

United States  
Department of  
Agriculture  
Forest Service

United States  
Department of Interior  
Bureau of Land  
Management

United States  
Department of Interior  
Fish & Wildlife Service

United States  
Department of Commerce  
National Marine Fisheries  
Service

---

**File Code:** 2670(FS)/6840(BLM) (OR-931)P

**Date:** December 11, 1998

**Route To:**

**Subject:** Charter for Implementing Biological Opinions

**To:** USDA Forest Service, Forest Supervisors, Regions 1, 4, and 6; Klamath and Columbia River Basins

USDI Bureau of Land Management, District Managers, WA/OR, ID, and MT; Klamath and Columbia River Basins

USDI Fish and Wildlife Service Project Leaders, WA, OR, ID, and MT; Klamath and Columbia River Basins

USDOC National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Region

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. Questions concerning implementation of the BOs and charter are to be directed to members of the IIT.

*/s/ Kathleen A. McAllister for*  
DALE N. BOSWORTH  
Regional Forester, FS  
Region 1

*/s/ Jack G. Troyer for*  
JACK BLACKWELL  
Regional Forester, FS  
Region 4

*/s/ Robert W. Williams*  
ROBERT W. WILLIAMS  
Regional Forester, FS  
Region 6

*/s/ Anne Badgley*  
ANNE BADGLEY  
FWS, Region 1

*/s/ James R. Cwings for*  
LARRY HAMILTON  
BLM State Director, Montana

*/s/ Martha G. Hahn*  
MARTHA HAHN  
BLM State Director, Idaho

*/s/ Elizabeth Holmes Gaar for*  
WILLIAM STELLE, JR.  
NMFS Regional Admin.

*/s/ Elaine Zielinski*  
ELAINE ZIELINSKI  
BLM State Director, OR/WA

Enclosure

# Charter for the Implementation of INFISH/PACFISH and Related Biological Assessments/Opinions

Prepared by the Interagency Implementation Team

11/24/98

## INTRODUCTION

Native salmonids in the Upper Columbia and Snake River basins have experienced significant population declines over the past 100 years. As a result, five anadromous fish species--Snake River sockeye salmon, Snake River spring/summer chinook salmon, Snake River fall chinook salmon, Snake River steelhead, and upper Columbia River steelhead-- as well as the bull trout, have been Federally listed as threatened or endangered. These fish are highly dependent on habitat provided by National Forests and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) watersheds, therefore, the management of those watersheds is critical for the survival of these native fishes.

The Forest Service (FS) and BLM have recently completed formal consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) on their land and resource management plans (LRMPs) for listed anadromous salmon and steelhead, and bull trout. The biological opinion (BioOp) from the NMFS relating to anadromous fish was issued on June 19, 1998, and the BioOp from the FWS for bull trout was signed on August 14, 1998. Table 1 lists the dates and summarizes the titles of related Biological Assessments (BAs) and BioOps. The FS/BLM BAs and the NMFS/FWS BioOps were formulated utilizing the principles set forth in the "Section 7 Consultation Streamlining" guidance; they were developed cooperatively utilizing interdisciplinary and interagency teams.

It is our goal to utilize the same collaborative interagency and interdisciplinary approach in meeting the requirements set forth in these BioOps. Many of these requirements have due dates that will be met only with a well coordinated effort and prompt attention. This effort is a Regional priority for FWS, FS, BLM and NMFS. As such, team leaders and team members responsible for carrying out the requirements will be expected to fully participate in scheduled meetings and accomplish quality products within specified timelines. This document outlines the organizational structure and the specific tasks that are to be completed. It is designed to facilitate implementation of the direction in the BAs. As such, it does not replace or supercede their requirements.

Overall, it is most important to emphasize the collective commitment of our agencies to recover and conserve all of the listed salmomid species in the Klamath and Columbia River basins. We are committed to working together to strategically protect land and restore watersheds to ensure the survival of bull trout, salmon, and steelhead leading to delisting population levels. The success of this effort depends on collaboration at all levels of our agencies and we play a major role in ensuring that success.

Table 1. Related Biological Assessments (BAs), Environmental Assessments (EA) and Biological Opinions (BioOps).

DOCUMENT	DATE
LRMP BioOp Columbia and Klamath Basin Bull Trout	8/14/98

LRMP BioOp Five Anadromous Species	6/19/98
Bull Trout BA amendment	6/19/98
Bull Trout BA	6/15/98
Steelhead and Salmon BA	9/16/97
Letter from NMFS extending PACFISH BioOp	10/8/96
INFISH Environmental Assessment (EA)	6/12/95
LRMP BioOp (salmon)	3/1/95
PACFISH BioOp	1/23/95
PACFISH BA	4/1/94

## OBJECTIVES

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 BioOps.

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.

