



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

Flathead  
National  
Forest

650 Wolfpack Way  
Kalispell, MT 59901  
(406) 758-5200  
Fax (406) 758-5367

---

**File Code:** 1920

**Date:** February 3, 2023

Dear Interested Party,

The Flathead National Forest has completed a Biennial Monitoring Evaluation Report (BMER) as required of the 2012 Planning Rule at 36 CFR 219.12(d). It evaluates monitoring questions and indicators presented in the Land Resource Management Plan (LRMP) monitoring plan chapter, in relation to management actions carried out in the plan area. Providing timely, accurate monitoring information to the responsible official and the public is a key requirement of the plan monitoring program.

Monitoring results are evaluated to make findings on the status or existing conditions of plan components selected for monitoring. Based on the findings, recommendations can be made for changes needed in forest plan direction, such as plan components or other plan content that guide management of resources in the plan area (e.g., forest plan, management activities, monitoring program, or forest assessment). The BMER is designed to provide the necessary information to help the responsible official determine a course of action based on the recommended management adjustments of this BMER. It is not a decision document. Future management decisions with appropriate environmental documentation may occur based on the BMER recommendations. The full 2021 biennial monitoring report for the Flathead National Forest is available at: <https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/flathead/landmanagement/planning/?cid=fseprd998005>.

The 2021 biennial monitoring report for the Flathead National Forest was made available to the public for comments from February 25<sup>th</sup> through March 28<sup>th</sup>, 2022 (FSH 1909.12, 21.5). Two comments were received.

These administrative changes are not subject to the objection process (36 CFR 219.50).

Changes made to the LRMP Monitoring Plan are finalized and effective upon signature of the responsible official (Flathead National Forest Supervisor).

Sincerely,

for

KURTIS E STEELE  
Flathead Forest Supervisor



**Table 1. Recommended Changes to Monitoring Questions and Indicators**

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>AQUATIC ECOSYSTEMS</b>				
<b>MON-WTR-01:</b> What are the changed conditions of instream physical habitat parameters in managed vs. unmanaged sites?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted except to add the following indicators from MON-WTR-05: <b>IND-WTR-10</b> (Number of bull trout redds) <b>IND-WTR-11</b> (Fish density -number/100 sq meters)	6
<b>MON-WTR-02:</b> To what extent are forest management activities moving towards habitat objectives for native fish?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Yes (E)	<b>Reword IND-WTR-03:</b> Number of fish passage barriers removed or created, <i>and the miles/acres of resource improvement.</i>	5
			<b>Reword IND-WTR-05:</b> Number of culverts removed or upgraded, <i>and the miles/acres of resource improvement</i>	5
			<b>Reword IND-WTR-06:</b> Number of other habitat improvement activities, <i>and the miles/acres of resource improvement</i>	5
<b>MON-WTR-03:</b> What vegetation treatment activities have occurred in the riparian management zone?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (A)	<b>Reword IND-WTR-08:</b> Miles of <del>road entries and road crossings</del> <i>new road construction and perennial stream crossings</i> inside riparian management zones	4
<b>MON-WTR-04:</b> What is the condition of water quality in waterbodies?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-WTR-05:</b> What is the status of native fish populations?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Yes (E)	<b>Drop this question.</b> <b>Move IND-WTR-10</b> (Number of bull trout redds) <b>to MON-WTR-01</b> <b>Move IND-WTR-11</b> (Fish density -number/100 sq meters) <b>to MON-WTR-01</b> <b>Drop IND-WTR-12.</b> Degree of hybridization (MFWP data, red counts)	3

