

Proposed "Other Monitoring Question" Changes dated 6/4/2025 - Green Mountain and Finger Lakes NFs

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
	Monitoring Category	Forest	Monitoring Item Name: Management Question	Detailed Monitoring Question	Forest Plan Driver	Measurement Indicator(s)	Question Status	Data Collection Methodology	Frequency	Best Available Scientific Information References
1	Heritage	Both	<b>Heritage Resource S&amp;Gs:</b> How well do Forest Plan components provide protection and stewardship for significant heritage resources?	How many National Historic Preservation Act, Section 110 activities have been completed?	Forest Plan Goal 16 Forestwide S&G 2.3.14 (GMNF); 2.3.15 (FLNF) - Tribal Relations Forestwide S&G 2.3.15 (GMNF); 2.3.16 (FLNF) - Heritage Resources	Total number of Section 110 Projects completed.	NEW QUESTION	Heritage Project Tracker & Natural Resource Manager (NRM) HWeb	Annually	<a href="https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-36/chapter-VIII/part-800?toc=1">https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-36/chapter-VIII/part-800?toc=1</a> <a href="https://outside.vermont.gov/agency/ACCD/ACCD_Web_Docs/HPI/Archaeology/ARCHEO_GUIDELINES.pdf">https://outside.vermont.gov/agency/ACCD/ACCD_Web_Docs/HPI/Archaeology/ARCHEO_GUIDELINES.pdf</a>
2	Heritage	Both	<b>Heritage Resource Program Objectives:</b> How well do Forest Plan components provide protection and stewardship for significant heritage resources?	How many acres surveyed and how many sites protected during Forest project National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 clearance?	Forest Plan Goal 16 Forestwide S&G 2.3.14 (GMNF); 2.3.15 (FLNF) - Tribal Relations Forestwide S&G 2.3.15 (GMNF); 2.3.16 (FLNF) - Heritage Resources	1) Number of sites monitored, updated or recorded. 2) Number of acres surveyed.	NEW QUESTION	Heritage GIS geodatabase	Annually	n/a
3	Heritage	Both	<b>Heritage Resource Site Protection:</b> How well do Forest Plan components provide protection and stewardship for significant heritage resources?	How many projects were reviewed under National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106?	Forest Plan Goal 16 Forestwide S&G 2.3.14 (GMNF); 2.3.15 (FLNF) - Tribal Relations Forestwide S&G 2.3.15 (GMNF); 2.3.16 (FLNF) - Heritage Resources	1) Total number of projects reviewed under Section 106 compliance. 2) Number of projects categorized by finding of effect.	NEW QUESTION	Heritage Project tracking index and annual SHPO Section 106 compliance report.	Annually	n/a
4	Lands	Both	<b>Special Uses - Lands:</b> How well do Forest Plan components ensure special use permits are properly administered?	Are special use permit authorizations administered to standard?	Forest Plan Goal 1 Forestwide S&Gs, 2.3.19 (GMNF); 2.3.20 (FLNF) - Special Uses	Percentage of special use permit authorizations administered to standard.	REVISED QUESTION	Data is readily available in the Corporate Data Warehouse (CDW).	Annually	<a href="https://web.fs.usda.gov/login/common.jsp?option=9">https://web.fs.usda.gov/login/common.jsp?option=9</a>
5	Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat	FLNF	<b>Grassland Habitat:</b> How well do Forest Plan components contribute toward restoration and maintenance of habitat for native and desirable non-native species?	What are the conditions of grasslands and pastures? What are the grassland bird use patterns of grazed and non-grazed grasslands?	Forest Plan Goal 2	1) Vegetation database queries or 2) Long-term site inspection and vegetative measures of grassland and pasture condition or 3) Breeding bird surveys	REVISED QUESTION	Various collection methods including grassland vegetation surveys and/or pasture forage surveys and/or grassland bird surveys completed on units with planned management.  