## TEAM OPERATIONS

### A. Interagency Implementation Team and Task Team (TT) Operating Guidelines

1. Teams will strive to obtain consensus on issues (see streamlining guidelines).
2. Team meetings will be arranged to have as many team members as possible present. When actions are taken by a team they will be final and not revisited unless there is a consensus to do so. Therefore, it is important that team members or designated alternates attend team meetings and agencies management consider their assignment a priority.
3. Facilitation and meeting records will be provided by the host unit.
4. Teams and team leaders will have the roles and responsibilities described below, and as amended through mutual agreement of the team members.

### B. Interagency Implementation Team (IIT)

1. Provide interagency leadership and policy direction for the implementation of PACFISH/INFISH amended LRMPs and corresponding BAs/BioOps.

2. Maintain coordination with ICBEMP staff to minimize duplication and maximize efficiency in transition from the interim aquatic strategies to the long-term aquatic strategy.

3. Advise regional executives on progress being made to meet commitments outlined in the PACFISH/INFISH amended LRMPs and corresponding BAs/BioOps.

4. Make adjustments in task team assignments and composition as needed to ensure that quality products are developed within established time lines.

5. Consistent with section 7 consultation streamlining guidance, elevate issues for which consensus cannot be reached.

6. Solicit input from and communicate with field units to insure understanding of tasks, roles, and responsibilities in meeting commitments outlined in the BioOps.

7. If significant changes in tasks, products or due dates in the BioOps become necessary, advise the Regional Executives of those needs and recommend consultation be re-initiated, if appropriate.

#### C. Interagency Implementation Team Coordinator

1. Facilitate coordination between the Regional Executives, IIT, TT's and ICBEMP staff.

2. Call meetings as needed to advise IIT of progress being made to meet time lines and work products agreed to by the task teams.

3. Make recommendations to IIT on staff and modifications of Task Team roles and responsibilities to meet task team objectives.

4. Sign correspondence to field units requesting information, describing tasks, etc. for implementation of the PACFISH/INFISH amended LRMPs and corresponding BAs and BioOps.

#### D. Task Teams

1. Responsible for developing strategies to meet the commitments as outlined in the PACFISH/INFISH amended LRMPs and corresponding BAs/BioOps. These tasks are summarized in Tables 2-5. Each team should familiarize themselves with the tasks for which their team is responsible.

2. Develop a statement of work which includes the relationship of the team responsibilities and those of field units. Collaborate in development of procedures to include field input and transfer results of the Task Team products to the field units.

3. Coordinate between task teams to minimize duplication and ensure products are transferable between teams (e.g. roads team information usable for restoration team to develop strategies).

#### E. Task Team Leaders

1. Call meetings to meet the objectives of the Task Team.
2. Advise IIT members or leader of progress at meeting target dates and commitments, and make recommendations for needed adjustments in team staffing and task time frames to meet commitments.
3. Coordinate between task teams to minimize duplication and ensure products are transferable between teams (e.g. roads team information usable for restoration team to develop strategies).
4. Coordinate with ICBEMP staff and managers to ensure team products area as compatible as possible wit related long-term plans and specific actions established in the ICBEMP Record of Decision.

#### INTERAGENCY IMPLEMENTATION TEAM (IIT)

STATEMENT OF WORK: Provide interagency oversight for the implementation of the PACFISH/INFISH amended LRMPs and related BAs/BioOps. Advise Regional Executives on progress being made to meet quality standards, commitments, and time lines. Advise Regional Executives, ICBEMP staff and managers, Field Units, Line, and Staff, of roles and responsibilities in meeting the commitments made in the BAs/BioOps. Work to minimize duplication and maximize efficiency by collaborating with ICBEMP staff in transition from the interim aquatic strategies to the long-term Aquatic Conservation Strategy that is anticipated to be developed by the ICBEMP. Assure that team products are developed in coordination and collaboration with field units, as appropriate, depending on the level of specific management unit information needed and the extent to which field units will be expected to implement task team products.

Coordinate with the Northwest Power Planning Council in the development of framework management of the Columbia River Basin fish and wildlife resources, and share information that will mutually benefit public and private lands management within the Columbia River basin.

Tasks for which the IIT are responsible are summarized in Tables 2-5.

#### Team Members

(\* Team Coordinator)

	<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>PHONE #</u>	<u>E-MAIL ADDRESS</u>
1.	Bill Burbridge	FS-R4	801-625-5669	bburbridge/r4@fs.fed.us
2.	Cindy Swanson	FS-R1	406-329-3520	cswanson/r1@fs.fed.us
3.	Ron Escano	FS-R6	503-808-2922	rescano/r6pnw@fs.fed.us
4.	Dave Brunner	BLM-ID	208-373-3800	dbrunner@id.blm.gov
5.	Mike Crouse	BLM-OR	503-952-6525	mcrouse@blm.gov
6.	Ted Meyers/ Russ Strach	NMFS- ID	208-378-5696	ted.meyers@noaa.gov russ.strach@noaa.gov
7.	Chuck Dunn/ Susan Martin	FWS	503-872-2761 208-378-5243	charles_a_dunn@fws.gov susan_martin@fws.gov
8.	Susan Giannettino	ICBEMP	208-334-1770x125	sgiannettino/r4,icbemp@fs.fed.us
9.	Gordon Haugen*	FS-R6	503-808-2929	ghaugen/r6pnw@fs.fed.us
10.	Lew Brown	BLM-ID	208-769-5040	lbrown@id.blm.gov