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>MON-WTR-06:</b> Do management activities contribute nutrients to Flathead Lake?	No	Modeling results show a very low estimated proportion of nutrients produced from management activities on NFS lands and the unlikelihood of a direct cause and effect relationship between management on FNF lands and conditions in Flathead Lake.	<b>Drop this monitoring question.</b> ( <del>Do management activities contribute nutrients to Flathead Lake?</del> )	7
<b>MON-WTR-07:</b> What is the status of streambanks within grazing allotments?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (B)	<b>Drop IND-WTR-15:</b> ( <del>Percent stubble height</del> ). IND-WTR-14 provides sufficient information for evaluation, and is consistent with methods/data sources.	5, 7
			<b>Reword IND-WTR-14:</b> Change from "Percent streambank alteration" TO <i>Percentage of stable streambanks for Squaw Meadows and Griffin Creeks, within the 2 active grazing allotments that have accessible streams.</i>	5
			<b>Forest Plan Component noted in monitoring plan is incorrect.</b> FW-GDL-05 should be replaced by FS-GDL-GR-04.	8
<b>TERRESTRIAL ECOSYSTEMS and FOCAL SPECIES</b>				

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>MON-TE&amp;V-01:</b> What is the change in key ecosystem characteristics for forest and non-forest vegetation?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (B)	<p><b>Reword IND-TE&amp;V-06:</b> Change from “Very large tree presence—proportion of area forestwide and by potential vegetation type” TO <i>Proportion of area (FW and by PVT) where large and very large tree structural components occur at densities that contribute to ecosystem functions.</i></p> <p><b>Reword IND-TE&amp;V-07:</b> Change from “Very large tree density, trees per acre. All species combined as well as for these species groups: cedar, Douglas-fir, larch, ponderosa pine, western white pine, cottonwood” TO <i>Density (tpa) of very large live trees, by PVT (Snag Analysis Group), Inside and Outside Wilderness/Roadless areas.</i></p> <p><b>Reword IND-TE&amp;V-08:</b> Change from “Snag density: Snags per acre ≥ 10 inches d.b.h.; ≥ 15 inches d.b.h.; ≥ 20 inches d.b.h., forestwide and by PVT” TO <i>Snag density: Snags per acre ≥ 10 inches d.b.h.; ≥ 15 inches d.b.h.; ≥ 20 inches d.b.h. by PVT (Snag Analysis Group)</i></p>	1
<b>MON-TE&amp;V-02:</b> What is the change in amount and severity of wildfire and the status of fire regimes?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (B)	<b>Reference to forest plan component FW-DC-TE&amp;V-03 being monitored is incorrect</b> (should be dropped). Monitoring question does not relate specifically enough to this DC.	8
<b>MON-TE&amp;V-03:</b> What is the change in insect hazard and root disease severity?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (B)	<b>Reword IND-TE&amp;V-10:</b> DROP western spruce budworm from the indicator: Acres or percent of Douglas-fir beetle hazard, mountain pine beetle hazard, <del>western spruce budworm hazard</del> , and root disease severity	1
			<b>Reference to forest plan component FW-DC-TE&amp;V-03 being monitored is incorrect</b> (should be dropped). Monitoring question does not relate specifically enough to this DC.	8



Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>MON-TE&amp;V-04:</b> How many acres of vegetation treatments are occurring that contribute to maintaining or moving towards achieving desired conditions in the plan?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-TE&amp;V-05:</b> To what extent have management actions maintained required levels of snags or snag replacement trees within harvest units?	Yes	Uncertain (A)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-TE&amp;V Focal-01:</b> What is the change in ecological conditions within the warm-moist and cool-moist PVTs, as indicated by conditions suitable for western white pine?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (B)	<b>Drop IND-TE&amp;V-Focal-02: Proportion (percentage of total acres) forestwide of forest size classes in the areas where western white pine is present</b>	1, 2
<b>MON-TE&amp;V Focal-02:</b> What management actions are contributing to the restoration of western white pine?	Yes	Uncertain (B)	No change warranted	NA
<b>PLANT SPECIES AT RISK/ OF CONSERVATION CONCERN</b>				
<b>MON-PLANT-01:</b> What is the status of water howellia in areas where disturbances (natural or human-caused) have occurred?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Yes (E)	<b>Add FW-GDL-PLANT-01 to the forest plan components being monitored</b>	8
<b>MON-PLANT-02:</b> How are ecological conditions in the cold PVT affecting whitebark pine populations and habitats?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (B)	<b>Drop IND-PLANT-04: (Proportion (percentage of total acres) forestwide of forest size classes in the areas where whitebark pine is present.)</b>	1, 2
<b>MON-PLANT-03:</b> What management actions are contributing to the restoration of whitebark pine?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-PLANT DIV-01:</b> What is the status of the known occurrences of plant species of conservation concern?	Yes	Uncertain (B)	No change warranted	NA
<b>NON-NATIVE INVASIVE PLANTS</b>				

