



## DECISION MEMO ALASKA REGION CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST

2002 Revised Land Management and Resources Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy Amendment

### Decision to be Implemented

It is my decision to amend the 2002 Revised Land and Resource Management Plan (Revised Forest Plan); updating the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy (Chapter 5) to clarify 15 questions and drop 15 questions as displayed in Table 2 (attached).

### Rationale

Monitoring and evaluation provides information to determine whether programs and projects are meeting forest plan direction (Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.12, chapter 60). Evaluation of the monitoring data is used to determine the effectiveness of the Revised Forest Plan and the need to change it through amendment. The intensity of the monitoring should be commensurate with the risks, costs, and values involved in meeting plan objectives. The implementation of the Revised Forest Plan monitoring strategy is based on the availability of funds to accomplish the work (Revised Forest Plan page 5-3).

The Revised Forest Plan, as amended, established 41 general monitoring questions for the Chugach National Forest. A Monitoring and Evaluation Interdisciplinary Team (MEIT) was established to facilitate implementation of the monitoring and evaluation program, including a monitoring guide and monitoring protocols. During development of the monitoring guide, the MEIT found that many of the items in the Revised Forest Plan Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy did not clearly address implementation and effectiveness of the standards, guidelines, goals and objectives of the Revised Forest Plan, or were being addressed through other national and regional monitoring efforts.

The MEIT evaluated the monitoring items using a logical, repeatable, objective system (DeVelice et al. 2011)<sup>1</sup> to prioritize the Revised Forest Plan monitoring questions. The identified criteria<sup>2</sup> MEIT used fall into two categories: (1) merit criteria: those that evaluate the monitoring item according to how well it addresses the Revised Forest Plan and regional and national information needs, and (2) design criteria: those that evaluate the statistical rigor of the sampling design and field protocols developed for the monitoring item in relation to the risk associated with the resource proposed for monitoring.

---

<sup>1</sup> DeVelice, R.L., M.A. Friberg, G.M. Harris, M.I. Goldstein, P.C. Reed, and D.A. Boyce. 2011. Prioritizing land management plan monitoring questions. USDA Forest Service, Chugach National Forest. *Manuscript in preparation for publication.*

<sup>2</sup> MEIT identified these criteria with the assistance of the Pacific Northwest Research Station and the Inventory and Monitoring Institute.

In general, the merit criteria assess the monitoring item according to:

1. How well it evaluates the Revised Forest Plan,
2. The ability of the forest to influence the state of the resource proposed for monitoring,
3. The risks associated with that resource, and
4. The extent to which the monitoring item will meet priority needs beyond the Revised Forest Plan.

The design criteria assess the monitoring protocols according to:

1. The appropriateness of the statistical rigor in relation to risks associated with the monitoring item, and
2. Efficiencies such as the use of existing data and cost of the monitoring.

The results of the MEIT and forest plan evaluation indicate a forest plan amendment is needed to clarify the language in 15 monitoring questions and drop 15 monitoring questions. Table 1(attached) displays these changes and my rationale for them. Table 2 (attached) displays the replacement for Table 5-1 in the Revised Forest Plan. This proposed monitoring strategy is a better reflection of what the Chugach can reasonably accomplish with current and projected appropriated funding.

### **Reasons for Categorically Excluding the Decision**

A proposed action may be categorically excluded from analysis and documentation in an environmental impact statement (EIS) or environmental assessment (EA) only if: (1) the proposed action is within a category listed in 36 CFR 220.6(d) or (e) and, (2) there are no extraordinary circumstances.<sup>3</sup>

This decision is within the scope of § 220.6(e)(16): “Land management plans, plan amendments and plan revisions developed in accordance with § 219 *et seq.* that provide broad guidance and information for project and activity decisionmaking in a NFS unit.”

