

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
1998	1	27	Section 7 Consultations -conf for Bull trout -replaces previous direction of Oct 20, 1997	In the June 13, 1997 Federal Register (Vol. 62, No. 114) the bull trout was proposed for listing; no critical habitat was proposed at this time. It is important the USDA Forest Service (FS), the USDI Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and USDI Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) meet their section 7 responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) for this proposed species. For proposed species, each Federal agency is required to confer with the FWS on any actions which are “likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any species proposed to be listed ... or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat proposed to be designated for such species.” (50 CFR 402.10.) Once a species is listed, consultation is required for actions that may affect listed species or critical habitat (50 CFR 402.14).	This memorandum sets forth interagency coordination agreements to ensure that the agencies’ responsibilities are met for proposed species. A further goal is to efficiently prepare for potential listing of the bull trout and the agencies’ responsibilities to consult on actions that may affect listed species or designated critical habitat. Both programmatic actions and project level actions of the FS and BLM will be considered. The programmatic actions are the FS Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMPs), and the BLM Resource Management Plans (RMPs), hereinafter referred to collectively as the LRMPs. Project level actions are site-specific actions undertaken by the agencies. This approach applies to those FS and BLM lands in the Klamath and Columbia River Basins.
1998	6	19	FS, BLM adopts commitments for PACFISH and INFISH in LRMPs. Sec 7 -letter to USFWS- Biological Assessment	By way of this letter, we are adopting the enclosed commitments in implementing the PACFISH and INFISH aquatic habitat conservation strategies to ensure the FS and BLM management plans and associated actions conserve the federally listed bull trout and sucker species addressed in the INFISH/PACFISH LRMP biological assessment. 1. Restoration and improvement, 2. Standard and guidelines, 3. Key and priority watershed networks, 4. Watershed analysis, 5. Monitoring, 6. Long-term Conservation and Recovery, 7. The FS and BLM, in coordination with the FWS, will complete section 7 consultation at the watershed level by May 1999.	See description
1998	6	22	Chronology of LRMP consultations with NMFS in PACFISH Area- list of docs between 1994-1998	chronology of documents from Feb 1994-June 1998 prior to LRMP BO	Pre BO
1998	6	22	Sec 7 consultation-Effects of Continued Implementation of LRMPs on ESA salmon and steelhead- <b>NMFS BO</b>	Biological opinion	Biological opinion
1998	7	22	Implementation of PACFISH and INFISH Biological Opinions	The workgroup is establishing Task groups that will address the five mechanisms within the Steelhead Biological Opinion and the seven commitments made in the Bull Trout Biological Opinion—many of which are similar if not identical. This group is collaborating with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in developing this strategy to meet the commitments made by the Forest Service (FS) and BLM or terms and conditions outlined in the Steelhead BO.	workgroups established
1998	8	14	Bull trout BO-inc 12/8/98 BT interim guidance	This document represents the Services biological opinion (BO) on the effects of continued implementation of the LRMPs as amended by PACFISH and INFISH on listed bull trout in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA)(16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). This BO is based on the information provided in the June 15, 1998 BA (USDA and USDI 1998a) and a June 19, 1998 letter amending the BA (USDA and USDI 1998b). In the BA, the	

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
				USFS and BLM determined that the action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the listed species, but that it may affect and likely adversely affect the bull trout. No critical habitat has been designated for this species; therefore, none was determined to be affected.	
1998	11	24	IIT charter	With this letter we sanction the Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) and direct the IIT to implement the actions identified in the enclosed charter. We support the collaborative implementation of the National Marine Fisheries Service 1998 biological opinion (BO) on anadromous fish and the Fish and Wildlife Service bull trout BO outlined in this charter. The primary objective of this effort is to establish a framework to strengthen the implementation of PACFISH/ INFISH amended LRMPs and the corresponding BAs and BiOps. A secondary objective is to maximize efficiency by collaborating with Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan (ICBEMP) staff in transition from the interim aquatic strategies of PACFISH/INFISH to the long-term Aquatic Conservation Strategy that is anticipated to be developed by the ICBEMP. To meet the second objective, the Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) will review plans and specific actions developed by the Task Teams (TT) for consistency with the Biological Assessments (BA) and Opinions (BO). These plans and specific actions will be in place as outlined in the BAs and their related BOs until adopted, modified, and /or replaced by the ICBEMP Aquatic Conservation Strategy.	ICBEMP didn't get finalized.
1998	12	9	Bull trout interim guidance - prepared by USFWS	The Bull Trout Interim Conservation Guidance (Guidance) was developed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) as a tool to be used by Service biologists in bull trout conservation and recovery. It is not intended to provide site specific land management prescriptions, but to provide recommended actions that may be adapted and modified to benefit bull trout in a particular locale. This Guidance addresses land management activities; other activities affecting bull trout will be addressed through additions to the Guidance or the Recovery Plan.	attached to 8/14/98 BO
1999	2	5	IIT - Interagency Implementation Team evaluations of Accomplishments for NMFS June 22, 1998 BO	<p>Summary of Significant Findings and Recommended Actions Where Additional Work is Needed</p> <p>The IIT found that most of the Opinion's mechanisms and subelements are underway and several have already been accomplished, though not always on schedule. The IIT is highlighting the findings listed here because these require specific attention to ensure implementation of all elements of the Opinion. The IIT plans to pursue the actions listed below in response to each of these findings.</p> <p>1. Missed timelines - Interagency checkpoints and some regulatory timelines have not been met.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends: (a) increasing IIT members' and task team leaders'</p>	The nine recommendations in the BA have been effect since September 16, 1997, when the BA was issued. Some of the recommendations (recommendations 5 and 7) have been further developed and incorporated as one of the five mechanisms, the implementation of which was discussed above. The other recommendations involve elements of section 7 consultation, and are implemented primarily through the consultation streamlining process. As noted in enclosure 2, a survey of level 1 teams has not been done to determine if these recommendations are being implemented. SUMMARY The IIT believes that it has developed a solid, productive interagency approach to implementing the Opinion. Elements of implementation have proved difficult; however, this team will continue to move forward with positive solutions to meet each requirement of the Opinion, and continue to build solid working relationships between the agencies which will be critical for both interim and long term approaches to recovery of listed species.

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>responsibilities for ensuring tasks are accomplished on schedule; and (b) developing implementation reports such as this memorandum beginning approximately one month before the regulatory reporting dates.</p> <p>2. Insufficient intra-agency understanding of Opinion requirements and their implementation - The IIT continues to hear that forest-level personnel and executives do not understand what is being accomplished under the BA and Opinion.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends: (a) briefing the executives on the requirements of the Opinion and accomplishments to date; (b) increasing management units' understanding of the Opinion's requirements by conducting a one-day workshop to inform and gather ideas from management units; and (c) distributing IIT meeting notes to the management units.</p> <p>3. Lack of review of grazing allotments effects determinations - The Monitoring Task Team's grazing implementation monitoring strategy will not be in place until March 1999; and the management agencies have not verified compliance with the Opinion by reviewing currently active grazing allotments and authorizing only those which are }not likely to adversely affect~ pending implementation of the monitoring strategy.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends that the IIT contact the management units to verify their compliance with this requirement. (The IIT is in the process of drafting a letter to management units to this effect).</p> <p>4. Need for feedback on and improvement of management units' batching/bundling of projects - Batching and bundling of projects achieved so far (per Opinion mechanism 2c) has shown a good effort by most management units; however, there is still substantial room for improvement to achieve the goal of ensuring compliance with ESA accurately and efficiently.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends: (a) that each management unit (or collection of units) and its level 1 and 2 teams meet as a group to determine how well they accomplished the batching/bundling requirement in the Opinion, and to develop a list of recommendations that will guide the next batching/bundling exercise and will be submitted to the IIT; and (b) that the IIT summarize managements units' input and provide overall guidance to the units on effective procedures for batching/bundling.</p> <p>5. Lack of progress on the mechanism addressing unroaded areas - The team tasked</p>	

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>with accomplishing this has made little progress so far.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends: (a) that the regional executives assist the IIT in making this a priority and procuring the time of agency scientists to be members of the unroaded areas task team; and (b) that this task team accelerate their efforts to accomplish the mechanism.</p> <p>6. Lack of recent review of how well management agencies are exercising existing authorities, particularly with respect to actions involving mining, ANILCA, and the Ditch Act - The IIT have not yet developed a means for determining that this requirement is being met.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends that it: (a) oversee the compilation of a list of these authorities; (b) provide direction to management units to clarify existing authorities; and (c) periodically evaluate if management units' use of their authorities meets the requirement in the Opinion. (The IIT has already tasked specific team members with overseeing development of the list in item a.)</p> <p>7. Lack of information on how well management units are implementing the special management considerations for projects in the South Fork Salmon, Middle Fork Salmon, and Selway River subbasins - The IIT has not yet developed a means for determining that this requirement is being met.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends that the IIT obtain from each relevant management unit a summary of how these management considerations are incorporated in project design. (An IIT subgroup has already been assigned to oversee this task.)</p> <p>8. Need for clearer vision of the multi-year strategies to accelerate restoration, per Opinion mechanism 5b - Discussions at the January 29, 1999, IIT meeting indicated the need for some description in addition to mechanism 5b in the Opinion to guide the formulation of multi-year restoration strategies.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends that the IIT provide a description of what is envisioned, in addition to the specific wording in the Opinion, to guide primarily the restoration team, and also other teams whose products will be used in developing the restoration strategy.</p> <p>9. Lack of information on implementation of BA recommendations - The IIT has not requested or received information from the management units evaluating implementation of the BA recommendations.</p>	

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>Action - The IIT recommends that it request this information from the management units and their level 1 teams.</p> <p>a status report from the Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) on the accomplishment of requirements in National Marine Fisheries Service's (NMFS) June 22, 1998, biological opinion (Opinion) on the subject actions. The IIT found that most of the Opinion's mechanisms and sub-elements are underway and several have already been accomplished, though not always on schedule. Enclosure 1 provides a table summarizing the IIT's findings on the accomplishment of the five mechanisms and their sub-elements. This table includes a brief description of each mechanism and sub-element, the regulatory reporting and interagency checkpoint dates, and a brief description of what has been accomplished. The text below provides additional description of the status of these mechanisms and sub-elements.</p> <p>Mechanism 1 - The Opinion requires that the management agencies develop a mechanism for accountability and oversight that ensures PACFISH direction, direction in the LRMP Opinions, and BA recommendations are fully implemented through a mechanism other than level 1 teams. The Opinion also requires reporting accomplishment of this mechanism to NMFS by November 1998. This report was not submitted on schedule; however, IIT meeting notes up to November 1998 provide some of this information, and this letter and enclosures serve to complete the report.</p> <p>The primary objective of mechanism 1 was accomplished: the IIT was formed to provide accountability and oversight at higher levels within the management agencies. As noted above, the IIT has met regularly, has defined its workings with a charter, and has embarked on an implementation strategy which includes task teams and coordination with management units. The IIT has been functioning well, with good representation from all agencies involved. The IIT felt it was important to have high level line officer involvement to broaden the agencies' understanding of and support for implementation of the Opinions; however, it was not possible to obtain representation from a deputy Regional Forester.</p> <p>Mechanism 1 also involves the priority watersheds/unroaded areas and monitoring task teams. The priority watershed/unroaded areas task team completed the delineation of priority watersheds for steelhead and submitted this to NMFS January 15, 1999. Personnel changes and data entry errors that were not discovered until late in the process slowed completion of this task. The monitoring task team convened on schedule, and has focused specifically on developing</p>	

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>methods for improving the quality and consistency of monitoring and responding to grazing impacts on streams (refer to mechanism 2 below). As noted in enclosure 1, the monitoring task team has either completed or is in the process of completing each specific sub-element it was assigned. This team has done an excellent job of making steady progress on a complex task and keeping the IIT well informed. The team has nearly completed the implementation monitoring component for grazing and will work on the effectiveness and validation components next. The task team will seek further guidance from the IIT regarding monitoring needs for other programs.</p> <p>Mechanism 2 - The Opinion requires that the management agencies complete prior commitments in PACFISH, LRMPs, and previous Opinions. The primary commitments identified are implementation of PACFISH grazing standard GM-1 and range monitoring, road evaluation and planning requirements in line with PACFISH standards RF-2 and RF-3, and batching/bundling of projects by watersheds instead of submitting project by project consultations. The Opinion requires reporting accomplishment of this mechanism to NMFS by January 15, 1999. The IIT meeting notes and this letter provide the required report.</p> <p>The monitoring task team is nearing completion of the implementation monitoring strategy for grazing. This strategy makes use of a }scorecard~ designed to ensure monitoring is consistent and broadly applied, and designed to identify and correct grazing which adversely affects listed fish or their habitat. This monitoring strategy will be put into use in March 1999, and thus will cover the majority, but not all of grazing in 1999. Grazing occurring prior to March should have an approved alternative monitoring strategy or be limited to that which level 1 teams deem }not likely to adversely affect.~ The IIT does not have information confirming that this requirement is being met.</p> <p>The roads task team reviewed available information on roads and found that, due to the large volume of information and variety of electronic and paper formats, it was unable to provide a single useable compilation of this material for NMFS. The team therefore proposed, and the IIT agreed, that in the short term road inventories would be kept at the management unit offices and would be available to NMFS on request. The roads team is working on mid- and long-term strategies to meet this requirement. The team was able to provide a short-term tool for restoration planning by compiling a list of the ten highest priority road-related projects for restoring listed fish and their habitat. The lists for all units, except for Oregon and Washington BLM, were delivered to the IIT on January 15, 1999. Oregon and Washington BLM indicated the lists will be provided in February. These lists may</p>	

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>be considered along with priority watershed information in the preparation of the multi-year restoration plans (mechanism 5), and will likely provide high priority restoration opportunities for 1999. The roads team also agreed to provide the IIT, by May 1999, maps of roads based on available information, and stratification of road densities by watershed based on recent electronic mapping tools where data are available.</p> <p>Individual management units are responsible for the final sub-element of mechanism 2, project bundling and batching. Management units are making varying levels of progress on this sub-element. Some units submitted progress reports on bundling/batching by the January 15, 1999, due date for this sub-element. These units have bundled all ongoing and many proposed actions by watershed or program and have submitted or will soon submit these for consultation. Other units are taking similar approaches, but appear to be not as far along. All units are having difficulty with describing actions up to two years from now, because it is a common practice to develop actions (and fulfill NEPA requirements) less than a year prior to action implementation.</p> <p>Mechanism 3 - The Opinion requires that the management agencies implement conservation actions based on mapping and analysis of unroaded areas and areas of species occurrence. The Opinion also requires submission of an implementation report for this mechanism to NMFS by September 1, 1999. While this deadline is not impending, the IIT is concerned that two interagency checkpoint dates have passed without substantial progress on those sub-elements (unroaded areas inventory and summary of existing direction: see enclosure 1, sub-elements 3a and 3b). The priority watersheds/unroaded areas task has been occupied with the priority watersheds task and has convened only briefly to discuss unroaded areas. The team also does not have the participation of key scientists who were initially identified for this task, and others have not be identified to provide that expertise. For those reasons, the team has made little progress on its tasks. The IIT will need to bolster membership/participation on this team and provide guidance to the team to ensure that this mechanism is completed by the regulatory reporting date.</p> <p>Mechanism 4 - The Opinion requires that the management agencies exercise existing authorities on land management programs with a pattern of adverse effects (e.g., mining, water conveyances, and some non-Federal activities enabled by Federal road access permits) in accordance with ESA section 7(a)(1). This mechanism will be tracked at the project level and does not require plan-level reporting under the Opinion. If efforts are underway to address mechanism 4,</p>	

