

Attachment 1 Errata #6

FY 2007 Monitoring Report for the Payette NF Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan)

The following errors have been found in the final Land and Resource Management Plan for the Payette National Forest. As with previous Errata, these changes represent factual corrections or clarifications that have no bearing on the analysis completed or the decisions made by the Responsible Official in the Records of Decision for the Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. Changes are presented here to correct inconsistencies between the final documents and technical report or project record information, and to help make the decisions easier to understand and implement for forest managers.

Table IV-2 (Monitoring Elements), pp. IV-6 through IV-15

The following minor changes are made to Table IV-2 to reflect improved understanding of monitoring methodology and reporting since the Forest Plan was approved in 2003. Text marked with “strikeout” indicates deletions from the original text included in the Forest Plan. Highlighted sections are those to be added. The far-right column provides rationale for the change.

Activity, Practice, Or Effect To Be Measured	Monitoring Question	Indicator	Data Reliability	Measuring Frequency and Recommended Method	Report Period	Rationale/Comments
Perception of management activities on the Forest	Are interested citizens raising concerns about management activities?	Comment cards, personal contacts, level of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)/National Forest Management Act (NFMA) involvement, appeals, litigation	Low	Annually, via leadership team review of substantive comments and NEPA decision appeals and/or feedback from Forest personnel staffing public events (i.e. county fairs, Idaho Sportsmen's Show, etc.)	5 years	Forest Planning personnel are able to evaluate the comments and appeals without leadership team participation. In addition, “frontliners” and other Forest personnel who staff major events receive much feedback regarding Forest management from members of the public who do not appeal or otherwise get involved with projects. Adding this as part of the methodology gives us another data source at very little cost.

Activity, Practice, Or Effect To Be Measured	Monitoring Question	Indicator	Data Reliability	Measuring Frequency and Recommended Method	Report Period	Rationale/Comments
State and local government participation with the Forest	Are current processes such as commission appearances, field reviews, etc., meeting coordination needs?	Program reviews and personal contacts	Moderate	Annually , using personal contacts, and formal feedback (surveys)	3 years	Surveys require Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. Adequate information can be obtained via personal contacts.
Accessibility improvement efforts in developed recreation and administrative use facilities	Is disabled access improving in relation to federal laws the American Disability Act and other related agency guidelines policy and direction?	Condition survey of Forest administrative and Accessibility status of Forest administrative facilities. Percentage of accessible developed recreation sites facilities	Moderate High	Annually , conduct from INFRA data based on annual site condition surveys of up to 20 percent of the Forest's administrative and developed recreation facilities	5 years	Deleted erroneous ADA citation and incorporated new INFRA data elements related to recreation facility accessibility.
Safety of administrative facilities	Are administrative sites safe and accessible for visitors and employees including drinking water sources?	On-site inspection of facilities and drinking water testing	High	As needed, but at least annually using building safety inspection forms that keys to INFRA database, and drinking water testing program	Annually	2003 version just specified "inspection forms that keyed to INFRA"; this change make it more specific (i.e. building safety) and allows for those forms that aren't tied to INFRA.
Safety of developed recreation sites	Are developed recreation sites free of high-risk conditions? Do water systems meet Federal, State, and local requirements?	On-site inspection of facilities and drinking water testing. % of developed rec sites that meet all Region 4 Critical Health and Safety Standards (e.g. Meaningful Measures).	High	As directed by State and/or agency requirements Annual review of Health and Safety Standard compliance based on-site inspection of facilities and drinking water testing as prescribed by State and/or agency requirements.	Annually for water systems; 5 years for other	Revised indicator and methodology. Original indicator wasn't really an indicator.

Activity, Practice, Or Effect To Be Measured	Monitoring Question	Indicator	Data Reliability	Measuring Frequency and Recommended Method	Report Period	Rationale/Comments
Condition, level of use, and maintenance of roads	Are road conditions improving related to safety or user comfort?	Miles maintained by maintenance class, and condition surveys	Moderate	Annually track miles of roads maintained via INFRA; Conduct condition surveys in accordance with National Condition Survey policy and protocol	5 years	The annual road maintenance tracking occurs in a spreadsheet and is not tied to INFRA.
Recreation demand	Are the amount and types of recreation opportunities provided meeting customer needs and expectations?	National recreation use monitoring survey results, Comment forms and user correspondence	Low Medium	Every 4 years (FY08-FY12) for the National Rec. Use Survey The National Recreation Use Monitoring survey results; Annually during Forest recreation meetings for other sources	5 years	Data reliability for NVUM is higher than "low." NVUM survey schedule has changed and is not conducted every 4 years in every case.
Recreation use trends, distribution and levels	Are recreation activity levels changing, and are shifts occurring between types of activities, and locations of recreation use?	Field observations by recreation staff, comments, letters, available State and industry data sources , and National Recreation Use Survey results	Low	Every 4 years (FY08-FY12) for the National Rec. Use Survey; Annually during Forest recreation meetings The National Recreation Use Monitoring survey results; Annually during Forest recreation meetings for other sources. Review and interpretation of State and industry data every 2 years.	5 years	Added additional data and information sources to the original.