36 CFR 220.6(b) identifies resource conditions that should be considered in determining whether extraordinary circumstances related to a proposed action warrant further analysis and documentation in an EA or an EIS. Below is a list of the resource conditions listed in § 220.6(b) that was considered:

#### **Federally listed threatened or endangered species or designated critical habitat, species proposed for Federal listing or proposed critical habitat, or Forest Service sensitive species.**

This is a programmatic action related to forest plan monitoring and does not authorize site-specific activities. Two monitoring questions related to Forest Service sensitive plant species would be rewritten for clarification purposes, but would not change the original monitoring intent. The trumpeter swan is no longer included on the Alaska Region sensitive species list because of healthy population numbers, therefore monitoring as a Forest Service sensitive status species is no longer necessary. The US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) will continue to monitor this species bi-annually. If future FWS surveys detect a downward trend, the swan's status will be re-examined as part of the annual review of the Sensitive Species List and reconsidered for forest monitoring. There are no changes proposed relative to any threatened or endangered species. Therefore, there are no extraordinary circumstances related to federally listed threatened or endangered species or designated critical habitat, species proposed for Federal listing or proposed critical habitat, or Forest Service sensitive species.

---

<sup>3</sup> 36 CFR 220.6(a).

**Flood plains, wetlands, or municipal watersheds.**

This is a programmatic action related to forest plan monitoring and does not authorize site-specific activities. There are would be no changes in monitoring related to flood plains, wetlands, or municipal watersheds. Therefore, there are no extraordinary circumstances related to flood plains, wetlands, or municipal watersheds.

**Congressionally designated areas such as wilderness, wilderness study areas, or national recreation areas.**

This is a programmatic action related to forest plan monitoring and does not authorize site-specific activities. There are would be no changes in monitoring related to wilderness, wilderness study areas, or national recreation areas. Therefore, there are no effects to wilderness, wilderness study areas, or national recreation areas.

**Inventoried roadless areas or potential wilderness areas**

This is a programmatic action related to forest plan monitoring and does not authorize site-specific activities. There are would be no changes in monitoring related to inventoried roadless areas. Therefore, there are no effects to inventoried roadless areas.

**Research Natural Areas**

This is a programmatic action related forest plan monitoring and does not authorize site-specific activities. One monitoring question related to research natural areas would be rewritten for clarification purposes, but would not change the original monitoring intent. Therefore, there are no effects to research natural areas.

**American Indians and Alaska Native religious or cultural sites**

This is a programmatic action related to forest plan monitoring and does not authorize site-specific activities. One monitoring question related to heritage resources would be dropped from the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy. There would be no change to the original monitoring intent because this question is being monitored through the protocol of the remaining heritage resources monitoring question. Therefore, there are no effects to any cultural sites.

**Archeological sites, or historic properties or areas**

This is a programmatic action related to forest plan monitoring and does not authorize site-specific activities. One monitoring question related to heritage resources would be dropped from the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy. There would be no change to the original monitoring intent because this question is being monitored through the protocol of the remaining heritage resources monitoring question. Therefore, there are no effects to any archeological or historic sites.

**Interested and Affected Agencies, Organizations and Persons Contacted**

This project has been listed on the Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA) since January 2012. The SOPA is available on the Chugach National Forest website and hard copies are mailed to 51 individuals. Scoping to determine the presence or absence of potential effects of extraordinary circumstances occurred September 24, 2012 through October 22, 2012. Scoping letters were mailed to 119 individuals, organizations and agencies including Tribes and Native Corporations. The scoping letter was also posted

on the Chugach National Forest website. Two comment letters were received. Neither letter listed any objections or concerns. One letter requested information regarding completed monitoring. The other letter requested a clarification edit, which is included in this decision. Based on my review of the interdisciplinary team analysis and public input, I determine there are no extraordinary circumstances related to this amendment.

## **Findings Required by Other Laws**

### **Chugach Revised Land and Resource Management Plan**

This decision is consistent with the Revised Forest Plan. It will not change the purpose and need of the Revised Forest Plan, nor will it change any goals, objectives, standards, or guidelines.

### **ANILCA Section 810, Subsistence Evaluation, and Finding**

As a programmatic action related to forest plan monitoring, there would be no effects to subsistence use. Therefore, this amendment would not result in significant restriction of subsistence use of wildlife, fish, or other foods.

### **ANILCA Section 811, Subsistence Evaluation, and Finding**

As a programmatic action related to forest plan monitoring, no access would be restricted as a result of this decision. Therefore, this action would not result in a significant restriction of subsistence users having reasonable access to subsistence resources on National Forest System Lands.