Coordinate with Charlie Smith (or contractor for grassland bird surveys) or use data from Breeding Bird Survey to determine if management (grazing, mowing, etc.) activities are affecting bird populations. It seems as though these questions are still based on BASI and adequately (medium) meets the intent of the monitoring element. Vegetation monitoring will be completed every 3-5 years on two units chosen to represent the forest grassland ecosystem. Pasture forage surveys will be completed by the range program and may be used as information for this monitoring question.	Biennially	<a href="https://extapps.dec.ny.gov/docs/wildlife_pdf/gbirdstrafinal.pdf">https://extapps.dec.ny.gov/docs/wildlife_pdf/gbirdstrafinal.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.bim.gov/sites/default/files/documents/files/Library_BLMTechnicalReference1734-08_V1.pdf">https://www.bim.gov/sites/default/files/documents/files/Library_BLMTechnicalReference1734-08_V1.pdf</a> <a href="https://wildlife.tamu.edu/files/2013/09/Native-Grassland-Monitoring-and-Management-WF-001.pdf">https://wildlife.tamu.edu/files/2013/09/Native-Grassland-Monitoring-and-Management-WF-001.pdf</a> <a href="https://wfw.tennessee.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/24/2020/07/Strategies-for-managing-early-succession-Weed-Tech.pdf">https://wfw.tennessee.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/24/2020/07/Strategies-for-managing-early-succession-Weed-Tech.pdf</a>
6	Terrestrial Ecology	Both	<b>Ecological Type Mapping and Representation:</b> How well do Forest Plan components maintain or restore ecological processes and systems within desired ranges of variability?	What proportion are ecological types on the Forest represented within the ecological reference area network?	Forest Plan Goal 6 (GMNF); Goal 5 (FLNF) Objective: Manage at least five percent of each ecological type present on the forest for old-growth characteristics.	Proportion of each ecological type on the Forest that occurs within the reference area network.	NO CHANGE	This monitoring focuses on representation and not condition, and directly addresses a Forest Plan objective threshold. Results change with ownership changes (i.e., land acquisitions or disposals) or theoretically with site designation changes (e.g., Management Area reallocation by Forest Plan amendment).  Compare Reference Area Network (RAN; GMNF spatial data) proportions with all of GMNF for: Ecological Land Unit Groups (ELUGs; TNC 2004), Land Type Associations (LTAs; GMNF/Burbank 1999), and Habitats (GMNF stand data) for the relevant time period.	Every 10 years	Burbank, D., C. Ferree, P. Giron, and J. Bove. 1999. "Preliminary Landtype Associations -Biophysical Features, Green Mountain National Forest." Unpublished report, Green Mountain National Forest, Vermont.  The Nature Conservancy. 2004. Evaluation of the Biological and Biophysical Diversity of the Green Mountain National Forest and Vicinity. Recommendations for Increasing Biodiversity Protection. The Nature Conservancy, Montpelier, VT.
7	Vegetation	Both	<b>Rare or Outstanding Natural Areas:</b> How well do Forest Plan components protect rare or outstanding biological, ecological, or geological areas?	To what extent are rare and outstanding biological, ecological, or geological features being protected, maintained, or enhanced?	Forest Plan Goal 7	1) Number of rare or outstanding natural area sites monitored. 2) Number of outstanding natural area sites for which condition was documented.	REVISED INDICATORS	1) Compile counts from Ecological Site Monitoring Forms - collaborative monitoring between Ecology, Botany, Wildlife, and Wilderness Programs. 2) Compile counts from Ecological Site Monitoring notes and by comparing spatial data.	5 years	VNHI Significant Natural Communities spatial data; Thompson, Sorenson, and Zaino 2019. Wetland, Woodland, Wildland: A Guide to the Natural Communities of Vermont, Second Edition.