Activity, Practice, Or Effect To Be Measured	Monitoring Question	Indicator	Data Reliability	Measuring Frequency and Recommended Method	Report Period	Rationale/Comments
Recreation use conflicts	Are conflicts rising between recreational uses? Are conflicts being resolved?	Comments or complaints from users.; number of citations related to closure orders Development of plans or other mechanisms (e.g. user group forums) to resolve conflicts.	Moderate	Annual review of comments, complaints, and outcomes of any resolution efforts during Forest recreation meetings.	3 years 5 years	Revised the monitoring question and indicators to recognize resolution efforts and successes. Added methodology where it was absent. Adjusted the report period because conflict resolution frequently spans more than 3 years of effort. Added resolution element to methodology.
Total Recreation Visitor Days (RVDs)	Are recreation activities levels changing, or are shifts occurring between types of activities?	Tracking RVDs by various types of recreation activities	Moderate	INFRA, Meaningful Measures, or other sampling techniques	5 years	Replaced by above element (Recreation use trends, distribution and levels) during the final stages of the revision process because RVDs are an obsolete measure. Deletion was missed prior to Forest Plan printing.
Dispersed recreation use and distribution	What is the level of use is occurring in dispersed sites and what having impacts are occurring to other resource values? If so, what actions were taken and were they effective?	Site inventory and use survey Reports, comments, complaints, and other information from the public, recreation and other resource specialists.	Moderate	Annually, survey up to 10 percent of dispersed sites via review of comments and necessary on-the-ground mitigations planned or implemented.	3 years 5 years	Revised indicator to more realistic approach. Given recreation budgets and low levels of staffing, little or no dispersed site inventory and survey is anticipated. Report period adjusted to reflect more appropriate timeframe for potential actions and effects.
Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) Inventory	Are management activities changing the ROS settings?	Review of project implementation and updating the ROS inventory to reflect any changes in settings ROS class acres	Moderate	Annually via review of selected projects at RD and SO project levels to determine changes in ROS class acres at Mgmt Area level.	5 years	Minor wording changes in the indicator to more accurately reflect what will be measured. Refined the methodology by focusing on bi-level project review which would be the most likely to result in changes to ROS acres.

Activity, Practice, Or Effect To Be Measured	Monitoring Question	Indicator	Data Reliability	Measuring Frequency and Recommended Method	Report Period	Rationale/Comments
Track actual daily and seasonal use versus use capacity	What level of use is occurring in special use areas, including recreation sites (e.g., downhill ski areas)?	Ski area attendance reports, annual reports from special uses	High	Annually	3 years	Element is of relatively low value. The information is not really useful in evaluating Forest Plan-level strategies to meet objectives. The data is available if needed.
Track actual daily and seasonal use versus use capacity	What level of use is occurring in special use areas, including recreation sites (e.g., downhill ski areas)?	Ski area attendance reports, annual reports from special uses	High	Annually	3 years	Element is of relatively low value. The information is not really useful in evaluating Forest Plan-level strategies to meet objectives. The data is available if needed.
Developed site use and distribution, and resource impacts to sites	What level of use is occurring in developed sites and what impacts are occurring to other resource values?	Use INFRA-Database to track site specific use data	Moderate	Annually via INFRA, survey, public comment cards	3 years	Duplicates processes and is obsolete. The RSFMP process analyzes dev site use, cost, efficiency, etc. and result in action plan. Significant dev site impacts have been addressed over the last 10 years. Sites with remaining impacts will be identified in RSFMP process and addressed during deferred mtce work.
Level of trail maintenance relative to trail use	Are trails being maintained for anticipated levels of use? Do trail maintenance priorities reflect trail use levels, health and safety issues, and resource impact mitigation needs?	Trail counters and MARS for trail construction/reconstruction or maintenance Miles of high priority trail maintained. Field observations of use and resource impacts from recreation staff, volunteers, and public comments.	Moderate	Annually, up to 10 percent of trail system review of completed trail maintenance accomplishments, trail use and resource impacts from observations and comments from recreation staff, resource specialists, volunteers, and trail users	3 years 5 years	We are currently able to fully maintain about 20 percent of our system trail miles each year. Concurrently, trail use is increasing while funding for trail construction, reconstruction and mtce is decreasing. The question was revised to reflect the fact that we prioritize our maintenance needs and try to maintain at least the high priority trails having health & safety or resource impact issues or ones that have very high use. As such, trail maintenance priorities will change somewhat from year to year. Report period adjusted to reflect more appropriate timeframe for reflecting the effects on all trails since we don't even visit every trail every year.

