

This roadmap is provided to assist the National Acceptance Advisory Team in assessing how the Indiana Comprehensive Wildlife Strategy addresses the eight elements required by Congress. The CWS manuscript and appendices are located at:

<http://www.djcase.com/incws/indianaacws.htm>

1st Element. Information on the distribution and abundance of species of wildlife, including low and declining populations as the State fish and wildlife agency deems appropriate, that are indicative of the diversity and health of the State’s wildlife.

- A. The Strategy indicates sources of information (e.g., literature, data bases, agencies, individuals) on wildlife abundance and distribution consulted during the planning process.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| VII | 26 | The 2002 Indiana Academy of Science <i>Revised Checklist of the Vertebrates of Indiana</i> for species range, relative abundance, season and status was the primary source of information for the development of the Indiana CWS. |
| VII | 26 | A list of endangered insects has been developed based on the recommendation of insect experts working in Indiana. |
| VII | 27 | Additional information on the distribution and status of mammals, birds, amphibians, reptiles, fishes and bi-valve mussels in Indiana is referenced in Appendix K. |

- B. The Strategy includes information about both abundance and distribution for species in all major groups to the extent that data are available. There are plans for acquiring information about species for which adequate abundance and/or distribution information is unavailable.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|------------|---------|--|
| Appendix C | 1-112 | The species range, relative abundance, season and status for all vertebrate wildlife species is provided in this section. |
| VII | 26 | Insects and other invertebrates, other than mollusks and crustaceans, are not protected by Indiana statute. A list of endangered insects has been developed based on the recommendation of insect experts working in Indiana. As resources allow systematic surveys for all insect orders should be conducted to provide a more holistic assessment of the status of Indiana’s insect fauna. |
| X | 59 | Table 6 indicates priority research needs for wildlife species by habitat association. |
| XII | 79-82 | Tables 12 & 14 lists suggested survey, monitoring, survey techniques, protocols and database needs for wildlife species in Indiana. |

- C. The Strategy identifies low and declining populations to the extent data are available.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|-----------|--|
| II | 3 & 25-33 | Table 1 provides the list of SGCN. Species of greatest |

| | | |
|-----|----|---|
| | | conservation need (SGCN) were identified utilizing the most current published list of federally endangered, threatened or candidate species and Indiana’s list of endangered species and species of special concern |
| VII | 26 | A list of endangered insects has been developed based on the recommendation of insect experts working in Indiana. |

- D. All major groups of wildlife have been considered or an explanation is provided as to why they were not (e.g., including reference to implemented marine fisheries management plans). The State may indicate whether these groups are to be included in a future Strategy revision.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| V | 18 | Using the Indiana Academy of Science <i>Revised Checklist of the Vertebrates of Indiana</i> as a guide, technical experts listed all vertebrate wildlife species with their associated habitats, forming <i>guilds</i> for more than 60 specific habitat types (See Appendix A for complete list of habitats and definitions and Appendix C for listing of guilds). Data for mussel species was provided by the Mussel Technical Advisory Committee and other mussel experts. |
| VII | 26 | Insects and other invertebrates, other than mollusks and crustaceans, are not protected by Indiana statute. A list of endangered insects has been developed based on the recommendation of insect experts working in Indiana. As resources allow systematic surveys for all insect orders should be conducted to provide a more holistic assessment of the status of Indiana’s insect fauna. |

- E. The Strategy describes the process used to select the species in greatest need of conservation. The quantity of information in the Strategy is determined by the State with input from its partners, based on what is available to the State.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|--|
| VII | 25 | The DFW had an established mechanism consistent with the State Endangered Species Act, for choosing SGCN. Table 1 provides a list of SGCN. |
| V | 18 | Indiana DFW chose to use a habitat-based model for its CWS. The intent of the model is to maximize limited knowledge about wildlife species by focusing on available research, enhanced by extrapolation from species that are better known, and by including best professional judgment. SGCN were linked to all wildlife species and to the habitats on which they depend by using representative species as surrogates. |
| VII | 25-26 | Describes process of how species are added or removed from Indiana endangered species list. |

2nd Element. Descriptions of locations and relative condition of key habitats and community types essential to conservation of species identified in the 1st element.