8										

Proposed "Other Monitoring Question" Changes dated 6/4/2025 - Green Mountain and Finger Lakes NFS

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Monitoring Category	Forest	Monitoring Item Name: Management Question	Detailed Monitoring Question	Forest Plan Driver	Measurement Indicator(s)	Question Status	Data Collection Methodology	Frequency	Best Available Scientific Information References
9	Invasive Species Population	Both	<b>Non-native invasive species:</b> How well do Forest Plan components prevent and control the spread of non-native invasive plants?	To what extent are non-native invasive species impacting other Forest resources?	Forest Plan Goal 2 Forestwide S&Gs 2.3.9 (GMNF); 2.3.10 (FLNF) - Pests, Diseases, and Non-Native Invasive Species	Extent of infestations in habitats of concern: 1) Percentage of sites infested, by resource area 2) Acres and/or sites infested, by resource area 3) Acres and/or sites treated, by resource area 4) Treatment effectiveness upon completion of treatment	REVISED INDICATORS	Resource areas (aka habitats of concern) include: rare plant populations, wildlife openings, and ecological special areas.  During the growing season, trained FS staff and volunteers record: species, population extent, density and/or count, percent infested, and canopy cover. Spatial extent is collected using handheld GPS units or a tablet with FieldMaps or a similar application. Sites surveyed and treated are either those we most want to protect or those that have the greatest potential to be sources of seeds or plant propagules for places we most want to protect. All sites will have "treatment effectiveness" recorded immediately after treatment completion. Long-term treatment effectiveness will only be measured at selected sites due to limited capacity.  We are interested in seeing the effects of NNIP on rare plant populations, wildlife openings, and ESA/cRNAs. These are the plant-adjacent resources areas; we assume other resource areas are monitored by their respective programs.	Annually	USDA Forest Service National Forest System "Data Recording Protocols and Requirements for Invasive Species Survey, Inventory, and Treatment"  <a href="https://fsweb.wo.fs.fed.us/invasivespecies/data.shtml">https://fsweb.wo.fs.fed.us/invasivespecies/data.shtml</a>
10	Fire	Both	<b>Prescribed Fire:</b> To what extent is prescribed fire benefitting resources?	Is prescribed fire restoring and/or maintaining desired vegetation composition and structure?	Forestwide S&Gs 2.3.10 (GMNF); 2.3.11 (FLNF) - Fire Management	1) Acres of desired habitat restored or maintained. 2) Acres where fire is reintroduced into historically fire adapted landscapes.	REVISED QUESTION & INDICATORS	Annual prescribed fire random unit fire effects review with specialists.  Utilize Fire Effects Monitoring and National Best Management Practices for Water Quality Management on NFS Lands Monitoring for "Wildfire Management Actions," are applied to prescribed fire effects monitoring and would be used for managing wildfire for resource benefit to ensure management practices are protecting natural resources.  Review Monitoring Trends in Burn Severity Viewer website for incidents that may be detected and require additional documentation. <a href="https://www.mtbs.gov/viewer/index.html">https://www.mtbs.gov/viewer/index.html</a>	Annually	n/a
11	Fire	Both	<b>Hazardous Fuels:</b> Are fuel treatment activities reducing fuel loads?	To what extent have management activities reduced hazardous fuels?	Goal 21 (GMNF)	Number of KP6 and KP3 acres treated for hazardous fuels reduction.	NO CHANGE	FACTS Database Reporting	Annually	n/a
12	Fire	Both	<b>Wildfire Occurrence:</b> To what frequency do wildfires occur?	How many wildfires occurred on National Forest System (NFS) land?	Goal 21 (GMNF)	1) How many wildfires occurred on NFS land? 2) How many total acres? 3) How many human-caused wildfires? 4) How many wildfires in wildland urban interface (WUI)? 5) If human caused, what is the statistical cause?	REVISED INDICATORS	InForm reporting ongoing, ensure accuracy and completeness of InForm fire reports.  Track trends within Fire Family Plus and Fire Danger Operating Plan.  Collect information annually but evaluate trends every 5 years.	Every 5 years	n/a
