan monitoring program, framed by extensive public comment, currently includes four Management Indicator Species (MIS) in Items 5, 13, and 14. These include (1)

Item 5—mayfly (*Drunella dodsii*), (2) Item 13—elk, and (3) Item 14—mountain goat and wolverine. These species were selected as MIS because they can be monitored and a connection between population trends, habitat conditions, and management activities can be established. Mountain goats and wolverines were selected as the best indicator of the effects of disturbance on high elevation winter range and denning habitat. Elk are a commonly hunted species important to Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks and the populace in general.

The best available science indicates that using an aquatic macroinvertebrate assemblage is preferable to a single species such as the mayfly; therefore, the performance measure used for Item 5 is changed to reflect this. They are useful and convenient indicators of the ecological health of a waterbody or river. They are almost always present and are easy to sample and identify. Aquatic macroinvertebrates can be used to reveal pollution problems and are ideal bioindicators of water quality because they live in the water for all or most of their life. We will continue to monitor the mayfly as a part of the macroinvertebrate assemblage. The PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinion Implementation and Effectiveness Monitoring Team (PIBO monitoring crew), established by the Forest Service to evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of that decision, collects and analyzes aquatic macroinvertebrate data annually. Item 5, as an aquatic macroinvertebrate assemblage, will be carried forward as a focal species.

Mountain goat, wolverine, and elk will continue to be monitored, but not as focal species.

Item 17, “Are levels of insect and disease increasing to damaging levels as a result of management activities?” is deleted since Item 8, Biodiversity, is updated to include an insects and disease component.

Item 21, “How is new information (science, technology, requirements) changing monitoring or the Plan?” is deleted since we will address this question under each monitoring question in the biennial reports.

At this time, species of conservation concern ((*iv*) in the list above) have not been designated by the Regional Forester for the BDNF. The Regional Forester will work with the unit to develop species of conservation concern in the near future and upon designation a review of the forest plan will be conducted to ensure the BDNF is providing or contributing to the long term persistence of designated species of conservation concern.

Please see Table 1 below, for specific details regarding proposed changes to the monitoring plan.

Table 1. PROPOSED PLAN MONITORING PROGRAM

<p>2009 Plan Components (links to 1982 legal requirements are removed with strikethrough text and replaced with references to goals and objectives from the 2009 Plan)</p>	<p>2009 Forest Plan Monitoring Item and Measure (Indicator)</p>	<p>Modified Monitoring Item Wording <i>(Changes made to meet 2012 Planning Rule)</i></p>	<p>Modified Indicators <i>(Measure)</i></p>	<p>2012 Planning Element(s) Addressed</p>
<p>GOAL (watersheds)</p> <p><i>Watersheds are maintained to ensure water quality, timing of runoff, and water yields necessary for functioning riparian, aquatic ecosystems, wetlands, and to support native aquatic species reproduction and survival. Watershed restoration projects promote long-term ecological integrity of ecosystems, conserve genetic integrity of native species, and contribute to attainment of desired stream function and support beneficial uses. (Forest Plan, pg. 13)</i></p>	<p>Item 1: Is the ecological condition of watersheds improving on the forest?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Percent of watersheds in functioning status or improving trend, measured by changes in key characteristics identified in Forest Plan objectives, by 6th code HUC</p>	<p>What is the status of watershed ecological conditions on the forest?</p>	<p>Percent of watersheds in functioning status</p> <p>Watershed Condition Class <i>(number of watersheds in each Class; e.g. 1, 2 or 3)</i></p>	<p>(i) The status of select watershed conditions;</p> <p>(ii) The status of select ecological conditions including key characteristics of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems</p> <p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities</p>
<p>GOAL (Key Watersheds)</p> <p><i>Fish Key Watershed: Populations of bull trout and westslope cutthroat trout exhibit numbers, life histories, age classes, recruitment levels, and reproductive characteristics representative of historic conditions. (Forest Plan, p. 13)</i></p> <p><i>Restoration Key Watershed: Fish habitat, riparian habitat, and water quality are recovered to desired conditions developed through watershed assessments. (Forest Plan, p. 13)</i></p>	<p>Item 2: Have restoration activities identified through watershed assessment resulted in improved watershed condition?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Percent of key watersheds in functioning status or improving trend, measured by changes in key characteristics identified in Forest Plan objectives, by 6th code HUCs.</p>	<p>Have restoration activities resulted in improved watershed condition?</p>	<p>PacFish/InFish Biological Opinion (PIBO) monitoring instream physical habitat <i>(changes in pools, woody debris, bank angle, channel substrate, D50, aquatic invertebrates – in managed vs. unmanaged sites).</i></p> <p>Watershed Condition Class <i>(number of watersheds moved from one Class to a higher functioning Class; e.g. 3 to 2 or 2 to 1)</i></p>	<p>(i) The status of select watershed conditions</p> <p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities</p>