### **Endangered Species Act of 1973**

This is a programmatic action related to forest plan monitoring and does not authorize site-specific activities. Therefore, there are no effects to any species listed as endangered or threatened, or proposed for listing or any proposed or designated critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

### **National Historic Preservation Act of 1966**

The Forest Service program for compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) includes locating, inventorying and evaluating the National Register of Historic Places eligibility of historic and archeological sites that may be directly or indirectly affected by scheduled activities. Regulations (36 CFR §800) implementing Section 106 of the NHPA require Federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on sites that are determined eligible for inclusion in or are listed in the National Register of Historic Places (termed "historic properties"). As a programmatic amendment to the forest plan monitoring and evaluation strategy, this decision does not authorize site-specific activities that may directly or indirectly affect historic properties.

### **Floodplain Management (E.O. 11988), Protection of Wetlands (E.O. 11990)**

This is a programmatic action and does not authorize site-specific activities. I have determined it will not have any impacts on floodplains and wetlands and will comply with Executive Orders 11988 and 11990.

### **Recreational Fisheries (E.O. 12962)**

This forest plan amendment is a programmatic action related to forest plan monitoring and does not authorize site-specific activities that would affect recreational fisheries.

### **Environmental Justice (E.O. 12898)**

As a programmatic decision related to forest plan monitoring, I have determined that, in accordance with Executive Order 12898, this project does not have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations.

### **Invasive Species (E.O. 13112)**

Executive Order 13112 directs Federal agencies not to authorize any activities that would introduce or spread invasive species. This programmatic forest plan monitoring and evaluation strategy amendment does not authorize any site-specific activities that would have the potential to introduce or spread invasive species. I have determined this amendment complies with Executive Order 13112.

### **Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act**

This forest plan amendment is a programmatic action related to forest plan monitoring and does not authorize site-specific activities that would affect anadromous species and continental shelf fisheries.

### **Finding of Consistency with All Applicable Federal Laws and Regulations**

Based on my review of the actions associated with this amendment and all applicable specialists' input, I find that the forest plan amendment to replace the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy to update 15 questions and drop 15 questions as displayed in Table 2 (attached) is consistent with applicable Federal laws and regulations.

### **Public Review Period and Objection Process**

Amendments to Forest Plans that are categorically excluded from analysis in an EIS and that are documented in a decision memo are subject to a 30-day objection process. A legal notice was published in the Anchorage Daily News on February 1, 2013, marking the beginning of the 30-day objection period. The regulations at 36 CFR 219.32<sup>4</sup> describe the objection process that governs this amendment. As of the close of the objection period, no objections were received.

### **AMENDMENT IMPLEMENTATION**

This decision shall be implemented in accordance with Forest Service regulations contained in 36 CFR 219.32(d)<sup>4</sup>. As no objections were received, this amendment is effective immediately upon my signature.

### **FOREST CONTACT**

For additional information, concerning this proposed amendment or for information on the objection process, contact Sharon Randall by phone: (907) 743-9497 or email: FS-comments-alaska-chugach@fs.fed.us.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
TERRI MARCERON  
Chugach Forest Supervisor

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

<sup>4</sup> Federal Register Volume 74, No. 242, December 18, 2009, 67073.

“The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual’s income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA’s TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410, or call (866) 632-9992 (Voice). TDD users can contact USDA through local relay or the Federal relay at (800) 877-8339 (TDD) or (800) 845-6136 (in Spanish). USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.

**Table 1. Description of Proposed Changes to the Revised Forest Plan (As Amended) Monitoring Items**

Monitoring Question as Stated in Revised Forest Plan as Amended	Proposed General Monitoring Questions in Revised Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy	Change (Yes/No/Drop)	Rationale for Change	Monitoring Protocol Status
<b>Compliance with Revised Forest Plan Direction</b>				
Are projects being implemented consistent with the Forest Plan direction?	–	No	–	Protocol complete
<b>Integrated Effectiveness/Validation Monitoring</b>				
Are management activities achieving their intended outcomes?	–	No	–	Protocol complete
To what extent is ecosystem composition and structure changing and has forest management influenced those changes? How do these changes compare to the expected range?	Is Forest Management influencing changes in ecosystem composition and structure outside the expected range of variability?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol complete
<b>Air Resources</b>				
Are Forest management actions contributing to changes in air quality on the Forest?	What is the potential that winter snowmachine use and its associated activities are causing violations of Alaska State air quality standards in areas of the Chugach National Forest where winter motorized use is the highest?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol complete