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>these were likely generated by project-specific issues which were elevated to the upper levels of the consultation streamlining process. For instance, specific projects have generated recent discussions at the regional or national levels to clarify land management agency discretion related to water conveyances and road use permits. The IIT does not know the status of these discussions, and is not aware that the discussions have resulted or would result in additional direction to consultation streamlining teams and project planners.</p> <p>Mechanism 5 - The Opinion requires that the management agencies implement long-term strategies to accomplish BA recommendations 4, 5, and 7. The Opinion also requires that if ICBEMP is not in place for the 2000 field season, the agencies must begin implementing key components of a long-term aquatic conservation strategy. Annual implementation reports are required for this mechanism beginning in May 1999. One mechanism 5 sub-element, the schedule for completion of watershed analyses (enclosure 1, item 5c), has been completed. The IIT has not requested or received information on how well the special management considerations for the Selway, South Fork Salmon, and Middle Fork Salmon Rivers (item 5a) are being implemented.</p> <p>Development of multi-year restoration strategies by March 1, 1999 (item 5b), is a critical sub-element of this mechanism. This sub-element should incorporate products from the priority watersheds/unroaded and roads task teams. The restoration team proactively developed regional direction for FY99 restoration (November 1998, letter) positioning the management agencies to be more effective in funding restoration projects when the multi-year strategies are developed. The restoration team also met in January to begin formulating the restoration strategies. This team is coordinating with the other task teams whose products will be used to develop the restoration strategies. Discussions of this task in the January 29, 1999, IIT meeting indicated the need for further description, in addition to the wording in the Opinion, of how various sources of information (including task team products) should be used to create a broad scale component of the restoration strategies.</p>	
1999	4	13	Range Resource Implementation Monitoring Module (Grazing)-April 7, 1999 -Reply Due	<p>We are directing those field units covered by the Biological Opinions (B0's) for salmon, steelhead, and bull trout to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Implement the Grazing Implementation Module for the 1999 grazing season.</li> <li>2. This module will replace all ongoing implementation monitoring. Forest range and fish staffs in coordination with Level 1 teams should review existing implementation monitoring requirements to determine if any implementation</li> </ol>	This module is designed to provide a consistent process for land management agencies to collect and report results of implementation monitoring on grazing allotments. Consequently this module covers implementation monitoring of grazing activities only. Additional modules for effectiveness and validation monitoring will be developed.

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
				<p>monitoring elements because of special or unique circumstances need to be retained (exceptions). Any exceptions identified must be approved by Level 2. The results of the review will be documented and reported to the Interagency Implementation Team Coordinator by June 1, 1999.</p> <p>When applied, the Module will meet the range implementation monitoring requirements of the steelhead and bull trout BO's issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service on June 19, 1998, and by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on August 14, 1998.</p>	
1999	4	20	Letter to NMFS & USFWS - Grazing Implementation Monitoring Module - April 7, 1999	Mr. Stelle and Ms. Badgley. The Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) chartered by the Regional Executives has received from the Monitoring Task Team the Grazing Implementation Monitoring Module (Module). The IIT is recommending the Module be applied on Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) allotments during the 1999 grazing season with intent to replace all existing ongoing implementation monitoring.	Enclosure-Range Resource Implementation Monitoring Module (Grazing)-April 7, 1999
1999	5	21	PACFISH commitments signed by FS and BLM to William Stelle (NMFS, Regional Administrator)	The following are the commitments that the FS and BLM will apply to PACFISH Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMPs) within the range of listed mid-Columbia steelhead and upper-Columbia Chinook, and proposed Snake River fall run Chinook extension. All of these are in various stages of completion and implementation and will be expanded by the ITT to be included in these Evolutionarily Significant Units. 1. Restoration and improvement, 2. Standards and guidelines, 3. Key and priority watershed networks, 4. Watershed analysis, 5. Monitoring, 6. Long-term Conservation and Recovery, 7. The FS and BLM, in coordination with the NMFS, will complete Section 7 consultation at the watershed level. After the effective date of the listings, until the watershed consultations are completed, all ongoing and proposed actions must conform. to PACFISH guidelines and these seven commitments.	By way of this letter, we are adopting the enclosed commitments in implementing the PACFISH aquatic habitat conservation strategy to ensure the FS and BLM management plans and associated actions conserve the federally listed mid-Columbia steelhead and upper-Columbia chinook salmon species and the proposed Snake River fall run extension. To implement these commitments, the FS and BLM will work collaboratively with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) through the Interagency Implementation Team (ITT) process and combine management direction within PACFISH and INFISH and the Biological Opinions for PACFISH and INFISH as needed to add efficiency and reduce duplication in the management of resident and anadromous habitat resources covered by those management strategies and Biological Opinions.
1999	5	25	Implementation of August 14, 1998 and June 19, 1998 BOs - semi-annual report	<p>The BOs (NMFS BO of June 19, 1998) contain terms and conditions, agency commitments, and reasonable and prudent measures, all of which are directed at reducing adverse effects on listed species. A formal reporting mechanism is essential for providing trackable documentation to show that the requirements of the BOs are being carried out. Likewise, the report would provide a clear record of conservation actions for the public, congressional interests, and the action and regulatory agencies.....</p> <p>Twice yearly, the IIT FS Regional or BLM State Office IIT members will forward consolidated FS Region and BLM State Reports from their respective field units to the regulatory agencies and the IIT Coordinator. The IIT Coordinator will monitor the reporting requirements, maintain a record of all Regional and State recommended responses, and report IIT accomplishments to the Regional Executives.</p>	data request

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
1999	6	9	Grazing Implementation Monitoring Module clarification	This letter provides clarification to questions raised at the three training sessions for the Grazing Implementation Monitoring Module (Module) held in Boise, Idaho; Pendleton, Oregon; and Missoula, Montana, on April 27, 28, and 30, respectively.	Q and As sent to all affected forests about the module.
1999	7	1	Bull trout section 7 project consultation	This memorandum is to remind Forest Service and BLM managers of the need to assure and document compliance with Section 7 consultation procedures for ongoing projects. Specifically, we are asking you to review the August 19 and August 27 memorandums to determine compliance with ESA Section 7 for all ongoing projects. The August 19 and August 27 memorandums, in summary, provided that compliance with ESA Section 7 can be met for ongoing projects by completing consultation (either with a Letter of Concurrence and Biological Opinion) or, where consultation is not complete, by documenting a Section 7(d) determination that the project is not an “irreversible or irretrievable commitment of resources with respect to the agency action which has the effect of foreclosing the formulation or implementation of any reasonable and prudent alternative measures” based on documented Level 1 Team agreement on the call for the project. It is important that you make sure that, if projects are ongoing, you are in compliance with the Section 7 documentation discussed above. Any ongoing projects that “may affect” bull trout where such documentation does not exist should be suspended.	Info sent to Forest Supervisors and District Managers Within the Range of Bull Trout.
1999	7	15	Key and Priority watershed task team report -signed by Rick Stowell (FS, R1)	Attached Is the final report for the key and priority watershed task team. With the listing of bull trout ( <i>Salvelineus confluentus</i> ), the Biological Assessment (BA) and Biological Opinion (BO) for Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMPs) identified several deficiencies in existing LRMP management direction. Commitments to resolve these deficiencies were presented to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) in a letter dated June 19, 1998. One of these deficiencies was in the key and priority watershed networks established under INFISH and PACFISH. Also in that letter, the U.S. Forest Service (FS) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) agreed to “reexamine the structure and function of INFISH priority and PACFISH key watershed networks to ensure the protection and recovery of bull trout ...	Attached is the final report for the Key and Priority Watershed Task Team. The report contains a map, data table of hydrologic unit codes (HUCs) and recommendations that will need to be acted upon by the IIT.
1999	10	14	IIT-Interagency Implementation Team Second semi-Annual Evaluation of Accomplishments for June 22, 1998 BO	This memorandum provides a status report from the Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) on the accomplishment of requirements in National Marine Fisheries Service’s (NMFS) June 22, 1998, biological opinion (Opinion) on the subject actions.	In its February 5, 1999, letter evaluating implementation of the Opinion over the first six months, the IIT identified specific recommended actions where needed to strengthen implementation of the Opinion. The evaluation below is in four sections: 1) a follow-up on the IIT’s recommended actions from the first evaluation period; 2) additional recommendations in response to implementation needs during the second evaluation period; 3) a summary of the implementation to date of each of the five mechanisms in the Opinion; and 4) a summary of the implementation of the nine BA recommendations. 1. Issue from first evaluation period - Missed timelines  Action - The IIT recommends: (a) increasing IIT members’ and task team leaders’

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
					<p>responsibilities for ensuring tasks are accomplished on schedule; and (b) developing implementation reports such as this memorandum beginning approximately one month before the regulatory reporting dates.</p> <p>Status - The IIT has addressed item a) by assigning specific IIT members as liaisons/overseers of particular task teams. Item b) was provided by discussing drafts of this evaluation memorandum in May, June, July, and August IIT meetings.</p> <p>2. Issue from first evaluation period - Insufficient intra-agency understanding of Opinion requirements and their implementation.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends: (a) briefing the executives on the requirements of the Opinion and accomplishments to date; (b) increasing management units' understanding of the Opinion's requirements by conducting a one-day workshop to inform and gather ideas from management units; and (c) distributing IIT meeting notes to the management units.</p> <p>Status - Item a) was first accomplished with a briefing at the February 8, 1999 Executive Steering Committee (ESC) meeting. The IIT plans to provide an updated briefing for the ESC, Forest Supervisors, and District Managers during Fall 1999. Item b) was partially accomplished with a series of workshops during Spring 1999 regarding the IIT monitoring task team's grazing implementation monitoring module; however, the majority of the requirements in the Opinion and BA have not been presented in a workshop. Item c) was dropped when the IIT decided this would be of limited value, and that efforts were better focused on establishing/bolstering other links between the IIT and management units. The IIT has committed to improving its communication with the field by developing a chronology of direction/accomplishments related to implementation of the Opinion, and by making this and other information available on a WEB site.</p> <p>3. Issue from first evaluation period - Lack of review of grazing allotments effects determinations.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends that the IIT contact the management units to verify their compliance with this requirement.</p> <p>Status - Accomplished. 4. Issue from first evaluation period - Need for feedback on and improvement of management units' batching/bundling of projects.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends: (a) that each management unit (or collection of units)</p>

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
					<p>and its level 1 and 2 teams meet as a group to determine how well they accomplished the batching/bundling requirement in the Opinion, and to develop a list of recommendations that will guide the next batching/bundling exercise and will be submitted to the IIT; and (b) that the IIT summarize managements units' input and provide overall guidance to the units on effective procedures for batching/bundling.</p> <p>Status - The first step in evaluating and improving on batching/bundling was made with the action agencies requests for subsequent reports from management units on their accomplishments of the elements of the Opinion and BA (BLM June 26, 1999, report; USFS July 13, 1999, report). The IIT has also identified a team to evaluate how well batching and bundling was accomplished and make recommendations to help guide future batching/bundling efforts.</p> <p>5. Issue from first evaluation period - Lack of progress on the mechanism addressing unroaded areas                      Action - The IIT recommends: (a) that the regional executives assist the IIT in making this a priority and procuring the time of agency scientists to be members of the unroaded areas task team; and (b) that this task team accelerate their efforts to accomplish the mechanism.</p> <p>Status - After difficulties obtaining staff time to complete this requirement of the Opinion, this task is underway, with the team having met twice and taking steps (described below under Mechanism 3) to accomplish this task.</p> <p>6. Issue from first evaluation period - Lack of recent review of how well management agencies are exercising existing authorities, particularly with respect to actions involving mining, ANILCA, and the Ditch Act.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends that it: (a) oversee the compilation of a list of these authorities; (b) provide direction to management units to clarify existing authorities; and (c) periodically evaluate if management units' use of their authorities meets the requirement in the Opinion.</p> <p>Status - An IIT subgroup has begun this process by providing a list of the questions which should be answered to clarify existing authorities. This list will be refined by a larger task team. The IIT subgroup will then request answers to these questions from experts among the action agencies. The questions and answers will be summarized in a memorandum from the IIT. The June 26, 1999, and July 13, 1999, implementation reports from the management units indicate that most units</p>

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
					<p>determined existing authorities are being exercised, whereas some units reaffirmed the need for further clarification of those existing authorities. There is a need for consistent interpretation of authorities/policies between Forests and Districts.</p> <p>7. Issue from first evaluation period -Lack of information on how well management units are implementing the special management considerations for projects in the South Fork Salmon, Middle Fork Salmon, and Selway River subbasins.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends that the IIT obtain from each relevant management unit a summary of how these management considerations are incorporated in project design.</p> <p>Status - The June 26, 1999, and July 13, 1999, implementation reports from the management units indicate that the special management considerations, where applicable, are either in progress or completed.</p> <p>8. Issue from first evaluation period -Need for clearer vision of the multi-year strategies to accelerate restoration, per Opinion mechanism 5b.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends that the IIT provide a description of what is envisioned, in addition to the specific wording in the Opinion, to guide primarily the restoration team, and also other teams whose products will be used in developing the restoration strategy.</p> <p>Status - Accomplished.</p> <p>9. Issue from first evaluation period - Lack of information on implementation of BA recommendations.</p> <p>Action - The IIT recommends that it request this information from the management units and their level 1 teams.</p> <p>Status - The June 26, 1999, and July 13, 1999, implementation reports from the management units provide this information. The implementation of BA recommendations were generally reported as either completed or in progress, with some specific notes from each unit expounding on the “in progress” rating.</p> <p>1) The IIT identified a need to begin addressing long term elements of mechanism 5. The long term elements will be needed if the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP) is not in effect for the 2000 field season. Current information indicates ICBEMP will not be in effect for the 2000 field season.</p>

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
					<p>2) The IIT recommends revising the management unit surveys so the second semi-annual survey includes BA recommendation 1 and provides clearer information on the level of units' accomplishments.</p> <p>3) The IIT recommends that the strategy for restoration funding/program of work review (mechanisms 1c and 5b) be completed as soon as possible.</p>
2000	3	7	Level 1 / 2 Meeting Missoula, MT, March 2 notes and enclosures- Letter to Cindy Swanson	I (Gordon Haugen) was disappointed to hear that we, the Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) have not been effective in keeping the Level 1 and 2 teams up to speed on actions that IIT has taken to meet our agencies responsibilities as outlined in the IIT Charter signed by the Regional Foresters in December 1998. I recognize that this was the first meeting of the Western Montana Level 2 coordinators and probably should have expected their reactions, however, the Level 1 team members present at the meeting also seem to be lacking in knowledge. I am forwarding to you some of our recent correspondence and web sites that you may want to share with the Level 1 and 2 people in your region to help bridge the information gap. I could have sent the information to them directly, but I think it would be better if it came from you as Director of Fish and Wildlife in Region 1.	Element documents linked. ...could be available in the later part of March or in April to come over and present to your Montana level one and two teams the presentation that was given to Regional Executives on the 17 the February
2000	3	9	Implementation of the "Grazing Implementation Module"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cards provide a consistent accounting system to assist land managers in separating pasture/use areas that require more attention (Pastures of special concern for some reason, i.e., fragile ground, past degradation, continued non-compliance) from those pasture/use areas that are meeting or moving towards PACFISH/INFISH Riparian Management Objectives.</li> <li>• The cards should assist the field units, Level 1 Teams and permittees in maintaining consistent, enduring and defensible implementation monitoring procedures and reporting.</li> <li>• As field units and permittees become more experienced in the application of the Module, consistent approaches and reporting will provide clear communication among all parties interested in protecting, maintaining and restoring stream-riparian and rangeland resources.</li> <li>• The Module has four parts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Implementation instructions to federal land managers responsible for application of the PACFISH/INFISH Management Strategy (Implementation letter).</li> <li>○ Background Information to assist the reader in determining "why" and "where" the module is necessary.</li> <li>○ The Implementation Monitoring Module Cards, instructions, and self-</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	The application of the Module will meet the grazing <u>implementation</u> monitoring requirements of the salmon, steelhead and bull trout PACFISH and INFISH Biological Opinions (BOs) issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service on June 19, 1998, and by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on August 14, 1998.