Activity, Practice, Or Effect To Be Measured	Monitoring Question	Indicator	Data Reliability	Measuring Frequency and Recommended Method	Report Period	Rationale/Comments
Modification of established VQOs	Are the VQOs appropriate given resource management needs?	Number of Forest Plan amendments that modify established VQOs	High	Annually Every 5 years review management areas where amendments for VQOs were completed	5 years	Because the purpose of this review is to determine if there is a need to change MA direction as a result of VQO amendments, this element is more appropriately addressed at the 5 th year.
Stewardship of historic properties	Are historic properties being managed to standard?	# of heritage priority assets with critical deferred mtce	Low	Annually survey up to 5 percent of the historic properties based on heritage assets using condition assessments	5 years	Corresponds to new criteria for reporting historic properties managed to standard.
Habitat for terrestrial Management Indicator Species (MIS)	Are management actions providing for, or moving toward the extent of vegetation components necessary to meet the needs of MIS species?	Changes in habitat acres	Moderate	Annual field review of up to 25 percent of projects within known habitats	5 years FY09 FY14 for MIS	Reordered with below element (terrestrial management indicator species), to group MIS elements and separate them from TEPC and Sensitive species.
Habitat for terrestrial Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate or Forest sensitive species (TEPCS), both plant and animal	Are management actions providing for, or moving toward the extent of vegetation components necessary to meet the needs of TEPC species?	Changes in habitat acres	Moderate	Annual field review of up to 25 percent of projects within known habitats Five years: project data and spatial tracking databases (e.g. FACTS) identifying known and restored habitats.	2 years 5 years	Revised 'effect to be measured' to include sensitive species and drop MIS (see next element). Sensitive species omitted in error. Standardized the report period for 5 years; the 2-yr period did not provide enough time to show meaningful change. Modified methodology to use existing databases for tracking vegetative components.

Activity, Practice, Or Effect To Be Measured	Monitoring Question	Indicator	Data Reliability	Measuring Frequency and Recommended Method	Report Period	Rationale/Comments
Terrestrial Management Indicator Species	Are management actions maintaining or restoring distribution and abundance of management indicator species?	Population trends, demographic population data	Moderate High	Annual coordination of population surveys with other agencies such as Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game, Idaho Dept. of Water Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Idaho Partners In Flight, and Idaho Conservation Data Center completion of monitoring surveys and the distribution of occurrence records across the species' range on the Forest by watershed.	5 years	Annual MIS surveys are completed by trained observers and data is collated and centrally stored at the Supervisor's Office; data can be spatially linked and temporally collated. Reliability is high. Correlating occurrence records by 5th field watershed across the historic range of the species addresses maintaining or restoring distribution of management indicator species.
Terrestrial Management Indicator Species	Are management actions providing for, or moving toward the extent of vegetation components necessary to meet the needs of MIS species?	Change in habitat acres; change in large tree structure by PVG	Moderate	habitats Five years – existing project data and spatial tracking databases (e.g. FACTS) identifying known habitats and restored habitats.	5 years	This element was previously part of an element that addressed habitat for terrestrial MIS and TEPC (Forest Plan, p. IV-11). The MIS component was removed and reordered here because it more appropriately fit under the Terrestrial MIS heading. The methodology was modified to utilize existing databases for tracking vegetative components. Large tree structure is the habitat component of interest for both wildlife MIS.
Botanical species of concern, Watch species or Sensitive species	Are Forest management actions affecting known Sensitive species or Watch species habitats at the project level?	Acres of disturbance of known occupied habitat	Moderate	Annually, Three years via review of up to 25 percent of projects within known occupied habitat	3 years	Change to 3 years because we have so few projects in known occupied habitat, we need to look at a greater percentage, compiled over a longer timeframe, to be meaningful.