<p>2009 Plan Components (links to 1982 legal requirements are removed with strikethrough text and replaced with references to goals and objectives from the 2009 Plan)</p>	<p>2009 Forest Plan Monitoring Item and Measure (Indicator)</p>	<p>Modified Monitoring Item Wording <i>(Changes made to meet 2012 Planning Rule)</i></p>	<p>Modified Indicators <i>(Measure)</i></p>	<p>2012 Planning Element(s) Addressed</p>
<p>OBJECTIVE (Watershed Analysis) <i>Watershed Analysis: Prepare and maintain a schedule for completing watershed analysis, with emphasis on key watersheds shown on page 58, or listed in Appendix H. (Forest Plan, p. 16)</i></p>	<p>Item 3: Are restoration and conservation activities focused in priority (key) watersheds? <u>Indicator:</u> Number of watershed plans completed, number and type of projects completed in key and other watersheds.</p>	<p>No change: Are restoration and conservation activities focused in priority (key) watersheds?</p>	<p>Projects completed in key and other watersheds <i>(number and type of)</i></p>	<p>(i) The status of select watershed conditions (vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities</p>
<p>GOAL (Stream Channels) <i>Stream Channels: Stream channel attributes and processes are maintained and restored to sustain natural desired riparian, wetland, and aquatic habitats and keep sediment regimes as close as possible to those with which riparian and aquatic ecosystems developed. (Forest Plan, p. 13)</i></p>	<p>Item 4: Are stream and riparian conditions improving? <u>Indicator:</u> Percent of stream channels functioning or in upward trend</p>	<p>What is the status of stream and riparian conditions?</p>	<p>Percent of stream channels functioning or in upward trend <i>(data from BDNF integrated stream monitoring protocol)</i></p>	<p>(i) The status of select watershed conditions; (ii) The status of select ecological conditions including key characteristics of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems (vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities</p>

<p>2009 Plan Components (links to 1982 legal requirements are removed with strikethrough text and replaced with references to goals and objectives from the 2009 Plan)</p>	<p>2009 Forest Plan Monitoring Item and Measure (Indicator)</p>	<p>Modified Monitoring Item Wording (Changes made to meet 2012 Planning Rule)</p>	<p>Modified Indicators (Measure)</p>	<p>2012 Planning Element(s) Addressed</p>
<p>OBJECTIVE (Management Indicator Species) <i>Maintain habitat conditions for native species as reflected by changes in abundance of <i>Drunella doddsi</i> (Mayfly) as a Management Indicator Species (MIS). (Forest Plan, p. 16)</i></p>	<p>Item 5: Are management activities effectively maintaining conditions for native species reproduction?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Changes in abundance of populations of the mayfly (<i>Drunella doddsi</i>) as an indication of changing sediment levels.</p>	<p>No change: Are management activities effectively maintaining conditions for native species reproduction?</p>	<p>Aquatic macroinvertebrate assemblage including the mayfly (<i>Drunella doddsi</i>) (<i>population changes in managed vs. unmanaged sites</i>). This focal species assemblage is used to detect changing conditions of aquatic integrity.</p> <p>PacFish/InFish Biological Opinion (PIBO) monitoring (<i>trend of aquatic habitat conditions in managed vs. unmanaged systems</i>)</p>	<p>(iii) The status of focal species to assess the ecological conditions required under 36 CFR 219.9</p> <p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities</p>
<p>LEGAL (land productivity, 1982 36CFR 219.12 (k)(2))</p> <p>OBJECTIVE (Soil Productivity) <i>Protect soil productivity through site-specific prescriptions. The objective would be achieved by applying the most current soil and water conservation practices and other appropriate mitigation measures identified during project analysis and design, in order to meet the most current Region 1 Soil Quality Standards and riparian area standards. (Forest Plan, p. 34)</i></p>	<p>Item 6: Are soil and water conservation practices (BMPs) being implemented during project work and are they resulting in protection of water quality and beneficial uses?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> BMPs implemented and percent rated effective</p>	<p>No change: Are soil and water conservation practices (BMPs) being implemented during project work and are they resulting in protection of water quality and beneficial uses?</p>	<p>Best Management Practices -BMP (<i>total number of activities that BMPs have been prescribed and implemented</i>)</p> <p>BMP effectiveness ranking (<i>sampling of total are checked for effectiveness</i>)</p>	<p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities</p> <p>(viii) The effects of each management system to determine that they do not substantially and permanently impair the productivity of the land (16 U.S.C. 1604(g)(3)(C)). (36 CFR 219.12(a))</p>

