

Olympic National Forest Plan Transition Monitoring Program

Topic/Goals (pg): Component (Standard & Guidelines or Desired Future Condition), (pg):	Existing Monitoring Question (s)	Is Existing Question Still Relevant?	Existing Question Continued?	Proposed Monitoring Question (If Applicable)	1. Existing Metric- 2. Proposed Metric (Indicator)- 3. Rationale-
(i) The status of select watershed conditions.					
<p><u>Topic:</u> Water Quality (IV-4)</p> <p><u>Standards and Guidelines (S&amp;Gs):</u> Water, Soil, and Air (IV-52)</p> <p><u>Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP)</u> <u>Standards and Guidelines:</u> Aquatic Conservation Strategy</p>	<p>a. Are water resource-related Best Management Practices (BMPs) and S&amp;Gs being implemented?</p> <p>b. Are water resource-related BMPs and S&amp;Gs effective?</p> <p>c. Are watershed improvement projects being accomplished?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Have water resource-related Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Forest Plan S&amp;Gs been implemented and are they effective at managing water quality consistent with the Clean Water Act?</p> <p>Are watershed improvement projects being implemented?</p> <p>Are activities in riparian areas {implemented} as planned?</p>	<p>a.</p> <p>1. Project review report</p> <p>2. U.S. Forest Service National BMP Annual Implementation/Effectiveness Monitoring Protocols – Complete Annual BMP Monitoring – Documentation in National BMP Database</p> <p>3. BMP to protect resources for projects; Improving watershed condition framework (WCF); these are tied to mandatory targets for annual reporting</p> <p>b.</p> <p>1. Turbidity</p> <p>2. U.S. Forest Service Watershed Improvement Target – Geographic Information System (GIS) and Field Measurement – Documentation in National WIT Database; U.S. Forest Service Watershed Condition Framework – Development of Watershed Restoration Action Plan – Watershed Indicator Evaluation and Watershed Condition Classification – Documentation in U.S. Forest Service WCF National Database</p> <p>3. BMP to protect resources for projects; Improving WCF; these are tied to mandatory targets for annual reporting</p> <p>c.</p> <p>1. Percent (%) of projects implemented</p> <p>2. U.S. Forest Service National BMP Annual Implementation/Effectiveness Monitoring Protocols – Complete Annual BMP Monitoring – Documentation in National BMP Database</p> <p>3. BMP to protect resources for projects; Improving WCF; these are tied to mandatory targets for annual reporting</p>

Olympic National Forest Plan Transition Monitoring Program

Topic/Goals (pg): Component (Standard & Guidelines or Desired Future Condition), (pg):	Existing Monitoring Question (s)	Is Existing Question Still Relevant?	Existing Question Continued?	Proposed Monitoring Question (If Applicable)	1. Existing Metric- 2. Proposed Metric (Indicator)- 3. Rationale-
<u>Topic:</u> Water cumulative effects (IV-4)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Water, Soil, and Air (IV-52)	a. Are coefficients used in analysis valid?          b. Are cumulative effects within range predicted in [Final Environmental Impact Statement] FEIS?	No          No	No          No	N/A          N/A	a. 1. Tons/year 2. N/A 3. Coefficient not used anymore   b. 1. Acres tons/year 2. N/A 3. While not relevant, different analysis are being used
<b>(ii) The status of select ecological conditions including key characteristics of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems.</b>					
<u>Topic:</u> Riparian Areas/Soil, Water, and Air (IV-4)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Riparian Areas (IV-101)	Are activities in riparian areas as planned?	Yes	Yes	Are activities in riparian areas as planned?	1. Project review reports 2. Projects meet Project Design Criteria's and Standard & Guidelines specified in project NEPA documents 3. Needed to meet the Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives
<u>Topic:</u> Soil Productivity/Soil, Water, and Air (IV-4)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Soil, Water, and Air (IV-52)	Is less than 20% of area disturbed?	Yes	Yes	Is less than 20% of the project area in detrimental condition?	1. Percent disturbed 2. Percent disturbed (GIS/field measured) in detrimental soil condition, Project Design Criteria's, and project monitoring 3. This is our current metric for maintaining natural productivity
<u>Topic:</u> Insect & Disease Control/Vegetation (IV-4)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Timber (IV-50)	Are destructive insect and disease problems remaining below acceptable damage levels?	Yes	Yes	Are destructive insect and disease problems remaining below acceptable damage levels?	1. Frequency of infection centers; acres of infection centers 2. Frequency of infection centers; acres of infection centers 3. Part of monitoring current stand condition for Forest health and Protection