Activity, Practice, Or Effect To Be Measured	Monitoring Question	Indicator	Data Reliability	Measuring Frequency and Recommended Method	Report Period	Rationale/Comments
Noxious weed prevention	Are Forest Plan standards and guides effective in preventing establishment of new noxious weed infestations?	Acres of new noxious weed infestations Forest areas classified as free of non-native invasive plant species (weed free)	Moderate	Annual field inspection of projects for 2 years during and after project implementation for selected high-risk projects. of selected Early Detection Rapid Response (EDRR) monitoring sites and 2-3 year follow-up monitoring identified for selected, representative projects in weed free areas	3 years	New infestations primarily are associated with human influence vectors (roads, trails and recreation). Review of projects alone cannot evaluate establishment of new infestations.
Noxious weed containment management	Are Forest management strategies effective in preventing further expansion of established noxious weed controlling, containing, or eradicating established non-native invasive plant populations?	Acres of known infestation	High Moderate	Annually; via inventories and surveys of selected known infestation areas in management areas where strategy is containment, treatment and EDRR surveys. Infestation data recorded in NRIS Terra database	3 years 5 years	Overall evaluation of invasive plan management program effectiveness for the Forest. Combines previous elements of containment, control and eradication.
Noxious weed control, containment and eradication	Are Forest Plan standards and guidelines effective in controlling, containing or eradicating targeted populations of noxious weeds established non-native invasive plant populations?	Acres of known infestation in management areas identified for eradication or control. Percent change in infested acres and density in populations affected by project activities.	High	Annual field inspection of treatment sites that have been identified for eradication or control for 3 years to determine changes in density or eradication. 2-3 year inventory of selected projects in areas that contain or adjoin existing non-native invasive plant populations.	3 years	Evaluates effectiveness of project related nonnative invasive plant issues, mitigation and restoration actions planned during project planning and NEPA.

Activity, Practice, Or Effect To Be Measured	Monitoring Question	Indicator	Data Reliability	Measuring Frequency and Recommended Method	Report Period	Rationale/Comments
Cooperation in management of non-native invasive plant species.	Is the Forest managing non-native invasive plant species in a cooperative manner with other agencies, land managers, and land owners and users associated with NFS lands?	1. Acres of the Forest included in coop weed mgmt areas. 2. List of cooperators participating in CWMA's and other Forest weed mgmt activities.	High	5 years	5 years	Six of the eight Forest Plan objectives (NPOB02 – NPOB06 & NPOB08) all focus on cooperative management of non-native invasive plant species. This will add a measurement that will address these objectives.
Head Months Under Permit	Are Forest Plan goals, objectives, standards, and guidelines affecting the number of head months associated with term grazing permits?	Billing and annual operating plans; allotment grazing module from IIT process	High	Annually, via Management Attainment Reporting System (MARS) reports and INFRA	5 years	This data is no longer reported through MARS. Rangeland INFRA (IWEB) is the agency required data repository for this item.
Range Improvements	Are range improvements being adequately maintained and serving their intended design?	Field inspection and documentation of improvements based on assigned maintenance standards.	High	Annually, on selected sample from improvements on allotments administered to standard. high and medium priority allotments via Condition recorded in INFRA, maintenance reported in annual compliance report.	5 years	Clarifies indicator and reporting sources.

Activity, Practice, Or Effect To Be Measured	Monitoring Question	Indicator	Data Reliability	Measuring Frequency and Recommended Method	Report Period	Rationale/Comments
Forage Utilization Levels	Are established utilization levels providing for desired ground cover, soil stability, plant vigor and composition?	Field observation/ utilization studies % ground cover for uplands, % bank stability in riparian areas, % utilization in uplands, & stubble height In riparian. Acres meeting/moving toward desired condition in INFRA database	High	Annually , review up to 10 percent of active allotments (allotments administered to standard). Measure use levels annually; ground cover and bank stability every 3-5 years.	3 to 5 years	In order to evaluation relation between use levels and ground cover/bank stability, both need to be measured.
Effectiveness of the Allotment Management System	Are current allotment management strategies effective in meeting or moving toward desired vegetation conditions for non-forested vegetation types?	Grazing Response Index: Frequency (duration of grazing); intensity (use levels); and opportunities (growing periods)	Moderate	Annually , review up to 10 percent of allotments (allotments administered to standard). Reported in annual compliance report.	5 years	Clarifies indicator and reporting sources.
Research Natural Areas	Have management plans been developed for Research Natural Areas that currently lack them?	Number of management plans completed	High	Annually 5 years	5 years	Little need to collect data annually considering how often plans are developed. This change will also provide consistency between the RNA elements (see below element).