13	Recreation	Both	<b>Trail Maintenance:</b> Is the quality of the Forest Service trail system being improved through operation and maintenance?	How many miles of trail are maintained annually and how many trail miles are meeting standard?	Forest Plan Goal 12 (GMNF); Goal 11 (FLNF)  Objectives: Reduce total deferred maintenance on the Forest trail system; and increase the number of miles that are operated and maintained to standard.	1) Miles of trail maintained 2) Miles of trail maintained to standard 3) Trends in percent of total trail miles maintained	REVISED INDICATORS	The Natural Resource Manager (NRM) is a system of database tools for managing agency data across the Forest Service. The NRM trail database is where FS staff record annual accomplishments (Trail Annual Accomplishment allows user to see data as far back as 2011).	Annually	n/a
14	Recreation	Both	<b>Partner Contributions:</b> To what extent are partners contributing to management of recreation facilities and trail systems?	Trend in partner contributions towards the improvement, maintenance and operation of the Forest Recreation Sites and Trails System.	Forest Plan Goal 12 (GMNF); Goal 11 (FLNF)  Objective: Increase the effective use of partnerships in the improvement, maintenance and operation of the Forest Trails System.	Trend in total cash, non-cash and in-kind contributions from partner agreements	NEW QUESTION	The Natural Resource Management (NRM) Report "G&A by Cooperator Type and Associated Funds"	Annually	n/a
15	Wild & Scenic Rivers	GMNF	<b>Wild and Scenic Rivers:</b> To what extent are eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers managed to preserve their outstandingly remarkable values?	Are management activities within the eligible National Wild & Scenic River management area consistent with the Outstandingly Remarkable Values for which each river segment was determined eligible?	Forest Plan Goal 7 Eligible Wild, Scenic & Recreational Rivers MA direction.	Number of projects or sites reviewed during annual monitoring and evaluation visits that did not maintain outstanding remarkable values (ORVs) and retain eligibility for river segments.	NO CHANGE	Design criteria, mitigation and standards and guidelines applied on the ground will be looked at in conjunction with the overall project implementation to determine if the ORVs were maintained. If not met, what could have been done differently?	Annually	n/a

Proposed "Other Monitoring Question" Changes dated 6/4/2025 - Green Mountain and Finger Lakes NFs

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Monitoring Category	Forest	Monitoring Item Name: Management Question	Detailed Monitoring Question	Forest Plan Driver	Measurement Indicator(s)	Question Status	Data Collection Methodology	Frequency	Best Available Scientific Information References
16	Range	FLNF	<b>Range Improvements:</b> How well do Forest Plan components provide for the sustainable use of grasslands for grazing?	Are management activities providing functioning range improvements (watering facilities, fence, corral) to support approximately 10,000 Animal Unit Months (AUMs) annually?	Goal 7  Objective: Maintain forage production sufficient to support approximately 10,000 Animal Unit Months (AUMs) annually. It quantifies the available forage needs for livestock and is an LRMP indicator (p. 3-234 LRMP EIS).	1) Number and condition of functioning systems and those in need of maintenance or construction.  2) Miles of fence maintained to standard.  3) Number and condition of corrals maintained to standard.	NO CHANGE	Collected primarily through the Annual Operating Instruction and pasture facilities inspection spreadsheet. Natural Resource Management (NRM) is not the primary source for maintenance needs of range infrastructure.	Annually	n/a
17	Range	FLNF	<b>Animal Unit Months:</b> How well do Forest Plan components provide for the sustainable use of grasslands for grazing?	Are management activities maintaining forage production sufficient to support approximately 10,000 Animal Unit Months (AUMs) annually?	Goal 7: Provide for the the sustainable use of grasslands for grazing on the FLNF.  Objective: Maintain forage production sufficient to support approximately 10,000 Animal Unit Months (AUMs) annually. It quantifies the available forage needs for livestock and is an LRMP indicator (p. 3-234 LRMP EIS).	Animal Unit Months (AUMs).	