USDA United States Department of Agriculture | Forest Service | Dixie National Forest | 820 N. Main Street Cedar City, UT 84720

File Code: 1920, 2620
Date: January 9, 2026

Notice of Proposed Administrative Changes to the Dixie National Forest Plan Monitoring Program

Dear Interested Party:

This posting is to inform the public about planned administrative changes to the Dixie National Forest (Forest) Plan Monitoring Program and to request input for these changes from the public. This is not a formal comment period, but we will consider your feedback for the next 21 days. Please send feedback to comments-intermtn-dixie@usda.gov. All input received by January 30, 2026, will be considered.

Forest monitoring plans are a required component of forest plans and facilitate periodic reporting of forest conditions. Monitoring reports are published every two years and help the responsible official determine whether changes are needed for the monitoring program, management activities, or forest plan components. Changes to monitoring plans may be necessary to comply with new regulations or to update questions and indicators to allow better reporting of ecosystem conditions and trends. The Dixie National Forest's monitoring plan was last updated in 2017 for consistency with the Forest Service's 2012 planning rule. Modifications to existing monitoring plans are made by administrative change (Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.12, chapter 30, section 32.4).

In response to findings and recommendations from recent monitoring reports, the Forest proposes to make the following administrative changes to the current monitoring plan:

- Update the indicators used for wilderness monitoring (substantive change);
- Update the Focal Species, monitoring questions, and indicators used for fish and wildlife monitoring (substantive change);
- Revise the snag management monitoring question and indicator and reassign it from the fish and wildlife program area to the goshawk program area (substantive change);
- Reassign one monitoring question from the goshawk program area to the range program area (substantive change); and
- Assign a number to each monitoring question (non-substantive change).

All other components of the current monitoring plan would remain the same. The changes to the wilderness, fish and wildlife, and goshawk monitoring programs are explained in Attachment 1, and Attachment 2 shows the proposed monitoring plan in full.

Following review of public input received, final changes to the monitoring plan will be posted to the Dixie National Forest website planning page: https://www.fs.usda.gov/r04/dixie/planning.

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the State or local Agency that administers the program or contact USDA through the Telecommunications Relay Service at 711 (voice and TTY). Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at How to File a Program Discrimination Complaint and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Mail Stop 9410, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.

Attachment 1. Explanation of Proposed Administrative Changes to the Dixie National Forest Plan Monitoring Program

Proposed Changes to the Wilderness Monitoring Program

Need for Change

The current monitoring program for the Dixie National Forest (Forest) uses four indicators to answer the question, "Is wilderness character being preserved on wilderness areas across the Forest?". Three of these indicators are not widely monitored on a regular basis (Table 1). Data is available for one current monitoring indicator (managed wildland/prescribed fire usage). However, reporting on this indicator alone would not fully represent whether wilderness character is being preserved. Additionally, previous monitoring reports recommended that wilderness reporting should account for the unique features and management issues of each wilderness area. Changing the indicators for wilderness monitoring would enable the Forest to more fully and consistently report on wilderness character, given current capacity.

Table 1. Current wilderness monitoring indicators and their status (Green = indicator is currently addressed; red = indicator is not currently addressed)

Monitoring Indicator	Status
Incursions of developed facilities, access, services and perception of safety	Not consistently monitored
Wilderness campsite condition	Not consistently monitored
Motorized/mechanized incursions	Not consistently monitored
Managed wildland/prescribed fire usage.	Regularly monitored

Monitoring Indicator Selected for Wilderness

The following indicator was selected for monitoring: **Wilderness Stewardship Performance (WSP) score in each wilderness area**.

The Forest Service uses the national WSP framework to track stewardship and preservation of wilderness character. Under the WSP framework, national forests annually monitor and assign scores to each wilderness area, based on ten wilderness stewardship elements. These elements, which are selected based on the individual characteristics of each wilderness area, collectively represent the following essential qualities of wilderness character:

- Natural
- Undeveloped
- Untrammeled
- Opportunities for solitude or primitive and unconfined recreation
- Other features of value

Using WSP scores as the monitoring indicator for wilderness would improve reporting consistency and address capacity challenges, as these scores are generated annually and are more readily accessible for reporting purposes than the current monitoring indicators. These scores also reflect more elements of wilderness character and stewardship than the current indicators and are tailored to the unique features of each wilderness area.

Table 4 in Attachment 2 shows the proposed change to the monitoring plan.