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>explanatory questions on the individual cards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Appendices that provide definition of terms, more detailed explanation of the Module components, and information papers with scientific references.</li> </ul> <p>Listed below are the major changes in the Module between 1999 and 2000:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Card 1 will be filled out on ALL FS/BLM pasture/use areas (including “no effect” pasture/use areas/allotments, except for scattered tract Groups 1-4, as described in appendix E). Card 1 will provide the basis for integrating grazing management prescriptions with PACFISH/INFISH conservation direction and Level 1 Team efforts to reduce incidental take. Card 1 will provide the PACFISH/INFISH Effectiveness Monitoring Group (Monitoring Teams from the FS/BLM Monitoring Center in Logan) with a list of all pasture/use areas/allotments that could be randomly selected for Effectiveness Monitoring (A separate Module). Card 2 will provide for annual evaluation of grazing and also provide a feedback loop for adaptive management discussions between agency specialists, permittees and Level 1 teams.</li> <li>2. Scattered Tracts, except for Group 5, as defined in appendix E, have been excluded from the Grazing Implementation Monitoring Module. However this does not exclude them from other agency monitoring or additional monitoring required by project level consultations.</li> <li>3. Pasture/use area Category descriptions have been refined and clarified.</li> <li>4. Direction is provided to Level 1 Teams to achieve consistent application of the Grazing Implementation Monitoring Module through: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Integration of Level 1 efforts to avoid or reduce incidental take and ensure resource protection on pastures/use areas of concern.</li> <li>b. Create a regular grazing staff/permittee/Level 1 Team feedback loop where management failures have occurred, using information from all of the Module’s cards for an allotment’s pastures, to adaptively modify management and monitoring requirements.</li> </ol> </li> <li>5. Residual stubble height (Median) is the end of season measure of success. In some cases, residual stubble height may not be applicable because of site-specific conditions. FS/BLM Resource Staff, in cooperation with Level 1 Teams and permittees, will develop a monitoring endpoint for that specific area if there is supporting scientific literature. Question 10 in Module background and Appendix F and H discusses potential end of season parameters associated</li> </ol>	

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>with scientific literature.</p> <p>6. Random sub-sampling of end of season compliance (median residual stubble height) of at least 40% Category I and 10% Category II currently grazed pastures/use areas. The end of season indicator is a link to effectiveness monitoring. Project level biological opinions may require additional end point measures for pastures of special concern. All monitoring must be supported by scientific literature.</p> <p>7. There is no longer an action agency requirement for 20% sub-sampling of livestock move triggers.</p> <p>8. Permittees will be encouraged to conduct monitoring to determine livestock moves. Training will be established to familiarize permittees with current monitoring protocols.</p> <p>9. Mandatory use reporting by permittees has been dropped.</p>	
2000	4	6	1999 Grazing Implementation Module - Recompilation of Reports, Reply due April 21	<p>Please recompile the data so that 1999 data will be compatible with the future 2000 report. The 2000 reporting format is a significant improvement over the original 1999 format. This memo includes the instructions and an <u>attached spreadsheet for you to record your data.</u></p> <p>A major change from the first round is that you are not being asked to upward report the names of pastures that did not meet end-of-season condition requirements. However, you will want to keep a list for your records. See items 5c., 6c., and 7c., for further clarification. The instructions follow below.</p> <p>NOTE: For items 1-4, exclude “no affect” pastures. <u>Use the definition for “no affect” given in the 1999 Grazing Implementation Monitoring Module, Appendix A. Glossary of Terms.</u> This definition changes in 2000.</p>	Recompilation of reports for the 1999 Grazing Implementation Monitoring Module..of units <u>NOT</u> ... received
2000	4	7	Interagency consultation streamlining process	<p><i>Actions to be taken by the Level 4 coordinators</i></p> <p>1. Develop an interagency training program to improve the agencies’ collective knowledge of the streamlining process by field staff and managers in the Forest Service (FS), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Training would focus on: new managers and Level 1 and 2 team members; issues such as how to deal with new listed species (particularly wide-ranging species); and questions about interpretation and application of streamlining procedures. A proposal has been developed by the Level 3 team for organizing local training workshops (see enclosure 1). Additional staff work by the Level 3 team is needed to further develop the training program and curriculum,</p>	In an effort to continuously improve implementation of the streamlining process and to reaffirm our commitments to this program, we are directing our respective field units to adopt the following guidance and support the actions described below to be taken by the Interagency Level 4 Coordinators.

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>assemble an interagency training cadre, and implement the training program.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Establish an interagency team to review the NMFS (salmon and steelhead) and FWS (bull trout) effect matrices, and address specific technical and policy issues identified by field staff.</li> <li>3. Establish an interagency team to explore and recommend ways to expedite land management plan, programmatic, and batched action consultations. A report summarizing this effort will be prepared by the team for Regional Executive review.</li> <li>4. Request that Regional Executives expedite resolution of outstanding issues such as water conveyance and road access issues that have been elevated to the national level.</li> </ol> <p>Supplemental Guidance for Level 1 and 2 Teams</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Level 1 and 2 teams that are not fully functioning are to follow the following steps:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Managers should ensure that interagency teams are in place;</li> <li>(b) Managers should encourage agency personnel to coordinate issues through the teams and use the streamlining process rather than circumventing it;</li> <li>(c) Workshops should be organized (see enclosed training proposal);</li> <li>(d) Level 1 teams in adjacent geographical areas should be encouraged to meet jointly to compare notes regarding the consultation process in an effort to ensure consistency of approaches across teams. Managers should actively encourage team members to identify any problems in carrying out the streamlining program so that they can be identified and addressed as soon as possible.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Based on concerns raised regarding the relationship between sections 7(d) and 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act, and questions regarding the applicability of section 10(a)(1)(A) permits to recovery-related projects, supplemental Questions and Answers (Q&amp;A's) addressing these issues have been developed (see enclosure 2; see also July 1999, guidance, pp. 1-5, Phase 2 Section, Question 1, Sections II-C, and II-F).</li> <li>3. Field personnel should have a good working knowledge of the guidance and the related Q&amp;A's. Some issues raised by the Level 1, 2, and 3 teams are already addressed in the guidance. Particular attention should be given to sections regarding: consultation time lines, what constitutes a complete Biological Assessment (BA), streamlining structure, and the use of Level 2 teams for elevations. We believe that if the basic streamlining protocol is being implemented, procedural inefficiencies in section 7 consultation will be reduced.</li> <li>4. Level 1 teams should review and sign off on the adequacy of final BAs</li> </ol>	

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>before they are submitted to the regulatory agencies. When the action agency submits the BA, as finalized by the Level 1 team, the agency's cover letter requesting consultation should reference the Level 1 team review and conclusions. The clock relative to consultation streamlining deadlines begins to run as of the date the BA, as approved by the Level 1 team, is formally received by NMFS/FWS. Subsequent modification to the proposed action by action agencies may require adjusting the deadline. (See also the July 1999, guidance, pp. I-4,5, Question 1, Section II-F).</p> <p>For actions that are not likely to adversely affect listed species or critical habitat, submitted via final BAs with Level 1 team sign-off, FWS and NMFS will provide a standard concurrence letter that incorporates by reference the Level 1-approved BA analysis. (See also the July 1999, guidance, Section II-C, 1).</p> <p>For actions that are likely to adversely affect listed species, assuming Level 1 team sign-off on final BAs, the FWS, NMFS, BLM, and FS as appropriate, will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) send the action agency "notice" (letter or e-mail) acknowledging receipt of the BA within 2 weeks;</li> <li>(b) request time extensions if either Service needs more time to complete consultation within 2 weeks;</li> <li>© request any additional information needed within two weeks of receiving the BA (however, such requests should be minimal due to Level 1 team review and sign-off); and</li> <li>(d) action agencies will contact regulatory agencies regarding the disposition of the BA if notice is not received within two weeks.</li> </ul> <p>[See also the July 1999, guidance, Section, II-C,1].</p> <p>5. Administrative units should consider watershed analysis results and recommendations (where completed and appropriate), project support rationale, and anticipated interagency agreed-upon project design criteria that avoid and minimize take of listed species into National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents prior to development of the BA. This should reduce the need for additional information requests or terms and conditions during the consultation process. (See also the July 1999, guidance, Section II-E,1).</p> <p>6. Discontinue quarterly interagency reporting. The consultation databases of the respective agencies can provide that information on an as needed basis. (See also the July 1999, guidance, Section II-D-2, items 6 and 7).</p>	

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
2000	4	25	Field Unit Semi-Annual Report Reply Due May 15	Enclosed is the field unit semi-annual report form that needs to be completed and returned to your respective Regional Forester with attention to your Regional Fish and Wildlife (FWL) Director by May 15	The Field Unit Semiannual Report is to be completed by each May 15 <sup>th</sup> and November 15 <sup>th</sup> . Information obtained from these reports is to be forwarded to the field unit's Interagency Implementation Team representative for compilation and forwarding to the regulatory agencies.
2000	5	1	Mechanism 5: Steelhead BO - Reply Due May 20	<p>The Steelhead Biological Opinion (BO) mechanism 5 states “in the event that the ICBEMP is not completed by the FY 2000 field season, it will be necessary to have the long-term strategy policy in place for the conservation for anadromous fish.”</p> <p>In order to begin complying with the BOs 5.d.2. requirement, each field unit is asked to identify the subbasin which they have or will be completing by the end of fiscal year 2000.</p> <p>The IIT subbasin task team will review the selected subbasin in context with subbasins throughout the Columbia River Basin. Information will be forwarded back to the forests and resource areas as to the appropriateness of their subbasin selections. The IIT, after consultation with the Regional Executives, will provide additional direction for completing the subbasin review</p>	Based on an assessment by the Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) subbasin task team, the protocol being proposed in the ICBEMP, DEIS (Chapter 3) will address the BO 5.d.2. commitment, with two caveats that are presently being discussed with several regional executives (1) peer review, for example, the IIT subbasin review task team and (2) accountability.
2000	6	23	Third Semi-Annual Accomplishments September 16, 1997 BO June 22, 1998 BO - LRMPs	<p><u>I. Additional Recommended Actions IIT Identifies in this Third Evaluation Period</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The IIT recommends the Restoration Task Team continue to seek consistency/understanding between IIT restoration protocol and restoration efforts of other entities (states, tribes, other federal agencies, model watershed groups, etc.).</li> <li>2) The IIT identified the need for the Unroaded Task Team to continue to coordinate with ICBEMP and the USFS National Roadless Team to avoid overlap and duplication of efforts and increase understanding.</li> <li>3) The IIT recommends the Monitoring Task Team coordinate the development of the Implementation Monitoring Modules with the ICBEMP staff.</li> <li>4) The IIT is disbanding the roads database task team. This action acknowledges the completion of work done by the Road Database Team and the Priority Watershed Team that meets the obligations in the BA and Opinion. Some task team members have been selected to participate in development of the road-monitoring module and assist the interagency Level 4 team with programmatic road guidance.</li> </ol>	This memorandum provides a status report from the Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) on the outstanding issues and accomplishment of requirements in the United States Forest Service (USFS)/ Bureau of Land Management (BLM) September 16, 1997, biological assessment (BA) and National Marine Fisheries Service's (NMFS) June 22, 1998, biological opinion (Opinion).