NO CHANGE	The question, indicators, measures, and protocols are based on the BASI. The following protocols, developed by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, would be used: National Range and Pasture Handbook, CH. 4: Estimating and harvesting (double sampling) or Harvesting methods for determining production and composition. Pasture Condition Scoresheet, and Soil Quality Test Kit. The question tells us what we want to know, the protocols are efficient to conduct, and have very low costs.	Annually	<a href="https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/sites/default/files/2022-06/National_Pasture_Condition_Scoring_Guide_and_Score_Sheet_-_January_2020.pdf">https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/sites/default/files/2022-06/National_Pasture_Condition_Scoring_Guide_and_Score_Sheet_-_January_2020.pdf</a>
18	Aquatic Ecosystems	Both	<b>Fish Habitat:</b> How well do Forest Plan components conserve or improve fisheries habitat?	To what extent are management activities conserving or improving fisheries habitat?	GMNF: -Forestwide Goal 2 (Fisheries Objectives) -Forestwide Goal 4  FLNF: -Forestwide Goal 2 (Fisheries Objectives) -Forestwide Goal 4 -Forestwide Goal 5 -Forestwide SWA Standards 1-8 -Forestwide SWA Guidelines 1-14	1) Implementation and effectiveness monitoring for Best Management Practices (BMPs).  2) Aquatic habitat improved – miles of stream and acres of lakes and ponds (excluding fish stocking-related accomplishments).	NEW QUESTION	1) Review all BMP monitoring completed by the Forest for each two-year BMP monitoring reporting period and provide qualitative discussion of impacts of land management activities on surface water quality. Differentiate between GMNF and FLNF.  2) Report the miles and acres of aquatic habitat improved each year, broken out by Forest. Qualitatively assess if or how this moves the Forests toward Goals and Objectives.	1) Biennially 2) Annually	1) National Best Management Practices for Water Quality Management on National Forest System Lands Volume 1: National Core BMP Technical Guide  2) N/A - BASI would apply on a case-by-case basis to the projects completed by the Agency in support of preserving, conserving, or restoring aquatic habitat. Assessment and description of these projects and their impacts does not relate to a concise BASI reference list.
19	Aquatic Ecosystems	Both	<b>Stream Function:</b> How well do Forest Plan components provide desirable aquatic organism passage and stream function conditions?	To what extent are management activities ensuring stream crossing structures allow desirable fish habitat and stream function conditions such as aquatic organism passage and passage of water and debris associated with high flows?	GMNF: -Forestwide Goal 2 (Fisheries Objectives) -Forestwide Goal 4 -Forestwide SWA Standards 5 and 6 -Forestwide Fisheries Standard 1 -Forestwide Road Design and Construction Standards 4 and 5  FLNF: -Forestwide Goal 2 (Fisheries Objectives) -Forestwide Goal 4 -Forestwide SWA Standards 5 and 6 -Forestwide Road Design and Construction Standards 4 and 5	Number of stream crossing structures improved per year to meet Aquatic Organism Passage design criteria (i.e., crossings mitigated to standard).	REVISED QUESTION & INDICATOR	Report the number of crossings improved to meet aquatic organism passage design criteria each year, broken out by Forest. Qualitatively assess if or how this moves the Forests toward Goals and Objectives.	Annually	<a href="https://www.fs.usda.gov/restoration/Aquatic_Organism_Passage/overview.shtml">https://www.fs.usda.gov/restoration/Aquatic_Organism_Passage/overview.shtml</a>
20	Aquatic Ecosystems	FLNF	<b>Pond Habitat:</b> How well do Forest Plan components conserve or improve ecosystem function and water quality in ponds?	To what extent are management activities improving ecosystem function and water quality in ponds?	*Forestwide Goal 2 (Fisheries Objectives) -Forestwide Goal 4, Range Standard 6, and Guideline 5 and 6 -Forestwide Fisheries Guideline 5 -Grassland for Grazing MA, Range Guideline 1 and 6	1) Proportion of all ponds not currently requiring impoundment maintenance, dredging, or treatment of non-native invasive aquatic vegetation.  2) Proportion of livestock ponds where livestock access to water (including pond outlets) is managed by fencing.  3) Implementation and effectiveness monitoring for Best Management Practices (BMPs) at livestock ponds.  4) Number of ponds maintained by dredging each year.	