Monitoring Question as Stated in Revised Forest Plan as Amended	Proposed General Monitoring Questions in Revised Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy	Change (Yes/No/Drop)	Rationale for Change	Monitoring Protocol Status
<b>Soil Resources</b>				
What is the effect of summer OHV use on soils and/or vegetation where OHV use is allowed? Are management practices (standards and guidelines, BMPs, mitigation measures) effective in maintaining soil quality and in meeting the severity limits for selected soil properties?	–	No	–	Protocol under development
<b>Water Resources</b>				
What is the existing water quantity?	–	Drop	This question reflects a research question rather than a monitoring need. It is highly unlikely that monitoring water quantity would detect any changes due to forest management activities because there are limited ground disturbing activities on the Chugach NF, undergrowth response is very quick, a high percentage of the watershed area is in backcountry designations, and there is a high natural variability in stream flows.	–
Are Best Management Practices (including wetland management) effective in meeting water quality standards?	–	No	–	Protocol complete
<b>Sensitive and Exotic Plant Species</b>				
What is the abundance and distribution of sensitive plants in areas affected by management activities?	Are Forest management activities contributing to changes in the abundance and distribution of sensitive plant populations?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol complete

Monitoring Question as Stated in Revised Forest Plan as Amended	Proposed General Monitoring Questions in Revised Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy	Change (Yes/No/Drop)	Rationale for Change	Monitoring Protocol Status
What is the distribution and abundance of exotic plants, particularly in areas affected by management activities?	Are Forest management activities contributing to changes in the abundance and distribution of invasive plant populations?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol complete
<b>Management Indicator Species</b>				
What are the population trends for Management Indicator Species (MIS) and their relationship to habitat? Are MIS truly reflective of all fish and wildlife species on the Forest?	–	Drop	Individual monitoring questions exist for each MIS identified in the Revised Forest Plan making this question redundant.	–
Has the Revised Forest Plan direction prevented adverse interactions between bears and humans?	Has the Revised Forest Plan been effective in reducing adverse interactions between (brown) bears and humans?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol complete
What are the population trends for brown bear and the relationship to habitat?	What are the population trends for brown bear and the relationship to habitat change?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol under development
What are the population trends for dusky Canada geese and the relationship to habitat?	What are the population trends for dusky Canada geese and the relationship to habitat change?	Yes	Clarification	Protocols complete
What are the population trends for moose and the relationship to habitat?	What are the population trends for moose and the relationship to habitat change?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol complete

<b>Monitoring Question as Stated in Revised Forest Plan as Amended</b>	<b>Proposed General Monitoring Questions in Revised Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy</b>	<b>Change (Yes/No/Drop)</b>	<b>Rationale for Change</b>	<b>Monitoring Protocol Status</b>
What are the population trends for mountain goats and the relationship to habitat?	What are the population trends for mountain goats and the relationship to habitat change?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol complete
What are the population trends for black oystercatchers and the relationship to habitat?	What are the population trends for black oystercatchers and the relationship to habitat change?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol complete
<b>Species of Special Interest</b>				
Is Forest management maintaining favorable conditions for sustaining gray wolves?	–	Drop	Low priority	–
Is Forest management maintaining favorable conditions for sustaining Kenai wolverines?	What are the population trends for wolverines on the Kenai Peninsula and the relationship to habitat change?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol complete
Is Forest management maintaining favorable conditions for sustaining Townsend warblers?	–	Drop	Low priority	–
Is forest management maintaining favorable conditions for sustaining northern goshawks?	–	Drop	Low priority	–
Is Forest management maintaining favorable conditions for sustaining Sitka black-tailed deer?	–	Drop	Low priority	–
Is forest management maintaining favorable conditions for sustaining the Montague Island marmot?	–	Drop	Low priority	–

Monitoring Question as Stated in Revised Forest Plan as Amended	Proposed General Monitoring Questions in Revised Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy	Change (Yes/No/Drop)	Rationale for Change	Monitoring Protocol Status
Is Forest management maintaining favorable conditions for sustaining cutthroat trout?	–	Drop	Low priority	–
<b>Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Animal Species</b>				
What are the status and trends of trumpeter swans?	–	Drop	The species was removed from the Alaska Region Sensitive Species List in 2009 because trumpeter swan populations appear healthy and viability is not a concern at this time <sup>1</sup> . Therefore monitoring of this species in the Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Animal Species category is no longer necessary. The USFWS conducts spring and fall surveys annually on the Copper River Delta and additional range-wide surveys occur every 5 years. If future USFWS surveys detect a downward trend, the swan's status will be re-examined as part of the annual review of the Sensitive Species List and reconsidered for forest monitoring.	–
<b>Riparian Habitat</b>				
Are riparian and aquatic habitat protection measures included in project planning and are Revised Forest Plan standards and guidelines being met during project implementation?	–	No	–	Protocol under development