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>5) The IIT recommends accelerating progress on Mechanism #5, subbasin assessments. Initial team members were identified, with final team composition determined in the April IIT meeting.</p> <p>6) The IIT recommends an increased emphasis be placed on completion of the task team assignment to evaluate efficiencies that can be gained by bundling/batching of projects.</p> <p><u>II. Status of Outstanding Recommended Actions from IIT's First and Second Evaluation</u></p> <p>During previous evaluation periods the IIT found that most of the Opinion's mechanisms and sub-elements were underway and several had already been accomplished, though not always on schedule. The following elements are specific actions, which the IIT recommended to improve implementation of requirements in the BA and Opinion, and the status of these actions through the end of the third evaluation period and up to the date of this memorandum.</p> <p>First Evaluation Period (May 13, 1999)</p> <p>Issue #1. Insufficient intra-agency understanding of Opinion requirements and their implementation.</p> <p><i>Action</i> - The IIT recommended: (a) briefing the executives on the requirements of the Opinion and accomplishments to date; and, (b) increasing management units' understanding of the Opinion's requirements by conducting a one-day workshop to inform and gather ideas from management units.</p> <p><i>Status</i> - Item a) has been accomplished with annual briefings (February 8, 1999, and February 17, 2000) to the Regional Executives. Item b) was partially accomplished with a series of workshops during Spring 1999 and 2000 regarding the IIT monitoring task team's grazing implementation monitoring module; however, the majority of the requirements in the BA and Opinion have not been presented in a workshop format. To better communicate with the field, a chronology of direction/accomplishments related to implementation of the Opinion has been made available on a WEB site (<a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish">www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish</a>). Based on these actions, the IIT concludes the issue has not been fully addressed.</p>	

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>Issue #2. Need for feedback on and improvement of management units' batching/bundling of projects.</p> <p><i>Action</i> - The IIT recommended that the IIT summarize management units' input and provide overall guidance to the units on effective procedures for batching/bundling.</p> <p><i>Status</i> - The IIT has identified a team to evaluate how well batching and bundling was accomplished and make recommendations to help guide future batching/bundling efforts. In some locations, Level 1 teams have accomplished this task and can provide constructive feedback to the team. Currently, this team has not been active due to a lack of agency commitment and team leadership.</p> <p>Issue #3. Lack of recent review of how well management agencies are exercising existing authorities, particularly with respect to actions involving mining, ANILCA, and the Ditch Act.</p> <p><i>Action</i> - The IIT recommended that it: (a) oversee the compilation of a list of these authorities; (b) provide direction to management units to clarify existing authorities; and (c) periodically evaluate if management units' use of their authorities meets the requirement in the Opinion.</p> <p><i>Status</i> - The IIT has assigned a task team to refine an initial list of questions to clarify existing authorities. The IIT will then request answers to these questions from experts among the involved agencies. The questions and answers will be summarized in a memorandum from the IIT. The status of this task was discussed at the February 2000 IIT meeting, with consideration of options to address this topic. Options included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) deferral of this task to the Interagency Level 4 team; and/or</li> <li>2) convening a new task team.</li> </ol> <p>No decision was made; therefore, the IIT will need to give this item added attention.</p> <p>Issue #4. Lack of information on implementation of BA recommendations.</p> <p><i>Action</i> - The IIT recommended that it request BA implementation information from the management units and their level 1 teams.</p> <p><i>Status</i> - The June 26, 1999, July 13, 1999, and December 22, 1999 (BLM only),</p>	

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>implementation reports from the management units provide this information. The implementation of BA recommendations were generally reported as either completed or in progress, with some specific notes from each unit clarifying the meaning of the “in progress” rating. Following feedback from field units, the report framework is being modified to reflect percent completion, projected completion dates, and to provide additional space for comments. This information will be requested of the field, gathered by State/Regional Office, reported to the State Director/Regional Forester, and presented to the IIT, who will then use this information in developing future field reviews.</p> <p>Second Evaluation Period (October 14, 1999)</p> <p>Issue #1. Begin addressing long-term elements of mechanism #5 (subbasin assessments).</p> <p><i>Action</i> - The long-term elements described in the Opinion (Mechanism #5) will be needed because ICBEMP will not be in effect for the 2000 field season.</p> <p><i>Status</i> - The IIT has convened a small group to evaluate the expectations associated with Mechanism #5. This has been completed and reported to the IIT. The IIT has also designated a new task team to evaluate agreed upon methodologies for conducting subbasin assessments, with your approval.</p> <p>Issue #2. Inclusion of Recommendation #1 into management unit surveys. Recommendation #1 involves the continued application of NMFS 1995 LRMP Opinion and all subsequent related direction, and extending application to the Clearwater and upper Columbia River basins.</p> <p><i>Action</i> – The IIT recommends revising the management unit surveys so the second semi-annual survey includes BA recommendation 1 and provides clearer information on the level of units’ accomplishments.</p> <p><i>Status</i> – Management unit surveys have been revised to incorporate BA recommendation #1. To date (for this third evaluation period), reports have only been received from OR/WA and ID/MT BLM units. Where applicable, the implementation of BA recommendation #1 was generally reported as “in progress”.</p> <p>Issue #3. Completion of restoration funding/program of work review.</p>	

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p><i>Action</i> – The IIT recommends additional emphasis be given to the restoration task team to prioritize completion of the Interim Restoration Strategy.</p> <p><i>Status</i> - The restoration task team has completed a final draft of the strategy (dated November 10, 1999). The task team has evaluated the FY 2000 funding/program of work to ensure consistency in the application of the strategy. It is anticipated to have a rollout letter and the strategy presented to the IIT in April, 2000.</p>	
2000	8	3	Cover letter for sending: Interim Watershed Restoration Strategy	The strategy provides a prioritization model and an implementation framework intended to contribute to recovery of aquatic habitat and watershed function. The strategy should be used to guide aquatic restoration program development until a long-term strategy is adopted.	Enclosed are 15 copies of <i>An Interim Watershed Restoration Strategy</i> . Development and implementation of this strategy are required by the biological opinions for Chinook salmon and steelhead (Snake River and upper Columbia River) and bull trout (Columbia and Klamath Rivers in areas not covered by the Northwest Forest Plan)
2001	1	2	EA correction for INFISH -GIS data separate	The priority watershed network acreages in the INFISH EA were corrected based on more accurate mapping using the Geographic Information System (GIS)	A correction of the Inland Native Fish Strategy (INFISH) Environmental Assessment (EA) was completed on December 4, 2000, (enclosure). The priority watershed network acreages in the INFISH EA were corrected based on more accurate mapping using the Geographic Information System (GIS)
2001	1	19	Supplement to PACFISH, INFISH Biological Opinions	<p>This letter transmits a Supplement to the National Marine Fisheries Service’s (NMFS) and Fish and Wildlife Service’s (FWS) 1998 Biological Opinions on Land and Resource Management Plans for National Forest and Bureau of Land Management Resource Areas in the Upper Columbia River Basin and Snake River Basins. The Supplement was prepared to update the 1998 opinions, in light of the passage of over two years since these consultations on interim direction were completed.</p> <p>Earlier today we signed a letter transmitting a supplement to our PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions. Following the signing of that document it was brought to our attention that there was a need to continue our dialogue with the action agencies on this document and additional ICBEMP consultation issues.</p>	<p>The Services have determined, based on the information, analysis, and assumptions described in this Supplement, that continued implementation of the interim direction is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the listed fish species addressed in the 1998 Opinions, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of their designated critical habitat, while the long-term direction in the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP) is being refined and consultation on the ICBEMP is being completed. In making this determination, NMFS and FWS considered the current status of the listed species, the environmental baseline conditions, the cumulative effects of actions anticipated in the action area, the likely effects of continued implementation of the amended LRMPs (including implementation of the 1998 Opinions), and the anticipated effects of actions taken and decisions made since the 1998 Opinions. We have found that the land management agencies have made excellent progress in implementing and adapting current direction over an extended time frame that was not contemplated when the interim strategies were adopted in 1995.</p> <p>In the Services’ 1998 Opinions, we noted that PACFISH and INFISH were not designed to provide landscape-scale, long-term aquatic conservation strategies for listed species but were intended as an interim strategy until a long-term strategy could be developed. The ICBEMP was designed as an outcome-based, ecosystem management strategy. ICBEMP is focused on restoring and maintaining ecosystems across the project area and providing for the social and economic needs of people,</p>

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
					<p>while reducing short- and long-term risks to natural resources from human and natural disturbances. One of the goals of this strategy will be to guide project level decisions for the conservation and recovery of listed species and their designated critical habitat over the long-term. The Services have been working collaboratively with the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management over the last several years on the ICBEMP and its final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Services anticipate that continued collaboration between the land management agencies and the regulatory agencies will result in adoption of a long-term strategy that will meet all applicable ESA standards.</p> <p>Earlier today we signed a letter transmitting a supplement to our PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions. Following the signing of that document it was brought to our attention that there was a need to continue our dialogue with the action agencies on this document and additional ICBEMP consultation issues. While we incorporated some of your comments in this document, additional questions were raised regarding this supplement which may not be reflected in the document we are transmitting today. The questions that you raised are of concern to us and we want to ensure that these issues are addressed. During our discussions if we find that it is necessary to amend this document, we will be pleased to consider doing so</p>
2001	3	22	IIT-Interagency Implementation Team, FY2000 Summary	<p>Enclosed is a summary report for Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) calendar year 2000 activities. The report summarizes the: (1) IIT Charter; (2) monitoring activities; (3) road accomplishments; and (4) accountability achieved through reporting.</p> <p>The IIT has provided interagency leadership and policy direction for the implementation of both the PACFISH and INFISH amended LRMP's and has maintained coordination with ICBEMP staff and workgroups to minimize duplication and ensure Task Team products are as compatible as possible with projected long-term plans. Products developed by the teams such as riparian monitoring protocols, processes to prioritize restoration actions, identification of steelhead, Chinook and Bull trout watersheds, road restoration directions, RDAT findings and subbasins analysis have been or will be transmitted to the field shortly for application. These products need to be applied and used to manage resources and we see implementation of these products as essential. We recommended that any final long-term direction place emphasis on the application of the products developed by the IIT.</p>	<p>Below are specific recommendations for FY 2001.</p> <p>The IIT recommends:</p> <p>Participate in the transitioning from the short to the long term CRB aquatic management strategies as out lined in the Mechanisms and addressed by the IIT Task Teams by:</p> <p>Continuing to work with the ICBEMP monitoring group and were possible adopting monitoring developed by the IIT or modify to meet the CRB aquatic long-term requirements.</p> <p>Continuing to implement the Grazing Implementation and Effectiveness Monitoring Module and reporting requirements in FY-2001.</p> <p>Implementing the timber, minerals and recreation implementation monitoring modules piloted in 2000 in FY-2000</p> <p>Acting CRB Coordinator continue to lead the IIT.</p>

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
					<p>Take the lead in ensuring that products developed by the IIT /Task Team are transmitted to, understood and applied by the field units, conduct field reviews and assist in and evaluate implementation.</p> <p>Implement recommendations contained in the Road Density Analysis Team (RDAT) report.</p>
2001	7	16	PACFISH, INFISH Implementation Monitoring Modules - Reply Due Nov 1, 2001	<p>The Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) has developed four new implementation monitoring modules to be tested in FY 2001. These four modules include Vegetation (harvest, prescribed fire, and non-timber special, noxious weeds), Recreation (developed sites), Minerals, and Wildland Fire (suppression). The modules have been designed to meet the implementation monitoring needs of the Forest Service PACFISH and INFISH and the legal requirements of the Biological Opinions for salmon (March 1, 1995) and steelhead (June 19, 1998) issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service, and for bull trout (August 14, 1998) issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Field units will implement these pilot modules beginning this field season.</p> <p>The pilot year objectives are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Evaluate the modules to ensure they are simple, practical and can be implemented consistently.</li> <li>2. Assess the cost and workload required to implement these modules; and</li> <li>3. Evaluate the module design to ensure that it is providing broad scale compliance information without causing redundant monitoring efforts.</li> </ol> <p>A copy of the pilot modules can be obtained from the <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish/">http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish/</a>.</p> <p>Directions for implementing the modules during 2001 are found in Enclosure 1. Clarification of what constitutes a “project” is found in each of the modules.</p> <p>By November 1, each unit will report results of pilot implementation. The report will address main elements of the listed objectives and clarity of direction and ease of implementation for individual modules. Point persons will coordinate with the field units, the IIT, the Monitoring team, and Regional/State Fisheries Program Managers in addressing pilot year objectives and to assist in development of a summary report. Additional guidance on reporting format will be provided by August 1. Report information will be analyzed and out-year monitoring proposals presented to the Interagency Implementation Team executives for decision in early</p>	<p>By November 1, each unit will report results of pilot implementation. The report will address main elements of the listed objectives and clarity of direction and ease of implementation for individual modules. Point persons will coordinate with the field units, the IIT, the Monitoring team, and Regional/State Fisheries Program Managers in addressing pilot year objectives and to assist in development of a summary report. Additional guidance on reporting format will be provided by August 1. Report information will be analyzed and out-year monitoring proposals presented to the Interagency Implementation Team executives for decision in early February 2002</p>

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				February 2002.	
2001	11	15	FY 2001 <i>Grazing Implementation Monitoring</i> Module reporting -Reply Due: Jan 3, 2002	We are requesting that field units report their FY 2001 Grazing Implementation Monitoring accomplishments. The format used for FY 2001 is similar to FY 1999, 2000 (Instructions enclosed for filling out the separate spreadsheet). The FY 2000 results are enclosed for your information.	Data request
2001	11	27	Field Unit annual Report - Reply Due Jan 8, 2002	Enclosed is the annual Paefish/Infish report to be completed by your staff. This report is due by January 8, 2002, to your respective Regional Fish and Wildlife (FWL) Director. The FWL Director will review and consolidate the reports and bring them to the January Interagency Implementation Team Meeting where they will be consolidated with the Bureau of Land Managements responses to produce an annual reporting to the Regulatory Agencies as to accomplishments in completing the Biological Opinions for Steelhead, Bull Trout, and Chinook salmon.	Data request
2002	4	3	Road Density Analysis Team final report	<p>The Biological Opinions on Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMPs) for Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) units within the Snake and Upper Columbia River Basins (CRB), for bull trout, require that the federal land management agencies develop an assessment of road construction and management, including identification of unroaded and low road density areas and their value to bull trout (Term and Condition #5). The 1998 Salmon and Steelhead Biological Opinion covering LRMPs within the Upper Columbia Basin and Snake River Basin Evolutionarily Significant Units requires a similar analysis (Appendix 2, Mechanism 3).</p> <p>The Road Density Analysis Team (RDAT) accomplished this task in accordance with the December 11, 1998, Charter for Implementing Biological Opinions through an Interagency Implementation Team (IIT). The RDAT completed a coarse-scale analysis using existing information and further described the relative value of low road density areas within each subbasin for salmon, steelhead, and bull trout within the Upper Columbia and Snake River basins. The 1998 Salmon/Steelhead (Mechanism 3c) and Bull trout (5c) Biological Opinions directed that the RDAT review this information and make recommendations regarding the need for additional habitat protection to senior level managers. The six RDAT recommendations adopted by the Regional Executives (RDAT Report, Executive Summary, p.6) are discussed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>RDAT Recommendation (1)</u>: The IIT should solicit a peer review of this analysis, along with coordination and review of this report with any National teams addressing roads and roadless areas, to ensure the approach, technical processes,</li> </ul>	<p><u>Regional Executive Decision</u>: Peer review and coordination with appropriate National teams was completed. The final RDAT report incorporates these comments and recommendations.</p> <p><u>Regional Executive Decision</u>: If significant new information becomes available regarding road densities or listed fish we will assess whether the RDAT report should be updated, or whether the new information would better be addressed through other ongoing analysis or planning processes.</p> <p><u>Regional Executive Decision</u>: We believe that condensing the document would reduce its value, and have chosen not to do so. This letter transmits the report to the field, as recommended by the RDAT and IIT.</p> <p><u>Regional Executive Decision</u>: While we agree that avoiding road construction in low road density areas with high to very high fish values may be desirable, we also recognize that providing direction precluding such development could conflict in some instances with our legal obligations under laws such as the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) and the 1872 Mining Laws. Rather than totally precluding such development, the BLM State Directors and Regional Foresters, through this transmittal letter, direct field units as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Avoid new road construction in low road density areas to the extent practical, consistent with existing authorities and LRMPs, but keep in mind that in some cases the need to remove hazardous fuels may be paramount for long term watershed restoration,</p>

