

Monitoring: An Essential Component of Environmental Management.¹

Angas Hopkins

Principal Research Scientist

CALM Science and Information Division

and contactable at:

Western Australian Wildlife Research Centre

PO Box 51 Wanneroo W.A. 6065

Phone (08) 9405 5100

Facs (08) 9306 1641

E-mail angash@calm.wa.gov.au

An understanding of processes supporting natural and disturbed ecosystems is a prerequisite for sustainable management of those ecosystems and for the development of sound environmental policies. Well designed monitoring programs can provide much-needed information on both patterns and processes at relatively low cost. Monitoring can be good science and should be viewed as a worthwhile research activity. More importantly, it should be regarded as an integral part of management. It can also provide a useful focus for community involvement in management activities.

The rationale for monitoring

Monitoring has long been considered an integral part of rapid response systems such as financial systems and manufacturing plants. Compliance monitoring and reporting is now a fairly standard requirement of pollution licencing. In contrast, acceptance of monitoring as an integral part of living natural resource utilization and management has been relatively slow to develop (for some early examples, see Goodwin and Walker 1972; Grimsdell 1978; Gwynne and Craze 1975; Morrissey 1976; National Science Foundation 1977, 1978; Noble 1977; Norton-Griffiths 1973; Winbush and Costin 1979a, 1979b, 1979c). Furthermore, there is still considerable confusion as to what such monitoring might involve. It is useful, therefore, to begin this discussion with a definition of the term monitoring and a general outline of the way in which the concept might be applied to management of living natural resources (*sensu* IUCN 1980 and subsequent National and State Conservation Strategies).

Monitoring has been defined as "...the process of repetitive observations of one or more elements or indicators of the environment according to pre-arranged schedules in time and space in order to test postulates about man's impact on the environment..." (Bisset and Tomlinson 1981). This definition highlights two key features: repeated observations according to pre-arranged schedules and testing

¹ Discussion Paper prepared for Murdoch University lecture, 27 October 1997.

hypotheses about impacts. At the same time, the definition is excessively restrictive in that monitoring should be used to gather data on non-anthropogenic impacts particularly those associated with stochastic events such as drought, fire, flood and outbreaks of pests and diseases. Monitoring techniques can also be used to structure observations that are not immediately related to an hypothesis, including the collection of baseline data. It is worth noting that some very important insights into environmental processes have been gained from the analysis of sets of long-term data collected systematically but for other purposes: perhaps the best known example is the long-term atmosphere monitoring program at Cape Grim, the data from which are now used to show changes in atmospheric CO₂ levels.

Monitoring is not the same as long-term ecological research: the two activities are complementary but different. Monitoring need not be long-term - the time scale depends entirely on the hypothesis being tested. However, many monitoring projects will often be medium to long-term because of the very nature of the issues being addressed. Monitoring as an activity is not necessarily confined to ecological issues although, in the context of this discussion, much of it will have an ecological orientation. A further important distinction is that monitoring often involves non-destructive sampling because of the need for continued sampling of the same place.

Long-term ecological research sites (LTERs) are usually large and diverse whereas monitoring sites can be small but may be more numerous - there may be many (separate) monitoring sites at a single LTER. LTER programs should include monitoring of a few key environmental parameters such as rainfall, water depth and quality, vegetation cover and so on, parameters that can be incorporated within the concept of a minimum standard installation. The other perspective is that the results of LTER programs are often very important in providing the basis for interpreting the results of monitoring programs.

Monitoring is central to living natural resource management for at least the following reasons (Hopkins 1988, 1989; Hopkins in press; Hopkins and Saunders 1987; Hopkins *et al.* 1987).

Firstly, the process of planning and management necessitates predicting the consequences of a range of options including the do-nothing option. For most areas, the knowledge that should form the basis for such predictions is lacking and it is unlikely to become available in the foreseeable future. It is generally not possible to postpone management until the research is done.

A solution to this dilemma is to incorporate some form of information gathering into on-going management. The suggested approach is to couch management decisions in the form of hypotheses, to implement the management decisions and then to test the hypotheses using monitoring procedures. This empirical approach to the study of process should lead to an incremental improvement in knowledge and understanding and, therefore, in subsequent planning and management. Figure 1 indicates how this form of experimental management (see Holling 1978) might operate.

Secondly, there is a need to establish procedures to evaluate whether management objectives are being met. For example, an agency charged with the responsibility for conserving the State's flora and fauna will need to be able to demonstrate that the complete array of species i.e. the biodiversity is being conserved. An agency responsible for management of a living, natural resource must be able to show that

the rate of exploitation is sustainable. A third example is where resources are expended to rehabilitate a degraded area, then it is necessary to be able to report success or to justify a request for additional resources. These information needs can be met by establishing programs to monitor outcomes of management activities.