Proposed Changes to the Fish and Wildlife Monitoring Program

Need for Change

The need for change in the fish and wildlife program area of the Forest monitoring plan is driven by the insufficiency of the current monitoring questions, indicators, and/or metrics. Currently, there are ten monitoring questions (Table 2) and eighteen Focal Species (Table 3) used to monitor effects of Forest actions on wildlife resources or the stability of ecological conditions that impact them. Of the ten questions, only three are adequately addressed by current monitoring activities (Table 2). Of the eighteen Focal Species listed in the monitoring plan, three are monitored regularly and only one of these three is monitored regularly by the Forest Service (Table 3).

It was determined that Focal Species and wildlife monitoring questions and indicators should be changed to match the current needs and capacity of the Forest. This change would not affect monitoring completed by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) shown in Table 3 Additionally, the Forest would continue annual and project-specific monitoring for the northern goshawk as well as project-specific monitoring for the northern flicker.

Table 2. Current fish and wildlife monitoring questions and their status (Green = question is currently addressed; yellow = question is partially addressed; red = question is not addressed)

Monitoring Question	Monitoring Indicator	Status
Is the diversity of wildlife habitat being maintained by managing Vegetative Structural Stage (VSS) distribution?	Diversity and stability of forest VSS – Comprehensive Stand Exam data (CSE)	CSE data are inadequate to fully answer the question.
Are forest management activities and/or natural events affecting the structure and function of upland and riparian ecosystems?	Structure and function of forest and riparian ecosystems – CSE and Greenline data	CSE and Greenline data partially answer the question.
Is big game habitat maintained to meet Forest Plan desired conditions?	Big game habitat condition, Focal Species, and VSS data	CSE and Focal spec data partially answer the question.
Are forest management activities and natural events affecting the ecological conditions indicated by the status of Focal Species?	Occupied habitat and population structure of Focal Species.	Focal Species data partially answers the question.
Are management activities maintaining and improving the ability of lakes and streams on the Forest to maintain self-sustaining coldwater fisheries?	Occupied habitat and population structure of Focal Species – fish surveys.	Currently addressed by Focal Species data.
Are forest management activities and/or natural events maintaining aquatic habitat to meet Forest Plan desired conditions and objectives or improving habitat to move toward those conditions and objectives?	Riparian vegetation diversity, condition, trend, structure and ground cover – Greenline and ocular data.	Greenline and ocular data adequately address this question – Botanist collected.
Are TES plant habitats being protected from forest plan implementation activities and maintaining sufficient numbers and distribution to maintain viable populations across the Forest?	TES species have suitable habitat to sustain population numbers to maintain viability – Greenline and ocular data.	Greenline and ocular data adequately address this question – Botanist collected.

Monitoring Question	Monitoring Indicator	Status
Are forest management activities and natural events affecting the ecological conditions indicated by the status of Focal Species?	Habitat conditions in the planning area in sufficient numbers and distribution to maintain species viability – VSS and Focal Species data.	CSE and Focal Species data partially address this question.
Are TES animal habitats being protected from forest plan implementation activities and maintaining sufficient numbers and distribution to maintain viable populations across the Forest?	TES species have suitable habitat to sustain population numbers to maintain viability.	Focal Species data partially addresses this question.
Is the spatial arrangement of snags in condition to meet needs of cavity nesters?	Snag species, density, size, height and condition – CSE data	CSE and Focal Species data partially address this question.

Table 3. Current Focal Species and their status (Green = species monitored regularly; yellow = species irregularly monitored; red = species not monitored)

Focal Species	Status	Notes
Mule deer	Monitored by the Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR)	Annual monitoring
Rocky Mountain elk	Monitored by the UDWR	3-year rotation
Townsend's big-eared bat	Not monitored	Not monitored
Spotted bat	Not monitored	Not monitored
Pygmy rabbit	Rarely monitored	Project specific
Greater sage grouse	Monitored by the UDWR	Annual monitoring
Northern flicker	Monitored by the Forest Service	Project specific
Northern goshawk	Monitored by the Forest Service	Annual monitoring
Wild turkey	Not monitored	Not monitored
Peregrine falcon	Rarely monitored	Project specific
Flammulated owl	Rarely monitored	Project specific
American three-toed woodpecker	Rarely monitored	Project specific
Bald eagle	Rarely monitored	Project specific
Bonneville cutthroat trout	Monitored by the UDWR	7-year rotation
Colorado River cutthroat trout	Monitored by the UDWR	7-year rotation
Southern leatherside chub	Monitored by the UDWR	Irregular rotation
Virgin River spinedace	Monitored by the UDWR	Irregular rotation/Not on Forest land
Non-native trout species	Monitored by the UDWR	Irregular rotation/Not on Forest lands