- A. The Strategy provides a reasonable explanation for the level of detail provided; if insufficient, the Strategy identifies the types of future actions that will be taken to obtain the information.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| VIII | 34 | None of the existing classification schemes is holistic, measuring both traditional habitat types and human-impacted lands such as developed lands. In order to track habitat changers, that is conversion from one habitat type to another, and the degree of habitat fragmentation a baseline measure of all habitat types is needed. Current technology makes this type of habitat analysis possible and repeatable for future comparisons. |
| VIII | 34-35 | More than 60 specific habitat types were identified in Indiana, and Indiana State University (ISU) was contracted to research and compile data on these habitats using GIS databases. Specifically, by June 2006 ISU will have compiled quantitative or index information on the total acreage, geographic distribution, patch size, native vs. non-native, vegetation diversity and relative abundance, ownership, and relative condition of the habitats (Table 2). |
| VIII | 35 | This CWS effort is the first comprehensive effort by the state to acquire statewide habitat data. A team of specialists, led by four scientists at Indiana State University, is to provide either a quantitative measure or an index of over 80 habitat features. |

- B. Key habitats and their relative conditions are described in enough detail such that the State can determine where (i.e. in which regions, watersheds, or landscapes within the State) and what conservation actions need to take place.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| VIII | 40 | Less than 6% of Indiana in public ownership. The Indiana landscape is dominated by agriculture and forest and Indiana's major habitat types are fragmented. Habitat conservation actions are often limited by the desires of the private land holders. Conservation partners need to be opportunistic and creative in retaining, restoring and connecting habitats in Indiana. |
| II | 3 | Indiana State University (ISU) has been contracted to research and compile data on these habitats using GIS databases. Major habitat categories included agricultural lands, aquatic systems, barren lands, developed lands, forestlands, grasslands, subterranean systems, and wetlands. Distribution maps show the changes in these habitats since presettlement times. Sophisticated mapping techniques will allow the agency to |

| | | |
|------|-------|--|
| | | repeat the calculations of area and distribution, so that trends will be revealed during implementation of the strategy. |
| VIII | 35-39 | Table 2 identifies data to be compiled by Indiana State University, available June 2006. |
| VIII | 40 | Less than 6% of Indiana in public ownership. The Indiana landscape is dominated by agriculture and forest and Indiana's major habitat types are fragmented. Habitat conservation actions are often limited by the desires of the private land holders. Conservation partners need to be opportunistic and creative in retaining, restoring and connecting habitats in Indiana. |
| VIII | 41-48 | Figures 2-9 provide maps of major habitat distribution. |
| VIII | 49 | Table 3 contains the percent of statewide existing habitats and the portions that are of high quality |

3rd Element. Descriptions of problems which may adversely affect species identified in the 1st element or their habitats, and priority research and survey efforts needed to identify factors which may assist in restoration and improved conservation of these species and habitats.

- A. The Strategy indicates sources of information (e.g., literature, databases, agencies, or individuals) used to determine the problems or threats.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|--|
| | | |
| II | 3-4 | Web-based surveys of <u>technical experts</u> were used to collect information on species and habitats, monitoring activities, current conservation efforts, and future conservation needs for representative species and habitats to specifically address the eight elements Congress requires in the CWS. |
| II | 3-4 | The DFW developed an information system designed for computer-based data entry to allow for an iterative process of generating and updating information, as well as improving the model for the future. |
| V | 18 | Indiana DFW chose to use a habitat-based model for its CWS. The intent of the model is to maximize limited knowledge about wildlife species by focusing on available research, enhanced by extrapolation from species that are better known, and by including best professional judgment. SGCN were linked to all wildlife species and to the habitats on which they depend by using representative species as surrogates. |
| V | 19 | Describes the process used to collect, compile and analyze information on conservation and monitoring |
| XVII | 98 | Lists the technical experts and conservation organizations that contributed to the development of the Indiana CWS. |

- B. The threats/problems are described in sufficient detail to develop focused conservation actions (for example, “increased highway mortalities” or “acid mine drainage” rather than generic descriptions such as “development” or “poor water quality”).