There will also be an increasing demand for monitoring-type data for State of Environment Reports and to meet other accountability requirements. In this context, it is worth noting that the recent ratification by Australia of the Convention on Biological Diversity imposes a duty to ensure that the biological diversity of the Nation is conserved, and that any utilisation of the biota is on a sustainable and equitable basis. This means that there will be continuing efforts to document the range of organisms including aspects of their genetics, and to document the assemblages of organisms (communities) and the ecosystem processes that support those assemblages. More particularly, it also imposes responsibilities to monitor the environment to ensure the persistence of biological diversity and to institute remedial action in the event that threats to persistence are perceived (see particularly Article 7 of the Convention, also Articles 8, 9, 10; ANZECC 1993).

Thirdly, there is a need to maintain an up-to-date knowledge of the distribution of the plant and animal species and their habitats throughout Australia. This can be achieved by establishing a network of biogeographic benchmark sites across the country coupled with a program for resurvey of those sites on a regular (if infrequent) basis. Monitoring of benchmark sites will also provide some insight into rates and directions of change. If a network of comparable sites is established throughout the State, the combined results will make it possible to distinguish general trends from localised fluctuations.

Setting objectives for monitoring

As with all scientific programs, it is important to have clearly stated objectives at the time of commencement. The framework of environmental monitoring developed by Wolfe and O'Connor (1986) and Wolfe *et al.* (1987) (both in Spellerberg 1991) provides a useful starting point for setting objectives for monitoring projects. They have identified three general categories of environmental monitoring, each with a characteristic temporal and spatial scale: compliance monitoring to ensure that activities meet statutory requirements, hypothesis testing (or model testing) to check the validity of assumptions and predictions (this would include the monitoring which is part of experimental management), and trend monitoring which may identify large-scale changes including those resulting from interactions of multiple factors. However, it is possible, and probably desirable, to design all individual monitoring projects to test hypotheses. For monitoring projects, this can probably best be done through devising appropriate hypotheses to test. There are at least three advantages in adopting this approach. Firstly, it helps to link monitoring to actual management issues. Secondly, it simplifies the task of deciding on target organisms and/or environmental parameters to be monitored. Thirdly, it ensures that monitoring is accorded recognition as a legitimate scientific pursuit and is, therefore, given appropriate institutional support.

For compliance monitoring or meeting accountability requirements, an appropriate hypothesis would be one that relates back to the original management objective eg

that there is no change to ambient levels of a pollutant. For experimental management, the hypothesis might be that the undertaking of the particular management action will not lead to any environmental degradation (say loss of topsoil or invasion by weed species). Where a resource is being utilized, such as in wildflower harvesting, the hypothesis might well be that the remaining, unharvested reproductive capacity is sufficient to maintain the population in perpetuity. For monitoring biogeographic benchmark sites, the appropriate hypothesis would be that there is no loss in diversity (species richness, equitability) within the native biota.

Designing individual monitoring projects

In order to develop any reasonable hypothesis to test using monitoring procedures, it is necessary to have some idea of what the likely impact or threat to the community or ecosystem might be. A provisional list of these, developed in the context of questions about the maintenance of biological diversity in the arid and semi-arid zones of Australia (Hopkins and McKenzie 1994), appears in Table 1.

Individual monitoring projects for testing hypotheses about impacts/threats will involve a variety of approaches and methodologies which, in each case, will reflect the nature of the specific problem. For example, if the hypothesis concerns erosion, the approach may well be to monitor the state of the soil crust and the A horizon using photography and measurements along fixed transects. If the hypothesis concerns effects of altered fire regimes on weed invasion, a direct sampling method would be used.

There will be a gradation of monitoring methods available for use at any particular site, and the choice of method or methods will depend on the objectives, logistic considerations including site access and funding. For the example of monitoring biodiversity in the arid and semi-arid zone, some appropriate methods are indicated in Table 2. The simplest and most convenient of these is photography: it can give useful data over a long period provided there is adequate standardisation (eg. Noble 1977). Photographs are a very important tool for communicating the nature of changes that may occur over time. However, photographic monitoring has two principal disadvantages. It is often difficult to explain the changes that may be interpreted from photographs. Secondly, photography does not readily produce quantitative data suitable for incorporation into a computerised data base. This latter disadvantage may be remedied through the use of horizontal stereo-photography in conjunction with the Micro-photogrammetric System (MPS-2), the system used for the latest general forest inventory in Western Australia.

As a starting generalisation, the methods that would be used for monitoring a particular component of the environment at a particular site would be those that would be used to sample or survey that component at that site on a one-off basis, taking into account the need for standardisation. The methods outlined in Table 2 reflect this: many are the methods that have been developed for biogeographic survey for Western Australia (eg see McKenzie *et al.* 1987, 1989).