Process for Selecting Monitoring Questions, Indicators, and Focal Species

The process used for selecting monitoring questions, indicators, and Focal Species included the following:

1. Identify ecological conditions in the Forest Plan and ecosystems within the Forest that are important to fish and wildlife.
2. Select questions to monitor chosen ecological conditions.
3. Select indicators for answering monitoring questions. Focal Species were selected when the species could be monitored through time and represent the integrity of ecological conditions that are difficult to monitor using other indicators.
4. Determine the methods that will be used to monitor the Focal Species and answer monitoring questions.
5. Make administrative changes to the Forest monitoring plan.

Ecosystems and Monitoring Questions Selected for Fish and Wildlife

Desired future conditions described in the Forest Plan include maintaining current habitat of threatened and endangered species; maintaining or increasing big game range capacity; and improving sensitive species habitat, fisheries habitat, and riparian ecosystems. The ecosystems identified below provide important habitat for threatened, endangered, sensitive, and proposed species as well as big game species on the Forest. Monitoring the health of these ecosystems will track whether the Forest Plan desired conditions for wildlife and wildlife habitat are being met or maintained.

1. **Riparian**: This habitat type has a limited distribution and is critical for a majority of wildlife species, including big game and numerous listed species.

   Monitoring Question: Are healthy riparian ecosystems being maintained and are impaired riparian ecosystems being improved on Forest lands?

2. **Shrub-Steppe (primarily sagebrush)**: Healthy shrub-steppe ecosystems are important to big game and other wildlife species including but not limited to the pygmy rabbit (sensitive), greater sage grouse (sensitive), Suckley's cuckoo bumble bee (proposed endangered), and monarch butterfly (proposed threatened)).

   Monitoring Question: Are healthy shrub-steppe habitats being maintained and are impaired shrub-steppe habitats being improved on Forest lands?

3. **Aspen**: Aspen forests are in decline and are important to many wildlife species, including but not limited to the northern goshawk (sensitive), three-toed woodpecker (sensitive), and big game species.

   Monitoring Question: Are aspen forests being maintained or expanded on Forest lands?

4. **Pinyon-Juniper**: Healthy and diverse pinyon-juniper habitats support multiple species, including but not limited to the Mexican spotted owl (threatened) and big game species.

   Monitoring Question: Are healthy pinyon-juniper habitats being maintained on Forest lands?

Focal Species Selected for Fish and Wildlife Monitoring

Focal species are a small subset of plant or wildlife species whose status permits inference to the integrity of the larger ecological system to which the species belongs thereby providing meaningful information regarding the effectiveness of the Forest Plan in maintaining or restoring these conditions to sustain the diversity of plant and animal communities in the plan area. Focal Species are generally selected on the basis of their functional role in ecosystems or their ability to document change within that ecosystem.

The process of identifying and using Focal Species is described in the Forest Service Manual (FSM) 1909.12, chapter 30, section 32.13c. The following are guidelines for selecting Focal Species:

1. Every monitoring program must identify at least one Focal Species and one or more monitoring question and indicator to track the status of the identified Focal Species.
2. It is not expected that a Focal Species be selected for every ecological condition.
3. Focal Species should be selected for monitoring when doing so is feasible and they are the best way to track ecological integrity and ecosystem diversity.
4. Monitoring Focal Species is intended to address situations where they provide more useful information or are more efficiently monitored than other potential indicators.
5. Focal Species can be selected and monitored when key ecological indicators of composition, structure, function, and connectivity are unavailable or difficult to monitor.
6. Focal Species are selected because they are indicative of key characteristics of ecological integrity and are responsive to ecological conditions to inform plan decisions.
7. The requirement for the Responsible Official to monitor Focal Species allows discretion to determine the most appropriate method and geographic scale for monitoring, within the financial and technical capabilities of the unit.

