

CFLRP Common Monitoring Strategy Fact Sheet

October 11, 2022

Building on the lessons learned in the first ten years of CFLRP monitoring, Forest, Range Management and Vegetation Ecology Staff has worked with the Regions, CFLRP projects, and collaborative partners to develop a new common CFLRP monitoring strategy for new and extended CFLRP projects (see announcement, Jan 2020). This strategy centralizes and standardizes key aspects of the monitoring process, improves how we store data, and encourages frequent reporting to be used by decision makers. The first ten years of CFLRP monitoring worked well at the project scale and helped build and maintain social license and collaborative relationships. Challenges included lack of capacity, use of monitoring results by decision-makers, and developing and implementing landscape scale monitoring.

The strategy addresses these concerns and is a response to feedback that more guidance and capacity is needed to support successful monitoring efforts over time. The common monitoring strategy emphasizes monitoring actual conditions and comparing those conditions to ecologically sustainable/resilient conditions, rather than desired conditions. This helps reflect absolute progress rather than relative accomplishments. The common monitoring strategy also emphasizes the landscape scale, meeting the intent of the authorizing legislation (CFLRA). This emphasis is intended both for more meaningful monitoring that will address the question of how CFLRP is affecting long-term change on landscapes. Project-scale monitoring will continue through multi-party monitoring.

Many CFLRP projects have been implementing restoration treatments and monitoring their progress prior to the implementation of the common monitoring strategy. As such, this effort may not capture the progress of every project over its lifetime, but instead provides an opportunity for all projects to take a step together in a unified monitoring approach.

Detailed information on questions, indicators, suggested approaches, and roles is available on the [CFLRP Monitoring Community of Practice Box website](#) (open to all, request access if needed).

There are three components of the Common Monitoring Strategy:

- **Core Questions:** The strategy includes 13 core monitoring questions that address core tenets of the CFLRA. Use of these core questions are mandatory for all new projects and for extensions with over five years of funding. A list of questions and suggested indicators can be found [here](#). The indicators associated with these questions are standardized within each Region.
- **Local Project Questions:** Recognizing that the context, interests, and monitoring needs vary across CFLRP project landscapes and communities, each CFLRP project is welcome and encouraged to add monitoring questions, indicators, and metrics that address issues specific to their landscapes and local interests.
- **Terrestrial Condition Assessment (TCA) pilot:** with feedback from the Regions, the Washington Office is testing use of the [TCA](#), a nationwide tool, to help evaluate effects of uncharacteristic stressors and disturbance agents on land-type associations (LTAs).

Monitoring Plans:

Each CFLRP project will develop a monitoring plan addressing the core monitoring questions and local project questions. While there is no set deadline nationally, we recommend completing a solid draft within the first year, based on lessons learned regarding monitoring program success. There is no set format or template that must be used. Example project monitoring plans and lessons learned are available on the [CFLRP Monitoring Community of Practice Box](#).

Reporting:

The strategy is designed to dovetail with the previous CFLRP five-year reports on Ecological Indicators. The specific questions and indicators can be used to report on ecological departure (fire regime), wildlife habitat, aquatic, and invasives indicators. The strategy also fulfills reporting for the community benefits, collaboration, and leverage national indicators.

Roles:

Roles should be developed in conversation between project monitoring leads, CFLRP regional coordinators, and other regional staff as needed. Generally, roles include:

- Project staff and partners should provide data, provide input on or in some cases do analysis, and interpret analysis outcomes. Project staff will work with the collaborative to develop and implement multi-party monitoring to assess progress toward desired conditions and treatment effectiveness.
- Regional coordinators and staff will document the planned indicators for the common monitoring strategy and work with projects to define landscape extents to be used consistently. They may also identify data sources, complete analyses, and interpret analysis outcomes. Data for core indicators should be contained in a single regional database, and made available online to all, with summary reports provided annually.
- Washington Office CFLRP staff will provide support to regions and projects in addressing the core monitoring questions. Support can include providing trainings, analysis and interpretation assistance, and troubleshooting as needed.

Common Monitoring Strategy questions (with links to report templates)

Q1	What is the reduction in fuel hazard based on our treatments?
Q2	What is the effect of the treatments on moving the forest landscape toward a more sustainable condition?
Q3	What are the specific effects of restoration treatments on the habitat of at-risk species and/or the habitat of species of collaborative concern across the CFLRP project area?
Q4	What is the status and trend of watershed conditions in the CFLR area, with a focus on the physical and biological conditions that support key soil, hydrologic and aquatic processes?
Q5	What is the trend in invasive species within the CFLRP project area?
Q6	How has the social and economic context changed, if at all?
Q7	How have CFLRP activities supported local jobs and labor income?
Q8	How do sales, contracts, and agreements associated with the CFLRP affect local communities?
Q9	Did CFLRP maintain or increase the number and/or diversity of wood products that can be processed locally?
Q10	Did CFLRP increase economic utilization of restoration byproducts?
Q11	Who is involved in the collaborative and if/how does that change over time?
Q12	How well is CFLRP encouraging an effective and meaningful collaborative approach?
Q13	If and to what extent have CFLRP investments attracted partner investments across the landscapes?
