

Revised Monitoring Questions and Indicators after Public Input

This attachment outlines the monitoring questions and associated indicators that the Hiawatha National Forest proposes to use from now on, including existing, new, and modified questions. The existing 33 monitoring questions are available on the Forest’s website:

(<http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/hiawatha/landmanagement/planning/>).

Table 1 includes the mixture of existing, new and revised monitoring questions. Table 2 contains deleted monitoring questions and the rationale for deletion. The Public Input Summary provides the breakdown of public concerns expressed during the 30-day public input period and HIF responses to those public concerns. Any changes to the monitoring questions or the indicators are indicated below through strikeout of original text and underlining revised text.

A list of definitions has been provided at the end of the document for reference.

Table 1. Monitoring Questions Proposed to Address the Eight Required Monitoring Elements

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| 1. Status of select watershed conditions (36 CFR 219.12(a)(5)(i)). | See below. | 2012 Planning Rule Required Monitoring Element | See below. | |
| 1a. To what extent is Forest Plan implementation affecting streams, lakes, ponds and wetlands and their associated riparian ecosystems? | Acres of streams, lakes, ponds and wetland and riparian ecosystems affected. | BMP Implementation and Effectiveness Monitoring (use National BMP protocols, evaluate % implemented and % effective) | Measure project by project/Report every 2-6 years | Not applicable; this is a new question. |
| 1b. To what extent are we moving riparian corridors toward the desired condition? | Miles of roads and trails obliterated, relocated outside of or improved in the riparian corridor | Forest Plan Watershed Management Objective 1 | Measure annually/Report every 2 years | Not applicable; this is a new question. |
| | Number of barriers removed for aquatic organism passage and to improve flow and sediment transport | Forest Plan Watershed Management Objective 2 | | |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| | Acres of non-native invasive species treated in riparian areas <u>and wetlands</u> | Forest Plan Watershed Management Objective 6; Forest Plan Aquatic Ecosystems Standards and Guidelines | | |
| | Acres of riparian vegetation improvements | Forest Plan Watershed Management Objective 7 | Measure annually/Report every 2 years | Not applicable; this is a new question. |
| | Watershed Condition Class Score (25 indicators) | Forest Plan Watershed Management Objective #4 and #52011 Watershed Condition Class | Measure annually/Report every 2-6 years | Not applicable; this is a new question. |
| | Percentage of fifth level watersheds with improved condition classes | Framework assessment of 6 th level subwatersheds | | |
| 1c. How is the Forest complying with the Clean Water Act requirements? | Effectiveness of Best Management Practices (BMP) application | Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C §1251 et seq. (1972)); Forest Service Policy for Water Quality Management; National Core BMP Monitoring Program; Forest Plan Watershed Management Goal 5 - Water quality is maintained to the standards identified by the State of Michigan | Measure annually/Report every 2 years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| 2. Status of select ecological conditions including key characteristics of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems (36 CFR 219.12(a)(5)(ii)). | See below. | 2012 Planning Rule Required Monitoring Element | See below. | |
| 2a. To what extent are ecologically healthy and productive aquatic ecosystems being restored? | Number of miles of riparian and in-channel stream habitat restored or enhanced during the planning period | Forest Plan Wildlife Objectives 1, 2, 3; Watershed Goals 3-8; Watershed desired condition | Measure annually/Report every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| Number of lakes restored or enhanced during the planning period | Forest Plan Wildlife Objective 2 | | | |
| Number and location of wetlands with aquatic invasive species (AIS) present or absent | Forest Plan Aquatic Ecosystems Standards and Guidelines and Soil Resources Objectives | | | |
| Acres treated to control AIS | | | | |
| Acres of wetlands with AIS eradicated | | | | |
| Number of educational contacts related to AIS | Forest Plan Soils Resource Objective 2 | | | |
| Trends in desired native fish population. | 2600 – Wildlife, Fish and Sensitive Plant Habitat Management Goals 3, 5, and 6 and Objectives 1, 2, and 3 | | | |
| 2b. To what extent is the Forest maintaining or restoring conditions that result from or emulate natural ecological processes? | Acres of prescribed burn to restore wetland and terrestrial habitat | Vegetation Management desired condition 1-3; Goals 1-3; Fire Management desired condition 3 | Measure annually/Report every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| Number of years since fire occurred compared to historical fire regimes for a given ELTP or biophysical setting | | | | |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Plant and animal population change before and after management that emulates natural ecological processes (prescribed burning, some timber harvest, mechanical opening treatments, stream flow restoration, etc.) | Vegetation Management desired condition 1-3; Goals 1-3; Fire Management desired condition 3 | Measure annually/Report every two -ten years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| | Compare the current percent of acres measured against the 2005/2006 desired future condition by MA, ELT, early-, mid- and late seral condition and tree size classes | | | |
| 2c. To what extent are insects and disease populations compatible with objectives for restoring or maintaining healthy forest conditions? | Acres, disturbance patterns, severity and trends observed by annual aerial flights for insect and disease damage | Vegetation Management desired condition 1; Forest Pest Management desired condition 1 | Measure annually/Report every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| | Site visits for insect and disease observations | | Measured as needed based on the indicator above/Report every two years | |
| 2d. To what extent is Forest management managing undesirable occurrences of fire, insect and disease outbreaks? | Acres harvested by salvage or for sanitation; compare acres treated to acres identified in previous monitoring question | Pest Management Guidelines 1-4 | Measure annually/Report every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| 2e. To what extent is Forest management providing ecological conditions to maintain habitat of native and desired non-native species? | Acres of habitat in the appropriate ecological condition needed for native and desired non-native species | TES Goals 1,3; Vegetation Management Guidelines 2,3; Wildlife Structural Guidelines 1-3 | Measure annually/Report every two years | Revised from: To what extent is Forest management providing ecological conditions to maintain viable habitat of native and desired non-native species? |
| | Plant and animal population levels before and after ecological restoration | | | |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2f. To what extent are RNAs and cRNAs being managed to protect their unique values and how are they contributing to research? | Acres managed to protect unique values | Land Ownership Goal 2; Prescribed Natural Fire Goal 1 (PNF is an outdated term. Appropriate Management Response is current term); Objective 1; Land Ownership Goal 2 | Measure annually/Report every six years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| 2g. To what extent are key terrestrial habitat components (e.g., mast, snags, down woody material) being provided? | Number of den and snag trees per acre in managed stands | Vegetation Management Guideline 3; Vegetation Management Structural Guideline 1a, 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c | Measure project by project/Report every two years | Not applicable; this is a new question. |