2009 Plan Components (links to 1982 legal requirements are removed with strikethrough text and replaced with references to goals and objectives from the 2009 Plan)	2009 Forest Plan Monitoring Item and Measure (Indicator)	Modified Monitoring Item Wording <i>(Changes made to meet 2012 Planning Rule)</i>	Modified Indicators <i>(Measure)</i>	2012 Planning Element(s) Addressed
GOAL (Soil Productivity) <i>Soil productivity is maintained or restored.</i> (Forest Plan, p. 34)	Item 7: How are management actions maintaining soil quality? <u>Indicator:</u> Effects of treatments on areas treated.	No change: How are management actions maintaining soil quality?	Percent Detrimental Soil Disturbance (DSD) <i>(measured in activity areas as determined by Region 1 Soil Criteria)</i>	(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities (viii) The effects of each management system to determine that they do not substantially and permanently impair the productivity of the land (16 U.S.C. 1604(g)(3)(C)). (36 CFR 219.12(a)).

<p>2009 Plan Components (links to 1982 legal requirements are removed with strikethrough text and replaced with references to goals and objectives from the 2009 Plan)</p>	<p>2009 Forest Plan Monitoring Item and Measure (Indicator)</p>	<p>Modified Monitoring Item Wording (Changes made to meet 2012 Planning Rule)</p>	<p>Modified Indicators (Measure)</p>	<p>2012 Planning Element(s) Addressed</p>
<p>GOAL (Biodiversity)</p> <p><i>A variety of disturbance processes are managed or allowed to occur that produce resilient vegetation communities able to sustain diversity in the face of uncertain climate-influenced disturbances. Resilient vegetation communities will have a mosaic of species and age classes of trees, shrubs, grasses, and forbs for animal forage and cover, and perpetuate the diversity of plants and the microbial and insect communities upon which they are dependent. Old growth is managed on a forest wide basis and is well distributed.</i> (Forest Plan, p. 43)</p>	<p>Item 8: What is the current condition and trend for key characteristics of vegetation diversity identified in the forest plan?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Changes and trends in vegetation composition and structure forest-wide. Measure by changes in forest dominance types by size class, distribution and density of sagebrush in sagebrush/grasslands, percent of old growth, number of snags, and tons of coarse woody debris.</p> <p>Broad scale Regional change for key characteristics.</p>	<p>Have disturbance processes (fire, climate, insects, diseases and management actions) occurred in order to create the mosaic of species and size diversity to create resilient vegetation communities?</p>	<p>Proportion of forest types (percentage of total acres) Forest-wide and by biophysical setting for each of these measures:</p> <p>01. Dominance type (i.e., cover type) 02. Species presence 03. Size class 04. Tree canopy cover</p> <p><i>Very large trees:</i></p> <p>05. Very large tree subclass – proportion of area Forest-wide and by biosetting 06. Very large tree density, trees per acre. Snag density, snags per acre. For >15 inch d.b.h., >20 inch d.b.h., in/out Wilderness/roadless</p> <p>Sage brush Forest-wide within non-forest types (proportion of)</p>	<p>(ii) The status of select ecological conditions including key characteristics of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems</p> <p>(vi) Measurable changes on the plan area related to climate change and other stressors that may be affecting the plan area</p> <p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities</p>
<p>OBJECTIVE (Forested vegetation)</p> <p><i>Aspen Component: Increase the aspen component within lodgepole pine and other types, on 67,000 acres.</i> (Forest Plan, p. 44)</p>	<p>Item 9: Are management activities restoring aspen at the rate projected in the forest plan?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Acres of aspen restored (treated or converted by wildfire)</p>	<p>Are conifers competing with growing space for aspen being removed through natural disturbance processes or management actions?</p>	<p>Acres of conifer removal within aspen stands by:</p> <p>01. Wildfire 02. Insects (bark beetle or western spruce budworm) 03. Management</p>	<p>(ii) The status of select ecological conditions including key characteristics of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems</p> <p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities</p>