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>and conclusions are reasonable.</p> <p><u>Regional Executive Decision:</u> Peer review and coordination with appropriate National teams was completed. The final RDAT report incorporates these comments and recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>RDAT Recommendation (2):</u> Assess the need for an update of this analysis every 3-5 years when there are significant updates in broad-scale information.</li> </ul> <p><u>Regional Executive Decision:</u> If significant new information becomes available regarding road densities or listed fish we will assess whether the RDAT report should be updated, or whether the new information would better be addressed through other ongoing analysis or planning processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>RDAT Recommendation (3):</u> After IIT acceptance of this analysis, a condensed version of this report should be prepared and distributed to field units in the analysis area.</li> </ul> <p><u>Regional Executive Decision:</u> We believe that condensing the document would reduce its value, and have chosen not to do so. This letter transmits the report to the field, as recommended by the RDAT and IIT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>RDAT Recommendation (4):</u> The Regional Executives provide direction to the field units that allow for road construction in undesignated low road density areas only after completion of the mid/fine scale analysis of these areas.</li> </ul> <p><u>Regional Executive Decision:</u> While we agree that avoiding road construction in low road density areas with high to very high fish values may be desirable, we also recognize that providing direction precluding such development could conflict in some instances with our legal obligations under laws such as the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) and the 1872 Mining Laws. Rather than totally precluding such development, the BLM State Directors and Regional Foresters, through this transmittal letter, direct field units as follows:</p> <p>A. Avoid new road construction in low road density areas to the extent practical, consistent with existing authorities and LRMPs, but keep in mind that in some cases the need to remove hazardous fuels may be paramount for long term watershed restoration,</p> <p>B. Decisions to allow new road construction in low road density areas should</p>	<p>Decisions to allow new road construction in low road density areas should not be made without an assessment of environmental effects, including any changes to the value of the low road density area as a current or potential stronghold for listed aquatic species. This assessment and/or analysis should also consider the amount of acreage within the watershed already in Wilderness and inventoried roadless areas, and</p> <p>Where new road development in low road density areas cannot be avoided, road location and design should minimize effects to aquatic resources and incorporate practical mitigation measures, including closure or decommissioning of the road if the need for the road is temporary.</p> <p><u>Regional Executive Decision:</u> The need for another IIT sub-team to develop guidance information, and tools to the field units in the analysis area for completion of the mid/fine scale analysis of individual low road density areas was determined by the IIT to not be warranted at this time. Field Unit participation in the Northwest Power Planning Council's subbasin planning process will provide a forum for refining this coarse-scale analysis with higher resolution, locally derived information.</p>

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>not be made without an assessment of environmental effects, including any changes to the value of the low road density area as a current or potential stronghold for listed aquatic species. This assessment and/or analysis should also consider the amount of acreage within the watershed already in Wilderness and inventoried roadless areas, and</p> <p>C. Where new road development in low road density areas cannot be avoided, road location and design should minimize effects to aquatic resources and incorporate practical mitigation measures, including closure or decommissioning of the road if the need for the road is temporary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>RDAT Recommendation (6):</u></li> </ul> <p><i>(5) The IIT commissioned the subbasin assessment team to outline and provide guidance, information, and tools for the field units in the analysis area for completion of the mid/fine scale analysis of individual low road density areas. The opportunity to combine this task with other IIT tasks should be evaluated.</i></p> <p><i>(6) The field units refine this information on high value low road density areas through Subbasin Assessment and Watershed Analysis and apply it for both LRMP adjustments and the development of aquatic conservation and restoration strategies.</i></p>	
2002	4	25	All H Progress Report for the FS - FY 2001	<p>Please find the enclosed All H Progress Reports for the Forest Service (FS) for fiscal year 2001. The FS manages approximately 50 percent of the accessible anadromous fish habitat in the Columbia River Basin. Over the last several years, the FS has made significant progress in protecting and improving aquatic habitat. Our accomplishments in the area of habitat management and restoration can be summarized into three areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Habitat Protection - Our main focus is on protecting and maintaining habitat through protective measures. Our main protective strategies are PACFISH, INFISH and the Northwest Forest Plan. Taken together, these strategies guide management activities in or adjacent to streams where listed salmonids are present on public lands in the Columbia River Basin. Our standards are some of the most protective stream standards in the Columbia River Basin, and include a strong monitoring strategy.</li> <li>2. Restoration – Restoring salmonid habitat on public lands administered by the FS, in addition to acquiring salmonid habitat through land exchanges, are strategies the FS have undertaken to restore high quality habitat, and reconnect spawning and rearing habitat for salmonids.</li> </ol>	FY 2001 All H progress report sent to Bob Lohn, National Marine Fisheries Service.

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
				<p>3. Coordination - Coordination of restoration activities, watershed planning, data sharing, monitoring, and priority setting are also a critical components of FS efforts to improve and maintain salmonid habitat on federal lands.</p> <p>The enclosed Progress Reports provide a more detailed description of progress made in each of the areas.</p>	
2002	5	15	Revised All H Progress Report for the FS - FY 2001	Please find the enclosed revised All H Progress Report for the Forest Service (FS) for fiscal year 2001. This replaces our previously transmitted report. We have identified 4 key messages. Our key messages focus on Habitat Protection, Habitat Restoration, Coordination and Interagency Partnerships, and Integration of FS programs.	The enclosed Progress Report provides a more detailed description of progress made in each of the areas.
2002	6	13	Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 Biological Opinions for Salmon, Steelhead, and Bull Trout	The Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) Monitoring Task Team has completed the FY2002 Implementation Monitoring Module (Module). This Module has been designed to accommodate implementation monitoring of any federally authorized action that may affect Endangered Species Act listed salmonids	In response to comments from Field Units in 2001, a new format for the Module has been developed. The Module's data entry system is contained within an EXCEL spreadsheet. An Implementation Monitoring Manual (Manual) has been developed in Adobe Acrobat format (.pdf) with specific monitoring direction included.
2002	7	24	2002 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 BOs - link to Boise webpage	<p>This memorandum applies to all forests, which are required to comply with the 1998 Biological Opinions (BO's) for salmon, steelhead and bull trout. The specific forests involved in the annual monitoring will change in concert with the Effectiveness Monitoring project schedule and the previous year's determinations of non-compliance.</p> <p>This memorandum provides instruction on the current procedures for monitoring federally authorized activities in compliance with Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) decisions.</p>	To more efficiently transfer the measurements and monitoring data, effective immediately, all information and data gathered in support of the Implementation Monitoring Program at the Forest and District levels, will be entered through a new system contained within an EXCEL spreadsheet accessed at the above website.
2002	10	17	FAQs for Implementing PACFISH and INFISH BOs	<p>The following information is presented to help clarify aspects of the implementation monitoring in support of the PACFISH and INFISH biological opinions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When are monitoring module files due?</li> <li>2. Where do we send them?</li> <li>3. .Where do we report all authorized activities?</li> </ol> <p>What do we need to record for projects for which there are local consultation requirements?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. What about the completion of Category 1 pastures, per the directive?</li> <li>5. What if I have already done a Card 1 to meet previous directives?</li> <li>6. Do I need to enter a UTM locator?</li> <li>7. What if I run out of time on the grazing module input?</li> <li>8. Who are my Regional Office point persons?</li> <li>9. Who is my Forest coordinator?</li> </ol>	Data request

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
				Who is responsible for getting this done at the Forest level?	
2002	11	1	PACFISH, INFISH Effectiveness Monitoring- Reply Due Feb 14, 2003	<p>In 1998, the Aquatic Conservation Strategies, PACFISH and INFISH, were amended to Land Management Plans within the Columbia River basin. To oversee implementation of requirements described in the associated 1998 Biological Opinions for Salmon, Steelhead, and Bull Trout, an Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) was convened in 1999. Under the direction of the four federal agency Regional Executives (BLM, FS, USFWS, NMFS), the IIT was to ensure compliance with Biological Opinion requirements in a manner consistent with, and subject to, the federal land management agencies' capability to address these commitments.</p> <p>The Effectiveness Monitoring (EM) Strategy, developed by a sub-team of the IIT, was designed to assure consistency in data collection while being responsive to the federal land management agencies' (FS, BLM) need to be cost-effective and reduce redundancies at the field level. The EM Strategy has been "piloted" for three years at approximately 50 percent of the funding required to fully implement this strategy.</p> <p>We are requesting that all interior Columbia basin Forest Supervisors complete an assessment to determine how existing effectiveness monitoring costs can be reduced, with response back to Regional Directors by February 14, 2003. To complete the assessment, please address or respond to the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Identify, review, and compare the results of IIT Effectiveness Monitoring with those from existing forest programs currently being used to assess the effects of management on aquatic habitat conditions.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Can information collected under the IIT EM program replace ongoing aquatic habitat effectiveness monitoring required at the Forest Plan scale? If no, provide an explanation.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Can the information from the IIT EM program be used as a substitute for addressing site-level or above-project (landscape, watershed) aquatic habitat effectiveness monitoring questions? If no, provide an explanation.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Can the information from the IIT EM program be used to address existing effectiveness monitoring requirements as identified in project-level Biological Opinions for salmon, steelhead, and bull trout? If no, provide an explanation [Note: Information from the attached FY02 demonstration assessments (demo) could provide a useful model to answer this question].</p>	Data request
2003	2	6	Field Unit annual Report -	Enclosed is the PACFISH, INFISH annual report to be completed by your staff.	Data request

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
			Reply Due Feb 28, 2003	The report includes both a Questionnaire and Spreadsheet.  Information generated will be used to complete the annual report cards to NOAA-Fisheries and US Fish and Wildlife Service on implementation of legal obligations identified in the 1998 programmatic Salmon, Steelhead and Bull Trout Biological Opinions. In addition, the responses to both the questionnaire and spreadsheet will be compiled and incorporated into the annual Federal Caucus progress report that will be submitted to the CEQ Salmon Policy team. These annual progress reports are used to evaluate the level and type of federal agency actions needed to implement commitments identified in the All H Strategy.	
2004	3	3	ICB Aquatic/Riparian Draft Framework Charter	At the conclusion of the ICB Deputies Team meeting on February 20, 2004, we agreed to charter a small interagency team to draft a possible framework that would clarify and refine the aquatic and riparian portions of the ICB Strategy. The purpose of this possible framework is to assist local offices of our agencies implementing the ICB Strategy	unknown
2004	3	19	Field Unit annual Report - Reply Due April 23, 2004	Information generated will be used to complete the annual report cards to NOAA-Fisheries and US Fish and Wildlife Service on implementation of legal obligations identified in the 1998 programmatic Salmon, Steelhead and Bull Trout Biological Opinions. In addition, the responses to both the questionnaire and spreadsheet will be compiled and incorporated into the annual Federal Caucus progress report that will be submitted to the CEQ Salmon Policy team. These annual progress reports are used to evaluate the level and type of federal agency actions needed to implement commitments identified in the nine federal agencies <i>Basinwide Salmon Recovery Strategy</i> (All H Paper).	Data request
2004	4	21	Availability Of PACFISH /INFISH Implementation Monitoring Database For All Implementation Monitoring Within The Columbia River Basin (R4)	This is to inform you of the availability of the Interagency Implementation Team's (IIT) Monitoring Program for your use in FY-2004. Although this program was established in response to the 1998 Biological Opinions for Salmon, Steelhead, and Bull Trout, which do not apply to your forests, opportunities exist for use of the program for your Forest level or eco-regional monitoring programs.  None of this supersedes any other local consultation requirements to use the Implementation Monitoring database for reporting.	Informational
2004	5	25	2004 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 BOs for Salmon, Steelhead, and Bull trout, reply due Dec. 1, 2004 (R6)	This explains the Interagency Implementation Team's (IIT) Monitoring Program requirements for FY-2004. Grazing is the only element of the module that is required to be reported in FY-2004. Field managers are strongly encouraged to continue implementation of other components of the monitoring module to reduce redundancy, maintain consistency, and assess trends over time. A more formal training program to orient field managers and to update field practitioners in recent advances in the livestock grazing monitoring component is anticipated to occur in	Data request  A more formal training program to orient field managers and to update field practitioners in recent advances in the livestock grazing monitoring component is anticipated to occur in FY 2005.

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
			2004 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 BOs for Salmon, Steelhead, and Bull trout ( R1) (dated: June 28, 2004)	FY 2005.  The monitoring program was developed to provide field unit line officers with a mechanism for implementing the monitoring requirements of PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 Biological Opinions for salmon, steelhead, and bull trout. Line officers are accountable to assure that actions they take are consistent with these requirements. Accordingly, you should receive and act upon the results of implementation monitoring. The monitoring module contains a “Non-compliance” questionnaire and report, which you can use to evaluate the need to modify or refine management actions. In addition, the module contains a “Local” questionnaire with comment fields that can be used to track and report monitoring results based upon local monitoring requirements of land use plans and/or NEPA decisions resulting from local ESA consultations.	
2004	7	9	A Framework for incorporating the Aquatic and Riparian Component of ICB Strategy into BLM and FS plan Revisions	The purpose of this memorandum is to transmit to agency field offices the attached document titled “A Framework for Incorporating the Aquatic and Riparian Component of the Interior Columbia Basin Strategy into BLM and Forest Service Plan Revisions (Framework).” The attached Framework provides a consistent foundation for implementation of the Aquatic and Riparian Habitat component of the January 2003 Interior Columbia Basin Strategy (Strategy) in BLM and Forest Service plan revision efforts. The Framework does not change the Strategy but clarifies, interprets, and in some instances enhances the principles and guidance found in the Strategy. It facilitates consistency among plans in terms of the structure of riparian and aquatic components, while providing for a high level of discretion to agency decision makers in the substance of individual plan revisions. Responsibility for adopting management direction in resource management plans rests with the agency official responsible for approving the plan  For each component, a number of guiding principles, and in some cases definitions and examples, are provided or identified	
2004	7	9	Endangered Species Act Section 7 Streamlining Workshop in Boise, ID (ICS Memo ##)	We wanted to express our appreciation for your support and participation in the Section 7 streamlining workshop 1. Expanded use of Programmatic Consultations 2. Increased Emphasis on Co-locating Field Offices 3. Requests for Training 4. Streamlining improvements- functional and Procedural 5. Counterpart Regulations Streamlining, and National Fire Plan Design Criteria	
2004	7	23	1998 PACFISH & INFISH BOs- Line Mgr Cert Report	At the April interagency (FS, BLM, NOAA, USFWS) Interior Columbia Deputy Team meeting, the Deputies directed the Interagency Implementation Team (IIT)	Data request