Olympic National Forest Plan Transition Monitoring Program

Topic/Goals (pg): Component (Standard & Guidelines or Desired Future Condition), (pg):	Existing Monitoring Question (s)	Is Existing Question Still Relevant?	Existing Question Continued?	Proposed Monitoring Question (If Applicable)	1. Existing Metric- 2. Proposed Metric (Indicator)- 3. Rationale-
<p><u>Topic:</u> Vegetation (IV-4)</p> <p><u>NWFP Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Survey and Manage Species</p>	Are projects contributing to the persistence of Survey and Manage species?	Yes	Yes	Are projects contributing to the persistence of Survey and Manage species?	<p>1. Acres of mid seral (old growth) habitat maintained, protected, or improved.</p> <p>2. Acres of mid seral (old growth) habitat maintained, protected, or improved.</p> <p>3. Currently monitoring under the NWFP</p>
<p><u>Topic:</u> Native plants/Wildlife Habitat (IV-3)</p> <p><u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Recreation (IV-63, IV-105) and Botanical Areas (IV-108)</p>	Are native plant species and communities receiving adequate protection? Are introduced plant/animal species adversely impacting native plants?	Yes	Yes	Are native plant species and communities receiving adequate protection? Are native plant species and communities well distributed and diverse and are there a complex assemblage of special habitats on the Forest in a condition that provides continued support flora and fauna that are dependent on these habitats? Are there introduced plant or animal species adversely impacting native plant communities?	<p>1. Number, distribution, and condition trend of sensitive or unusual species and communities</p> <p>2. Trend for native species or communities to determine the number, distribution, and condition.</p> <p>3. This question answers how the Forest maintains and develops vegetation diversity</p>
<p><u>Topic:</u> Fish habitat (IV-3)</p> <p><u>NWFP Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Riparian Reserves &amp; Aquatic Conservation Strategy</p>	<p>a. Is habitat capability being maintained?</p> <p>b. Are projects implemented?</p> <p>c. Are S&amp;Gs adequate and being implemented?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>a. Are Standards and Guidelines effective in maintaining or enhancing fish habitat capability?</p> <p>b. Are Standards and Guidelines effective in maintaining or enhancing fish habitat capability?</p> <p>c. Are projects contributing to improvements in fish habitat?</p>	<p>a.</p> <p>1. Fish habitat capability</p> <p>2. AREMP aquatic habitat condition ratings</p> <p>3. This ties in with the Regional Aquatic Monitoring</p> <p>b.</p> <p>1. Percent of projects implemented</p> <p>2. Miles of potential fish habitat blocked by barrier culverts</p> <p>3. This ties in with the Regional Aquatic Monitoring</p> <p>c.</p> <p>1. Reports</p> <p>2. Miles of streams and acres of lakes improved</p> <p>3. This ties in with the Regional Aquatic Monitoring</p>

Olympic National Forest Plan Transition Monitoring Program

Topic/Goals (pg): Component (Standard & Guidelines or Desired Future Condition), (pg):	Existing Monitoring Question (s)	Is Existing Question Still Relevant?	Existing Question Continued?	Proposed Monitoring Question (If Applicable)	1. Existing Metric- 2. Proposed Metric (Indicator)- 3. Rationale-
<u>Topic:</u> Native Plants (IV-3)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Forest Plan Amendments #13 and #15 (Invasive Plants)	Are native plant species and communities receiving adequate protection? Are introduced plant/animal species adversely impacting native plants?	Yes	Yes	Are control measures resulting in effective protection against the spread of invasive plants from Forest actions? If there are new infestations occurring, why?	1. Number, distribution, and condition trend of sensitive or unusual species and communities 2. Acres of surveyed lands for new and active invasive species infestations; effectiveness of treatment methods through pre-and post-treatments surveys 3. This better aligns current monitoring to the Forest Plan amendments for invasives
<b>(iii) The status of focal species to assess the ecological conditions required under §219.9.</b>					
<u>Topic:</u> Wildlife habitat (IV-3)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Wildlife, Fish, and Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species (IV-46)	Are management indicator species using habitat areas set up for each species?	Yes	Yes	Are the species using the habitat areas set up for each species?	1. Spotted Owl Habitat Area (SOHA) occupancy (% occupied) and Pileated woodpecker & marten area occupancy (% occupied) 2. Acres and distribution of habitat components (old growth, young stands, snags) specific to each species 3. Recovery of federally listed species