| 2h. To what extent are existing and potential old-growth forest conditions being created? <u>To what extent are existing and potential old-growth forest stands being managed or unmanaged to develop into or accelerate toward old growth?</u> | Acres of existing and potential old growth by forest type | Vegetation Management Goals 1-3; Objective 1; Guidelines 1-5 | Measure every four years/ Report every four years | Not applicable; this is a new question. |
| | Connectivity of old growth system | | | |
| 2i. How much even-aged management (especially clear-cutting) should be used? In what forest types should it be used? | Acres of even-aged harvest that emulates natural disturbance regimes, creates wildlife habitat (e.g., jack pine barrens and well-distributed age classes of aspen-spruce-fir mixed stands) and moves toward veg comp goals | Forest Plan 2600-Wildlife, Fish and Sensitive Plant Habitat Management. 2400-Vegetation Management Guideline 1 | Measure annually/Report every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| 3. Status of focal species to assess the ecological conditions required under §219.9 (36 CFR 219.12(a)(5)(iii)). | See below. | 2012 Planning Rule Required Monitoring Element | See below. | |
| 3a. To what extent are forest management activities promoting the regeneration of hemlock? | Presence, abundance and spatial distribution of hemlock (focal species is hemlock). | 2012 Planning Rule Required Monitoring Element Forest Plan MA 2.3, 4.5, MA 6.1, MA 6.2, MA 6.4 and Dukes RNA all list a hemlock component in the DFC. Forest Plan veg comp goals list hemlock as late seral component. Key ecosystem characteristics include suitable conditions for hemlock reproduction including shade, moisture and large woody debris. There are 96 birds and 47 mammals associated with hemlock in the north-east US. Acres of new Hemlock recruitment is important to the abundance and distribution. Scale: Forest wide mixed northern hardwood, hemlock and white pine hemlock late seral ecosystems. | Measure every 5 years (FIA data) and report every 6 years. Also monitor with standard Forest Plan vegetative composition goals monitoring. Monitor project by project with standard stocking surveys. | Not applicable; this is a new question. |
| 3b. To what extent are high quality, free flowing cold water stream ecosystems being provided? | Miles of intact cool and cold water streams and brook trout population trend within those reaches (focal species is brook trout). | 2012 Planning Rule Required Monitoring Element Forest Plan DFC goal (25000 watershed management) to manage riparian areas to meet Forest designations for warm, cool and cold water streams. Follow State of Michigan water quality Best Management Practices for managing forest resources. Indian, Carp and Tahquamenon W&S rivers have a DFC to provide resident trout habitat and components of a diverse aquatic ecosystem (i.e., Large Woody Debris). | Measure annually/Report every two years | Not applicable; this is a new question. |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Key ecosystem characteristics include; cold water, large woody debris, cobble spawning substrate, aquatic organism passages, mussels, invertebrates, caddisfly, stonefly, creek chub, sculpin beaver dams, and non-native brown trout.</p> <p>Scale: Forest-wide cool and cold water reaches and associated riparian habitat.</p> | | |
| <p>3c. Is the type and frequency of disturbance associated with dry-sand outwash plains (ELT 10/20) appropriate to maintain ecosystem integrity throughout the historical range of variation?</p> | <p>Sharp-tailed grouse population trend</p> | <p>2012 Planning Rule Required Monitoring Element</p> <p>Forest Plan (2600) objective to maintain permanent openings within vegetation composition goals for habitat suitable for sharp-tailed grouse. Provide for KW management within forest-wide vegetation goals. Prescribed fire mimicking natural fires used as a management tool (2400). In MA 4.4 provide wildlife habitat for KW and other upland species such as sharp-tailed grouse, KW and Black-backed woodpecker. Provide large openings and savanna complexes.</p> <p>Key ecosystem components of dry northern forest/barrens include, frequent fire or management to mimic fire (including timber harvest and prescribed burning), a large number of snags, biological legacies (large red/white pine retained) habitat connectivity resulting in large early successional complexes, pine age-class diversity.</p> <p>Scale: ELT 10/20, primarily on Management Areas 4.2 and 4.4, Forest-wide.</p> | <p>Measure annually/Report every two^{ten} years</p> | <p>Not applicable; this is a new question.</p> |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 4. Status of a select set of the ecological conditions required under §219.9 to contribute to the recovery of federally listed threatened and endangered species, conserve proposed and candidate species, and maintain a viable population of each species of conservation concern (36 CFR 219.12(a)(5)(iv)). | See below. | 2012 Planning Rule Required Monitoring Element | See below. | |
| 4a. To what extent is the management of the Forest contributing to the conservation of threatened, endangered and species of conservation concern (TES)? | Number of TES species for which recovery actions are accomplished | Wildlife Goal 5; TES Goals 1, 3; Standards 1, 2; Guidelines 1-4; Land Ownership Goal 2; Eastern Regional Sensitive Species Framework | Measure annually/Report every two years | Revised from: To what extent is the management of the Forest contributing to the conservation of threatened and endangered and sensitive species? |
| | Acres of habitat improved for TES species | | | |
| | Number of species removed from TES lists | | <u>Measure every ten years/Report every ten years</u> | |
| | TES population trends | | | |
| | Acres of appropriately stocked jack pine for KW habitat (over or under and with appropriate opening percentage) | Lands are adequately restocked as specified in the Forest Plan | <u>Measure annually/Report every two years</u> | |
| 4b. To what extent is the Forest maintaining the amount and juxtaposition of Canada lynx foraging and denning habitats? | Acres of compacted snow. | Wildlife Goal 5; Canada lynx Goal 1; Guideline 1; TES Standards 1,2; Guideline 4 | Measure every two years/Report every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| | Acres of contiguous habitat connectivity | | | |
| | Juxtaposition of forage and denning habitat | | | |
| 4c. To what extent is the Forest working cooperatively with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, state and other federal agencies to update and implement recovery plans and conservation assessments for TES? | Number of consultation efforts | Wildlife TES Goals 3 and 4; Guideline 1 | Measure annually/Report every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| | Number of representatives on interagency Recovery Teams | | | |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| 5. Status of visitor use, visitor satisfaction, and progress toward meeting recreation objectives (36 CFR 219.12(a)(5)(v)). | See below. | 2012 Planning Rule Required Monitoring Element | See below. | |