2009 Plan Components (links to 1982 legal requirements are removed with strikethrough text and replaced with references to goals and objectives from the 2009 Plan)	2009 Forest Plan Monitoring Item and Measure (Indicator)	<u>Modified Monitoring Item Wording</u> <i>(Changes made to meet 2012 Planning Rule)</i>	<u>Modified Indicators</u> <i>(Measure)</i>	2012 Planning Element(s) Addressed
<p>OBJECTIVE (Grassland/Shrubland)</p> <p><i>Grassland/Shrubland/Riparian: Reduce conifer encroachment on 74,000 acres of riparian areas, shrublands, and grasslands. (Forest Plan, p. 44)</i></p>	<p>Item 10: Are management activities restoring grassland/shrublands at the rate projected in the forest plan?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Acres of encroachment species treated (all methods) or converted by wildfire</p>	<p>No change: Are management activities restoring grassland/shrublands at the rate projected in the forest plan?</p>	<p>Encroachment species treated (all methods) or converted by wildfire (<i>acres of</i>)</p>	<p>(ii) The status of select ecological conditions including key characteristics of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems</p> <p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities</p>
<p>OBJECTIVE (Reference populations of sensitive plants)</p> <p><i>Monitor G1 thru G3 ranked sensitive plants, perform conservation assessments, and develop conservation strategies for species showing downward trends. (Forest Plan, p. 44)</i></p>	<p>Item 11: Are we maintaining static or upward trends in globally designated 1, 2 & 3 sensitive plants?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Change in cover or number of plants.</p>	<p>What is the status of rare plants?</p>	<p>Occurrences (<i>number of stems, acres of occupancy</i>)</p> <p>Surveys (<i>presence/absence</i>)</p>	<p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities.</p>
<p>GOAL (Sage Grouse)</p> <p><i>Sagebrush habitat supports sage grouse and pygmy rabbit populations by providing suitable sage grouse brood-rearing habitat on at least 40% of the sagebrush habitat within 18 kilometers of documented active or inactive sage grouse leks and the area mapped as potential pygmy rabbit habitat. (Forest Plan, p. 45)</i></p>	<p>Item 12: Are management activities affecting sage grouse brood rearing habitat?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Acres of sagebrush cover affected by scheduled vegetation treatments on BDNF lands within 18km of historic or active leks.</p>	<p>Are management activities occurring near historic or active sage grouse leks?</p>	<p>Sagebrush cover affected by scheduled vegetation treatments on BDNF lands within 18 km of historic or active leks (<i>acres of</i>)</p>	<p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities.</p>
<p>GOAL (Elk Security)</p> <p><i>Elk security is managed to provide quality elk habitat, provide a variety of recreational hunting opportunities, and provide support for Montana's fair chase emphasis. (Forest Plan, pg. 46)</i></p>	<p>Item 13: How are populations of elk changing?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Population data for elk from Montana Fish Wildlife & Parks</p>	<p>What is the change in elk population?</p>	<p>Elk (<i>numbers of, by hunting district</i>)</p>	<p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities.</p>