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|------------|---------|--|
| IX | 56 | Table 4 provides ranked threats to wildlife by major habitat type in Indiana. (See Appendix E-1 to E-78 for responses to expert questionnaire). |
| IX | 53 | The survey provided an extensive list of potential threats to habitats. Individual results were compiled and mathematically ranked for responses to this prepared list. See Appendix E for all expert questionnaire results. As a summary of these data, average rankings only are presented within the text below. Additional comments from the surveys are provided to illustrate specific concerns. All comments were captured and are presented in Appendix F. |
| IV | 15-16 | Data were collected for representative species in all habitats that contained SGCN. This allows the habitat information to be used to infer conservation needs for SGCN. This will be especially significant for SGCN for which little species-specific information is currently known. Habitat conservation efforts that benefit SGCN will also benefit all other wildlife in those habitats. |
| IV | 15 | Information used to create recommendations for Indiana’s CWS was generated through an information system, or tool, that was developed specifically to link species of greatest conservation need (SGCN) to all wildlife species and the habitats on which they depend. This was done by using a set of representative species as surrogates for the SGCN and for habitat needs of all wildlife species. In some cases, enough was known about certain SGCN that they were also used as representative species. |
| Appendix D | 2-3 | A questionnaire was developed to specifically address the eight elements Congress requires to be included in the CWS. The survey was standardized across major taxonomic groups and habitats to facilitate comparison and identification of critical conservation efforts to be implemented in Indiana. Eighty-six professionals throughout Indiana completed more than 180 questionnaires (See Appendix E 1-78 for questionnaire results). |

- C. The Strategy considers threats/problems, regardless of their origins (local, State, regional, national and international), where relevant to the State’s species and habitats.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|--|
| IX | 56-57 | Threats identified to wildlife included Degradation of |

| | | |
|----|-------|---|
| | | movement /migration routes, Viable reproductive population size, Small native range (high endemism), Near limits of natural geographic range, Large home range requirements, all of which transcend geopolitical borders. |
| IX | 56-57 | The approach utilized did not differentiate threats/problems based on geographical origin. |

D. If available information is insufficient to describe threats/problems, research and survey efforts are identified to obtain needed information.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|--|
| X | 59 | Table 6 indicates priority research needs for wildlife species by habitat association. (See Appendix E-1 to E-78 for sub-habitat needs). |
| X | 60 | Table 7 details ranked research and survey efforts needed by each major habitat type. (See Appendix E-1 to E-78 for sub-habitat needs). |
| XIIa | 82 | Table 14 lists suggested survey, monitoring, survey techniques, protocols and database needs for wildlife species in Indiana. |
| XIIb | 85 | Table 15 provides the habitat monitoring needs and associated database requirements. |

E. The priority research and survey needs, and resulting products, are described sufficiently to allow for the development of research and survey projects after the Strategy is approved.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| XV | 89 | The magnitude of the conservation needs identified in the CWS is such that the logical next step is to provide more focus for implementation. This focus can be accomplished by the development of an action plan in coordination with conservation partners and in consideration of available research and survey resources. |
| X | 59 | Table 6 indicates priority research needs for wildlife species by habitat association. (See Appendix E-1 to E-78 for sub-habitat needs). |
| XIIa | 58 | Provides examples of specific research and survey needs for wildlife |
| X | 60 | Table 7 details ranked research and survey efforts needed by each major habitat type. (See Appendix E-1 to E-78 for sub-habitat needs). |
| XIIb | 59 | Provides examples of specific research and survey needs for habitats |
| XIIa | 82 | Table 14 lists suggested survey, monitoring, survey techniques, protocols and database needs for wildlife species in Indiana. |
| XIIb | 85 | Table 15 provides the habitat monitoring needs and associated database requirements. |

4th Element. Descriptions of conservation actions determined to be necessary to conserve the identified species and habitats and priorities for implementing such actions.