<sup>1</sup> 2009 Forest Service Alaska Region Sensitive Species List Assessment and Proposed Revisions to the 2002 List. Located at: [http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE\\_DOCUMENTS/fsbdev2\\_037658.pdf](http://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fsbdev2_037658.pdf)

Monitoring Question as Stated in Revised Forest Plan as Amended	Proposed General Monitoring Questions in Revised Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy	Change (Yes/No/Drop)	Rationale for Change	Monitoring Protocol Status
<b>Forest Products</b>				
Are harvested forestlands restocked?	–	No	–	Protocol complete
Have conditions changed that would affect the suitability of timber production lands?	Have lands once identified as unsuitable for timber production been examined to determine if they have become suitable?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol complete
<b>Minerals</b>				
Are mining plans of operations consistent with Revised Forest Plan direction?	–	Drop	The monitoring protocol developed for ‘Are projects being implemented consistent with the Forest Plan direction?’ answers this question. Therefore, this monitoring item is redundant and no longer necessary as a stand-alone item.	–
<b>Heritage Resources</b>				
Are National Register eligible heritage resources being adequately maintained and protected?	–	No	–	Protocol complete
What is the status and condition of heritage resources on the Forest?		Drop	The monitoring protocol developed for the immediately preceding heritage question answers this question. Therefore, this monitoring item is redundant and no longer necessary as a stand-alone item.	–

Monitoring Question as Stated in Revised Forest Plan as Amended	Proposed General Monitoring Questions in Revised Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy	Change (Yes/No/Drop)	Rationale for Change	Monitoring Protocol Status
<b>Recreational Opportunities, Tourism, Access, and Facilities</b>				
What are the characteristics of recreational visitors? What is their pattern of recreational use? What are their perceptions of opportunities and settings?	–	Drop	The National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) program provides adequate information for answering these monitoring questions.	–
Is the Revised Forest Plan direction for motorized and nonmotorized access working?	–	No	–	Protocol complete
Are areas of the Forest being managed in accordance with the prescribed Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) class in Forestwide standards and guidelines?	–	Drop	Low priority	–
What is the use of developed recreational facilities and how does it compare to capacity?	What is the trend in the use of developed recreational facilities and how does it compare to capacity?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol complete
What is the trend in commercial recreation services on the Forest and how does it compare to capacity?	–	No	–	Protocol complete
<b>Scenic Quality</b>				
Are areas of the forest being managed in accordance with the scenic integrity objectives (SIO) in forestwide standards and guidelines?	–	No	–	Protocol complete

Monitoring Question as Stated in Revised Forest Plan as Amended	Proposed General Monitoring Questions in Revised Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy	Change (Yes/No/Drop)	Rationale for Change	Monitoring Protocol Status
<b>Fire Protection and Fuels Management</b>				
What is the pattern of abundance of different fuel types on the Kenai Peninsula?	Are human life, property and facilities being protected from wildland fire hazards?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol complete
<b>Wilderness</b>				
Is the wilderness character of the wilderness study area (WSA) and areas recommended for Wilderness being maintained?	–	No	–	Protocol complete
<b>Research Natural Areas</b>				
Are proposed and established Research Natural Areas (RNA) being maintained in a state unmodified by human activity?	Are proposed and established Research Natural Areas (RNA) being maintained in a manner consistent with the purposes for which the area was established?	Yes	Clarification	Protocol complete
<b>Community Effects</b>				
What are the trends in local economies?	–	Drop	Low priority	–
What are the effects of National Forest management on lands, resources and communities adjacent to the Forest?	–	Drop	Low priority	–

**Table 2. Proposed Replacement for Table 5-1 in the RLMRP:  
“Table 5-1: Monitoring Items for the Chugach National Forest”**