| 5a. What are the effects of OHVs on the physical, biological and social environment? | Acres of habitat impacted by OHV use | Motorized/non-motorized Trails Goals 1-3; Objectives 2 and 4 | Measure annually/Report every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| | Acres of soil compacted, rutted or eroded by OHV use | Motorized/non-motorized Trails Goals 1-3; Objectives 2 and 4; Watershed Management Objective 1; Riparian Ecosystem Standard 1 and Guidelines | | |
| | Number of water quality erosion sites caused by OHVs | | | |
| 5b. What are the effects of snowmobiles on the physical, biological and social environment? | Acres of habitat impacted by off trail use | TES Goals 2; Guidelines 1-4 | Measure annually/Report every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| 5c. To what extent is the Forest providing snowmobile opportunities? | Miles of designated snowmobile trails | Motorized/Non-Motorized Trails Goals 1-3; Objectives 2 & 4 | Measure annually/Report every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| 5d. To what extent is the Forest providing and maintaining a variety of inland lake watercraft accesses in motorized and non-motorized settings? | Number of access sites by setting | Great Lakes and Inland Lakes Access Goal 1; Objective 2 | Measure annually/Report every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| 5e. To what extent is wilderness being managed to protect the biological and physical resources and wilderness values while accommodating recreational uses? | Number of Wilderness Performance Elements met | Wilderness Goal 1 | Wilderness Performance Elements measure annually/Report every two <u>ten</u> years | Not applicable; this is a new question. |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| 5f. To what extent are Wild and Scenic River (WSR) values being managed to protect the biological and physical resources while accommodating recreational uses? | Outstandingly Remarkable Values (ORVs) improved | WSRs Goals 1 and 4 | ORVs measured project by project/ reported every two years | Not applicable; this is a new question. |
| 5g. What is the status of visitor use and visitor satisfaction? | National Visitor Use Monitoring (NVUM) Metrics | 2012 Planning Rule Required Monitoring Element | Measured every five years/Reported every five <u>six</u> years | Not applicable; this is a new question. |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| 6. Measurable changes on the plan area related to climate change and other stressors that may be affecting the plan area (36 CFR 219.12(a)(5)(vi)). | See below. | 2012 Planning Rule Required Monitoring Element | See below. | |
| 6a. How are the timing and duration of winter weather conditions changing across the plan area on an annual basis? | Accumulated Winter Season Severity Index (AWSSI). Index is based on data measured on a daily basis: 1. Max temperature 2. Min temperature 3. Snowfall 4. Snow depth | 2012 Planning Rule Required Monitoring Element | Report every two years | Not applicable; this is a new question. |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 7. Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities (36 CFR 219.12(a)(5)(vii)). | See below. | 2012 Planning Rule Required Monitoring Element | See below. | |
| 7a. How close are projected outputs and services to actual? | Comparison of actual to projected outputs and services for all resources as described in the Forest Plan <u>FEISA quantitative and qualitative estimate of performance, comparing outputs and services with those projected by the Forest Plan.</u> | <u>36 CFR 219.12 (a)(5)(vii) Progress toward meeting the desired conditions and objectives in the plan, including for providing multiple use opportunities. Forest Plan Appendix A Forest Plan Appendix A.</u> | Depending on resource this may be measured annually or on a multiple year interval/Report every two to ten years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| 7b. How close are projected costs with actual costs? | Comparison of projected costs with actual costs for project activities for all resource areas <u>Documentation of costs associated with carrying out the planned management prescriptions compared with costs estimated in the Forest Plan.</u> | Documentation of costs associated with carrying out the planned management prescriptions | Depending on resource this may be measured annually or on a multiple year interval/Report every two to ten years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| 7c. To what extent is the Forest meeting the vegetative composition objectives? | Vegetative composition percentages by ELTP and MA | Vegetation Management desired condition 1 and 2; Goals 1-3 | Measured every two to ten years/Report every two to ten years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| 7d. Has public demand for commodity uses and non-commodity opportunities changed? | By resource, situations that generate resource damage or demand exceeds Forest capacity to provide | Vegetation Management, Forest Products Goals 1-2; Land Uses Management Goals 1-2; Minerals and Geology Goals 1, 4; Recreation, Great Lakes and Inland Lakes Access Goals 1, 3; Recreation Development and Recreation Facilities Goal 1 | Measured annually/Reported every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| 7e. To what extent is the Forest meeting its transportation system objectives? | Miles of roads decommissioned or constructed to be within guidelines Number of effective road closures Miles of roads reconstructed and bridges constructed and/or reconstructed Number of culverts replaced | 7700-Transportation system Goals, Guidelines, and Objectives | Measured annually/Reported every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| 7f. To what extent is timber management occurring on lands suitable for such production? | Acres inventoried by stand exams, walk-throughs, photo interpretation and during project-area analysis | Forest Plan Appendix A – Suitability. | Measured project by project/ Reported every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| 7g. To what extent do output levels, location of timber harvest and mix of saw timber & pulpwood compare to those levels? | The difference between actual output of saw timber and pulpwood and projected output | Forest Plan Appendix A. | Measured annually/Reported every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |
| 7h. Are harvested lands adequately restocked after 5 years? | Acres meeting required minimum percentages through first-, third- and fifth-5 th year stocking surveys | Lands are adequately restocked as specified in the Forest Plan. | Measured annually/Reported every two years | Existing Forest Plan monitoring question |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|---------------------------------|---|--------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | Acres that fail to meet minimum stocking requirements by silvicultural prescription | | | |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>8. The effects of each management system to determine that they do not substantially and permanently impair the productivity of the land (16 U.S.C. 1604(g)(3)(C)) (36 CFR 219.12(a)(5)(viii)). For purposes of this subpart, a timber management system, including even-aged management and uneven-aged management.</p> | <p>See below.</p> | <p>2012 Planning Rule Required Monitoring Element</p> | <p>See below.</p> | |
| <p>8a. Are the effects of Forest management, including prescriptions, resulting in changes to the productivity of the land?</p> | <p>Acres of whole tree harvesting on xeric sands</p> | <p>2500 Watershed Management – Soil Resources Goal 2</p> | <p>Measured annually/Reported every two years</p> | <p>Revised from: Are the effects of Forest management, including prescriptions, resulting in significant changes to the productivity of the land?</p> |