- A. The Strategy identifies how conservation actions address identified threats to species of greatest conservation need and their habitats.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|--|
| XI | 64 | Table 8 details the ranked conservation efforts needed for wildlife by each major habitat type. (See Appendix E-1 to E-78 for sub-habitat responses) as determined by technical experts. |
| XI | 65 | Table 9 lists the ranked conservation needs for habitats. (See Appendix E-1 to E-78 for sub-habitat responses) as determined by technical experts. |
| XI | 61 | In the technical expert survey, experts were asked what conservation actions were most needed in Indiana for both species within habitats, as well as for the habitats themselves. Technical experts were asked to respond to each of the following information needs: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rank a list of conservation efforts by how well they address threats. 2. Describe other current conservation practices for species and habitats in Indiana. 3. Provide more detailed recommendations for more effective conservation actions (not ranked). |

- B. The Strategy describes conservation actions sufficiently to guide implementation of those actions through the development and execution of specific projects and programs.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|--|
| XI | 61-63 | Provides specific examples of needed species conservation actions and provides sideboards for partner participation. |
| XI | 63, 89 | Provides specific examples of needed habitat conservation actions. Specific details will be developed with partners during the implementation phase. |
| XV | 89 | The magnitude of the conservation needs identified in the CWS is such that the logical next step is to provide more focus for implementation. This focus can be accomplished by the development of an action plan in coordination with conservation partners and in consideration of available implementation resources. |

- C. The Strategy links conservation actions to objectives and indicators that will facilitate monitoring and performance measurement of those conservation actions (outlined in Element #5).

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| XV | 89 | During implementation partners (including DFW) are expected to claim conservation actions appropriate to their goals and objectives that contribute to the goal of the CWS (page 25) and that are consistent with the conservation actions outlined in Element 5. Periodic review of partner progress provides a performance measure |
| XIIc | 85-86 | Describes the steps needed to direct and evaluate the effectiveness of conservation actions undertaken and to allow for adaptive management. This includes conducting species and habitat survey/monitoring efforts as resources allow (including, but not necessarily limited to those identified in Tables 12, 14, & 15) and to participate, as appropriate, in regional or national monitoring programs. |

- D. The Strategy describes conservation actions (where relevant to the State’s species and habitats) that could be addressed by Federal agencies or regional, national or international partners and shared with other States.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| XV | 89 | During development of conservation needs no actions unique to specific potential partners (including federal agencies, etc.) were identified. During implementation conservation partners, including federal agencies, and regional, national, and international partners will be encouraged to claim those activities most aligned with their mission, goals and resources |
| XIII | 87 | Describes Coordination of Conservation Actions Among Relevant Federal, State, Local Agencies, and Other Public and Private Partners |

- E. If available information is insufficient to describe needed conservation actions, the Strategy identifies research or survey needs for obtaining information to develop specific conservation actions.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|--|
| X | 59 | Table 6 indicates priority research needs for wildlife species by habitat association. (See Appendix E-1 to E-78 for sub-habitat needs). |
| X | 60 | Table 7 details ranked research and survey efforts needed by each major habitat type. (See Appendix E-1 to E-78 for sub-habitat needs). |
| XIIa | 82-83 | Table 14 lists suggested survey, monitoring, survey techniques, protocols and database needs for wildlife species in Indiana. |
| XIIb | 85 | Table 15 provides the habitat monitoring needs and associated database requirements. |
| XIIa | 58 | Provides examples of specific research and survey needs for wildlife |
| XIIb | 59 | Provides examples of specific research and survey needs for |

| | | |
|----|----|--|
| | | habitats |
| XV | 89 | The magnitude of the conservation needs identified in the CWS is such that the logical next step is to provide more focus for implementation. This focus can be accomplished by the development of an action plan in coordination with conservation partners and in consideration of available implementation resources. |

F. The Strategy identifies the relative priority of conservation actions.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| XI | 64 | Table 8 details the ranked conservation efforts needed for wildlife by each major habitat type. (See Appendix E-1 to E-78 for sub-habitat responses). |
| XI | 65 | Table 9 lists the ranked conservation needs for habitats. (See Appendix E-1 to E-78 for sub-habitat responses). |

5th Element. Descriptions of the proposed plans for monitoring species identified in the 1st element and their habitats, for monitoring the effectiveness of the conservation actions proposed in the 4th element, and for adapting these conservation actions to respond appropriately to new information or changing conditions.