Olympic National Forest Plan Transition Monitoring Program

Topic/Goals (pg): Component (Standard & Guidelines or Desired Future Condition), (pg):	Existing Monitoring Question (s)	Is Existing Question Still Relevant?	Existing Question Continued?	Proposed Monitoring Question (If Applicable)	1. Existing Metric- 2. Proposed Metric (Indicator)- 3. Rationale-
<p><u>Topic:</u> Wildlife habitat (IV-3)</p> <p><u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Wildlife, Fish, and Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species (IV-48)</p> <p><u>Existing MIS species (1990):</u></p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Habitat is managed for the pileated woodpecker (IV-89)</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Habitat is managed for the American pine marten (IV-89)</p> <p><u>Standards and Guidelines:</u> Elk and Deer Winter Range (IV-48)</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Habitat is managed for the Northern Spotted Owl (IV-86)</p> <p><u>Desired Future Condition:</u> Habitat is managed for the Bald Eagle (IV-92)</p> <p><u>Standard and Guidelines:</u> Wildlife, Fish, and Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species; Primary Cavity Excavators (IV-46)</p>	<p>Are management indicator species [MIS] populations +/- 20% of that predicted in Habitat Capability Index?</p> <p><u>Existing MIS species (1990):</u></p> <p>Pileated Woodpecker (yes, continue)</p> <p>American Marten (yes, continue)</p> <p>Roosevelt Elk and Columbia Black-tailed Deer (yes, continue)</p> <p>Northern Spotted Owl (yes, continue)</p> <p>Bald Eagle (no, discontinue)</p> <p>Primary Cavity Excavators (yes, continue)</p>	Yes	Yes	<p>a. What is the trend for mature and late successional habitat needed for pileated woodpecker persistence?</p> <p>b. What is the population trend for mature and late successional habitat for American marten?</p> <p>c. What is the trend for earl seral habitat needed for deer and elk persistence?</p>	<p>a.</p> <p>1. Percent being used by Primary Cavity Excavator; % of deer and elk in winter range; Number of bald eagle nests active; Number of owls; Number of Pileated woodpeckers and marten; Number of birds; Number deer and elk; Number of nests</p> <p>2. Acres and distribution of habitat components (old growth, young stands, snags)</p> <p>3. Bald eagle was delisted as TES</p> <p>b.</p> <p>1. Same as a. 1.</p> <p>2. Acres of late successional and old growth habitat on the Forest tracked over time (population monitoring)</p> <p>3.</p> <p>c.</p> <p>1. Same as a. 1.</p> <p>2. Acres of early seral habitat distributed on the forest using westside elk model or other vegetation maps</p> <p>3. Use the current data from NSO demography</p>