<b>Monitoring Questions</b>	<b>Protocol Name<sup>2</sup> (Monitoring Guide Protocol Number)</b>
<b>Compliance with Revised Forest Plan Direction</b>	
Are projects being implemented consistent with the Forest Plan direction?	Plan Consistency (1)
<b>Integrated Effectiveness/Validation Monitoring</b>	
Are management activities achieving their intended outcomes?	Intended Outcomes (2)
Is Forest Management influencing changes in ecosystem composition and structure outside the expected range of variability?	Ecosystem Change (3)
<b>Air Resources</b>	
What is the potential that winter snowmachine use and its associated activities are causing violations of Alaska State air quality standards in areas of the Chugach National Forest where winter motorized use is the highest?	Air Quality (46)
<b>Soil Resources</b>	
What is the effect of summer OHV use on soils and/or vegetation where OHV use is allowed? Are management practices (standards and guidelines, BMPs, mitigation measures) effective in maintaining soil quality and in meeting the severity limits for selected soil properties?	Soil Quality (4)
<b>Water Resources</b>	
Are Best Management Practices (including wetland management) effective in meeting water quality standards?	Water Quality (6)
<b>Sensitive and Exotic Plant Species</b>	
Are Forest management activities contributing to changes in the abundance and distribution of sensitive plant populations?	Sensitive Plants (7)
Are Forest management activities contributing to changes in the abundance and distribution of invasive plant populations?	Invasive Plants (8)

<sup>2</sup> The Chugach NF Revised Land and Resource Management Plan Monitoring Guide includes the established protocols. This includes information regarding methods, frequency, precision, and estimated costs. Development and improvement of the monitoring guide and all protocols is ongoing. The current version of the monitoring guide can be found on the Chugach NF website at: <http://www.fs.usda.gov/main/chugach/landmanagement/planning>.

<b>Monitoring Questions</b>	<b>Protocol Name<sup>2</sup> (Monitoring Guide Protocol Number)</b>
<b>Management Indicator Species</b>	
Has the Revised Forest Plan been effective in reducing adverse interactions between (brown) bears and humans?	Brown Bear - Humans (10)
What are the population trends for brown bear and the relationship to habitat change?	Brown Bear (12)
What are the population trends for dusky Canada geese and the relationship to habitat change?	Dusky Canada Geese Artificial Nest Island (13.1) Dusky Canada Goose Population Trends (13.2)
What are the population trends for moose and the relationship to habitat change?	Moose (14)
What are the population trends for mountain goats and the relationship to habitat change?	Mountain Goat (15)
What are the population trends for black oystercatchers and the relationship to habitat change?	Black Oystercatchers (17)
<b>Aquatic Species</b>	
Are riparian and aquatic habitat protection measures included in project planning and are Revised Forest Plan standards and guidelines being met during project implementation?	Riparian and Aquatic Habitat Protection (47)
<b>Species of Special Interest</b>	
What are the population trends for Kenai wolverines and the relationship to habitat change?	Kenai Wolverine (21)
<b>Forest Products</b>	
Are harvested forestlands restocked?	Forestlands Restocked (28)
Have lands once identified as unsuitable for timber production been examined to determine if they have become suitable?	Timber Suitability (29)
<b>Heritage Resources</b>	
Are National Register eligible heritage resources being adequately maintained and protected?	Heritage Condition (32)
<b>Recreational Opportunities, Tourism, Access, and Facilities</b>	
Is the Revised Forest Plan direction for motorized and non-motorized access working?	Motorized – Nonmotorized Access (36)
What is the trend in the use of developed recreational facilities and how does it compare to capacity?	Developed Recreational Facilities (38)
What is the trend in commercial recreation services on the Forest and how does it compare to capacity?	Commercial Recreation Services (39)

Monitoring Questions	Protocol Name <sup>2</sup> (Monitoring Guide Protocol Number)
<b>Scenic Quality</b>	
Are areas of the forest being managed in accordance with the scenic integrity objectives (SIO) in forestwide standards and guidelines?	Scenic Integrity Objectives (40)
<b>Fire Protection and Fuels Management</b>	
Are human life, property and facilities being protected from wildland fire hazards?	Wildland Fire Hazards (41)
<b>Wilderness</b>	
Is the wilderness character of the wilderness study area (WSA) and areas recommended for Wilderness being maintained?	Wilderness Study Area (42)
<b>Research Natural Areas</b>	
Are proposed and established Research Natural Areas (RNA) being maintained in a manner consistent with the purposes for which the area was established?	Research Natural Areas (43)