Two focal species were selected to monitor riparian and aspen habitats. These species are:

1. **Trout** (for riparian habitat): Trends in trout species reflect the quality of cold water streams and lakes and will be used as an indicator for these types of riparian habitat.
2. **Aspen** (for aspen habitat): Aspen forests provide habitat for many wildlife species. Monitoring the extent of aspen on the Forest provides direct information about the availability of this habitat type for wildlife species.

Monitoring Indicators Selected for Fish and Wildlife

Five indicators, including the two Focal Species listed above, were selected to monitor the four priority ecosystems. These indicators are:

1. **Trend in trout populations** (for riparian habitat)
2. **Riparian vegetation diversity, condition, trend, structure and ground cover, as indicated by Riparian Greenline Surveys and/or Multiple Indicator Monitoring** (for riparian habitat)
3. **Trend in range condition** (for shrub-steppe habitat)
4. **Total acres of aspen cover type on Forest lands** (for aspen habitat)
5. **Acres of healthy pinyon-juniper cover type on Forest lands** (for pinyon-juniper habitat)

Summary of Changes to the Fish and Wildlife Monitoring Program

Four monitoring questions representing riparian, shrub-steppe, aspen, and pinyon-juniper habitats would replace eight monitoring questions currently listed for the fish and wildlife monitoring program. Five monitoring indicators would be used to answer these questions, and two Focal Species (trout and aspen) would replace the eighteen Focal Species currently listed. These changes would simplify the monitoring program while still focusing on the most critical ecological conditions for wildlife. Monitoring questions for the northern goshawk and for threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant species will be retained. The monitoring question and indicators for snag management were reassigned to the goshawk program area and slightly revised (see below). These changes would not affect monitoring completed by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, which monitors multiple species previously listed as Focal Species (see Table 3). Additionally, the Forest would continue annual and project-specific monitoring for the northern goshawk as well as project-specific monitoring for the northern flicker.

Table 4 in Attachment 2 shows the proposed changes to the monitoring plan.

Proposed Changes to the Goshawk Monitoring Program

Snag Management

The monitoring question and indicator for snag management would be reassigned from the fish and wildlife monitoring program to the goshawk monitoring program. It would also be revised to the following:

- Question: Is snag habitat (i.e., number and size of snags) being maintained in accordance with the 2000 Utah Northern Goshawk Amendment?
    - *Previously: Is the spatial arrangement of snags in condition to meet needs of cavity nesters?*
- Indicator: Snag species, density, size, and height.
    - *Previously: Snag species, density, size, height and condition.*

Revising and reassigning this monitoring question would align the monitoring plan with the Goshawk Amendment, which describes guidelines for snag management and includes snag habitat as a monitoring element.

Grazing Practices

The following monitoring question and indicator would be reassigned to the range monitoring program:

- Question: Are appropriate adjustments to grazing practices being made where grazing is contributing to at-risk conditions?
- Indicator: Ungulate grazing practices in at-risk locations.

Answering this question requires evaluating range utilization data and grazing practices, and reassigning it would facilitate the involvement of range staff. No changes would be made to the question and indicator, and both the range program manager and wildlife program manager would contribute to answering this monitoring question.

Table 4 in Attachment 2 shows these proposed changes to the monitoring plan.

Attachment 2. Proposed Plan Monitoring Program

Table 4. Proposed Monitoring Plan. Blue text indicates changes, including new questions and indicators or reassigned questions. Questions or indicators proposed for removal are indicated by ~~stricken text~~.

Program	Activity	Monitoring Question	Monitoring Indicator
Recreation	Developed Sites; Actual Use	1. Are developed recreation sites meeting Forest Plan standards for use, and are visitors satisfied?	Developed site use and visitor satisfaction.
	Developed Sites; Condition	2. Are developed recreation sites meeting Forest Plan standards for condition?	Developed site condition.
	Dispersed Sites; Actual Use	3. Are dispersed recreation sites meeting Forest Plan standards for use, and are visitors satisfied?	Dispersed site use and visitor satisfaction.
	Dispersed Sites; Condition	4. Are dispersed recreation sites meeting Forest Plan standards for condition, and are visitors satisfied?	Dispersed site condition.
	Trail Condition	5. Are trails meeting Forest Plan standards for use and condition, and are visitors satisfied?	Trail use and visitor satisfaction; miles of motorized trail managed to standard; miles of non-motorized trail managed to standard.