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>MON-NNIP-01:</b> What is the status of plant communities at highest risk of negative impacts to their system functions from established or new invaders?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (B)	<b>Change wording of monitoring question to:</b> <i>What is the status of acres infested on the Forest by non-native invasive plants, and the treatments of invasive plant infestations?</i> <b>Reword IND-NNIP-01:</b> Change FROM "Percent of invasive plant species cover within identified high-risk/high-priority areas. These would include such areas as forests of the warm-dry PVT, dry grassland plant communities, wilderness trailheads, and management area 3b (special areas) TO <i>Acres infested by invasive plant species.</i> <b>Add new indicator IND-NNIP-01a:</b> <i>Acres treated for invasive plants.</i>	1
			<b>ADD forest plan component FW-OBJ-NNIP-01</b> to the list of plan components that are being monitored by this item	8
<b>MON-NNIP-02:</b> What management actions are contributing to coordination and cooperation with adjacent landowners and partners in managing non-native invasive weeds?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Yes (E)	<b>Reference to forest plan component FW-DC-P&amp;C-16 is incorrect (should be instead FW-DC-P&amp;C-17)</b>	8
<b>SOIL PRODUCTIVITY</b>				
<b>MON-SOIL-01:</b> To what extent are vegetation management activities not causing irreversible damage to soil conditions?	Yes	Uncertain (B)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-SOIL-02:</b> How many miles of temporary road are constructed and rehabilitated?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (B)	<b>Add wording to the monitoring question to read:</b> "How many miles of temporary road are constructed and rehabilitated, <i>and was soil function successfully restored as a result?</i> "	4
<b>FIRE AND FUELS</b>				
<b>MON-FIRE-01:</b> What management actions are contributing towards reducing wildland fuels?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>MON-FIRE-02:</b> To what extent is natural fire used to achieve desired ecological, social, or economic conditions?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-FIRE-03:</b> To what extent is prescribed fire used to achieve desired ecological, social, or economic conditions?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>WILDLIFE - THREATENED AND ENDANGERED</b>				
<b>GRIZZLY BEAR:</b>				
<b>MON-NCDE-01:</b> Within the NCDE primary conservation area, what is the level of secure core, open motorized route density (> 1 square mile) and total motorized route density (> 2 square miles) within each bear management subunit during the non-denning season?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-NCDE-02:</b> a) Within the NCDE PCA, what is the number and overnight capacity of developed recreation sites designed and managed for overnight use on NFS lands within each bear management unit, and how does this compare to the baseline? b) Within the NCDE primary conservation area, what is the status of administrative sites, day-use developed recreation sites, and trailheads in each bear management unit?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-NCDE-03:</b> Within the NCDE primary conservation area, is there a change in the number of allotments? Have conflicts occurred between grizzly bears and livestock on NFS lands?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>MON-NCDE-04:</b> If new leasable and locatable mineral activities occur in the PCA, do the record of decision and permit/plan of operation include a monitoring plan for changes in habitat and/or measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental impacts to grizzly bears or their habitat?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-NCDE-05:</b> Within the NCDE primary conservation area, what is the status of grizzly bear subunits that have temporary increases in motorized access due to projects (see glossary)?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-NCDE-06:</b> Within the NCDE primary conservation area, are projects (see glossary) completed within the five-year time period specified by guideline FW-GDL-IFS-01?	Yes	Uncertain (A)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-NCDE-07:</b> In the Salish DCA, what is the density of roads and motorized trails on NFS lands that are open to public use during the non-denning season? In zone 1 outside the Salish DCA, what is the density of roads on NFS lands that are open to public use during the non-denning season?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-NCDE-08:</b> What is the risk of human disturbance in areas modeled as grizzly bear denning habitat during the den emergence time period (see glossary)?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>CANADA LYNX:</b>				