REVISED QUESTION & INDICATORS	1) Coordinate with Range, Wildlife, and Engineering staff to identify how many of the managed ponds, regardless of primary benefiting program, are in need of impoundment or sediment management work. Qualitatively discuss the trends in meeting Goals and Objectives.  2) Coordinate with Range staff to identify how many livestock ponds do not currently have functioning controls on livestock access. Qualitatively discuss trends in and controlling factors on this number.  3) Review all BMP monitoring completed specifically on livestock ponds by the Forest for each two-year BMP monitoring reporting period and provide qualitative discussion of impacts of land management activities on surface water quality.  4) Coordinate with Range, Wildlife, and Engineering staff to identify how many of the managed ponds, regardless of the primary benefiting program, have been dredged per year. Qualitatively discuss trends and controlling factors.	Biennially	1) Small Impoundment Management in North America, American Fisheries Society, 2012.  2) RIPARIAN AREA MANAGEMENT: Grazing Management Processes and Strategies for Riparian-Wetland Areas, TR1737-20.  3) National Best Management Practices for Water Quality Management on National Forest System Lands Volume 1: National Core BMP Technical Guide  4) Small Impoundment Management in North America, American Fisheries Society, 2012.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Monitoring Category	Forest	Monitoring Item Name: Management Question	Detailed Monitoring Question	Forest Plan Driver	Measurement Indicator(s)	Question Status	Data Collection Methodology	Frequency	Best Available Scientific Information References
22	Soils	FLNF	<b>Grassland Soil Productivity, Condition, and Quality:</b> How well do Forest Plan components maintain or restore the natural, ecological functions of the soil?	Are the effects from management activities resulting in significant changes to soil productivity?	Forest Plan Goal 3	Within sample pastures measure: 1) Plant composition (desirable forage plants, legumes, plant vigor) 2) Grazing Severity 3) Soil Cover 4) Soil Compaction 5) Soil Erosion 6) Soil pH	REVISED QUESTION & INDICATORS	Natural Resources Conservation Service Pasture Condition ScoreSheet and USDA Soil Quality Test Kit Guide	Triannually	USDA Forest Service, Natural Resources Conservation Service Guide to Pasture Condition Scoring, January 2020  Sanderson, M. A., Goslee, S. C., Gonet, J., & Stout, R. (2009). Pasture monitoring at a farm scale with the USDA NRCS pasture condition score system. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation, 64(6), 423–433. <a href="https://doi.org/10.2489/jswc.64.6.423">https://doi.org/10.2489/jswc.64.6.423</a>
23	Terrestrial Wildlife Population	GMNF	<b>Sensitive Species:</b> How well do Forest Plan components maintain and restore habitats to ensure population viability for native and desirable non-native species?	Are management activities ensuring the protection and promotion of Regional Forester Sensitive Species (RFSS) habitats and populations?	Forest Plan Goal 2  Objective: Protect critical habitat and key habitat features upon which federally listed endangered, threatened, proposed species, and Regional Forester's Sensitive Species depend.  Objective: Implement established conservation strategies for Regional Forester's Sensitive Species where they exist; otherwise, maintain or enhance habitat conditions for these species through the development of specific site prescriptions during project development.	1) What management activities protect or promote RFSS? 2) What monitoring of RFSS individuals, populations, and habitats has occurred? 3) Do RFSS conservation plans exist or are we moving toward creating plans? 4) If a plan exists, what actions are we taking to implement the plan?	NEW QUESTION	Document the activities conducted relevant to any RFSS wildlife species during a given year. There is not an expectation to have a report for each species. Rather, the open-endedness of this question allows us to focus on several key species for the time period based on level of threat, distribution, and other factors. The long term goal is to consider the occurrence and protection of all RFSS wildlife species.  Possible activities that contribute to answering this question include: -Writing or updating a forest-specific conservation summary/plan -Monitoring or survey of individual species or habitats -Reviewing projects mid- and post-implementation for affect	Annually	<a href="https://downloads.regulations.gov/FWS-R4-ES-2016-0121-0069/content.pdf">https://downloads.regulations.gov/FWS-R4-ES-2016-0121-0069/content.pdf</a>  GMFL Wildlife Monitoring RFSS Question Framework updated April 2025