On-ground monitoring

Because of the need to ensure repeatability, the program for monitoring should centre around a system of fixed ground sites (permanently marked) that are sampled

Satellite data have already found some uses in the arid and semi-arid zones of Australia (eg. Graetz and Pech 1987; Graetz *et al.* 1986). A promising technology is the use of airborne video scanners which can produce high precision (eg. 0.1m resolution) digital data of extensive areas at relatively low cost. It is highly probable that applications suitable for monitoring environmental processes will emerge in the present decade provided that appropriate questions are asked and research funds are made available.

Data management

A well designed record-keeping system is an essential component of any successful, long-term monitoring program (Hopkins in press). The data from the meteorological equipment, the information on disturbance events, the photographs, the biological monitoring data and the remotely-sensed data need to be gathered together and maintained in an accessible form, ready to be analysed. Ideally, they should be compiled in a Relational Data Base suitable for use with a Geographic Information System (GIS). This computerised data base should be designed to allow for ready analysis and display of results, and provision of observer prompts and feedback.

In addition, it is important to have a detailed record (archive) of all management decisions that may have some implications for the component(s) of the environment being monitored, and the reasoning behind those decisions. This would include decisions to do nothing. It is only by having access to this kind of detailed management information that results of monitoring programs can be unequivocally interpreted.

Systematic review and evaluation

To ensure that the monitoring program continues to be seen as relevant and useful, it should be designed to provide necessary and appropriate information to all end-users. Therefore, it is important to identify at the outset all the client groups, their specific information needs and the possible actions that they might take in response to adverse trends. For example, politicians and senior decision-makers in Government have responsibilities to make policies that impact on land-use; therefore it would be appropriate to provide regular State-wide summaries of the results of the monitoring program together with interpretations relating to land-use policy. Land managers, on the other hand, are interested in trends at a more local scale and can make more immediate but limited responses; for these users, results should be presented at least annually and in terms of land condition and potential productivity.

The cyclic process of planning and management is illustrated in Figure 1. This process provides for evaluation and subsequent review of policy and management strategies and plans.

Results of each monitoring project should be evaluated on an annual basis. The evaluation should take place following receipt of new data and should address the following questions:

- i) Are the new observations reliable - have the data been correctly recorded and do they seem to make sense?

using standardised methods. For the biodiversity monitoring program, it is envisaged that the system would have two components: the biogeographic benchmark sites which would be sampled comprehensively, supplemented by a series of sites where only key elements of the environment relevant to the particular problem and hypothesis are sampled. The layout that is proposed to be used at each sample site is given in Figure 2 (from Hopkins *et al.* 1987). This involves the use of nested quadrats with quadrat size determined on the basis of size and density of the organisms or parameter to be monitored. For example, for soil organisms, a 1m x 1m quadrat may suffice. In contrast, during the biological survey of the Nullarbor region, 2 km x 2 km quadrats were used (McKenzie *et al.* 1987, 1989) while, for survey of the more geologically complex eastern Goldfields, 0.25 km x 0.25 km quadrats were used (BSCWA 1984).

Minimum standard installation for on-ground monitoring

There is usually a minimum data set that is necessary to interpret results from any monitoring program. For example, monitoring biological diversity will need to be accompanied by monitoring of key environmental attributes and disturbance events. Stochastic events such as falls of rain and fires are particularly important triggers of processes in most environments; these kinds of events, therefore, must be recorded on a regular and continuing basis to permit interpretation of the biological monitoring data. Records of indices such as greenness or photosynthetic activity derived from satellite imagery will be an important adjunct to traditional sources of data in providing some explanation of highly localised or patchy events at individual quadrats.

A minimum standard installation for a monitoring site should include rainfall and temperature data, and annual ground photography and satellite imaging.

Each site will also need to be permanently marked and comprehensively described at the time of establishment. The basic site description will include precise location information, altitude and other topographic data such as aspect and whether it is water and nutrient losing or gaining, details of substrate including geological relationships, description of the soil profile and salinity and other chemical attributes.

Remote sensing

Remote sensing including airborne methods such as aerial photography and videography, and satellite methods particularly multi-spectral scanning (MSS) and thematic mapping (TM) have potential for use in monitoring but this may be limited. The limitations arise on two fronts. Firstly, the objectives of most monitoring projects involves tracking species-scale phenomena; this requires species-scale rather than landscape-scale data. Secondly, there is a requirement to be able to implement remedial action promptly in the event that threats to the environment are perceived: experience to date has been that remote sensing has detected deterioration in quality of terrestrial environments at the point where it is (almost or actually) irreversible.