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<p><b>MON-LYNX-01:</b> How much of lynx critical habitat does not yet provide stand initiation snowshoe hare habitat (PCE1a) but is progressing towards providing PCE1a?</p>	<p>Yes (with recommended edits)</p>	<p>Yes (E)</p>	<p><b>Drop a word in the monitoring question:</b> How much of lynx <del>critical-habitat</del> does not yet provide stand initiation snowshoe hare habitat (PCE1a) but is progressing towards providing PCE1a?</p> <p><b>Drop a word in IND-LYNX-01 and IND-LYNX-02:</b>  (01) Percentage of lynx <del>critical-habitat</del> on NFS lands in each lynx analysis unit that is not yet winter snowshoe hare habitat due to wildfire.  (02) Percentage of lynx <del>critical-habitat</del> on NFS lands in each lynx analysis unit that is not yet winter snowshoe hare habitat due to vegetation management projects</p>	<p>4, 6</p>
<p><b>MON-LYNX-02:</b> What is the percentage of lynx critical habitat that has vegetation treatments in stand initiation hare habitat (PCE1a)?</p>	<p>Yes – but this monitoring item is dropped because results are included in another monitoring question (MON-LYNX-05)</p>	<p>NA – monitoring question dropped (results are covered in another monitoring item)</p>	<p><b>Drop monitoring question:</b> data is provided under MON-LYNX-05: What is the percentage of lynx critical habitat that has vegetation treatments in stand initiation hare habitat (PCE1a)?</p> <p><b>Drop IND-LYNX-03:</b> Number of acres of lynx <del>critical habitat on NFS lands in each lynx analysis unit that were pre-commercially thinned using exceptions to VEGSS.</del></p> <p><b>Drop IND-LYNX-04:</b> Number of acres of lynx <del>critical habitat on NFS lands in each lynx analysis unit that were pre-commercially thinned using wildland-urban interface exemptions to VEGSS</del></p>	<p>3</p>

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>MON-LYNX-03:</b> If modified precommercial thinning techniques are used in lynx critical habitat, do they increase snowshoe hare habitat (PCE1a) and/or its persistence?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Yes (E)	<b>Drop a word in the monitoring question:</b> If modified precommercial thinning techniques are used in lynx <del>critical</del> habitat, do they increase snowshoe hare habitat (PCE1a) and/or its persistence? <b>Drop a word in IND-LYNX-05:</b> Number of acres of lynx <del>critical</del> habitat that were treated with modified thinning techniques under VEG S5 exception #2 or #3.	4, 6
<b>MON-LYNX-04:</b> What is the percentage of lynx critical habitat that has vegetation treatments in multistoried hare habitat (PCE1a)?	Yes – but this monitoring item is dropped because results are included in another monitoring item (MON-LYNX-05)	NA – monitoring question dropped (results are covered in another monitoring item)	<b>Drop monitoring question:</b> data is covered under MON-LYNX-05: <del>What is the percentage of lynx critical habitat that has vegetation treatments in multistoried hare habitat (PCE1a)?</del> <b>Drop IND-LYNX-07:</b> Number of acres of multistory hare habitat in lynx critical habitat on NFS lands in each lynx analysis unit that were treated using exceptions to VEGS6. <b>Drop IND-LYNX-08:</b> Number of acres of multistory hare habitat in lynx critical habitat on NFS lands in each lynx analysis unit that were treated using wildland-urban interface exemptions to VEGS6	3
<b>MON-LYNX-05:</b> Are fuel treatment and vegetation management projects compliant with the Canada lynx vegetation standards in the Northern Rockies Lynx Management Direction?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Yes (E)	<b>Change year in IND-LYNX-09 and IND-LYNX-13:</b> (-09) “Cumulative total acres of fuel treatment projects in lynx habitat conducted under exemptions to standards VEGS1, S2, S5, and S6 within the WUI (as defined by HFRA), by LAU and forestwide, since the end of 2017 2018”. (-13) “Cumulative total acres of vegetation treatments conducted under exceptions to VEG S5 and VEGS6 since the end of 2017 2018”.	5



Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>WILDLIFE - OTHER SPECIES / HABITAT</b>				
<b>MON-WL-01:</b> What is the status of habitat conditions that support harlequin ducks during the nesting season?	Yes	Uncertain (B)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-WL-02:</b> What is the status of habitat conditions that support flammulated owls during the nesting season?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (B)	<p><b>Reword IND-WL-05:</b> Change from: " Percentage of the warm-dry PVTs with presence of live trees and dead trees (ponderosa pine preferable) greater than or equal to 15 inches d.b.h." TO:</p> <p><i>The conditions of five attributes associated with flammulated owl habitat.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the warm-dry PVT, acres with presence of live ponderosa pine 15"+ DBH</li> <li>2. In the warm-dry PVT acres with presence of dead ponderosa pine 15"+ DBH</li> <li>3. In the warm-dry PVT acres with presence of both live and dead ponderosa pine 15"+ DBH</li> <li>4. In the Ponderosa pine Dominance type, Acres with canopy cover &lt;=40%</li> <li>5. In the Ponderosa pine Dominance type, Proportion (%) with canopy cover &lt;=40%</li> </ol>	1, 5, 6
			<p><b>Drop IND-WL-07:</b> Density (canopy cover) in the ponderosa pine dominance type forestwide (it is combined into IND-WL-05)</p>	3

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>MON-WL-03:</b> What is the status of habitat conditions that support fisher?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (A)	<b>Reword IND-WL-09:</b> Change FROM "Percentage of area in the warm-moist PVT where very large live trees and very large dead trees ( $\geq 20$ " DBH) are present" TO the following: <i>IND-WL-09a. Percent of NFS lands in the Warm Moist PVT with at least one snag/acre greater than or equal to 20 inches d.b.h. Inside and Outside Wilderness/Roadless areas.</i> ADD new indicator IND-WL-09b: <i>Density (tpa) of very large live trees in the warm moist PVT, Inside and Outside Wilderness/Roadless areas.</i> ADD new indicator IND-WL-9c: <i>Proportion of warm moist PVT where large and very large tree structural components occur at densities that contribute to ecosystem functions.</i>	1, 5
			<b>Reword IND-WL-10:</b> "Acres and percent of area in the warm moist PVT that meets modeled habitat criteria for fisher winter and summer habitat (as classified in the R1 Summary database, using FIA data)".	5
<b>MON-WL-04:</b> What is the status of forest conditions that support wildlife habitat connectivity for fisher and other species?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (B)	<b>Reword IND-WL-11:</b> In the areas of the Forest where the warm moist PVT with presence of western red cedar or western hemlock is concentrated modeled as potential fisher habitat, what is the landscape pattern of forests with tree size class 5 inches or greater DBH (small, medium, large and very large forest size classes), and tree canopy cover is greater than 40%?	5
<b>MON-WL-05:</b> What is the status of habitat conditions that support Clark's nutcrackers during the nesting season?	Yes (with recommended	Uncertain (B)	<b>Reword IND-WL-15:</b> "Trees per acre of live whitebark pine greater than or equal to 10 inches d.b.h. in the Cold PVT."	6

