

**APPENDIX A.**  
**Regional Office Monitoring & Evaluation Report Recommendations**  
**March 30, 2005**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Clearly address the monitoring requirements in the current forest plan. Show that we are doing what we said we would.
2. Align future monitoring reports with the requirements of the 2004 planning rule and directives (see attached summary)
3. Report on progress toward agency initiatives such as addressing the four threats, progress toward GPRA Strategic goals, and Regional priorities.
4. Report on progress toward resolving issues identified through the planning process and identify emerging issues.
5. Report on not only the projects and activities implemented, and the outputs from those activities, but also on the outcomes (movement toward desired conditions and meeting multiple-use objectives).
6. Establish the context for why information being reported is important in terms of trends and potential need for adjustment.
7. Engage regional program managers in annual review of forest reports. Make the annual report, including the results of Environmental Management System audits, a focus for any regional program reviews or General Management Reviews.
8. Demonstrate that we are using the best available science.
9. Monitor habitat and populations trends for Management Indicator Species (see attached)
10. Communication.

**MONITORING FOR MANAGEMENT INDICATOR SPECIES**

- Include all types of Management Indicator Species (MIS) monitoring, including what the Forest Service is doing and what our partners are doing for both population and habitat monitoring. Take credit for data collected by others. Review and cite USFWS, State, TNC, and University monitoring efforts that contribute to your understanding of the status of the species. Remember that both the 1982 and 2004 planning rules encourage us to work with states when monitoring MIS to the extent practicable.
- If using trends in habitat as a proxy for monitoring MIS populations (“proxy for proxy method”), provide evidence that the habitat model is a reasonable index of populations. Evidence can be in several forms. The highest level of evidence is validation of the habitat model with an independent population data set. If model predictions are consistent with the independent data, you have demonstrated that you have a reasonable approach. A lesser level of evidence, but still valuable, is a confirmation that the map of habitat that we are using includes the features that the MIS requires. For example, FIA data could be used to confirm that certain habitat polygons have sufficient densities of snags or large trees to meet MIS requirements. The “proxy for a proxy” approach is not advised unless you can demonstrate that this approach is reasonable for the species and consistent with the best available science.
- Describe the monitoring methods used. Both scientific sampling and general program reviews are important sources of monitoring information. If scientific sampling, provide references in scientific form to the sampling methods or protocols used. Always explain the basis for conclusions and recommendations.
- When reporting management indicator species population data also discuss corresponding changes in habitat. The 1982 planning rule directs that both habitat and population trends be evaluated. Develop a method to map habitat and track changes on at least a sample basis. If population and habitat cannot be monitored, amend the plan.