- ii) Is the project continuing to provide information relevant to the objectives - should it be continued or discontinued?
- iii) Are the results consistent or inconsistent with expectations - should there be a review of management policy, strategies or programs?

The responses to these three questions should be recorded on the files for each project and should also form part of the regular feedback to observers.

To ensure that the relevant results of the monitoring program are used in subsequent management decision-making, results of each project should be published on a 3-4 year interval. Project reports should be widely circulated. By bringing results to the attention of decision-makers and the public, it is expected that review of management policy, strategy and programs will become axiomatic.

In addition to the individual monitoring project reviews, there should be regular reviews of themes within the overall monitoring program. The timing of these thematic reviews should relate to reviews of relevant policy but it should not occur any less often than every 5 years.

Setting priorities

Despite the efficiency of the monitoring procedures, it would not be feasible to implement monitoring projects to evaluate every management action and to address every gap in knowledge immediately. It will be necessary, therefore, to establish priorities for monitoring: this is a task that will best be done by environmental planners and managers in collaboration. Monitoring needs can be identified by both groups but only managers know the practical limits to what monitoring can be achieved. At the same time, planners generally have the broad perspective to enable them to rationalise monitoring needs between particular districts and regions. Some co-ordination is essential to minimise duplication in monitoring projects whilst ensuring that important issues are addressed.

Costs for on-ground monitoring

It is difficult to do more than indicate a ball-park figure for the cost of establishing and running a comprehensive program for on-ground monitoring program because each project is designed to test a particular, locally-relevant hypothesis. In addition, the actual monitoring will usually be integrated within normal management activities and so costs will be low and partly concealed.

Estimated set-up costs for a site to monitor impacts of grazing by sheep and cattle in the pastoral region of Western Australia are \$ 700 - 1000 and annual monitoring costs are \$ 500 - 700 (1994 dollars, A. Holm, personal communication 1994).

Costs for sites where information recorded includes more than soils and simple vegetation parameters may be 20 - 50 % higher. For a system of 11,000 monitoring sites throughout the arid and semi-arid zones of Australia, the estimated costs are \$ 9 - 12 M for setting-up and \$ 6 - 7 M for annual monitoring (3 - 5 year rotation) (Hopkins and McKenzie 1994). Data management costs are additional.

These cost estimates are for a stand-alone monitoring system throughout that part of Australia most remote from scientific and technical support facilities. They are,

therefore, not to be regarded as representative estimates for the more general monitoring that might be proposed for metropolitan or near-metropolitan areas.

Is this cost justifiable? In making a case for the establishment of the Environmental Management and Assessment Program (EMAP) in the United States, it was estimated that annual expenditure on environmental regulatory programs (mainly various forms of compliance monitoring) in that country was in excess of \$ 70 Billion. Yet, despite this level of expenditure and the massive volume of data collected, it was not possible to say whether or not the regulatory programs were effective in ensuring maintenance of the overall quality of the environment (US EPA 1990). EMAP is now in its developmental phase with over 200 scientists from a broad range of Government agencies, universities and research institutes and private organisations involved (Jones undated). It is anticipated that there will be a network of 12,500 new monitoring sites in addition to those already in place through existing programs. The literature suggests that the United States Government has accepted the need for a comprehensive and integrated, scientifically-based program for monitoring the state of living natural resources and has made the appropriate, substantial, financial commitment.

Is it possible to reduce the costs of on-ground monitoring? Firstly, certain costs may be reduced as a consequence of sampling design and the use of modelling techniques. For example, if sites are to be sampled on a regular, rotational basis, there is a choice between sampling all sites in a region in the same year or sampling a subset each year. The former sampling strategy is likely to be cheaper but it may not permit rigorous statistical analyses. The intensity of on-ground sampling may also be reduced through the application of techniques such as environmental domain analysis. Secondly, there is potential for rationalisation and cost-sharing through integration with other monitoring programs. For example, it might be possible to incorporate biodiversity issues within the existing State rangeland monitoring programs (WARMS see Holm *et al.* 1987) at little additional cost. And thirdly, there is potential for substituting remote sensing for some components of on-ground monitoring and thereby reducing field costs. This substitution is unlikely to be significant in the short-term, and in the medium to long-term it will depend on the identification of landscape-scale phenomena that are adequate and reliable indicators or surrogates of process at the species to communities/ ecosystem scale. For example, an uncoupling of the relationship between the vegetation greenness index and rainfall could trigger an alert of incipient land degradation and/or decline in biological diversity which could, in turn, lead to localised, supplementary, on-ground sampling.