Olympic National Forest Plan Transition Monitoring Program

Topic/Goals (pg): Component (Standard & Guidelines or Desired Future Condition), (pg):	Existing Monitoring Question (s)	Is Existing Question Still Relevant?	Existing Question Continued?	Proposed Monitoring Question (If Applicable)	1. Existing Metric- 2. Proposed Metric (Indicator)- 3. Rationale-
(iv) The status of a select set of the ecological conditions required under §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.					
<p><u>Topic:</u> Fish habitat (IV-3)</p> <p><u>Standard and Guidelines:</u> Wildlife, Fish, and Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species (IV-46, IV-79)</p> <p><u>NWFP Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Riparian Reserves &amp; Aquatic Conservation Strategy</p>	<p>a. Is habitat capability being maintained?</p> <p>b. Are projects implemented?</p> <p>c. Are S&amp;Gs adequate and being implemented?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>a. Are Standards and Guidelines effective in maintaining or enhancing aquatic habitat for TES fish?</p> <p>b. Are Standards and Guidelines effective in maintaining or enhancing aquatic habitat for TES fish?</p> <p>c. Are projects contributing to improvements in TES fish habitat?</p>	<p>a.</p> <p>1. Fish habitat capability</p> <p>2. AREMP aquatic habitat condition ratings</p> <p>3. This ties in with the Regional Aquatic Monitoring</p> <p>b.</p> <p>1. Percent of projects implemented</p> <p>2. Miles of potential fish habitat blocked by barrier culverts</p> <p>3. This ties in with the Regional Aquatic Monitoring</p> <p>c.</p> <p>1. Reports</p> <p>2. Miles of streams and acres of lakes improved</p> <p>3. This ties in with the Regional Aquatic Monitoring</p>
<p><u>Topic:</u> Wildlife habitat (IV-3)</p> <p><u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Wildlife, Fish, and Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species (IV-46)</p> <p><u>NWFP Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Late successional reserves (8)</p>	<p>What is the trend for mature and late successional habitat needed of the northern spotted owl [NSO] and marbled murrelet to persistence?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>What is the trend for mature and late successional habitat needed for the northern spotted own and marbled murrelet to persistence?</p>	<p>1. Acres of late successional and old growth habitat on the Forest tracked over time. Habitat trend analyses from Regional Effectiveness Monitoring Teams for northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet.</p> <p>2. Acres of late successional and old growth habitat on the Forest tracked over time. Habitat trend analyses from Regional Effectiveness Monitoring Teams for northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet.</p> <p>3. Currently required using NSO owl demography data</p>

Olympic National Forest Plan Transition Monitoring Program

Topic/Goals (pg): Component (Standard & Guidelines or Desired Future Condition), (pg):	Existing Monitoring Question (s)	Is Existing Question Still Relevant?	Existing Question Continued?	Proposed Monitoring Question (If Applicable)	1. Existing Metric- 2. Proposed Metric (Indicator)- 3. Rationale-
<p><u>Topic:</u> Wildlife habitat (IV-3)</p> <p><u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Wildlife, Fish, and Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species (IV-46)</p> <p><u>NWFP Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Late successional reserves (8)</p>	What is the population trend for the Northern spotted owned and marbled murrelet that inhabit the Olympic Peninsula? Is the population decreasing, increasing, or stabilized?	Yes	Yes	What is the population trend for the Northern spotted own and marbled murrelet that inhabit the Olympic Peninsula? Is the population decreasing, increasing, or stabilized?	<p>1. Population size and reproduction results from the annual surveys by the Olympic Peninsula Northern Spotted Owl Tracking the population level over time. Demographic study. Results and conclusions from the Northern Spotted Owl and Marbled Murrelet Effectiveness Monitoring Plans for the Northwest Forest Plan. At-sea population monitoring from Washington Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife (WDFW) and United States Fish &amp; Wildlife Service (USFWS) to estimate population trends within each Recovery Zone.</p> <p>2. Population size and reproduction results from the annual surveys by the Olympic Peninsula Northern Spotted Owl Tracking the population level over time (demographic study). Results and conclusions from the Northern Spotted Owl and Marbled Murrelet Effectiveness Monitoring Plans for the Northwest Forest Plan. At-sea population monitoring from WDFW and USFWS to estimate population trends within each Recovery Zone.</p> <p>3. Currently required using NSO owl demography data</p>
<b>(v) The status of visitor use, visitor satisfaction, and progress toward meeting recreation objectives.</b>					
<p><u>Topic:</u> Wilderness (IV-3)</p> <p><u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Wilderness (IV-46) and Wilderness (IV-82)</p>	Is Wilderness character maintained?	Yes	Yes	Is Wilderness character maintained?	<p>1. Limits of acceptable change indicators</p> <p>2. Monitored using points via Wilderness Challenge</p> <p>3. Wilderness Stewardship challenge now covers metrics</p>
<p><u>Topic:</u> Scenery (IV-2)</p> <p><u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Recreation (IV-43) and Undeveloped Recreation (IV-63)</p>	Are VQOs met?	No	Yes	Are scenery and visual goals being met using the Scenery Management System?	<p>1. Acres by VQO</p> <p>2. Acres by SMS</p> <p>3. VQO outdated; Scenery Mgmt System (SMS) now</p>
<p><u>Topic:</u> Developed Recreation (IV-2)</p> <p><u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Developed Recreation Sites and Administrative Sites (IV-70)</p>	Are sites receiving heavy use?	Yes	Yes	Are people having a high level of satisfaction during their visit to the Olympic National Forest?	<p>1. Recreation Visitor Days (RVD) and Proposed and existing capacity (PAOT)</p> <p>2. National Visitor Use Monitoring Data</p> <p>3. Metrics have changed, for different reasons</p>