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
			(LMCR) 2004-Reply Due Aug 18,2004  Wenatchee-Okanogan, Umatilla, and Wallowa Whitman National Forests, CRGNSA Managers	to develop a strategy for transitioning coordination, and accountability for the 1998 NMFS and USFWS Biological Opinions from the IIT to agency line managers. The IIT transition strategy includes replacement of the annual Field Questionnaire and FS, BLM report card with a simplified version (4 questions) to be completed by Forest Supervisors and BLM District Managers in coordination with their staffs, NOAA, and USFWS through Level ½ or similar interagency process.  The enclosure, <i>Line Manager Certification Report</i> , will be used to document implementation and compliance with PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 NMFS and USFWS Opinion requirements covering existing FS (and BLM) Land Management Plans, by administrative unit, FS Region/BLM State Offices, and at the scale of the interior Columbia basin.	
2004	7	29	Clarification of NMFS and USFWS 1998 BO requirements for completing Watershed Analysis	The purpose of this letter is to review the 1998 Opinion requirements, clarify the objectives of these assessments, and highlight the flexibility inherent in the assessment procedures. <i>Watershed Analysis</i> <i>What is it?</i> <i>What are the objectives of Watershed analysis and associated benefits to Line Managers?</i> <i>What is the appropriate methodology(s) for conducting Watershed Analysis?</i> <i>What are the expectations for Line Managers in completing Watershed Analyses?</i> <i>Subbasin-Scale Assessment (Required for Administrative Units with Anadromous Fish ONLY)</i> <i>What is it?</i> <i>What are the objectives of Subbasin-scale assessments and associated benefits to Line Managers?</i> <i>What is the appropriate methodology(s) for conducting Subbasin Assessments?</i> <i>What are the expectations for Line Managers in completing Subbasin Scale Assessments?</i>	Information for clarification
2004	11	16	1998 NMFS and USFWS BOs and 2003 (Jarbridge) Bull Trout BO -LMCR for 2004-Reply Due Jan 15, 2005	At the April, 2004 interagency (FS, BLM, NOAA, USFWS, EPA) Interior Columbia Deputy Team meeting, the Deputies directed the Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) to develop a strategy for transitioning coordination and accountability for implementation of the 1998 Interior Columbia Basin and 2003 Jarbidge Bull Trout Biological Opinions (PIBO) from the IIT to agency line managers. The PIBO/IIT transition strategy includes the replacement of the annual Field Questionnaire and FS, BLM report cards with a more simplified version (4 questions) to be completed by Forest Supervisors and BLM District Managers in coordination with USFWS through Level 2 or similar interagency process.	Data request

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>Responses to the questions are to be shared and discussed with the USFWS prior to submission.</p> <p>The <i>Line Manager Certification Report</i> {Enclosure} will be used to document implementation and compliance with INFISH and/or PACFISH and the 1998 and 2003 USFWS Opinion requirements covering existing FS and BLM Land Management Plans by administrative unit, FS region/BLM state offices, and at the scale of the interior Columbia basin.</p>	
2004	11	16	1998 Salmon, Steelhead, and Bull Trout BOs-LMCR Report for 2004	<p>At the April, 2004 interagency (FS, BLM, NOAA, USFWS, EPA) Interior Columbia Deputy Team meeting, the Deputies directed the Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) to develop a strategy for transitioning coordination and accountability for the 1998 NMFS and USFWS PACFISH and INFISH Biological Opinions (PIBO) from the IIT to agency line managers. The subsequent PIBO/IIT Transition Strategy includes replacement of the annual Field Questionnaire and FS, BLM report card with a simplified version (5 questions) to be completed by Forest Supervisors and BLM District Managers in coordination with NOAA Fisheries and USFWS, through Level 2 or similar interagency process. Responses to the questions are to be shared and discussed with NOAA Fisheries and the USFWS prior to submission.</p> <p>The <i>Line Manager Certification Report</i> {Enclosure} will be used to document implementation and compliance with PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 NMFS and USFWS Opinion requirements covering existing FS and BLM Land Management Plans, by administrative unit, FS region/BLM state offices, and at the scale of the interior Columbia basin.</p>	Data request
2004	11	16	Coordination and accountability of PACFISH-INFISH 1998 BOs and 2003 (Jarbidge )BO	<p>At the April, 2004 interagency (FS, BLM, NOAA Fisheries, USFWS, EPA) Interior Columbia Basin Deputy Team meeting, the Deputies requested that the Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) develop a strategy for transitioning coordination and accountability for implementation of PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 NMFS and USFWS Biological Opinions (PIBO) from the IIT to agency line managers. Based on this request, the PIBO/IIT transition strategy (Enclosure A) replaces the November 24, 1998 <i>Charter for Implementation of INFISH/PACFISH and Related Biological Assessments/Opinions</i> transmitted to FS, BLM, NMFS, and USFWS managers December 11, 1998 by the Regional Executives.</p> <p>The new PIBO/IIT Transition Strategy disbands the IIT and moves the accountability and responsibility for implementation of PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 and 2003 (Jarbidge) Opinions to FS, BLM, NOAA Fisheries, and USFWS</p>	We believe that this transition from the IIT back to agency line managers will facilitate better integration of programs, funding, and priorities to ensure that PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 and 2003 Biological Opinions remain durable until replaced by local plan revisions. We understand that you or your staff might encounter questions involving the oversight and accountability transition, or completion of the new certification report.

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p>Field Managers, the Deputy Team, and, where appropriate, the Regional Executives. Specific components of the PIBO/IIT Transition Strategy agreed to by the Deputy Team include:</p> <p><u>Monitoring Team</u> – We are continuing our commitment to both Grazing Implementation monitoring and Effectiveness monitoring. The “standing” monitoring team will be comprised of the following members: <i>Grazing Implementation Monitoring</i> Tim Burton/BLM- ID and Dan Fissel/FS-R6 (Co-Leads), Kerry Overton/FS Rocky Mountain Research Station (Database/Technical Support), Paul Moroz/USFWS, Kim Kratz/NOAA Fisheries, and Don Martin/EPA; <i>Effectiveness Monitoring</i> Rick Henderson and Jeff Kershner (FS, Logan UT). The monitoring team will provide needed coordination with the field and raise issues that may require further consideration by the Deputies. The Field Review Coordinator, Dorothy Mason (BLM –OR/WA), will be part of this team.</p> <p><u>Line Manager Certification Reports</u> - Replacement of the Annual Field Questionnaire (documentation of field implementation of obligations under the 1998 NMFS and USFWS and 2003 USFWS (Jarbidge) Opinions with an annual, simplified <i>Line Manager Certification Report</i>. The <i>Line Manager Certification Report</i> is to be completed by Forest Supervisors and BLM District Managers, in coordination with NOAA Fisheries and USFWS, through Level 2 or similar interagency processes. Information provided in these reports will be compiled annually by FS and BLM Deputies for their associated regions and states to help identify priority issues needing resolution, certify compliance with the legal requirements of the Opinions, more efficiently address FOIA requests, and assure the durability of PACFISH, INFISH , and the 1998 and 2003 Opinions until replaced by plan revisions.</p> <p><u>2005 PACFISH, INFISH Restoration Strategy</u> – The lack of a formal restoration strategy in PACFISH and INFISH was addressed in both the 1998 NMFS and USFWS Biological Opinions. Restoration was identified as necessary under ESA for continued implementation of Land Use Plans amended by PACFISH and INFISH. To meet the terms and conditions in these Opinions, the <i>2000 Interim Restoration Strategy</i> was developed by an interagency (FS, BLM, NMFS, USFWS) team. The 2005 PACFISH, INFISH Restoration Strategy {Enclosure B} updates and replaces the 2000 Interim Restoration Strategy. The 2005 Strategy relies on new information, ensures the durability of PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 Opinions until replaced by a new restoration or aquatic conservation strategy in plan revision. It is to be used to guide restoration programs for all FS and BLM field units beginning in FY05.</p>	

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				Continuation of Annual Field Reviews - The Deputy Team agrees that continuation of annual field reviews by an interagency team on select units within the interior basin has value in assessing progress in implementation of PIBO. In addition, annual field reviews will provide needed training and assist the Deputies in resolving broad-scale issues in a timely manner. The annual selection of field units will be based on individual BLM State and FS Regional Office staff review of responses from Line Manager Certification Reports and monitoring reports, NOAA Fisheries and USFWS feedback, and requests by field managers to their respective Deputies. Dorothy Mason, BLM OR/WA Resource Policy Advisor, will serve as the Field Review Coordinator and will work with the monitoring team and others to schedule and assemble field review teams.	
2004	12	7	PACFISH-INFISH R1 transition info-includes 11/16/04 letter To: R1 PACFISH/INFISH Forest Supervisors	The first letter describes an agreed upon strategy to transition the coordination and accountability from the Interagency Implementation team (IIT) to agency line managers. The IIT, which was made up of regional level staff from the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, NOAA Fisheries, and US Fish and Wildlife Service, was originally chartered with oversight responsibilities for implementation of PACFISH/INFISH and the 1998 Biological Opinions. As per the transition strategy, the IIT has been disbanded. The second letter describes the new Line Manager Certification Report that will be used to document implementation and compliance with INFISH, PACFISH, and the 1998 Biological Opinions. (see 11/16/04 letter info above for other info)	Attached is the LMCR data request again, to ensure it gets filled out.
2005	4	20	Response to NOAA fisheries request for FS assistance in Recovery planning : 6 pacific northwest recovery domains	Thank you for your letter dated March 23, 2005, requesting Forest Service assistance in completing key recovery planning tasks for development of draft plans by December 31, 2005. Although your request focuses on the need for our assistance in completing key recovery planning tasks to meet your December 2005, deadline, we recognize that additional participation by National Forest technical staff and line officers in fiscal year 2006 may also be needed to complete needed implementation plans. Our response focuses on four areas related to recovery planning: (1) designated Points of Contact (POC), by Domain, for each of the three Forest Service regions; (2) funding needed to support our participation (Northwest Pacific, Intermountain, and Northern regions); (3) concurrence on operating principles needed for Forest Service participation in completion of key recovery planning tasks; and (4) consistency with your recent policy statements, up-front agreement on assurances that would be provided to the Forest Service in conjunction with completion of recovery plans.	As requested, we are providing you with POCs for each Domain (Enclosure A). These POCs will share information and will negotiate Forest Service technical and policy participation in the recovery planning process based on available resources and funding. Agency participants may change as we proceed through this process. You also asked for inventories of programs and projects currently underway that are anticipated to contribute to salmon recovery. Your request appears to be more consistent with development of the Implementation Plan/Schedule than the draft recovery plan (e.g., Lower Columbia Draft Recovery Plan). We recommend that any request for information from National Forests or Regional Offices be negotiated with Forest Service individual Domain POCs.
2005	6	2	ICB Interagency Deputy Team meeting notes- Exec Summary	<u>PIBO IM AND EM (D. Martin – EPA Facilitator)</u> <i>Objective of Presentation: Address questions – How do PIBO EM and IM relate to</i>	ADMINISTRATIVE Decisions PIBO IM information –to be placed on worldwide website but require password for

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<p><i>each other and how will they be used in the future in plan revisions? How do we move them forward? Do we want to?</i></p> <p>Plan revisions – how can PIBO EM be used? Example SW Idaho (Payette, Boise, Sawtooth)</p> <p>PIBO EM has produced useful products:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sampling methods and study designs</li> <li>2. Sample sizes needed to detect change</li> <li>3. Value of reference sites, training, and standardization</li> </ol> <p>What management questions can PIBO EM answer at plan level?</p> <p>Are Field Unit management activities maintaining or restoring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aquatic ecosystems (Watershed condition indicators or RMOs)</li> <li>• Water Quality and Beneficial Use Status (water quality to support beneficial uses), however different program needed to address questions under CWA (303d)</li> <li>• Multi-unit LUPs allow for increased efficiencies in answering monitoring questions</li> </ul> <p><i>Can assist but cannot answer the following questions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Species of Concern (distribution, abundance, habitat quality for MIS &amp; TEPC species)</li> <li>• Forage Utilization Levels (ground cover, soil stability, plant vigor, composition)</li> <li>• Riparian Condition (are forest management and RCA delineations effective)</li> <li>• Field Units will still need to fund additional monitoring to fully meet plan-level questions</li> </ul> <p><u>Mid-scale (e.g. subbasin)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PIBO EM does not address mid-scale management questions</li> </ul> <p>PIBO EM - Grazing Allotment Level (T. Burton)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both EM and IM monitoring on allotments. IM not limited to measuring vegetation, bank stability, etc. but includes compliance monitoring of management (e.g., movement of cows by specific date, etc.)</li> <li>• PIBO EM not required in all pastures.</li> <li>• EM assesses attainment of riparian management objectives (long-term)</li> <li>• Cannot extrapolate EM data (DMA) from one pasture to another. Issues vary by grazing unit or pasture further complicating extrapolation</li> <li>• EM and IM MUST be combined</li> <li>• As we transition to “adaptive management” strategies, monitoring becomes a more integral component of management</li> </ul>	<p>agencies to access</p> <p>Summary of 2005 Line Mgr. Certification Reports – Each BLM State Office and FS region to complete summary form, due to L. Ulmer by COB August 3. Draft report to be sent to Deputies for review and discussion at Oct 20 meeting.</p> <p>Conclusions of the PIBO EM-IM Discussion</p> <p>More localized monitoring is required to implement an adaptive management approach as opposed to the prescriptive management approach. PIBO did not fully satisfy this monitoring need, but guidance could be developed to allow for a more consistent and reliable approach across field units using the existing PIBO EM and IM data and monitoring strategy as much as possible. As FS and BLM cannot afford to “do everything everywhere” local managers will need to prioritize where they apply an adaptive management philosophy</p> <p>DRAFT PIBO EM LETTER to Field Managers– L. Ulmer to redraft using Powerpoint information to clarify what PIBO IM/EM provides and what it doesn’t</p>