Existing monitoring projects

Within Western Australia and Australia, a wide range of biophysical factors are monitored by many agencies and using different methods. Climate and weather monitoring is undertaken by the Bureau of Meteorology. Environmental agencies look at air and water quality parameters. The condition of vegetation on pastoral lands is monitored by managers using both fixed points with on-ground sampling methods and low level aerial photography, and attempts are being made to use multi-spectral scanning techniques (eg. Friedel and Shaw 1987 a,b; Graetz *et al.*

1986; Graetz and Pech 1987). Some of these agencies are using a common computerised database management system, WARIS (Worldwide Application Resource Information System), which was developed by the Queensland Department of Primary Industries (see Walker *et al.* 1973).

At an even broader scale, global networks of environmental monitoring sites are currently being established in order to accumulate standardised observations on land, sea and air and to coordinate interpretation of the data (Dyer *et al.* 1988; Gwynne 1987).

The Western Australian Department of Conservation and Land Management has a policy on monitoring entitled: *Reporting, Monitoring and Re-evaluation of Ecosystems and Ecosystem Management* (Policy No 28). The objectives of this Policy are:

- To study and record management decisions and their effects on CALM lands, and to incorporate the information so gained in subsequent development of policy and management plans.
- To maintain up-to-date records of distribution and status of the State's biota, and the management decisions that are made about that biota and about Departmental lands (and waters) and the consequences of those decisions.
- To provide a mechanism for systematically reviewing management policy and programs in the light of new information.
- To provide an on-going record system which will document changes in community species composition through natural ecological changes as well as management.

The policy acknowledges that present levels of knowledge about ecosystems and ecosystem processes are inadequate. It prescribes the establishment of a series of monitoring sites on Departmental lands (and waters) throughout the State and a program for systematic sampling of those sites. Management of Departmental lands will continue but the effects of management will be monitored. Results from the monitoring program will be assessed and used in making subsequent management decisions. In this way, the monitoring program will contribute to a gradual improvement in knowledge and in management.

A recent survey of Departmental monitoring and related activities has reported 336 projects, of which around 200 are considered highly relevant to the Departmental monitoring program, based on the judgement that they could be integrated into a more formal, structured program with minimal additional effort. Projects and activities that are largely consistent with the Departmental Policy can be grouped into eleven general categories:

- studies on effects of disturbance regimes, including fire and logging;
- actions under management or recovery plans for rare and/or threatened species;
- timber utilization, post-logging regrowth and inventory plots;
- agroforestry trials including regeneration of sandalwood;
- biological survey;
- wetland and stream monitoring;
- activities associated with the fox and feral cat control program;

- mapping of the extent of infection by *Phytophthora* species and other pathogens and monitoring outbreaks of insect pests;
- VISTAT, the program for collecting data on visitor use of CALM-managed lands and waters, and related human-use data-gathering;
- effects of particular management practises such as weed control, firebreak maintenance and rehabilitation; and
- special monitoring projects such as those associated with the Dawesville Channel.

Benefits of the Monitoring Program

Monitoring can be an efficient and cost-effective means for gathering information about the resources being managed and the effects of management actions on those resources. Through improving the public and scientific knowledge-base, it will lead to gradual improvements in management.

The monitoring provides a framework whereby all management decisions and actions become accountable. This allows managers to identify closely with the work they are undertaking. Government Departments and private organisations will be able to show how they are achieving their objectives and, where the objectives aren't being achieved, how management policy, strategies and programs have been modified to improve the level of achievement.

With the concept of monitoring that is outlined here, much of the work will fall on the field managers. In this way it is hoped that monitoring will become an integral part of management. But the process of designing and implementing and analysing results from monitoring projects will also involve policy makers, planners and researchers. Monitoring can, therefore, become a focus for collaborative work within an organisation and between organisations that have common environmental goals.

As a further benefit, the monitoring program can provide a vehicle for public involvement in management. Local interest groups can be invited to participate in simple monitoring projects. They will learn more about the places and things being monitored and may well come to better understand the issues involved in environmental management programs.

Community Environmental Monitoring

A directory of environmental monitoring activities being undertaken by individuals and groups of individuals within the community has recently been produced (Alexandra *et al.* 1996). The directory details over 200 projects throughout Australia, involving in excess of 200 000 volunteers. Projects are diverse, and cover issues such as urban land-use/ remnant vegetation, climate and air quality, nature conservation (flora and fauna), water quality in rivers, streams, lakes and estuaries, groundwater, shore and marine life, agricultural and pastoral land-use and land and water degradation issues. When asked, "What do you hope to achieve by monitoring?", the responses from the individuals and groups involved were: 27% to record environmental change;

57% to improve community awareness, empowerment etc;
56% to gain insight into processes of change, to identify problems that can then be addressed;
57% to ensure better decision-making by providing factual information to the public and decision-makers; and
43% to achieve improvements in the environment.