Olympic National Forest Plan Transition Monitoring Program

Topic/Goals (pg): Component (Standard & Guidelines or Desired Future Condition), (pg):	Existing Monitoring Question (s)	Is Existing Question Still Relevant?	Existing Question Continued?	Proposed Monitoring Question (If Applicable)	1. Existing Metric- 2. Proposed Metric (Indicator)- 3. Rationale-
(vi) Measurable changes on the plan area related to climate change and other stressors that may be affecting the plan area.					
Topic: Air Quality/Soil, Water, and Air (IV-4)  Standard and Guidelines: Water, Soil, and Air (IV-52) and Protection (IV-59)	What are effects of prescribed burning and is State Implementation Plans (SIP) Program Effective?	Yes	Yes	What are effects of prescribed burning and is State SIP Program Effective?	1. Incidents 2. Incidents of burning 3. State and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requirement
(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities.					
Topic: Semi-Primitive and Primitive Recreation (IV-2)  Standard and Guidelines: (FW:IV-43, IV-63 to 67)	Are Primitive, Semi-Primitive non-Motorized and Semi-Primitive motorized ROS area provided?	Yes	Yes	Are Primitive, Semi-Primitive non-Motorized and Semi-Primitive motorized ROS area provided?	1. Acres and ROS criteria 2. Acres and ROS criteria 3. Relevant b/c ROS areas ID'd but are we maintaining to desired future conditions?
Topic: Trails (IV-2)  Standard & Guidelines: Recreation (IV-43) and Undeveloped Recreation (IV-64)	Are trails objectives met?	Yes	Yes	Are trails objectives met?	1. Number of conflicts and damage 2. Number of damage 3. Change metric/indicator to miles or percent (%) of trail maintained to standard
Topic: Off Road Vehicle (ORV) Use/Recreation (IV-2)  Standard & Guidelines: Undeveloped Recreation, Motorized (IV-66)	Are adverse effects occurring?	Yes	Yes	Are adverse effects occurring?	1. Number (#) of violations, conflicts, and damage 2. Number (#) of violations and damage 3. Need for spectrum of opportunity and resource effects



Olympic National Forest Plan Transition Monitoring Program

Topic/Goals (pg): Component (Standard & Guidelines or Desired Future Condition), (pg):	Existing Monitoring Question (s)	Is Existing Question Still Relevant?	Existing Question Continued?	Proposed Monitoring Question (If Applicable)	1. Existing Metric- 2. Proposed Metric (Indicator)- 3. Rationale-
<u>Topic:</u> Recreation (IV-2)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Recreation (IV-43) and Wild, Scenic, and Recreational Rivers (IV-74)	Are attributes maintained?	Yes	Yes	Are attributes (outstanding features/values) maintained?	1. Wild and Scenic River classification criteria 2. Wild and Scenic River classification criteria 3. Per Act requirements, still a need to monitor
<u>Topic:</u> Cultural Resources (IV-5)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Cultural Resource Management (IV-44)	Are surveys performed?	Yes	Yes	Are surveys performed?	1. Projects and acres 2. Projects and acres 3. Required by NEPA and SHPO consultation; maintaining heritage standard/target
<u>Topic:</u> Cultural and Historical Site Rehabilitation/Cultural Resources (IV-5)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Cultural Resource Management (IV-44)	Are repair, stabilization or rehabilitation projects scheduled and performed as necessary?	Yes	Yes	Are repair, stabilization or rehabilitation projects scheduled and performed as necessary?	1. Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines 2. Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines 3. Required by NEPA and SHPO consultation; maintaining heritage standard/target
<u>Topic:</u> Cultural and Historic Site Protection (IV-5)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Cultural Resource Management (IV-44)	Are cultural resource properties (unevaluated or eligible for inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places) being adequately protected?	Yes	Yes	Are cultural resource properties (unevaluated or eligible for inclusion to the National Register of Historic Places) being adequately protected?	1. Sites 2. Sites 3. Required by NEPA and SHPO consultation; maintaining heritage standard/target
<u>Topic:</u> Coordination with American Indians/American Indians (IV-5)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Human and Community Development (IV-55)	Are programs and Indian concerns coordinated?	Yes	Yes	Are programs and Indian concerns coordinated?	1. Contacts 2. Contacts 3. No incidents of conflict between Forest Policy and Indian rights; no deviation permitted in contacts/coordination