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exec Guidance (J. Troyer, K Lynn Bennett) – cannot implement adaptive management everywhere, all at once; requires a phased-in and prioritized approach; priorities to be selected by Field Mangers with input from mostly field-level specialists with training from Regional/State level.</li> <li>• M. Crouse (NMFS) – no broad-scale monitoring will be required above what PIBO is currently doing to meet our 1998 Opinion requirements. T. Rabot (USFWS) outside of a few places in Montana where additional effectiveness monitoring is being required to meet local consultation obligations, no additional monitoring will be required to meet their 1998 Opinions.</li> </ul> <p>Level 1 Team Perspective on Utility of PIBO IM &amp; EM Info - (B. Ries/NMFS, No.-Central ID Level 1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level 1 team not concerned with 1998 Opinion requirements as too broad-scale, interested in issues on grazing allotments and have opted to use PIBO EM methods to address</li> <li>• PIBO IM covers most but not all grazing {IM} needs as additional monitoring needed to address plan-level requirements, allotment sec 7 consultations, local management issues, &amp; lawsuits</li> <li>• Field unit grazing staff sometimes forced to choose between IM reporting and permit administration</li> <li>• FS and BLM Units (Nez Perce &amp; Clearwater NFs, Cottonwood BLM) identified the following <i>benefits</i> of PIBO IM:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. standardized documentation and reporting format</li> <li>2. allows for mapping/assessing grazing activities</li> <li>3. provides framework for integrating other IM monitoring efforts.</li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p><i>Disadvantages</i> include: redundant reporting requirements {additional internal agency reporting requirements), and random selection of PIBO EM sites may not align with unit needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PIBO EM – 3 scales of interest to units: <i>allotment-level</i>, covers some monitoring needs (requires supplementation by unit); <i>mid scale</i> (e.g., salmon population or subbasin scale) – no information; <i>Broad-scale</i> (Interior Columbia basin scale) – covered well by PIBO</li> </ul>	
2005	6	30	2005 Implementation Monitoring PACFISH, INFISH, and 1998 BOs - Reply Due Dec 1, 2005	This explains the Interagency Implementation Team’s (IIT) Monitoring Program requirements for FY-2005. Grazing is the only element of the module that is required to be reported in FY2005. Field managers are strongly encouraged to continue using this database for implementation of other components of the monitoring module to reduce redundancy, maintain consistency, and assess trends over time. An improvement to past Implementation Monitoring (IM) protocols is the recently developed “Multiple Indicator Monitoring” (MIM), by Cowley/Burton, 2005. New this year to the database module is the ability to record this MIM data	Data request and training notification

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
				sampled at the Designated Monitoring Areas (DMA's).	
2005	7	27	PACFISH & INFISH BOs-clarification of Riparian Monitoring and Assessment protocols and implementation	<p>District Managers and Forest Supervisors are accountable for implementing the monitoring requirements of the 1998 PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions for salmon, steelhead, and bull trout. Accordingly, managers should ensure proper completion of monitoring information and appropriately act upon the results. The guidance contained in the following enclosure is intended to assist the field units with understanding current monitoring protocols and complying with PACFISH/INFISH Standard and Guide Grazing Management-1.</p> <p>This memorandum identifies appropriate long- and short-term riparian assessment and monitoring protocols for use on grazing allotments in eastern Oregon and Washington in watersheds containing Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed salmon, steelhead, and bull trout. Use of the identified protocols complies with the 1995 interim strategies for PACFISH/INFISH and the 1998 Biological Opinions for salmon, steelhead, and bull trout. The protocols would also apply to critical habitat for fish species that may be designated in the future under ESA, as appropriate</p>	Letter to Forest supervisors and District managers noting the accountability to Review guidelines and protocols of the 1998 PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions for salmon, steelhead, and bull trout
2005	8	25	2005 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 Biological Opinions Reply due 11/10/06	The Region 6 cover letter with general instructions, definitions, and current procedures for monitoring federally authorized activities in compliance with Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) decisions is enclosed. Direction for 2005 data is essentially the same as 2004. District data on grazing for the Module is due to the Supervisor's Office by November 10, 2005 as the reporting date to the Regional Office is December 1, 2005. Data for all other resource areas will be due January 13, 2006. Information from this report will be used to complete the Line Managers Certification Report, which will be due to the Regional Office in January 2006.	Data request
2005	8	30	2005 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH/INFISH, the 1998 BOs, and the 2003 BO for Jarbridge Reply due 12/15/05 (R-4)	This explains the Interagency Implementation Team's (IIT) Monitoring Program requirements for FY-2005. Grazing is the only element of the module required to be reported in FY-2005. Field managers are strongly encouraged to continue using this database for implementation of other components of the monitoring module to reduce redundancy, maintain consistency, and assess trends over time. An improvement to past Implementation Monitoring (IM) protocols is the recently developed "Multiple Indicator Monitoring" (MIM), by Cowley/Burton, 2005. New this year to the database module is the ability to record this MIM data sampled at the Designated Monitoring Areas (DMA's).	Data request
2005	8	30	2005 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH and the 1998 BOs (R1)	This letter explains the Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) Implementation Monitoring Program requirements for FY 2005. Grazing is the only element of the module that is required to be centrally reported in FY 2005. The Implementation Monitoring Database is designed to store grazing monitoring data as well as monitoring data from other land management activities. Field managers are	Data request

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
				strongly encouraged to use the monitoring module for all activities, to meet local monitoring requirements, to reduce redundancy, maintain consistency, and assess trends over time.	
2005	11	23	Guidelines for Development of Project Proposals for funding under the NW Power and Conservation Council's CRB FWL Program (MOU)	<p>A Partnership Agreement (MOU) has been developed between the Forest Service (Regions 1, 4 and 6) and Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) that enables National Forests alone, or in cooperation with other entities (states, tribes, etc.), to fund proposed projects on National Forest System (NFS) lands for BPA funding under the NW Power and Conservation Council's (Council) Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program.</p> <p>From the attached guidelines:                      ISRP <i>assesses</i> proposed actions to determine if they:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide a fully-developed proposal (objectives, tasks, methods), not abstract;</li> <li>1. Describe the proposed action's relationship to other projects on this species within the geographic area (ESU, Recovery Unit, etc) funded by other entities;</li> <li>2. Identify if it is a priority action through some established coordination group, if applicable;</li> <li>3. Establish a basic logic pathway for defining the species or group that is the focus of the proposed action;</li> <li>4. Clearly define/describe the key stressors responsible for depressed condition or conversely, in need of protection related back to Subbasin Plans (EDT- salmon or other approach used);</li> <li>5. Provide a description of the conservation action/solution/strategy evaluated to improve or protect the species, to incorporate any supporting rationale on why a specific approach was selected. <i>Supporting rationale should include discussion on why a more "passive" strategy was not appropriate;</i></li> <li>6. Describe the expected outcome (project benefits, magnitude). <i>Outcomes should be cast as hypotheses to be evaluated after project completion;</i></li> <li>7. Describe how adaptive management will be applied (well-defined hypotheses, robust and rigorous monitoring/evaluation component &amp; design). Include any linkages for cooperation and coordination with other regional monitoring efforts (e.g., FCRPS RME "Subbasin Pilot" program, PIBO/AREMP, etc.;</li> <li>8. Tie back to the respective Subbasin Plan or other coordination effort (Recovery Plan, NMFS CHART process that identified limiting factors) and how.</li> </ol>	Memorandum of Understanding Region 6-Agreement No. 06-MU-11060000-435 Guidelines for Development of Project Proposals. MOU covers all forests within the Columbia River Basin (regions 1, 4, 6)
2005	12	22	1998 NMFS and USFWS BOs- Line mgr cert report- 2005-	Enclosed is the annual Line Manager Certification Report (LMCR), which must be completed by February 24, 2006. The LMCRs provide a mechanism for	Data request

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
			Reply Due Feb 24, 2006	documenting Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) administrative units' implementation and compliance with PACFISH and INFISH Standards & Guidelines, and the terms and conditions as described in the 1998 NMFS and USFWS Biological Opinions.	
2005	12	22	1998 and 2003 (Jarbridge) Bull Trout BO -LMCR for 2006- Reply Due Feb 24, 2006	Enclosed is the annual Line Manager Certification Report (LMCR) which must be completed by February 24, 2006. The LMCRs provide a mechanism for documenting Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) administrative units' implementation and compliance with INFISH Standards & Guidelines, and the terms and conditions as described in the 1998 & 2003 USFWS Biological Opinions. Information will be compiled by FS Region, BLM State Office, and the Interior Columbia Basin scale. This information will assist the Deputy Team in identifying priority issues needing resolution, certify compliance with the legal requirements of the 1998 Opinion, more efficiently address FOIA requests, and assure the durability of INFISH, and the 1998 & 2003 Opinions until replaced through plan revisions.	Data request
2006	6	8	2006 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 BOs - due Dec. 15, 2006 (R-1)	The Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have agreed to monitoring program requirements under the PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions (PIBO). For a variety of reasons, the Northern Region has fallen short of these requirements in the past, particularly with respect to the Designated Monitoring Areas (DMAs) used by the effectiveness monitoring teams. We cannot continue to do so. Outlined below and in the attachments is information that describes the requirements for 2006 and contextual information that will provide you with a better understanding of why the information is important and how it is used.  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LINK TO EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING</li> <li>2. COMPLIANCE/NON-COMPLIANCE FEEDBACK</li> <li>3. SAMPLING AND REPORTING FOR 2006:ANCE FEEDBACK</li> <li>4. DATABASE</li> <li>5. COORDINATION</li> </ol>	Data request
2006	6	26	Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 NMFS and USFWS BOs - reply due Dec. 1. 2006 (R-6)	This directive explains the Regional Deputy Team's Monitoring Program requirements under the PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions (PIBO) for 2006. Grazing is the only element of the module that is required to be reported in 2006 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Link to Effectiveness Monitoring</li> <li>2. Compliance/Non-compliance Feedback</li> <li>3. Adaptive Management</li> <li>4. Sampling and Reporting for 2006:</li> <li>5. Database</li> <li>6. Coordination</li> </ol>	Data request

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
2006	8	22	2006 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH, the 1998 BOs, and 2003 Jarbridge Reply due Dec. 15, 2006 (R-4)	This letter explains the Regional Deputy Team's Monitoring Program requirements under the PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions (PIBO) for 2006. Grazing is the only element of the module that is required to be reported in 2006. 1. LINK TO EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING 2. COMPLIANCE/NON-COMPLIANCE FEEDBACK 3. SAMPLING AND REPORTING FOR 2006:ANCE FEEDBACK 4. DATABASE 5. COORDINATION	Data request
2006	9	19	2006 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 BOs-- sent by WW NF to field reply due Nov 9, 2006 (R6-WW NF)	The Region 6 cover letter with general instructions, definitions, and current procedures for monitoring federally authorized activities in compliance with Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) decisions is enclosed. Monitoring of federally authorized activities is only required for grazing this year; however, I am requiring that monitoring other activities, including recreation developments, trails, and dispersed sites; minerals including claims, common materials, energy, and wastes; forest vegetation management including timber sales, KV, BD, and other appurtenant activities, special forest products, noxious weed control, prescribed fuel treatments; wildland fire suppression; and road construction, reconstruction, and obliteration associated with vegetation management activities, as required by biological opinions that are specific to this Forest and the programmatic BOs for culvert replacements, be reported using this database. The database can accommodate requirements of Biological Opinions specific to this Forest in addition to the PACFISH or INFISH standards contained in the database.  For grazing activities, field units will apply the Module to all federally authorized activities that have already been started on-the-ground or that have been completed during the current year and fall within the following sampling regime:  Attached: June 26, 2006 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH/Infish and the 1998 BO for Bull trout reply due Dec. 1. 2006.(R-6)	Data Request
2006	12	19	1998 and 2003 (Jarbridge) Bull Trout BO -LMCR for 2006-Reply Due Feb 23, 2007	Enclosed is the annual Line Manager Certification Report (LMCR) which must be completed by February 23, 2007. The LMCRs provide a mechanism for documenting Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) administrative units' implementation and compliance with INFISH Standards & Guidelines, and the terms and conditions as described in the 1998 & 2003 USFWS Biological Opinions. Information will be compiled at FS Region and BLM State Office levels and will assist the Deputy Team in identifying priority issues needing resolution, certify compliance with the legal requirements of the 1998 Opinion, more efficiently address FOIA requests, and assure the durability of INFISH, and	Data request

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
				the 1998 & 2003 Opinions until replaced through plan revisions.	
2006	12	19	1998, Salmon, Steelhead, and bull Trout BOs -LMCR for 2006-Reply- Due Feb 23, 2007	Enclosed is the annual Line Manager Certification Report (LMCR), which must be completed by February 23, 2007. The LMCRs provide a mechanism for documenting Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) administrative units' implementation and compliance with PACFISH and INFISH Standards & Guidelines, and the terms and conditions as described in the 1998 NMFS and USFWS Biological Opinions. Information will be compiled at FS Region and , BLM State Office levels to assist the Deputy Team in identifying priority issues needing resolution, certify compliance with the legal requirements of the 1998 Opinions, more efficiently address FOIA requests, and assure the durability of PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 Opinions until replaced through plan revisions.	Data request
2007	6	13	2007 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 BOs— Reply due 12/13/07 (R-6)	<p>This directive explains the Regional Deputy Team's Monitoring Program requirements under the PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions (PIBO) for 2007. Grazing is the only management activity that is required to be reported for 2007</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Link to Effectiveness Monitoring</li> <li>2. Compliance/Non-compliance Feedback</li> <li>3. Adaptive Management</li> <li>4. Sampling and Reporting for 2006:</li> <li>5. Database</li> <li>6. Coordination</li> </ol> <p>Background: Region 6 of the Forest Service (FS) has made commitments through the PACFISH and INFISH Management Strategies to improve aquatic resources found in the Interior Columbia River Basin. Since the Region began implementing these strategies, and in some cases even before, there has been marked improvement in management for aquatic resources. This effort is recognized and commended. It is expected that FS line officers will continue to work with grazing permittees to ensure that this cooperative effort continues.</p> <p>The application of the Implementation Monitoring Module will meet the interagency grazing implementation monitoring requirements of the salmon, steelhead, and bull trout PACFISH and INFISH biological opinions issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service and by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1998.</p>	Data request
2007	7	9	2007 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH,	This letter explains the Regional Deputy Team's Monitoring Program requirements under the PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions (PIBO) for 2007. Grazing is the	Data request