<p>2009 Plan Components (links to 1982 legal requirements are removed with strikethrough text and replaced with references to goals and objectives from the 2009 Plan)</p>	<p>2009 Forest Plan Monitoring Item and Measure (Indicator)</p>	<p>Modified Monitoring Item Wording (Changes made to meet 2012 Planning Rule)</p>	<p>Modified Indicators (Measure)</p>	<p>2012 Planning Element(s) Addressed</p>
<p>GOAL (Wildlife Security)* <i>Secure areas and connectivity for ungulates and large carnivores are provided, while recognizing the variety of recreational opportunities.</i> (Forest Plan, p. 45)</p> <p>OBJECTIVE (Management Indicator Species) <i>Maintain habitat conditions for elk security and winter habitat integrity for wolverine and mountain goat as reflected by changes in abundance of these Management Indicator Species.</i> (Forest Plan, p. 47)</p>	<p>Item 14: Are management activities effectively protecting high elevation winter habitats for mountain goats and wolverines? *The Mount Jefferson Recommended Wilderness boundary will be monitored for illegal snowmobile intrusions into the wolverine habitat closure. Illegal use will be monitored during the period open to snowmobiles December 2 to May 15 and any other time of the year snow conditions make snowmobiling possible. The number and distance of intrusions into the closed area will be recorded. A reassessment of the decision to allow snowmobile use will be triggered if:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Illegal intrusions are documented throughout the closure period 2. Illegal intrusions penetrate the closed area. <p>Illegal intrusions extend as far as the BLM Wilderness Study Area.</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Populations of mountain goats from MT Fish Wildlife & Parks. Number of snowmobile entries into non-motorized high elevation units protected for wolverines and mountain goats. Presence or absence of wolverines in high elevation habitats.</p>	<p>No change: Are management activities effectively protecting high elevation winter habitats for mountain goats and wolverines?</p>	<p>Mountain goats (numbers of) Snowmobile entries (number of entries into non-motorized high elevation units protected for wolverines and mountain goats.) Wolverines (presence or absence in high elevation habitats)</p>	<p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities.</p>

2009 Plan Components (links to 1982 legal requirements are removed with strikethrough text and replaced with references to goals and objectives from the 2009 Plan)	2009 Forest Plan Monitoring Item and Measure (Indicator)	<u>Modified Monitoring Item Wording</u> (Changes made to meet 2012 Planning Rule)	<u>Modified Indicators</u> (Measure)	2012 Planning Element(s) Addressed
<p>GOAL (Wildlife Secure Areas and Connectivity) Manage density of open motorized roads and trails by landscape year-round, except fall rifle big game season, to achieve levels at or below the following (see Table 13 on p. 45 of the Forest plan).</p>	<p>Item 15: Are road and trail densities trending towards goals described by landscape? <u>Indicator:</u> Change in open motorized road and trail density for both seasons by landscape</p>	<p>No change: Are road and trail densities trending towards goals described by landscape?</p>	<p>Open motorized road and trail density (changes in density for both seasons by landscape)</p>	<p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities.</p>
<p>OBJECTIVE (Noxious Weeds) Prevent, reduce, or eliminate infestations of non-native or noxious weed species with emphasis on areas where there is a high likelihood of establishment and spread. Manage noxious weeds through Integrated Pest Management as described in the most current Beaverhead-Deerlodge Noxious Weed Control Record of Decision. (Forest Plan, p. 44)</p>	<p>Item 16: Are management actions preventing or controlling new and existing infestations of weeds? <u>Indicator:</u> Change of acres of known noxious weed infestations. Number of sites of new species and extent.</p>	<p>What is the change in weed infestations?</p>	<p>Weed infestations (acres of known infestations) New species (Number of sites and extent)</p>	<p>(ii) The status of select ecological conditions including key characteristics of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems (vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities.</p>
<p>OBJECTIVE (Wildland Urban Interface) Reduce the risk from wildfire to communities and resources in the following order of priority:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Areas where a community wildfire protection plan has been developed. 2. High risk areas adjacent to communities, for example: condition classes 2 and 3 in fire regimes 1, 2, & 3. 3. Areas in condition class 2 and 3 in fire regimes 4 & 5. 4. Areas to be maintained in condition class 1. (Forest Plan, p. 22) 	<p>Item 18: Are fuels reduction projects being implemented in high risk urban interface areas? <u>Indicator:</u> Acres in wildland urban interface areas (WUI) of reduced fuel loadings and crown fire risk.</p>	<p>No change: Are fuels reduction projects being implemented in high risk urban interface areas?</p>	<p>WUI treatments (acres of) Wildland urban interface areas with reduced fuel loadings and crown fire risk (acres of)</p>	<p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities.</p>