| Proposed Monitoring Question(s) | Indicator(s) | Driver | Measurement & Reporting Frequency | Original Question Wording |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| <p>9. To what extent is the Forest meeting its Federal Indian trust responsibility, including, but not limited to, meeting the requirements of memoranda of understanding, consulting with tribes on Forest management and actively seeking collaborative opportunities?</p> | <p>Number of notifications and consultations, e.g., documentation of National Environmental Policy Act notifications and consultations, National Historic Preservation Act and Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act consultations</p> | <p>Nothing in this Plan or its implementation is intended to modify, abrogate or otherwise adversely affect tribal reserved or treaty guaranteed rights applicable within the Forest. 1500-External Relations Objective 1</p> | <p>Measured annually/Reported annually</p> | <p>Not applicable; this is a new question.</p> |
| | <p>Number of consultation meetings</p> | | | |
| | <p>Number of collaborative meetings and discussions</p> | | | |
| <p>10. How are Heritage properties being protected from damage or disturbance?</p> | <p>Number of heritage structures and sites protected</p> | <p>36 CFR 79; 36 CFR 800; 43 CFR 3; 43 CFR 7; 43 CFR 10. 43 CFR 7; 43 CFR 10. Compliance with 36 CFR 219.11 (d)</p> | <p>Measured annually/Reported every two to ten years</p> | <p>Existing Forest Plan monitoring question</p> |