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
	edits)		<b>Drop IND-WL-16:</b> Basal area per acre of live whitebark pine greater than or equal to 10 inches d.b.h., in the Cold PVT	2
<b>MON-WL-06:</b> What is the status of habitat conditions that support Townsend's big-eared bats and other bat species?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (C)	<b>Reword IND-WL-19:</b> Change from: "Number of caves or structures (e.g., old buildings) surveyed and number of detections of Townsend's big-eared bats or other bat species." TO the following " <i>Number of grid cell acoustic surveys and number of detections of each bat species</i> "	5, 6
<b>MON-WL-07:</b> What is the status of habitat conditions that support common loons on code A territorial nesting lakes?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Yes (E)	<b>Reference to forest plan component FW-GDL-WL DIV-03</b> is incorrect (should be instead FW-GDL-WL DIV-05)	8
<b>MON-WL-08:</b> What is the status of habitat for wildlife species associated with hardwood tree habitats on NFS lands?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-WL-09:</b> What is the status of habitat for wildlife species associated with grass/forb/shrub habitats on NFS lands?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Yes (E)	<b>Reword IND-WL-27:</b> Change from "Percentage of NFS lands in the grass/forb/shrub condition class" TO " <i>Percentage/acres of NFS lands that are grass, forb or shrub non-forest lifeform and percentage/acres of NFS lands that are seedling forest size class.</i> " <b>Reword IND-WL-28:</b> Number of acres treated to promote grass/forb/shrub habitats for wildlife to maintain or restore key ungulate winter grass/forb/shrub habitats.	4

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>MON-WL-10:</b> What is the status of habitat for wildlife species associated with snags and potential live snag replacement trees in the 20-inch-or-greater d.b.h. class?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (A)	<p><b>Reword IND-WL-30:</b> Change from: "Percentage of NFS lands with presence of snags greater than or equal to 20 inches d.b.h. in each PVT" TO the following: "Percent of NFS lands with presence of <del>snags</del> <i>at least 1 snag per acre</i> greater than or equal to 20 inches d.b.h. in each PVT, <i>Inside and Outside Wilderness/Roadless areas.</i>"</p> <p><b>Reword IND-WL-32:</b> Change FROM: "Average number of live trees per acre greater than or equal to 20 inches d.b.h. in each PVT" TO the following: "<i>Density (tpa) of Live trees greater than or equal to 20 inches d.b.h. (tpa) in each PVT, Inside and Outside Wilderness/Roadless areas.</i>"</p>	1
<b>MON-WL-11:</b> What is the status of habitat for wildlife species associated with snags and potential live snag replacement trees in the 10-inch or greater d.b.h. class?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (A)	<p><b>Reword IND-WL-33:</b> Change FROM "Percentage of NFS lands with presence of snags greater than or equal to 10 inches d.b.h. in each PVT" TO "<i>Percent of NFS lands with presence of <del>snags</del> at least 1 snag per acre</i> greater than or equal to 10 inches d.b.h. in each PVT, <i>Inside and Outside Wilderness/Roadless areas.</i>"</p> <p><b>Reword IND-WL-35:</b> Change FROM "Average number of live trees per acre greater than or equal to 15 inches d.b.h. in each PVT" TO the following: "<i>Density (tpa) of Live trees greater than or equal to 15 inches d.b.h. (tpa) in each PVT, Inside and Outside Wilderness/Roadless areas.</i>"</p>	1
<b>MON-WL-12:</b> What is the status of habitat for wildlife species associated with downed woody material?	Yes	Uncertain (A)	No change warranted	NA