2009 Plan Components (links to 1982 legal requirements are removed with strikethrough text and replaced with references to goals and objectives from the 2009 Plan)	2009 Forest Plan Monitoring Item and Measure (Indicator)	<u>Modified Monitoring Item Wording</u> (Changes made to meet 2012 Planning Rule)	<u>Modified Indicators</u> (Measure)	2012 Planning Element(s) Addressed
<p>GOAL (Allocations, Opportunities) <i>See pages 29-31 for specific allocations and opportunities.</i></p>	<p>Item 19: Is the BDNF providing desired recreation opportunities?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Change in visitor numbers, activities, demographics, and satisfaction.</p>	<p>Is a wide spectrum of recreation opportunities provided?</p>	<p>NVUM survey results (<i>change in visitor numbers, activities, demographics, and satisfaction</i>).</p> <p>Recreation-related services provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miles of trail maintained • Miles of road maintained • Number of campgrounds maintained • Number of ski areas permitted • Number of developed recreation sites maintained • User survey responses • Number of guide permits issues and service days • Challenge cost share agreements and partnership agreements • Number of recreation user events • Number of cabin rental agreements issued 	<p>(v) The status of visitor use, visitor satisfaction, and progress toward meeting recreation objectives.</p> <p>FSH 1909.12, Chapter 30: Social Sustainability</p> <p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities.</p>
<p>GOAL (Recreation Settings) <i>Offer a choice of recreation settings ranging from remote backcountry to more developed front country areas. Recreation allocations use Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) concepts and definitions (Forest Plan, Tables 8 and 9, p. 30). The allocations are mapped on p. 54 of the Forest Plan and are listed on pp. 29-30.</i></p>	<p>Item 20: Are management actions resulting in the desired recreation settings?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Change in percent of Forest in each recreation allocation and ROS class.</p>	<p>No change: Are management actions resulting in the desired recreation settings?</p>	<p>ROS Classes (<i>Change in percent of Forest in each recreation allocation and ROS class</i>).</p>	<p>(v) The status of visitor use, visitor satisfaction, and progress toward meeting recreation objectives.</p> <p>FSH 1909.12, Chapter 30: Social Sustainability</p> <p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities.</p>

<p>2009 Plan Components (links to 1982 legal requirements are removed with strikethrough text and replaced with references to goals and objectives from the 2009 Plan)</p>	<p>2009 Forest Plan Monitoring Item and Measure (Indicator)</p>	<p>Modified Monitoring Item Wording (Changes made to meet 2012 Planning Rule)</p>	<p>Modified Indicators (Measure)</p>	<p>2012 Planning Element(s) Addressed</p>
<p>STANDARDS (Heritage 1-3)</p> <p><i>Standard 1: Heritage resources determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places will be preserved in place, or a consensus determination of “no adverse effect” will be reached with the Montana SHPO, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and appropriate Indian tribes. (Forest Plan, p. 23)</i></p> <p><i>Standard 2: Unplanned discoveries of heritage resources during project implementation shall cause project operations in the area of discovery to cease until analysis and evaluation of the heritage resources are completed, including consultation with the Montana SHPO and appropriate Indian tribes. (Forest Plan, p. 23)</i></p> <p><i>Standard 3: Heritage protection measures will be added to all appropriate contracts, sales documents, and special use permits. (Forest Plan, p. 23)</i></p>	<p>Item 22: Are cultural resources being protected as the forest plan is implemented? Are mitigation measures sufficient to prevent damage to cultural resources from projects?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Number of projects that protect cultural resources.</p>	<p>No change: Are cultural resources being protected as the forest plan is implemented?</p> <p>Are mitigation measures sufficient to prevent damage to cultural resources from projects?</p>	<p>Projects that protect cultural resources (percentage of sites monitored in implemented projects with no effects)</p>	<p>FSH 1909.12 Chapter 30— Cultural Sustainability</p>
<p>GOAL (Economy Contribution)</p> <p><i>Contribute to the social and economic well-being of local communities by promoting sustainable use of renewable natural resources. Provide timber for commercial harvest, forage for livestock grazing, exploration and development opportunities for mineral resources, and recreation settings consistent with other resources goals. (Forest Plan, p. 21)</i></p>	<p>Item 23: What is the status and trend of goods and services provided from the forest?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Quantities of goods and services and the cost of producing them compared to Plan predictions.</p> <p>Contribution of employment and labor income to the 8-county impact area attributable to goods and services provided by the forest.</p>	<p>What multiple use services have been provided?</p>	<p>Goods and services (quantities, cost of producing them compared to plan predictions)</p> <p>Revenue sharing with state & local governments (Dollars)</p> <p>Contribution of employment and labor income to the 8-county impact area attributable to goods and services provided by the forest (Dollars)</p> <p>Federal payments (Dollars)</p>	<p>FSH 1909.12 Chapter 30— Economic Sustainability</p> <p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities.</p>