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
			INFISH, 1998 BOs, and 2003 Jarbridge BO- -Reply due 12/31/07 (R-4)	only element of the module that is required to be reported in 2007. 1. LINK BETWEEN IMPLEMENTATION and EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING 2. COMPLIANCE/ NON-COMPLIANCE FEEDBACK FOR LINE OFFICERS 3. ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT 4. SAMPLING AND REPORTING FOR 2007 5. DATABASE 6. COORDINATION	
2007	7	12	PACFISH, INFISH Effectiveness Monitoring Program – Trend in Physical Stream Habitat Variables in the Interior Columbia River Basin (2001 through 2006) (R-1,4,6, BLM OR/WA, ID)	Preliminary results indicate neutral or favorable trends for seven of the twelve aquatic habitat attributes examined. This suggests a neutral to favorable trend in aquatic habitat conditions at the scale of the Interior Columbia River basin. At the administrative unit and stream reach scales, more information will be required (increase in the # of sites revisited out of the 1, 331 watersheds sampled to date) before conclusions regarding the overall trend of aquatic habitat conditions can be reached. Over the next few years, the PIBO EM program will also imitate analyses to try and establish a ‘cause and effect’ linkage between management actions and habitat condition.	<p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Data collected by PIBO EM should be utilized to develop new RMO values based on the combinations of a number of attributes or ranges of values for specific attributes, to represent good riparian and instream habitat. These should be developed for specific stream types within the different geographic areas in the basin.</p> <p>The present suite of parameters used should continue to be measured and evaluated based on landscape differences, to provide status and trends of stream and riparian condition on federal lands;</p> <p>PIBO EM will need consistent data on the location and intensity of management activities to allow for the development of direct cause-and-effect relationships between management and watershed status/trends;</p> <p>PIBO EM will continue to monitor reference sites in order to identify changes that occur due to natural or climatic changes.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>It is our recommendation that we continue to measure our present suite of attributes to ensure trends in stream and riparian condition can be assessed. In addition, PIBO EM needs consistent data on the location and intensity of management activities to allow the development of direct cause-and-effect relationships in watershed status and trend.</p> <p>It is important, when long term habitat attributes are measured, to employ methods which are not flow dependent. Attributes like wetted width and depth and pools per km can be heavily influenced by flow at the time of sampling and are not recommended as long term monitoring variables.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>Data collected by PIBO EM should be utilized to develop new RMO values based on combinations of a number of attributes, or ranges for specific attributes, to represent good riparian area and stream condition within the different geographic areas of the basin.</p>

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

Y	M	D	title/subject	Description	Decision
					In most instances these values will vary based characteristics such as stream size, gradient, precipitation, topography and geology. We are presently working with personnel from R1, to accomplish this task for the Lolo, Bitterroot, and Flathead Forest Plan. Our current approach is to use multiple regression analysis to predict good quality aquatic habitat and instream conditions based on site characteristics. These types of exercises should lead to site-specific desired condition objectives based on landscape and stream characteristics. If long-term RMOs are to be used as criteria against which proposed management actions are assessed, they should be developed from comparable streams in geographical similar areas.
2007	7	18	Clarification of NMFS and USFWS 1998 BO requirements for completing Waters Analysis (PAC INFISH) and Subbasin Assessments (Pacfish Only)- R1	The purpose of this letter is to review the 1998 Opinion obligations related to watershed analysis and subbasin assessments, clarify their objectives, and provide options for meeting these requirements, including participation in development of salmon & steelhead recovery plans and continued oversight of plan implementation (attachment). We strongly encourage you to work with your counterparts in the streamlining process to develop both a schedule and list of priorities for completing watershed analyses, and where applicable, subbasin assessments.	Information
2007	7	23	2007 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH and 1998 BOs - Region 1-reply due 12/31/07	The Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have agreed to a set of monitoring program requirements under the PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions (PIBO). Outlined below, and in the attachments, is information that describes the Deputy Team’s Monitoring Program requirements under PIBO for 2007 and contextual information that will provide you with a better understanding of why this information is important and how it is used. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LINK TO EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING</li> <li>2. COMPLIANCE/NON-COMPLIANCE FEEDBACK</li> <li>3. ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT:</li> <li>4. SAMPLING AND REPORTING FOR 2007</li> <li>5. DATABASE:</li> </ol>	Data Request
2007	7	24	Clarification of July 9, 2007 PACFISH, INFISH letter- Region 4	This letter corrects and clarifies 2200/2400/2670; 2007 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH/INFISH and the 1998 Biological Opinions for Salmon, Steelhead, and the 2003 Biological Opinion for the Jarbidge Population of Bull Trout, sent July 9. The clarification concerns implementation monitoring of Category II pastures. Paragraph (d) in Part 4 of the original direction addresses which grazing activities are to be monitored and reads: “Grazing activities in Category II pastures. These pastures are those within PACFISH/INFISH subwatersheds that lack ESA listed fish.” In reality, Category II pastures need only be monitored if they contain DMAs that the EM team will monitor in 2007 and 2008. Consequently,	Information  The enclosed direction is the corrected version and should be substituted for the original direction sent July 9. We apologize for this inconvenience, and hope these corrections make your monitoring efforts somewhat easier

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
				Paragraph (d) has been deleted and Paragraph (a) has been altered as follows: “Those grazing activities occurring at DMAs within the subwatersheds (6 <sup>th</sup> field Hydraulic Unit Codes [HUCs]) selected for monitoring by the EM Team. This includes DMAs in HUCs to be monitored in both 2007 and 2008, and may include DMAs that occur in a combination of both Category I and Category II pastures.”	
2007	8	28	PACFISH/INFISH-Effectiveness Monitoring Program 2001-2003--Region 1	Region 1 has been an active participant in the PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinion Effectiveness Monitoring Program (PIBO EM) since 2001. In the Columbia Basin within Region 1 there are 453 monitoring sites established (2001-2006). Additional sites will be added to complete the monitoring panels on each Forest. Generally, each Forest within the Columbia Basin will have PIBO monitoring sites within approximately 1/3 of the 6 <sup>th</sup> code HUCs.  PIBO monitoring information has already proven to be useful in establishing desired conditions for Forest Plan revision. In addition the PIBO EM structure and attributes will be key to future aquatic monitoring throughout the Region including the Missouri Basin. The rigorous testing and quality assurance with the PIBO EM program is yielding results that can be used to determine status and trend of key aquatic and riparian ecosystem attributes. We are very pleased with the preliminary results outlined in the attached white paper and are encouraged that the PIBO EM program can be refined to fit monitoring needs at scales smaller than the Columbia Basin.	
2008	8	1	2008 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH, 1998 BiOps and the 2003 BiOp for the Jarbidge Population of Bull Trout-Region 4-Reply Due 12/31/08	This directive explains the Regional Deputy Team’s Monitoring Program requirements under the PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions (PIBO) for 2008. Grazing is the only management activity that is required to be reported in 2008. The application of the PIBO Implementation Monitoring Module will meet interagency grazing implementation monitoring requirements of the salmon, steelhead, and bull trout PACFISH and INFISH biological opinions issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service and by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1998 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Link Between Implementation and Effectiveness Monitoring</li> <li>2. Compliance/ Non-Compliance Feedback for Line Officers</li> <li>3. Adaptive Management</li> <li>4. Sampling and Reporting for 2008</li> <li>5. Database</li> <li>6. Coordination and Spring Meetings</li> </ol>	Data request
2008	8	1	2008 Implementation Monitoring Requirements for	This letter explains the Regional Forester’s monitoring and data reporting requirements for Southwest Idaho Eco-group (SWIEG) forests associated with the	Data Request

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
			Southwest Idaho Eco-group Forests in regard to PACFISH/INFISH and the Effectiveness Monitoring Program (R4-SWEG)	PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions (PIBO) program. 1. Link between Implementation and Effectiveness Monitoring 2. Sampling and Reporting for 2008 3. Implementation Monitoring Backlog Reporting for Years 2001-2007 4. Database 5. Coordination and Spring Meetings	
2008	8	15	PACFISH, INFISH Effectiveness Monitoring Program – Trend in Physical Stream Habitat Variables in the Interior CRB (2001 through 2007)-signed by Deputy Team	Executive Summary and White Paper describing results from the PACFISH, INFISH Effectiveness Monitoring Program (PIBO EM).. Status and trend monitoring of aquatic habitat on federally- managed lands across the Interior Columbia River basin was a requirement of the 1998 National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Biological Opinions issued for the interim aquatic strategies, PACFISH and INFISH (Decision Notices issued in 1995). Trends of eleven stream habitat attributes were examined using PIBO Effectiveness Monitoring (EM) information collected between 2001 and 2007. The analysis used 252 Integrator reaches that were originally sampled in 2001 and 2002 and then repeated five years later. For 9 of 11 attributes examined, there was a favorable trend from 2001 to 2007. Of the 9 attributes that showed a positive trend, 4 were significantly different from 0. Two attributes showed an unfavorable trend over the same time period. However, only 1 was significant.	Data collected by PIBO EM should be utilized to develop new RMO values based on combinations of a number of attributes, or ranges for specific attributes, to represent good riparian area and stream condition within the different geographic areas of the basin
2008	8	15	2008 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH, INFISH and the 1998 Biological Opinions for Salmon, Steelhead, and Bull Trout -Region 6 -Reply Due 12/31/08	This directive explains the Regional Deputy Team’s Monitoring Program requirements under the PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions (PIBO) for 2008. Grazing is the only management activity that is required to be reported in 2008. The application of the PIBO Implementation Monitoring Module will meet interagency grazing implementation monitoring requirements of the salmon, steelhead, and bull trout PACFISH and INFISH biological opinions issued by the National Marine Fisheries Service and by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 1998	Data request
2008	8	21	A Framework for Incorporating The Aquatic and Riparian Habitat Component of the ICB Strategy into BLM and FS Plan (BLM/FS/FWS/NOAA/EPA)	The purpose of this memorandum is to transmit to agency field offices the attached document titled “A Framework for Incorporating the Aquatic and Riparian Component of the Interior Columbia Basin Strategy into BLM and Forest Service Plan Revisions (Framework).” This guidance replaces the July 9, 2004, ACS Framework.	The purpose of this document is to provide a framework for use in developing the aquatic and riparian resource components for land management plan revisions.
2008	8	25	(PACFISH, INFISH, 1998 BiOPs) Direction for implementation (PIBO) Imp Monitoring-BLM-ID Monitoring for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008	Direction for implementing FY 2008 PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions (PIBO) Implementation Monitoring. Policy/Action: This directive explains the Deputy Team’s Implementation Monitoring Program requirements under PIBO for 2008. This Instruction Memorandum implements the monitoring requirements of the PIBOs (1998). The monitoring requirements were developed to implement terms and conditions of the 1998 opinions, which are applicable to all Resource Management Plan’s (RMP) in Idaho and Montana inclusive of ESA-listed bull	Data collection imputed into PACFISH/INFISH Implementation Monitoring Database and copies submitted to the coordinator by January 15, 2009

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
				trout, salmon, and steelhead, until such RMP's have been amended by a new decision and final biological opinion. New RMPs should also incorporate this monitoring program as part of the aquatic conservation strategy for the ESA-listed fish.	
2008	8	26	PACFISH, INFISH Effectiveness Monitoring Program--Trend in Physical Stream Habitat variables in the Interior CRB-Region 1-cover letter to August 15 PIBO EM letter	see description above	
2008	9		Guidance for developing Aquatic Conservation Strategies for BLM Resource Management Plans within the CRB	This document provides clarification and guidance for developing aquatic conservation strategies (ACS) in Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Resource Management Plans (RMPs). RMPs ensure that the public lands are managed in accordance with the intent of Congress as stated in the Federal Land Policy Management Act (FLPMA) (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. Pursuant to the Endangered Species Act (ESA) a number of aquatic species across the Northwest have been listed as threatened or endangered. For such species the BLM is required to "conserve listed species and the ecosystems upon which they depend and shall use existing authority in furtherance of the purposes of the ESA"(Handbook 6840.06). BLM is also directed to conserve Candidate species or species listed by the State Director-as sensitive. In addition to general guidance, this document includes examples of content that might be useful for developing RMPs	This guidance is intended for BLM District and Field Managers who direct the development of RMPs in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. Members of land use planning teams assigned to develop planning objectives and management actions for aquatic species should use this guidance to further implement BLM policy and assure that aquatic conservation strategies are consistent across the Northwest
2008	9	4	Review of the 1998 NMFS and FWS BiOps for Forest Plans amended by PACFISH and/or INFISH-Region 6-Reply Due 10/06/08	At the April 2008 meeting, the DT identified the need to take a 'fresh look' at the terms and conditions in 1998 BiOPs and the mechanism for documenting compliance with them. The following tasks and assignments were made by the DT:(1) Columbia River Basin (CRB) Coordinator will compile and transmit to the DT a list of BiOP terms and conditions that:a. Display a decline in compliance as documented in Line Manager Certification Reports; and b. Have acceptable replacement actions as summarized in previous DT decisions. (2) FS and BLM Deputies will query field units to: a. Validate list (1 above); and b. Identify additional Terms and Conditions that may no longer be relevant in meeting PACFISH and INFISH Riparian Management Objectives (RMOs); and c. Describe existing actions/programs or participation in interagency processes that support meeting RMOs over the long-term. (3) Once information from parts 1 and 2 are compiled, an interagency team will convene to address 'replacement' of existing	The CRB coordinator completed the task 1 of the Deputy Team assignment.

**Chronology of Documents related to the 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion for Salmon and Steelhead (06/22/98) and the 1998 USFWS Biological Opinion for Bull Trout (08/14/98).**

<b>Y</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>title/subject</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
				Terms and Conditions through identification of options or other adjustments that can be made without triggering the need to re-initiate consultation on the 1998 BiOPs.	
2008	9	12	Review of the 1998 NMFS and FWS BiOps for Forest Plans amended by PACFISH and/or INFISH-Region 4-Reply Due 10/06/08	At the April 2008 meeting, the DT identified the need to take a ‘fresh look’ at the terms and conditions in 1998 BiOPs and the mechanism for documenting compliance with them. The following tasks and assignments were made by the DT: (1) Columbia River Basin (CRB) Coordinator will compile and transmit to the DT a list of BiOP terms and conditions that: a. Display a decline in compliance as documented in Line Manager Certification Reports; and b. Have acceptable replacement actions as summarized in previous DT decisions. (2) FS and BLM Deputies will query field units to: a. Validate list (1 above); and b. Identify additional Terms and Conditions that may no longer be relevant in meeting PACFISH and INFISH Riparian Management Objectives (RMOs); and c. Describe existing actions/programs or participation in interagency processes that support meeting RMOs over the long-term. (3) Once information from parts 1 and 2 are compiled, an interagency team will convene to address ‘replacement’ of existing Terms and Conditions through identification of options or other adjustments that can be made without triggering the need to re-initiate consultation on the 1998 BiOPs.	The CRB coordinator completed the task 1 of the Deputy Team assignment.
2008	11	3	2008 Implementation Monitoring for PACFISH/INFISH and the 1998 Biological Opinions for Salmon, Steelhead (R-1)	<p>This letter explains the Regional Deputy Team’s Monitoring Program requirements under the PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions (PIBO) for 2008. Grazing is the only element of the module that is required to be reported in 2008.</p> <p>Region 1 has made commitments through the PACFISH and INFISH Management Strategies to improve aquatic resources found in the Interior Columbia River Basin. Since the Region began implementing these strategies, there has been improvement in management for aquatic resources in many areas. This effort is recognized and commended. It is expected that FS line officers and resource specialists will continue to work with grazing permittees to ensure that this cooperative effort continues</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Link Between Implementation and Effectiveness Monitoring</li> <li>2. Compliance/ Non-Compliance Feedback for Line Officers</li> <li>3. Adaptive Management</li> <li>4. Sampling and Reporting for 2008</li> <li>5. Database</li> <li>6. Coordination and Spring Meetings</li> </ol>	Data Request