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>MON-WL-13:</b> What is the status of habitat for wildlife species associated with forests burned with moderate- to high-severity wildfire?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (B)	<b>Reword IND-WL-37:</b> "Forestwide acres burned by wildfire <del>by severity class (low, medium, high)</del> in the previous decade	5
			<b>Reword IND-WL-41:</b> For wildfires with salvage harvest, number of <i>standing and downed</i> trees per acre greater than 20 inch d.b.h. retained within salvage harvest units that were verified old-growth forest prior to the fire	4
<b>MON-WL-14:</b> What is the risk of human disturbance in areas modeled as wolverine maternal denning habitat during the time period of February 15 to May 15?	Yes	Uncertain (B)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-WL-15:</b> What is the status of the breeding season bird community on the Forest (including neo-tropical migratory birds)?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (B)	<b>Reword IND-WL-44:</b> Bird species <del>presence</del> <i>observations and occupancy</i> on the Forest based upon data collected for Integrated Monitoring in Bird Conservation Regions	5
			<b>Reword IND-WL-46:</b> Bird species for which there are statistically significant <del>changes in Bird Conservation Region 10.s</del> <i>(95% credible interval) population changes (trends- compare FNF with MT-Bird Conservation Region 10</i>	4
<b>MON-WL-16:</b> What is the status of the aquatic amphibian community on the Forest?	Yes	Uncertain (B) & (C)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-WL-17:</b> What is the status of forest mesocarnivores (e.g., lynx, wolverine, fisher) on the Forest?	Yes	Uncertain (A)	No change warranted	NA
<b>RECREATIONAL USES AND TRAILS</b>				
<b>MON-REC-01:</b> What is the status of visitor use?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Uncertain (A)	<b>Reference to forest plan components should be FW-DC-REC-04, FW-DC-REC-14, and FW-DC-REC-15</b>	8

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>MON-REC-02:</b> Are facilities maintained to users' satisfaction?	Yes	Uncertain (A)	Reference to forest plan components should be FW-DC-REC-04, FW-DC-REC-14, and FW-DC-REC-15	8
<b>MON-REC-03:</b> Are the recreation objectives in the plan being achieved??	Yes (with recommended edits)	Yes (E)	Reference to forest plan components should be FW-OBJ-REC-01; FW-OBJ-REC-03; FW-OBJ-REC-04; GA-NF-OBJ-02; GA-SV-MA7-Crane-OBJ-01; GA-SM-OBJ-01; GA-SM-OBJ-02; GA-SM-MA7-Blacktailski-OBJ-01	8
<b>MON-REC-04:</b> Are current recreation settings and opportunities meeting or moving toward desired recreation settings and opportunities?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-IFS-03:</b> What is the status of the trail system on the Forest?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>ROAD INFRASTRUCTURE</b>				
<b>MON-IFS-01:</b> Are road closure devices effective at restricting public motorized use?	Yes	Uncertain (B)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-IFS-02:</b> What is the status of the road system on the Forest?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Yes (E)	<b>Reword IND-IFS-08.</b> Change FROM <del>Number of culverts inspected, assessed, and/or cleaned.</del> (See indicator on culvert inspection for Bull Trout in Aquatics section.). TO: <i>Miles of new road construction.</i>	3, 6
			Reference to forest plan component FW-GDL-IFS-03 should be dropped	6
<b>WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS, WILDERNESS, &amp; INVENTORIED ROADLESS</b>				
<b>MON-MA2a-01:</b> Are the statutory requirements (outstandingly remarkable values, water quality, and free-flowing conditions) of the three forks of the Flathead Wild and Scenic River being protected?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-MA2b-01:</b> Are the outstandingly remarkable values for which the river was deemed eligible and the free-flowing conditions protected?	Yes	Uncertain (B)	No change warranted	NA



Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>MON-WILD-01:</b> Do management activities in designated wilderness areas preserve and protect wilderness character?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-RWILD-01:</b> Do outcomes from management activities protect the wilderness characteristics of the recommended wilderness area?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-IRAs-01:</b> Do outcomes from management actions maintain roadless area characteristics within inventoried roadless areas?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>SCENERY</b>				
<b>MON-SCN-01:</b> Is the existing condition and trend of the scenic character meeting or moving toward desired conditions??	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>TIMBER PRODUCTION</b>				
<b>MON-TIMB-01:</b> How are management actions contributing to a sustainable mix of forest products in response to market demands?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-TIMB-02:</b> How are management actions contributing to the recovery of economic value of dead or dying trees on suitable lands?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC</b>				
<b>MON-S&amp;E-01:</b> To what extent is the Forest providing goods and services for local communities?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Yes (E)	<b>Reword IND-S&amp;E-01.</b> “Levels of production of <i>tangible</i> multiple uses, including timber products, grazing, recreational visits, wilderness hunting and fishing opportunities, and downhill skiing (as measured through day visits, night visits, local and non-local visits, animal unit months, thousand cubic feet of harvest and sales)	5
<b>MON-S&amp;E-02:</b> To what extent is the Forest contributing to desired conditions for a stable and functioning local economy?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA

Monitoring Item/Question	Plan Monitoring Results <sup>1</sup>	Plan Implementation Status <sup>2</sup>	Recommendation	Reason for Change <sup>3</sup>
<b>MON-S&amp;E-03:</b> To what extent do opportunities to connect people, including youth, with nature exist across the Forest?	Yes (with recommended edits)	Yes (E)	<p><b>Reword monitoring question.</b> Change FROM: "To what extent do opportunities to connect people, including youth, with nature exist across the Forest?" TO the following: "<i>To what extent are there opportunities for all people, including youth, to connect with the Forest through conservation education, interpretive and visitor information programs across the Forest?</i>"</p> <p><b>Reword IND-S&amp;E-04.</b> "Number and type of education and youth programs; national visitor use monitoring report IND-REC-01; visitor center tracking education, interpretive, visitor info programs."</p> <p><b>Reword IND-S&amp;E-05.</b> "Number of people, including youth, participating in various Forest education, interpretive and visitor info programs."</p>	4
<b>MON-S&amp;E-04:</b> Is the cost of implementing the forest plan consistent with projections?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>				
<b>MON-CR-01:</b> To what extent are cultural resource objectives being met, and are they trending towards desired conditions to identify, evaluate, and nominate cultural resources for listing in the National Register of Historic Places?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA
<b>MON-CR-02:</b> To what extent are plan components ensuring treaty rights are preserved and trending towards desired conditions for consultation with each tribe?	Yes	Yes (E)	No change warranted	NA

<sup>1</sup> Does the monitoring question/indicator(s) provide the information necessary to understand the status of the associated plan component?

<sup>2</sup> Plan implementation status:

A. UNCERTAIN – Availability of data or Interval of data collection beyond this reporting cycle (indicate date of next time this monitoring item will be evaluated).

- B. UNCERTAIN – More time/data are needed to understand status or progress toward achieving plan components.
- C. UNCERTAIN – Methods inadequate to assess the status or progress towards achieving plan components.
- D. NO - Implementation of Plan Component(s) ARE NOT trending, progressing, and/or conducted as desired.
- E. YES - Implementation of Plan Component(s) ARE trending, progressing, and/or conducted as desired.

<sup>3</sup> Reasons:

- 1. Rewording to be consistent with the regionally produced Broad Scale Monitoring Strategy (BSMS) reports, resulting in improved efficiency of forest plan monitoring task.
- 2. Dropped because of high workload or complexity of analysis required to compile data, and results do not contribute sufficient value to the evaluation of conditions for the resource. Often there are multiple indicators for one monitoring question.
- 3. Dropped because the data is already very similar or equal to information provided by another monitoring item or indicator.
- 4. Changes in monitoring item or indicator to clarify purpose/intent.
- 5. Changes in monitoring item or indicator to be consistent with methods or data sources that are used.
- 6. Changes in monitoring item or indicator to provide data or results that are more pertinent or meaningful to the evaluation.
- 7. Dropped because irrelevant, does not provide useful data related to the Forest Plan component being monitored.
- 8. Typos or errors in identification of the forest plan components that are being monitored by the monitoring item.