The results of the survey indicate the existing strength of community environmental monitoring and the potential for monitoring to become a powerful vehicle for environmental change.

References (incomplete)

- Alexandra, J., Haffenden, S. and White, T. (1996), *Listening to the Land. A Directory of Community Environmental Monitoring Groups in Australia.* Australian Conservation Foundation, Fitzroy.
- Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council (ANZECC) (1993), *Implementation of and Implications of Ratification of the Convention on Biological Diversity.* Report to First Ministers from the Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council in consultation with relevant Ministerial Councils. Department of Environment, Sport and Territories, Canberra.
- Biological Survey Committee, Western Australia (BSCWA) (1984), *The biological survey of the eastern goldfields of Western Australia. Part I. Introduction and methods. Records of the Western Australian Museum.* Supplement No 18, 1-19.
- Bisset, R. and Tomlinson, P. (1981), *Environmental impact and assessment, monitoring and post-development audits.* In: *Environmental Impact Assessment.* PAOC, EIA and Planning Unit, Toulouse, France, pp. 405 - 425.
- Driver, A. and Hopkins, A. J. M. (1997), *Monitoring in the Department of Conservation and Land Management.* Unpublished report.
- Dwyer
- Friedel, M. H.
- Goodwin, W. F. and Walker, J. (1972), *Photographic recording of vegetation in regenerating woodland. CSIRO Woodland Ecology Unit Technical Communication No 1.*
- Graetz, R. D. and Pech, R.P. (1987), *Detecting and monitoring impacts of ecological importance in remote arid lands: a case study in the southern Simpson desert of South Australia. Journal of Arid Environments* 12, 269 - 284.
- Graetz, R. D., Pech, R.P., Gentle, M. R. and O'Callaghan, J. F. (1986), *The application of Landsat image data to rangeland assessment and monitoring: the development and demonstration of a land image-based resource information system (LIBRIS). Journal of Arid Environments* 10, 53 - 80.
- Grimsdell, J. J. R. (1978), *Ecological Monitoring.* Handbook No 4. African Wildlife Leadership Foundation, Nairobi.
- Gwynne, M. D. and Craze, H. (1975), *East African habitat monitoring practice: a review of methods and application.* In: *Evaluation and Mapping of Tropical African Rangelands.* International Livestock Centre for Africa, Addis Ababa.
- Holling, C. S. (ed)(1978), *Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management.* Wiley -Interscience, Chichester.
- Holm, A. McR., Burnside, D. G. and Mitchell, A. A. (1987), *The development of a system of monitoring trend in range condition in the arid shrublands of Western Australia. Australian Rangelands Journal* 9, 14 -20.
- Hopkins, A. J. M. (1988), *Monitoring : Is it of use in the integration of research and management?* In: Burbidge, A. A. and Saunders, D. A. (eds), *Ecological Theory and Biological Management of Ecosystems.* Western Australian

Department of Conservation and Land Management Occasional Paper No 1/88, 57-57

Hopkins, A. J. M. (1989), Monitoring for fire management in natural areas in Western Australia. In: Burrows, N., McCaw, L. and Friend, G. (eds), *Fire Management on Nature Conservation Lands. Western Australian Department of Conservation and Land Management Occasional Paper No. 1/89*, 133-136.

Hopkins, A. J. M. (in press), Establishment of a Departmental monitoring program. *CALMScience Supplement*.

Hopkins, A. J. M., Goodsell, J. T. and Brown, J. M. (1987), A monitoring system for use in the management of natural areas in Western Australia. In: Saunders, D. A., Arnold, G. W., Burbidge, A. A. and Hopkins, A. J. M. (eds), *Nature Conservation : The Role of Remnants of Native Vegetation*. Surrey Beatty & Sons, Sydney, pp. 337 - 339.

Hopkins, A.J.M and McKenzie, N.L. (1995), Part 5. Options for long-term monitoring of arid and semi-arid terrestrial ecosystems in Australia. Papers for a workshop on Options for a National Program on Long-term Monitoring of Australian Biodiversity, held in Canberra, May 1994.

Hopkins, A. J. M. and Saunders, D. A. (1987), Ecological studies as the basis for management. In: Saunders, D. A., Arnold, G. W., Burbidge, A. A. and Hopkins, A. J. M. (eds), *Nature Conservation : The Role of Remnants of Native Vegetation*. Surrey Beatty & Sons, Sydney, pp. 15-28.

Hopkins, A. J. M., Saunders, D. A. and How, R. A. (1990), Managing Australia's environment : directions for the future. *Proceedings of the Ecological Society of Australia* **16**, 579 - 583.

International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN, now World Conservation Union) (1980), *World Conservation Strategy: Living Resource Conservation for Sustainable Development*. International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, Switzerland.