24	Terrestrial Wildlife Population	Both	<b>YES Bats:</b> To what extent are Forest Service management activities contributing toward population viability for native and desired non-native species?	Are threatened, endangered, and sensitive bat species continuing to persist on the landscape?	Forest Plan Goal 2  Objective: Protect critical habitat and key habitat features upon which federally listed endangered, threatened, proposed species and Regional Forester Sensitive Species (RFSS) depend.  Implement established conservation strategies for Regional Forester's Sensitive Species where they exist; otherwise, maintain or enhance habitat conditions for these species through the development of specific site prescriptions during project development.	Species presence/no detection, location, and/or number of individuals at North American Bat Monitoring Program (NABat) and pre-project monitoring sites.	REVISED QUESTION & INDICATORS	Continue with acoustic monitoring methodology during the bat active season for NABat and pre-project protocols. Collaborate with FVWD and NYDEC to report hibernacula counts.	Annually	<a href="https://www.fws.gov/media/range-wide-indiana-bat-and-northern-long-eared-bat-survey-guidelines">https://www.fws.gov/media/range-wide-indiana-bat-and-northern-long-eared-bat-survey-guidelines</a>  <a href="https://www.nabatmonitoring.org/">https://www.nabatmonitoring.org/</a>
25	Air	GMNF	<b>Air Particulate:</b> To what extent are air quality and atmospheric deposition affecting sensitive components of the forest ecosystem?	What is the composition of particles in the air, and how are the levels of particulates changing over time?	Forest Plan Goal 5 and Objectives	Elements and compounds (type and amount) present in the particulate matter.	NO CHANGE	The Interagency Monitoring of Protected Visual Environments (IMPROVE) Air Monitoring Station at Mount Snow collects aerosol data every third day and the filters are changed weekly. The filters are analyzed at the UC Davis Air Quality Research Center.  IMPROVE data is reported annually.	Annually	<a href="https://airquality.ucdavis.edu/improve">https://airquality.ucdavis.edu/improve</a>  <a href="https://views.cira.colostate.edu/fed/Express/ImproveData.aspx">https://views.cira.colostate.edu/fed/Express/ImproveData.aspx</a>
26	Wilderness	GMNF	<b>Wilderness Areas Managed to Standard:</b> To what extent are management activities meeting the intent of the Wilderness Act?	Are wilderness areas trending to meet the national Wilderness Stewardship Performance?	Forest Plan Goal 13 and Objectives	1) Wilderness stewardship performance (WSP). 2) Increase in the total element score per Wilderness for WSP measures.	NO CHANGE	Wilderness Stewardship Performance Measures annual reporting based on Wilderness program of work implementation.	Annually	Wilderness Stewardship Performance Measures
27	Human Dimensions	Both	<b>Partnerships Maintenance and Enhancement:</b> To what extent are partnerships maintained and enhanced?	Are partnerships active and effective to help meet Forest Plan goals and objectives, and are Forest Service staff participating in partnership activities?	Forest Plan Goal 18 (GMNF); Forest Plan Goal 15 FLNF and Objectives	1) Number of formal partnership agreements (inter-agency, Challenge Cost Share, Memorandums of Understanding). 2) Number of Forest Service staff participating in outside organizations in official capacity (representing Forest Service interest). 3) Evaluation (narrative) of how the partnership has been effective in helping the Forest Service meet Goals and Objectives. 4) Number of people hours contributed by partnerships.	NO CHANGE	Natural Resource Manager (NRM)	Annually	n/a

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Monitoring Category	Forest	Monitoring Item Name: Management Question	Detailed Monitoring Question	Forest Plan Driver	Measurement Indicator(s)	Question Status	Data Collection Methodology	Frequency	Best Available Scientific Information References