Olympic National Forest Plan Transition Monitoring Program

Topic/Goals (pg): Component (Standard & Guidelines or Desired Future Condition), (pg):	Existing Monitoring Question (s)	Is Existing Question Still Relevant?	Existing Question Continued?	Proposed Monitoring Question (If Applicable)	1. Existing Metric- 2. Proposed Metric (Indicator)- 3. Rationale-
<u>Topic:</u> Standards and Guidelines (General)/All program areas (IV-2 to 7)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Forest-Wide Standards and Guidelines (IV-43-60)	Are S&Gs implemented and do they meet objectives?	Yes	Yes	Are S&Gs implemented and do they meet objectives?	1. program element or mgmt unit S&G review 2. program element or mgmt unit S&G review 3. B-51 worksheet has narrative but this might be covered somewhere else
<u>Topic:</u> Road mileage/Lands (IV-6)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Facilities (IV-56)	Does transportation systems meet objectives and projections?	Yes	Yes	Does transportation systems meet objectives and projections?	1. Miles of road 2. Miles of road 3. Currently a key metric for accessing lands
<u>Topic:</u> Minerals development & rehabilitation/Minerals and Energy (IV-4)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Minerals, Energy, and Geology (IV-54)	Are Standards and Guidelines reasonable and effective?	Yes	Yes	Are Standards and Guidelines reasonable and effective for Minerals development & rehabilitation?	1. Cases 2. Cases 3. Existing element speaks to rock pits and hydropower approval w/ Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. No cases with inadequate protection measures or substandard rehabilitation.
<b>(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)).</b>					
<u>Topic:</u> Costs and Values/Vegetation (IV-4)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Timber (IV-50)	Are allocations and prescriptions still cost-efficient?	Yes	Yes	How do the timber output estimates in the Forest Plan compare with actual production?	1. Dollars 2. Probable Sale Quantity (PSQ) 3. FORest PLANing (FORPLAN, computer program) no longer used
<u>Topic:</u> Budgets/Socio-Economic (IV-7)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Not tied to Standard	Are projected Forest Plan programs and budgets realized?	Yes	Yes	Are projected Forest Plan programs and budgets realized?	1. Dollars 2. Dollars 3. Relates to accomplishment of Forest program

