## Index

Aerial Photography, 4-17	Error
Best Management Practice Evaluation	allowable, 2-19
Program, U.S. Forest Service, 2-15	measurement, 2-8, 2-10
Bias	relative, 2-19
measurement, 2-8	sampling, 2-8
BMP	Type I, 2-12
binary rating system, 4-9, 4-10	Type II, 2-12
compliance, 1-4	Estimation, 2-10
design and installation, 1-4	Evaluation
effectiveness, 1-1, 1-4, 2-1	variable selection, 4-4
implementation, 1-1, 1-3	variables, 4-2
implementation plans, 1-3	Evaluations
rating, 4-9	consistency, 4-8
rating terms, 4-11	expert, 4-4
scale rating system, 4-10	presentation of results, 5-1
standards and specifications, 1-4	self, 4-1, 4-13
voluntary implementation, 1-3	site, 4-4
BMP implementation	teams, 4-8
and water quality, 1-1	Guidance Specifying Management Measures
Bureau of Land Management, 2-14, 4-18	For Sources Of Nonpoint Pollution in
CNPCP, 1-2, 1-3	Coastal Waters, 1-2
Company X, 2-21, 2-23, 2-24	Hypothesis
Confidence interval, 2-11	testing, 2-1
Contingency table, 3-4	Hypothesis testing, 2-10
Cumulative effects	Kendall τb, 3-6
of BMP implementation, 1-3	Management
CWA, 1-2	goals and objectives, 1-4
303(d), 1-2	Monitoring
319(h), 1-2	baseline, 1-4, 1-4
CZARA, 1-1	compliance, 1-4
6217(b), 1-2, 1-2	Effectiveness, 1-4, 1-4, 2-1
6217(d), 1-2, 1-2	goals, 2-1
6217(g), 1-2	implementation, 1-1, 1-3, 2-1
technical assistance, 1-2, 1-2	long-term, 1-3
Data	objectives, 2-1
categorical, 3-4	project, 1-4
evaluation, 3-1	purpose, 5-1
nominal, 3-4	purpose of, 1-4
ordinal, 3-4, 3-6	scale, 1-1, 1-3
FPA 1-2 1-2 2-1 2-19	trend 1-3 1-4

types, 1-3	double-barreled questions, 4-16
validation, 1-4	layout, 4-17
water quality, 1-1	multiple-choice questions, 4-17
Monitoring programs	open-ended questions, 4-17
Florida, 2-14	ordering of questions, 4-17
Idaho, 2-15	phrasing of questions, 4-16
Montana, 2-15	pretest, 4-17
US Forest Service, 2-15	refusal to answer, 4-16
NOAA, 1-2, 1-2	response format, 4-17
Nonpoint Source Monitoring and Evaluation	revision, 4-17
Guide, 1-5	target audience, 4-16
NPDES, 1-2	Sample size, 2-17
Photography	Sampling, 2-1
aerial, 2-14, 4-17	accuracy, 2-10
altitude, 4-19	alternative hypothesis, 2-12
drawback, 4-19	balanced designs, 2-2
large-format, 4-18	bias, 2-10, 2-14
navigational errors, 4-19	cluster, 2-5, 2-26
resolution, 4-18	comparing more than two, 3-4
scale, 4-18	comparison of means, 3-2
small-format, 4-19	comparison of proportions, 3-3
training, 4-19	cost-effectiveness, 2-5
Population	distribution, 3-3
periodic variation, 2-8	intervals, 2-8
sample, 2-2	Neyman allocation, 2-24
target, 2-2, 2-2	null hypothesis, 2-11
units, 2-2	power, 2-12
Presentations	precision, 2-10
audience, 5-2	Probabilistic, 2-2
criteria, 5-1	program design, 2-1
format, 5-2, 5-2	proportional allocation, 2-24
graphics, 5-3	simple random, 2-2, 2-19
medium, 5-2	site selection, 2-13
oral, 5-3	site selection criteria, 2-13
potential audiences, 5-2	site selection data, 2-14
references, 5-6	sources of variability, 2-10
use of VCR, 5-6	strategy, 2-13
Written, 5-3	stratified random, 2-3, 2-23
Questionnaire, 4-1	systematic, 2-3, 2-8, 2-26
design, 4-15	water quality, 2-1
dichotomous questions, 4-17	Significance level, 2-12, 2-17

```
Site-specific, 1-3
Statistical inference, 2-2
Statistics
   descriptive, 2-10
   estimation, 2-17
   finite population correction term,
   2-17
   summary, 2-2
Surveys
   accuracy of information, 4-14
   Cost, 4-14
   landowner involvement, 4-13
   mail, 4-14, 4-17
   postevaluation activities, 4-13
   site visit, 4-14
   telephone, 4-14
Test
   analysis of variance, 3-4
   Friedman, 3-4
   Kruskal-Wallis, 3-4, 3-5
   Mann-Whitney, 3-2, 3-2
   one-sided, 3-1
   Student's t, 2-20, 3-2
   Tukey's, 3-4
   two-sided, 3-1
   Wilcoxon's, 3-2
US Forest Service, 2-16
Variables
   examples of good, 4-2
Watershed assessment, 1-3
```