Jones, K. B. (undated ?1992), The Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program: An ecological monitoring program for the 1990's and beyond. Environmental Monitoring Systems Laboratory, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Las Vegas.

McKenzie, N. L., Belbin, L., Margules, C. R. and Keighery, G. J. (1989), Selecting representative reserve systems in remote areas: a case-study in the Nullarbor region, Australia. *Biological Conservation* **50**, 239-261.

McKenzie, N. L. and Robinson, A. C. (eds) (1987), *A Biological Survey of the Nullarbor Region, South and Western Australia, in 1984*. South Australian Department of Environment and Planning, Adelaide.

Morrissey, J. G. (1976), Photography and range site monitoring. *Rangeland Bulletin* No 24. Western Australian Department of Agriculture, South Perth.

National Science Foundation (1977), *Long-term ecological measurements. Report of a conference, Woods Hole, Massachusetts, March 1977*. National Science Foundation, Directorate for Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences, Division of Environmental Biology, Washington.

- National Science Foundation (1978), *A pilot program for long-term observation and study of Ecosystems in the United States. A report of a second conference on long-term ecological measurements.*, Woods Hole, Massachusetts, February 1978.
- National Science Foundation, Directorate for Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences, Division of Environmental Biology, Washington.
- Noble, I. R. (1977), Long-term biomass dynamics in an arid chenopod shrub community at Koonamore, South Australia. *Australian Journal of Botany* **25**, 639 - 653.
- Norton-Griffiths, M. (1973), *Serengeti Ecological Monitoring Program*. African Wildlife Leadership Foundation, Nairobi.
- Spellerberg, I. F. (1991), *Monitoring Ecological Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) (1990) The Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program - an overview. EPA/600/9-90/001. Office of Research and Development, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. 8pp.
- Vinogradov, B. V. and Wiersma, G. B. (1987), Promoting monitoring activities in Biosphere Reserves. In: Proceedings of the European MAB Conference on Biosphere Reserves and Ecological Monitoring. Czechoslovak National MAB Committee, České Budejovic, Czechoslovakia, pp. 269 - 271.
- Wiersma, G. B., Franklin, J. F., Kohler, A., Croze, H. and Boelcke, C. (1987), Integrated Global Background Monitoring Network. In: Proceedings of the European MAB Conference on Biosphere Reserves and Ecological Monitoring. Czechoslovak National MAB Committee, České Budejovic, Czechoslovakia, pp. 129 - 149.
- Wimbush, D. J. and Costin, A. B. (1979a), Trends in vegetation at Kosciusko. I . Grazing trials in the subalpine zone, 1957 - 1971. *Australian Journal of Botany* **27**, 741 - 787.
- Wimbush, D. J. and Costin, A. B. (1979b), Trends in vegetation at Kosciusko. II . Subalpine range transects, 1959 - 1978. *Australian Journal of Botany* **27**, 789 - 831.
- Wimbush, D. J. and Costin, A. B. (1979c), Trends in vegetation at Kosciusko. III . Alpine range transects, 1959 - 1978. *Australian Journal of Botany* **27**, 833 - 871.
- Wolfe, D. A. and O'Connor, J. S. (1986), Some limitations of indicators and their place in monitoring schemes. In: *Oceans '86 Conference Record. Volume 3. Monitoring Strategies Symposium*. Marine Technology Society Society, Washington, D. C., pp. 878 - 884.
- Wolfe, D. A., Champ, M. A., Flemer, D. A. and Mearns, A. J. (1987), Long-term biological data sets: their role in research, monitoring, and coastal marine systems. *Estuaries* **10**, 181 - 193.

Table 1. Impacts on and threats to biological diversity in the arid and semi-arid zones of Australia and proposed approaches to monitoring.

