

P

SCOPING PLAN  
FOR  
LAND USE PLAN IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING,  
AMENDMENT, AND MAINTENANCE EVALUATION

1. Background

We intend to conduct an evaluation of the implementation, monitoring, amendment, and maintenance of land use plans statewide.

2. Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to define the extent of a potential problem. Limited observation indicates that land use plan decisions are not always implemented. We are concerned that the plan monitoring prescribed by the planning regulations is not being completed and that the plans are not being maintained in current condition. We are further concerned that the scope of land use plans is being broadened through plan maintenance, rather than amendment.

If decisions are not implemented, then the time and money we spent forming the plans was at least partly wasted. Management actions that are needed to correct resource problems may go undone. If plan monitoring is not occurring, plan users may remain unaware of important changes in resource conditions in other resource-related plans, or in policy. Plans would soon be inaccurate. When this happens, the staff that should be guided by the plan loses faith in it and ignores it. If plans are being broadened in scope through "maintenance" rather than amendment, we are probably not involving the public as we should and could be successfully challenged for not following our own procedures.

The statewide priority for this evaluation is relatively high because of the potential for wasting large amounts of money and effort, and because of the regulatory requirements we may not be meeting. Further, the evaluation could have Bureauwide ramifications. Potential problems identified here exist in other states as well, but no other states have yet conducted an evaluation to define the situation.

3. Goals and Objectives

The goal of the evaluation is to ensure that Idaho land use plans are kept in a current, valid condition so that they serve as the legitimate basis for daily decisionmaking.

The objectives of the evaluation are to answer the following questions and, if the answers identify a need for improvement, to identify ways to gain the improvement.

- Are plan decisions being implemented?
- Is the plan being maintained so that it is a useful tool for the Area Manager and Area Staff?
- Are management actions in conformance with the approved plan?
- Is the scope of the plan being broadened through plan "maintenance" rather than plan amendment?

**Purpose:**

- Define the intervals and responsibilities for plan monitoring.
- Insure that needed plan monitoring is not overlooked.
- Increase the likelihood of keeping the land use plan in dependable condition.
- Define the specifics and the details of the generalized monitoring plan given in the RMP.

**Directions for completing the form:**Monitoring Action

List each needed monitoring step. Include monitoring plan implementation, resource objectives (refer to detailed resource monitoring plan), the other resource-related plans with which you need to be consistent, new data, and policy.

Priority

Assign "High(H)" priority to the monitoring that you are going to do regardless of special funding in the AWP. This is the monitoring you do so long as we stay in business. Assign "Normal (N)" priority to monitoring that requires significant funding. This category would include some resource condition monitoring.

Interval

Indicate whether the monitoring is to be daily (part of routine business), annually, every three years, or whatever.

First year scheduled

Give fiscal year in which this monitoring step is to be done for the first time.

Responsible individual

List the name of the person who is to do the monitoring.

Completed

Note the year that the monitoring is actually done. Some items might have every year listed.

Results

Note any significant findings. Note the need for plan amendment or revision.

RMP (OR MFP)

MONITORING PLAN

Monitoring Action	Priority High (H) Normal (N)	Interval	First Year Scheduled	Responsible Individual	Completed	Results-- Need For Followup

Monitoring and Evaluation  
of Land Use Plans

I. Introduction -

The planning regulations (43 CFR 1610.4-9) say:

The proposed plan shall establish intervals and standards, as appropriate, for monitoring and evaluation of the plan....The District Manager shall be responsible for monitoring and evaluating the plan in accordance with the established intervals and standards and at other times as appropriate to determine whether there is sufficient cause to warrant amendment or revision of the plan.

The Bureau Manual (1601) defines monitoring as:

the orderly collection and analysis of data to evaluate progress in meeting resource management objectives and in complying with laws, regulations, policies, executive orders, and management decisions.

Evaluation is defined as:

the process of analyzing and interpreting data to determine the effectiveness of on-the-ground management actions.

So the Manual definitions indicate an overlap in the two terms. Monitoring includes collecting and analyzing data; evaluation is analyzing and interpreting the data. The distinction between the two seems more confusing than helpful. This memorandum will treat monitoring and evaluation as a unified process of gathering and analyzing information for the purpose of determining whether the land use plan is accomplishing what we intended. For brevity, the term monitoring will be used to indicate this process.

There are many reasons why we must monitor land use plans:

We are required to by regulation.

Monitoring insures that needed management actions are taken.

Monitoring will provide for better plans in the future and for fine-tuning existing plans.

The record of our monitoring provides a ready response to inquiry from individuals, groups, or agencies outside the Bureau.

Monitoring tells us whether our objectives are being met.