<p>2009 Plan Components (links to 1982 legal requirements are removed with strikethrough text and replaced with references to goals and objectives from the 2009 Plan)</p>	<p>2009 Forest Plan Monitoring Item and Measure (Indicator)</p>	<p>Modified Monitoring Item Wording <i>(Changes made to meet 2012 Planning Rule)</i></p>	<p>Modified Indicators <i>(Measure)</i></p>	<p>2012 Planning Element(s) Addressed</p>
<p>GOAL (Lands Suitable for Timber Production) <i>Manage lands suitable for timber production for the growth and yield of saw timber, crop trees, pulpwood, and other forest products, including salvage harvest. (Forest Plan, p. 38)</i></p>	<p>Item 24: Are we maintaining the productivity of suitable timber lands? <u>Indicator:</u> Acres of suitable timber lands under management compared to acres projected by SPECTRUM to keep lands in rotation.</p>	<p>What are the changes of suitable timber lands?</p>	<p>Suitable timber lands <i>(total acres, acres taken out of, and acres put into)</i></p>	<p>(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities.</p>
<p>OBJECTIVE (Developed Sites) <i>High quality developed recreation facilities are strategically located to concentrate use, provide access to backcountry settings, and protect natural resources. Sites are clean, well maintained, and designed for universal accessibility. (Forest Plan, p. 31)</i></p>	<p>Item 25: Are we maintaining and reconstructing campgrounds and developed sites on schedule? (30% over the planning period) <u>Indicator:</u> Number of developed sites reconstructed.</p>	<p>No change: Are we maintaining and reconstructing campgrounds and developed sites on schedule (30% over the planning period)?</p>	<p>Reconstructed sites <i>(number of)</i></p>	<p>(v) The status of visitor use, visitor satisfaction, and progress toward meeting recreation objectives. FSH 1909.12 Chapter 30—Social Sustainability (vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities.</p>

2009 Plan Components (links to 1982 legal requirements are removed with strikethrough text and replaced with references to goals and objectives from the 2009 Plan)	2009 Forest Plan Monitoring Item and Measure (Indicator)	<u>Modified Monitoring Item Wording</u> <i>(Changes made to meet 2012 Planning Rule)</i>	<u>Modified Indicators</u> <i>(Measure)</i>	2012 Planning Element(s) Addressed
<p>LEGAL (1982 36CFR(1.5))</p> <p>TIMBER MANAGEMENT, STANDARD 2</p> <p><i>On lands suitable for timber production, the maximum size of openings created by one regeneration harvest operation should not exceed 40 acres. Exceptions can be made where a natural event, such as fire, insect, disease, or wind throw created an undesirable opening. A regeneration harvest larger than 40 acres may be allowed after public notice, and review and approval by the officer one level above the responsible official. This only applies to harvest on suitable timber lands for timber production activities.</i></p> <p>TIMBER MANAGEMENT, STANDARD 5</p> <p><i>When trees are cut to achieve timber production objectives the cuttings shall be made in such a way as to assure that the technology and knowledge exists to adequately restock the lands. (Forest Plan, p. 39)</i></p> <p>TIMBER MANAGEMENT, STANDARD 6</p> <p><i>The following Timber Harvest Classification Protocol establishes where timber harvest is not allowed and where timber harvest is permitted to meet other resource objectives (see p. 39 of the Forest Plan for the protocol).</i></p>	<p>Item 26: Are we complying with appropriate NFMA requirements?</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Stocking of lands</p> <p>Lands suited for timber production</p> <p>Harvest Unit size limits</p>	<p>What is the status of stocking of lands and harvest unit size limits?</p>	<p>Stocking of lands <i>(trees/acre, over percent of area treated, by tree species)</i></p> <p>Harvest unit size limits <i>(maximum size limits for harvest areas evaluated to determine whether such size limits should be continued).</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>