Program	Activity	Monitoring Question	Monitoring Indicator
Wilderness	Wilderness Character	6. Is wilderness character being preserved on wilderness areas across the Forest?	Wilderness Stewardship Performance (WSP) score in each wilderness area. ~~Incursions of developed facilities, access, services and perception of safety.~~ ~~Wilderness campsite condition.~~ ~~Motorized/mechanized incursions.~~ ~~Managed wildland/prescribed fire usage.~~
Cultural Resources	Identify, protect, interpret and manage the significant cultural resources on Forest lands.	7. Are heritage resources being protected and are mitigation measures sufficient to prevent damage to heritage resources from Federal actions, looting, environmental disturbance, and other actions?	Number of historic properties recorded and evaluated for the National Register. Number of eligible historic properties being impacted by Federal actions, looting, environmental disturbance, and other actions.
Fish, Wildlife, and TES Species	Riparian Habitat	8. Are healthy riparian ecosystems being maintained and are impaired riparian ecosystems being improved on Forest lands?	Trend in trout populations. Riparian vegetation diversity, condition, trend, structure and ground cover, as indicated by Riparian Greenline Surveys and/or Multiple Indicator Monitoring.
	Shrub-Steppe Habitat	9. Are healthy shrub-steppe habitats being maintained and are impaired shrub-steppe habitats being improved on Forest lands?	Trend in range condition.
	Aspen Habitat	10. Are aspen forests being maintained or expanded on Forest lands?	Total acres of aspen cover type on Forest lands.

Program	Activity	Monitoring Question	Monitoring Indicator
	Pinyon-Juniper Habitat	11. Are healthy pinyon-juniper habitats being maintained on Forest lands?	Acres of healthy pinyon-juniper cover type on Forest lands.
	Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Plant Species	12. Are TES plant habitats being protected from forest plan implementation activities and maintaining sufficient numbers and distribution to maintain viable populations across the Forest?	TES species have suitable habitat to sustain population numbers to maintain viability.
	~~Wildlife Habitat Diversity~~	~~Is the diversity of wildlife habitat being maintained by managing Vegetative Structural Stage (VSS) distribution across the planning area?~~	~~Diversity and stability of forest and rangeland vegetation.~~
	~~Modification of Ecosystem~~	~~Are forest management activities and/or natural events affecting the structure and function of upland and riparian ecosystems?~~	~~Structure (VSS) and function of forest and riparian ecosystems.~~ ~~Upland and riparian vegetation diversity, condition, trend, structure and ground cover.~~
	~~Big Game Habitat Condition~~	~~Is big game habitat maintained to meet Forest Plan desired conditions?~~	~~Big game habitat condition and/or VSS Distribution across the landscape and within projects.~~

Program	Activity	Monitoring Question	Monitoring Indicator
	~~Fish~~ ~~Quantity and Quality of Aquatic Habitats~~	~~Are forest management activities and natural events affecting the ecological conditions indicated by the status of focal species?~~ ~~Are management activities maintaining and improving the ability of lakes and streams on the Forest to maintain self-sustaining cold water fisheries?~~ ~~Are forest management activities and/or natural events maintaining aquatic habitat to meet Forest Plan desired conditions and objectives or improving habitat to move toward those conditions and objectives?~~	~~Occupied habitat and population structure of focal species.~~ ~~Riparian vegetation diversity, condition, trend, structure and ground cover.~~ ~~Stream channel condition, morphology, bank stability and substrate composition.~~ ~~Compliance with State water quality sediment, turbidity and temperature standards and maintenance of beneficial uses.~~ ~~Function and condition of lentic riparian areas.~~
	~~Indicator and Special Status Species~~	~~Are forest management activities and natural events affecting the ecological conditions indicated by the status of focal species[1]?~~	~~Habitat conditions retained across the planning area in sufficient numbers and distribution to maintain species viability.~~
	~~Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Animal Species~~	~~Are TES animal habitats being protected from forest plan implementation activities and maintaining sufficient numbers and distribution to maintain viable populations across the Forest?~~	~~TES species have suitable habitat to sustain population numbers to maintain viability.~~

[1] ~~Mule deer, rocky mountain elk, wild turkey, Northern goshawk, Northern flicker, and sage grouse, pygmy rabbit, spotted bat, Townsends Wester big eared bat, bald eagle, sage grouse, peregrine falcon, Flammulated owl, and three toed woodpecker.~~