Impact/threat	Factor to be monitored	Monitoring method
Grazing and trampling by ungulates	cover/biomass of native vegetation	photograph, plant density, dimensions in belt transects, use Bitterlich gauge of spherical densiometer for cover estimates in quadrats, remote sensing
	intactness of soil crust and organic A horizon, geomorphological structures (including termite mounds), erosion and downstream sedimentation	photograph, Tongway method (shrublands), estimate along transect or in subquadrats, measure soil loss at fixed markers, sediment input into dams etc, remote sensing
	populations of palatable native plant species	census in fixed nested quadrats or along transects (also record reproductive output, seed bank size)
	populations of weeds and unpalatable species	photograph, census in fixed nested quadrats or along transects
	nutrients, nutrient cycles (loss through harvesting of livestock, erosion)	litter, soil and foliar samples coupled with biomass estimates, (record livestock offake)
Grazing by native herbivores	cover/biomass of native vegetation	photograph, intercepts along line transect, use Bitterlich gauge or spherical densiometer for estimates in quadrats, remote sensing.
	populations of palatable native plant species	census in fixed nested quadrats or along transects (also record reproductive output, seed bank size)
	populations of weeds and unpalatable species	photograph, census in fixed nested quadrats or along transects
Altered fire regimes	availability of shelter, food resources for vertebrates and invertebrates	photograph, estimate cover and structure in quadrats or use intercepts along line transect,
	vegetation structure/physiognomy	photograph, describe in detail in quadrat using Bitterlich gauge or spherical densiometer for cover estimates, hypsometer for height estimates of trees
	population structures of native plant species	census in fixed nested quadrats or along transects, record reproductive output, seed bank size with seed traps, soil samples
Invasion by foxes and feral animals	cover/biomass/populations of weed species	photograph, census in fixed nested quadrats or along transects, estimate biomass in subquadrats
	in the case of herbivores, as for grazing and trampling by ungulates	see above
	predation on native animal species ie. populations of predator and prey species	estimate populations of predator and prey species using appropriate capture techniques, track/spoor counts, scat and gut content analyses

Harvesting of timber (<i>Callitris</i> , <i>Santalum</i> spp., and historical uses including fuel, pit props and fenceposts)	populations dynamics of harvested species	photograph, census in fixed nested quadrats or along transects, record reproductive output, germination and establishment
	availability of relevant shelter, food resources for vertebrates and invertebrates	photo, estimate cover and structure in quadrats or use intercepts along line transect
Exploration, mining and mineral processing	cover/biomass of native vegetation , intactness of soil crust, geomorphological structures, erosion and downstream sedimentation	photograph, plant density, dimensions in belt transects, use Bitterlich gauge of spherical densiometer for cover estimates in quadrats, estimate soil crust using Tongway method, measure sediment input into dams etc, remote sensing
	extent of spread of atmospheric pollutants (particularly SO ₂) and effects on native plant species	photograph, soil, lichen and foliar samples, estimate specific effects along transect or in quadrats
	effects of solid and liquid tailings on native animal species	tissue analyses
	groundwater levels and quality, effects of changes on native vegetation	piezometer in bores, laboratory analyses of samples, estimate specific effects along transect or in quadrats
Visitor usage	cover/biomass of native vegetation , intactness of soil crust, geomorphological structures, erosion (trampling)	photograph, plant density, dimensions in belt transects, use Bitterlich gauge of spherical densiometer for cover estimates in quadrats, soil crust in subquadrats with Tongway method, measure soil loss at fixed markers, remote sensing
	fire regimes	(see above)

Table 2. Proposed methods for survey and monitoring for components of biological diversity in the arid and semi-arid zones of Australia.

Component of the biota	Survey and monitoring method
Floristic assemblage	record within nested quadrats up to 400 m ² , occasionally up to 1000 m ² , with additional records of species in 0.25 - 4.0 km ² vertebrate quadrat
Vegetation (physiognomy/ habitat)	photograph and describe in detail within 400 m ² quadrat, occasionally up to 1000 m ² , with additional notes of unusual features in 0.25 - 4.0 km ² vertebrate quadrat, record height and intercepts along diagonal line transect
Soil crust	photograph, record details along diagonal line transect through 400 m ² quadrat.
Soil organisms	record details of geomorphological features such as termite mounds within 400 m ² quadrat, sample using small pit traps in grid within quadrat.
Invertebrates	sample systematically using pit traps, light traps and foliar sweeping all habitats within 400 m ² quadrat, sample other habitats occurring within 0.25 - 4.0 km ² vertebrate quadrat including unusual habitats, record ant and termite fauna, land snails and/or other groups with reasonable taxonomy for use as indicators
Reptiles and amphibians	3 x sets of 6 pitfall traps with drift-fences within 0.25 - 4.0 km ² quadrat, supplemented by opportunistic sampling and headtorching
Small mammals	3 x sets of 6 pitfall traps within 50 m drift-fences within 0.25 - 4.0 km ² quadrat, supplemented by Elliott traps in moist habitats, opportunistic sampling, headtorching, predator stomach analyses
Large mammals	aerial survey supplemented with opportunistic observations within the 0.25 - 4.0 km ² quadrat
Bats	record species using ultrasonic recording techniques supplemented by mist netting within vertebrate quadrat supplemented by records from caves, likely flyways and drinking sites
Birds	record during regular census times within 0.25 - 4.0 km ² quadrat, with supplementary, opportunistic observations within the quadrat at other times




Figure 1a. The traditional linear process for planning and management of natural lands.




Figure 1b. The process for planning and management of natural lands incorporating monitoring and evaluation and review of policy.




Figure 2. Nested quadrat design proposed for use in the Monitoring Program.