Monitoring uncovers the need for plan maintenance, amendment, or revision.

Land use plans are expensive to write. When they are left on the shelf, they quickly go out of date and the time and money spent on their preparation is largely wasted.

Noting the accomplishment of resource objectives that do not require expensive, long-term investigation to uncover.

As new data becomes available, or new policy is written, reviewing the affected decisions and deciding whether they are still appropriate.

When supervising construction projects, insuring that mitigating measures are used.

Maintaining communication with other federal agencies, state and local governments, and Indian Tribes so that we know when they originate or change resource-related plans.

Funding from plan monitoring will come from 4410 and other subactivities, as appropriate. General monitoring (is the plan being implemented?) is funded by 4410. Subactivity-specific monitoring (is vegetative condition improving?) is funded by the affected subactivity.

#### Detailed monitoring Plan

As noted above, the Resource Management Plan (RMP) is to establish intervals and standards for monitoring the plan. This is a generalized plan. Acceptable examples are found in the completed Idaho RMPs. In addition to this general plan the District will prepare, within six months of the approval of the RMP, a detailed monitoring plan that will establish priority for each monitoring action. When funds are not adequate to complete all monitoring, top priority will get first attention. The detailed monitoring plan will identify the position within the organization that carries the responsibility for completing the monitoring, thus providing a link to the PIPR system and accountability for all required monitoring.

(Note: A sample detailed monitoring plan will be offered for discussion during the P&EC Workshop, January 28-30.)

#### Implementation of Decisions

A detailed implementation plan is to be prepared at the time of the Record of Decision (ROD). (This implementation plan is distinct from the detailed monitoring plan.) The implementation plan would identify priority (when), who does it, and estimated cost of implementing each decision. The implementation plan may then be used in preparing the AWP and individual PIPR.

State Director approval is not required, but the implementation plan must be completed and sent to SD (930) for information prior to approval of the ROD.

(Note: A sample implementation plan will be prepared for discussion at the P&EC Workshop.)

#### Consistency With Other Resource-Related Plans

Consistency with other plans is best monitored as part of continuing, routine communication with personnel of other federal agencies, state agencies, local government, and Indian Tribes.

### III. Who Monitors

The regulations (43 CFR 1410.4-9) state that the District Manager is responsible for monitoring and evaluating the RMP. The job must be done, however, by those who work daily with the plan--the Area Manager and Resource Area staff. The District Resources staff should periodically (at least one plan per year) evaluate the land use plan to insure that monitoring is occurring and the plan is being kept useful. The Idaho State Office has oversight responsibilities and will conduct a special evaluation of plan implementation and monitoring every three to five years.

District planners should participate in the writing and administration of the detailed monitoring plan described above. They should insure that the monitoring plan provides for recording and reacting to the monitoring results.

The Area Manager and the District Resources Chief should build plan monitoring into PIPRs to assign responsibility for the different steps in monitoring.

In monitoring consistency with other plans, the subject of the plan would determine who monitors it. A resource-specific plan (e.g., a State Fish and Game plan for deer management) would be monitored by the appropriate Resource Area staff specialist, who would pass the findings to the Area Manager. A generalized County Land Use Plan would best be monitored by the Area Manager.

## DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

### Purpose:

- Provide a clear picture of what the land decisions are.
- Provide an organized, realistic approach to doing what we have said we need to do.
- Provide a means of recording our accomplishments.
- Provide links among decisions, AWP, PIPRs, accomplishments.

The Plan should be prepared for MFPs and RMPs.

It is not too late to prepare an implementation plan for an MFP if you are still operating under an MFP.

There is no requirement to submit the implementation plan to the State Director on those plans that have already been approved.

On those land use plans that have not yet been approved, the implementation plan must be sent to SD (930) for information prior to the ROD approval.

### Directions for Completing the Form:

#### Decision

State the decision that you are tracking. When completed, this form will list each discrete land use plan decision.

For example, from an MFP,

"Implement AMPs on three allotments in the following priority:

1. Mountain Home Subunit
2. Long Tom
3. Ditto Creek."

Or, from an RMP,

"Close 345 acres in Devils Corral to ORV use to protect cultural resources and soils."

Decisions in land use plans have often been stated in rather vague and non-specific terms. It will frequently be difficult to decide what the decision is supposed to be. Care must be taken to state the decision as specifically as possible without saying more than was intended by the decisionmaker.

#### Priority

The priority will be determined by the decisionmaker based upon urgency, need to correct deteriorating resources, ease of implementation, and other factors.

RMP (or MFP)

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Decision	Priority High (H) Normal (N)	Subactivity/ Estimated Cost (000)	Approved AWP (FY)	PIPR Assignment	Decision Implemented (FY)