A. The Strategy describes plans for monitoring species identified in Element #1, and their habitats.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| XII | 77-86 | Includes the Proposed Plans for monitoring with Time Lines. |
| XII | 79-82 | Table 12 documents the Current species monitoring efforts conducted by the State (DFW) with an indication of which efforts include Species of Greatest Conservation Need. |
| XII | 82-83 | Table 14 lists the suggested survey, monitoring, survey technique, survey protocol, and database needs for wildlife species in Indiana, especially SGCN. |

B. The Strategy describes how the outcomes of the conservation actions will be monitored.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| XIIc | 85-86 | Describes the steps needed to direct and evaluate the effectiveness of conservation actions undertaken and to allow for adaptive management. This includes conducting species and habitat survey/monitoring efforts as resources allow (including, but not necessarily limited to those identified in Tables 12, 14, & 15) and to participate, as appropriate, in regional or national monitoring programs. |
| XIIc | 87 | Identifies mechanisms for the collaboration and information sharing by all partners will facilitate the application of accurate, timely information to the environmental review process. |

- C. If monitoring is not identified for a species or species group, the Strategy explains why it is not appropriate, necessary or possible.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|-------------|
| NA | NA | NA |

- D. Monitoring is to be accomplished at one of several levels including individual species, guilds, or natural communities.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| XII | 79-82 | Table 12 describes the current species monitoring efforts conducted by the DFW grouped by species group. |
| XII | 82-83 | Table 14 lists the suggested survey, monitoring, survey technique, survey protocol, and database needs for wildlife species in Indiana. |
| XII | 85 | Table 15 provides the habitat monitoring needs and associated database requirements. |

- E. The monitoring utilizes or builds on existing monitoring and survey systems or explains how information will be obtained to determine the effectiveness of conservation actions.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| XIIc | 85-86 | Describes the steps needed to direct and evaluate the effectiveness of conservation actions undertaken and to allow for adaptive management. This includes conducting species and habitat survey/monitoring efforts as resources allow (including, but not necessarily limited to those identified in Tables 12, 14, & 15) and to participate, as appropriate, in regional or national monitoring programs. |
| XIIa | 78 | In recognitions that there are not appropriate survey techniques for some species and the need to compare results across jurisdictions the Indiana CWS supports the development of new survey/monitoring techniques and the standardization of survey protocols that facilitate comparison. |
| XIIc | 88 | Identifies mechanisms for the collaboration and information sharing by all partners that will facilitate the application of accurate, timely information to the environmental review process. |

- F. The monitoring considers the appropriate geographic scale to evaluate the status of species or species groups and the effectiveness of conservation actions.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|--|
| XII | 79-85 | Tables 12, 14 and 15 describe the current and needed species and habitat monitoring efforts including a schedule and the area that is covered. |

- G. The Strategy is adaptive in that it allows for evaluating conservation actions and implementing new actions accordingly.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| XIIc | 85-86 | Describes the steps needed to direct and evaluate the effectiveness of conservation actions undertaken and to allow for adaptive management. This includes conducting species and habitat survey/monitoring efforts as resources allow (including, but not necessarily limited to those identified in Tables 12, 14, & 15) and to participate, as appropriate, in regional or national monitoring programs. |
| XIV | 87 | Describes how the Indiana CWS process and associated electronic tools have been designed from the outset to provide a mechanism for gathering baseline information in a format that can be updated as needed |

6th Element. Descriptions of procedures to review the Strategy/Plan at intervals not to exceed ten years.