28	Lands	Both	<b>Land Ownership Adjustment:</b> Has Forest land ownership been adjusted to meet future needs and improve management effectiveness?	To what extent has the Forest's land base been adjusted through purchase, exchange, transfer, interchange, boundary adjustment and donation?	Forest Plan Goal 22 and Objectives (GMNF)	Amount of acres adjusted.	NO CHANGE	Data is available in LADS	Annually	n/a
29	Human Dimensions	Both	<b>Payments to Towns:</b> To what extent have Forest programs supported regional and local economies?	How much funding was paid to towns through Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) and Secure Rural Schools (SRS) payments?	Forest Plan Goal 17 (GMNF); Forest Plan Goal 14 (FLNF)  Objective: Maintain communications with Forest communities with regard to Payment in Lieu of Taxes, 25 Percent Fund, and/or Secure Schools and Community Self-Determination Act.	Amount of PILT and SRS payment to towns and/or counties.	REVISED QUESTION & INDICATORS	Collect information from PILT and SRS payment websites:  <a href="https://www.fs.usda.gov/working-with-us/secure-rural-schools/payments">https://www.fs.usda.gov/working-with-us/secure-rural-schools/payments</a>  <a href="https://www.doi.gov/pilt">https://www.doi.gov/pilt</a>	Annually	n/a
30	Human Dimensions	GMNF	<b>Local and Regional Economies:</b> To what extent have management activities supported regional and local economies?	What is the range of dollar amounts and board feet in timber sale contracts?  Who has been awarded the timber sale contract?	Forest Plan Goal 17 and Objectives	1) Number of timber sale contracts awarded for ranges of board feet and monetary values, and location of contractor.  2) Number of board feet processed at local mills.	NO CHANGE	Timber Sale Bid Monitoring Reports	5 years	n/a
31	Vegetation	Both	<b>Stocking Level:</b> Are harvested lands adequately restocked according to National Forest Management Act requirements?	Are lands adequately restocked within five years of a regeneration harvest or site preparation activities?	Forestwide S&Gs 2.3.4 - Timber or Vegetation Management	Acres with percent stocked to minimal standards.	NO CHANGE	Forest Activity Tracking System (FACTS), Stocking Surveys	Annually	n/a
32	Vegetation	Both	<b>Outputs Accomplished - Volume and Acres of Timber Offered and Sold:</b> To what extent are management activities providing sustainable supply of forest products?	How do actual outputs compare to those projected in Appendix D, Proposed and Probable Practices, specifically related to timber offered and sold?	Forest Plan Goal 8 and Objectives	1) Acres of even-aged regeneration harvest annually and total for the decade.  2) Acres of even-aged intermediate harvest annually and total for the decade.  3) Acres of uneven aged harvest annually and total for the decade.  4) MMBF Volume of Sawtimber and Pulp offered and sold annually and total for the decade.	NO CHANGE	Forest Activity Tracking System (FACTS) and Timber Sale Accounting (TSA) reports	Annually	n/a
33	Vegetation	Both	<b>Forest-wide Habitat Composition:</b> To what extent are management activities maintaining and restoring quality, amount, and distributions of habitats to desired levels?	To what extent are management activities and natural processes moving forest composition and age classes toward Forest Plan objectives (Tables 2.2-1 and 2.2-2)?	Forest Plan Goal 2 and Objectives	1) Number of acres and proportion in each type and of each age class.  2) Number of acres of treatments associated with habitat objectives, including:  -To enhance softwood component or convert to mixedwood or softwood habitat. -To maintain, enhance, or restore oak habitat. - To maintain, enhance, or create aspen habitat. - To maintain, enhance, or create permanent or temporary upland opening habitat. - To maintain, enhance, or create old-growth characteristics.	REVISED QUESTION & INDICATORS	Vegetation treatment activity as tracked in the Forest Activity Tracking System (FACTS) and FSVeg databases	Every 5 years	n/a
34	Human Dimensions	Both	<b>Teacher Development and Forest Stewardship:</b> To what extent have Forest programs provided a diverse range of information and education opportunities?	Was educator development or support in forest stewardship offered?	Forest Plan Goal 19 Objective : Include teacher development in stewardship of living systems in the educational outreach program.	Number of programs offered.	REVISED QUESTION & INDICATOR	Year end reporting from partner organizations as well as NICE database reports.	Every 5 years	n/a