Olympic National Forest Plan Transition Monitoring Program

Topic/Goals (pg): Component (Standard & Guidelines or Desired Future Condition), (pg):	Existing Monitoring Question (s)	Is Existing Question Still Relevant?	Existing Question Continued?	Proposed Monitoring Question (If Applicable)	1. Existing Metric- 2. Proposed Metric (Indicator)- 3. Rationale-
<u>Topic:</u> Social and Economic Effects/Socio-Economic (IV-7)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Not tied to specific standard and guideline	Are results consistent with predictions and expectations?	Yes	Yes	Are there changes in the projected supply or demand of Forest goods and services used in economic evaluation or in sensitive issues response?	1. Numerous 2. What is the economic impact if the PSQ is not met or exceeded in terms of revenue to the Forest Service and private sector jobs? 3. Ambiguous whether tied to S&G. Some statistics are monitored at the Regional level and through the census data. The RO tracks the timber market and comparison. Planning expectation; continue supplying timber/forest products for local/regional economy
<u>Topic:</u> Environmental Analysis (not tied to one specific goal)  <u>Standard and Guidelines:</u> Not tied to specific standard and guideline	a. Are proposed activities in compliance with NEPA?	Yes	Yes	Are proposed activities in compliance with NEPA?	a. 1. Reports reviewed 2. Review project plans and NEPA documents for sufficiency and conduct activity reviews 3. Legal requirements under NEPA
	B. Was project implemented as stated in NEPA documentation?	Yes	Yes	Was project implemented as stated in NEPA documentation?	b. 1. Project review 2. Review project plans and NEPA documents for sufficiency and conduct activity reviews. 3. Legal requirements under NEPA

Olympic National Forest Plan Transition Monitoring Program

Topic/Goals (pg): Component (Standard & Guidelines or Desired Future Condition), (pg):	Existing Monitoring Question (s)	Is Existing Question Still Relevant?	Existing Question Continued?	Proposed Monitoring Question (If Applicable)	1. Existing Metric- 2. Proposed Metric (Indicator)- 3. Rationale-
<u>Topic:</u>  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Timber Offered, IV-50	a. Is Forest offering of charge- able and nonchargeable volume commensurate with ASQ and TSPQ?  b. Are stands adequately restocked within three years?  c. Is precommercial and release completed according to silvicultural prescriptions?  d. Is fertilization completed on soils with demonstrated response according to silvicultural prescriptions?  e. Is genetic stock utilized for reforestation in the appropriate zone?  f. Are clearcuts within size limits and are objectives for variety, dispersal openings and vegetative stages effective?  g. Are harvest methods commensurate with Forest Plan objectives?	Yes  No  Yes  No  Yes  No  Yes	Yes  No  Yes  No  Yes  No  Yes	a. Is Forest offering of charge- able and nonchargeable volume commensurate with ASQ and TSPQ?          c. Is precommercial and release completed according to silvicultural prescriptions?          e. Is genetic stock utilized for reforestation in the appropriate zone?          g. Are harvest methods commensurate with Forest Plan objectives?	a. 1. Million cubic feet (MMCF)/million board feet (MMBF) 2. MMCF/MMBF 3. Allowable Sale Quantity (ASQ) no longer used; probable timber sale quantity (PSQ) is now used  b. 1. acres/years 2. N/A 3. N/A  c. 1. acres/years 2. acres/years 3. Part of monitoring component  d. 1. acres 2. N/A 3. Currently don't fertilize  e. 1. trees/acres 2. trees/acres 3. Still applicable  f. 1. acres 2. N/A 3. No longer do clearcuts  g. 1. acres 2. acres 3. To ensure Standard & Guidelines are followed

Olympic National Forest Plan Transition Monitoring Program

Topic/Goals (pg): Component (Standard & Guidelines or Desired Future Condition), (pg):	Existing Monitoring Question (s)	Is Existing Question Still Relevant?	Existing Question Continued?	Proposed Monitoring Question (If Applicable)	1. Existing Metric- 2. Proposed Metric (Indicator)- 3. Rationale-
<u>Topic:</u> Land Suitable for Timber Management/Vegetation (IV-4)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Timber (IV-50)	Are lands which were identified as not suitable for timber projection still unsuitable? (And lands which were identified as suitable for timber projection still suitable?)	Yes	Yes	Are lands which were identified as not suitable for timber projection still unsuitable? (And lands which were identified as suitable for timber projection still suitable?)	1. Acres 2. Acres 3. Still a pertinent monitoring question
<u>Topic:</u> Old-growth/Vegetation (IV-4)  <u>Standard &amp; Guidelines:</u> Wildlife, Fish, and Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species (IV-46) and Timber (IV-50)	Are acres as expected?	Yes	Yes	Old-growth- Are forest plant species, structure and landscape patterns moving towards the desired condition?	1. Acres 2. Distribution of old-growth forests on the landscape. 3. Driving recovery of listed species (5 year RO monitoring report)





