Table 2. Deleted monitoring questions.

| Deletion of Existing Monitoring Questions | Rationale |
|--|---|
| To what extent is the Forest providing OHV opportunities? | Combined into other monitoring questions addressing recreation topics. |
| How effective are Forest management practices in managing OHV use? | Combined into other monitoring questions addressing recreation topics. |
| Are habitat trends of MIS consistent with Forest Plan expectations? | The 2012 Planning Rule does not support continued monitoring of management indicator species. |
| To what extent are Forest management activities achieving semi-primitive ROS objectives? | Combined into other monitoring questions addressing recreation topics. |
| To what extent are wetlands being protected and wetland functions being restored? | Combined into other monitoring questions addressing aquatic ecosystem topics. |
| Are the effects of forest management, including prescriptions, resulting in significant changes to the productivity of the land? | Combined into other monitoring questions addressing productivity of the land. |
| How are the MOUs between the Forest and Native American Tribes being implemented? | Combined into another monitoring question addressing Indian Trust responsibility. |

Key

Monitoring Question: A specific question developed to ensure that monitoring and evaluation address information essential to measuring the effects of Forest Plan implementation.

Monitoring Indicator: A statement used in concert with the monitoring question to measure trends, either quantitatively or qualitatively.

Driver: Identifies the reasons why we are monitoring a particular element, such as legal requirements for the 2012 Planning Rule.

Measurement and Reporting Frequency: How often monitoring information is collected (Monitoring Frequency) and evaluated for reporting (Reporting Frequency).

Original Question Wording: If noted, this original wording is from the existing 2006 Forest Plan monitoring program.