Program	Activity	Monitoring Question	Monitoring Indicator
Goshawk	Snag Management	13. Is snag habitat (i.e., number and size of snags) being maintained in accordance with the 2000 Utah Northern Goshawk Amendment? ~~Is the spatial arrangement of snags in condition to meet needs of cavity nesters?~~	Snag species, density, size, and height. ~~Snag species, density, size, height and condition.~~
	Goshawk territory occupancy at the forest level	14. Are known goshawk territories on NFS lands remaining occupied?	Goshawk territory occupancy.
	Goshawk territory occupancy following vegetative management treatments	15. Are goshawk territories remaining occupied following vegetation management?	Goshawk territory occupancy.
	Dispersion & patch size of mature/old forest groups	16. Is mature and old forest habitat connectivity being adequately maintained?	Percent and distribution of mature and old forest cover.
	Down log & woody debris amounts/sizes within a 10 acre treatment block	17. Is downed wood being maintained in sufficient amount, size, and location?	Quantity of downed logs and woody debris.
Range	Ungulate grazing practices in identified at-risk locations	Are appropriate adjustments to grazing practices being made where grazing is contributing to at-risk conditions?	Ungulate grazing practices in at-risk locations.
	Permitted Animal Unit Months (AUMs)	19. Are goods and services being provided in accordance with Forest Plan goals and objectives?	Level of permitted livestock grazing.

Program	Activity	Monitoring Question	Monitoring Indicator
	Range Condition and Trend	20. Are desired conditions for rangeland plant communities being met in regards to species composition, trend and ground cover?	Range condition, trend and ground cover.
	Invasive Species	21. What is the extent of the change of ecological conditions due to invasive species?	Estimated acres infested with invasive plants and noxious weeds.
Timber	Assure that vegetation manipulation will not favor an increase in forest pests (insects, diseases, etc.)	22. Are vegetation conditions stable or moving toward Forest Plan desired conditions?	Extent of insect and disease infestations.
Water	Water Quality	23. Are beneficial uses, identified by the state of Utah, being maintained for all water bodies?	Impairment or degradation of water quality. Number of impaired or degraded water bodies.
	Changes in stream channels and riparian areas due to management	24. Are forest management activities affecting stream channels and riparian ecosystems?	Riparian ecosystem vegetation diversity, condition, trend, structure and ground cover. Stream channel condition, morphology, bank stability and substrate composition. Riparian species occupied habitat and population structure.
	Best Management Practices (BMP) effectiveness and compliance on land disturbing projects	25. Are appropriate BMPs being followed with forest management activities and are they meeting their intended effectiveness with respect to impacts to riparian ecosystems?	BMP compliance and effectiveness.

Program	Activity	Monitoring Question	Monitoring Indicator
Soils	Accelerated Soil Loss	26. Are forest management activities impairing soil productivity of the land?	Changes in soil properties (physical, chemical, and/or biological) and ground cover that result in the loss of the inherent ecological capacity or hydrologic function of the soil resource.
Facilities	Transportation System Management	27. Is adequate road access and maintenance being provided?	Miles of classified road open for public use. Number and condition of deficient bridges.
	Road Maintenance	28. Are open roads maintained to standard?	Miles of road maintained to standard.
	Water Systems	29. Do potable and non-potable water systems meet Federal, State, and Local requirements?	Water quality monitoring results and condition surveys.
	Dams and Water Impoundments	30. Do dams on Forest Service lands meet State and Local safety requirements?	Critical safety items identified during dam inspections.
Protection	Fuel Treatment	31. Are fuel treatment projects reducing risk to property, human health and safety, and reducing the potential for unwanted fire effects through reduction of total fuel loading to manageable levels?	Percent of projects where post-treatment total fuel load is reduced from pre-treatment levels.
	Fire Management	32. Are forest vegetation conditions trending towards safe and efficient fire response and restoring fire as a disturbance agent consistent with management area emphasis and historic fire return intervals?	Percent of fires suppressed during initial attack where that is the chosen strategy. Percent of natural ignition acres with resource benefit.
	Insect and Disease	33. Are forest vegetation conditions stable or moving toward Forest Plan desired conditions?	Extent of insect and disease infestations.

Program	Activity	Monitoring Question	Monitoring Indicator
Education	Public Outreach	34. Education and information: Are we delivering key education/enforcement messages to forest employees and users? (Key focus areas are: OHV use, recreation user ethics, fire's role/hazardous fuels, noxious weeds, watershed health.)	Number of key messages.