- A. The State describes the process that will be used to review the Strategy within the next ten years.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|---------|---------|---|
| XV | 89-90 | The next major revision of the CWS is scheduled for completion before 2015 and is expected to build on the 2005 effort and to benefit from over 8 years of experience gained from the implementation of this CWS. The 2005 Indiana CWS was developed to establish baseline information on the distribution and abundance of wildlife in Indiana, including species of greatest conservation need, the habitats upon which the species depend and the threats to the species and their habitats, and research and monitoring needs. The online surveys used to gather information on these elements can be updated and used to replicate this study at regular intervals to track the progress of Indiana's conservation efforts. Comparison of the 2005 and 2015 results will provide the best long-term evaluation of the conservation efforts guided and supported by this congressionally mandated and funded strategic process. |

7th Element. Descriptions of the plans for coordinating, to the extent feasible, the development, implementation, review, and revision of the Plan-Strategy with Federal, State, and local agencies and Indian tribes that manage significant land and water areas within the State or administer programs that significantly affect the conservation of identified species and habitats.

- A. The State describes the extent of its coordination with and efforts to involve Federal, State and local agencies, and Indian Tribes in the development of its Strategy.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|------------|---------|--|
| V | 18-22 | Describes the extensive public involvement and partnership solicitation during the development of the Indiana CWS. |
| VI | 23 | Describes the coordination of Federal, State and local agencies, Indian tribes and neighboring States during the development of the CWS. |
| XI | 72-76 | Table 11 provides a list of conservation partners involved in the development of the CWS and the percent time they conduct efforts in each major habitat type. |
| Appendix H | 1-366 | Contains the results of the conservation partner survey. Over 100 conservation organizations in Indiana participated sharing their efforts and interests. |

- B. The State describes its coordination with these agencies and tribes in the implementation, review and revision of its Strategy.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|-----------|---------|---|
| XV | 89 | <p>In early 2006, all partners (including relevant individual federal, state and local agencies and other conservation partners) will be invited to develop an operational plan (action plan) for implementation of the 2005 CWS. These partners will be encouraged to participate to the greatest extent possible and to assist in the dissemination of information relative to the implementation of the CWS. Information gathered via the electronic partnership survey (page 19) and presented in Appendix H will allow partners to recognize where organizations and resources can come together to address conservation needs.</p> <p>All active partners are expected to claim conservation actions appropriate to their goals and objectives and to provide performance measures for their efforts. Review and revision of Indiana's 2005 CWS based on the partner's self-determined performance measures is expected to be an ongoing activity. A great deal of insight is expected to result from the ongoing iterative process of the action plan that includes implementation of conservation actions, evaluation, strategy revision, and adaptation. These insights will be applied to the next major revision of the Indiana CWS.</p> |
| Next Step | | In recognition of the importance of the implementation stage of the CWS process, the DFW has contracted with D. J. Case and Associates to facilitate the initiating of the implementation stage in 2005 and 2006. |

8th Element. Descriptions of the necessary public participation in the development, revision, and implementation of the Plan.

- A. The State describes the extent of its efforts to involve the public in the development of its Strategy.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|------------|---------|--|
| XI | 72-76 | Table 11 provides a list of conservation partners involved in the development of the CWS and the percent time they conduct efforts in each major habitat type. |
| Appendix H | 1-366 | Contains the results of the conservation partner survey. Over 100 conservation organizations in Indiana participated sharing their efforts and interests. |

- B. The State describes its continued public involvement in the implementation and revision of its Strategy.

| SECTION | PAGE(S) | EXPLANATION |
|-----------|---------|---|
| XV | 89 | In early 2006, all partners (including relevant individual federal, state and local agencies and other conservation partners) will be invited to develop an operational plan (action plan) for implementation of the 2005 CWS. These partners will be encouraged to participate to the greatest extent possible and to assist in the dissemination of information relative to the implementation of the CWS. Information gathered via the electronic partnership survey (page 19) and presented in Appendix H will allow partners to recognize where organizations and resources can come together to address conservation needs. |
| Figure 1. | 15 | All active partners are expected to claim conservation actions appropriate to their goals and objectives and to provide performance measures for their efforts. Review and revision of Indiana's 2005 CWS based on the partner's self-determined performance measures is expected to be an ongoing activity. A great deal of insight is expected to result from the ongoing iterative process of the action plan that includes implementation of conservation actions, evaluation, strategy revision, and adaptation. These insights will be applied to the next major revision of the Indiana CWS. |