11	Bill LeVere	FS-SNF	208-737-3216	blevere/r4_sawtooth@fs.fed.us
12	Jim Caswell	FS-CNF	208-476-4541	jaswell/r4_clearwater@fs.fed.us

## ROAD DATABASE TASK TEAM

STATEMENT OF WORK: Establish a framework that will assure that road data, including transportation system inventory information, road condition assessments and the potential road restoration funding will be made available to guide restoration of habitat and recovery for the listed anadromous fish and bull trout in the Klamath and Columbia River Basins. Assure that team products are developed in coordination and collaboration with field units and ICBEMP staff and managers, as appropriate, depending on the level of specific management unit information needed and the extent to which field units will be expected to implement task team products. Specific action items relevant to these broad tasks are found in the 1998 BioOps on the LRMPs and are summarized in Tables 2-5.

Work will be broken into two primary components. First, efforts will focus on providing transportation inventory information either as hard copy maps and tabular inventory data or as GIS spatial data with the associated road attribute data to FWS and NMFS and assuring it is available within the FS and BLM. It is recognized that this data is very important to the restoration and recovery efforts and to the efforts of several of the other Task Teams chartered by the IIT. Initial efforts will be targeted to meet early Fall 1998 dates, with follow up efforts expected to meet or precede the two year target date for complete transportation system data. Second, will be a more comprehensive multi year, multi agency approach to direct restoration efforts, including road restoration, in collaboration with FWS and NMFS, addressing priority watersheds for steelhead and identifying key processes, prioritizing key locations and project types addressing implementation and scheduling issues, and providing preliminary estimates of costs for bull trout. The roads and restoration teams will work together to complete that longer term, more comprehensive effort.

### Team Members

(\* Task Team Leader)

	<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>PHONE #</u>	<u>E-MAIL ADDRESS</u>
1.	Tom Pettigrew*	FS-R1	406-329-3175	tpettigrew/r1@fs.fed.us
2.	Bruce Anderson	FS-R1	208-983-1950	banderson/r1@fs.fed.us
3.	Gary Stevens/ Tom Wawro	BLM-ID	208-373-3951 503-952-6492	glsteven@id.blm.gov
4.	Jan Pisano/ Ralph Browning	NMFS Boise	208-375-5696	jan.pisano@noaa.gov ralph.browning@noaa.gov
5.	Bryon Holt	FWS	509-921-0160	bryon_holt@fws.gov
6.	Ken Brewer			
7.	Scott Russell	FS-R1	208-983-5148	srussell/r1,nezperce

## RESTORATION TASK TEAM

STATEMENT OF WORK: Ultimately the aim of this effort is to develop an integrated, interagency framework to guide restoration of habitat for listed anadromous salmon and steelhead, and bull trout in the Klamath and Columbia River Basins. Assure that team products are developed in coordination and collaboration with field units, as appropriate, depending on the level of specific management unit

information needed and the extent to which field units will be expected to implement task team products. Specific action items relevant to this task are found in the 1998 BioOps on the LRMPs and are summarized in Tables 2-5.

Work will be broken into two primary components. First, efforts will focus on developing strategic guidance for FY 1999 budget allocation. This will provide a mechanism for focusing activities with FY 1999 funding, to achieve restoration goals in an integrated manner. This effort will need to be completed relatively quickly, likely before September 1, 1998, in order to fit budget allocation/direction schedules. Second, will be a more comprehensive effort to develop a multi-year, multi-agency strategy in collaboration with the Roads Database Team and the field units, and coordinated with the IIT. The team will coordinate with the ICBEMP project to ensure that team products are compatible with plans and specific actions established by the ICBEMP Record of Decision.

Team members:

(\* Task Team Leader)

	<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>PHONE #</u>	<u>E-MAIL ADDRESS</u>
1.	Dave Heller*	FS-R6	503-808-2994	dheller/r6pnw@fs.fed.us
2.	Rick Edwards/ Dale Brege	NMFS	208-378-5696	rick.edwards@noaa.gov dale.brege@noaa.gov
3.	Trish Carroll/ Mike Lohrey	FS-R4/ FS-R6	208-334-1770x134 503-808-2902	tcarroll/r4,icbemp@fs.fed.us mlohrey/r6pnw@fs.fed.us
4.	Mike Ash	FS-R6	503-668-1700	mash/r6pnw,mthood@fs.fed.us
5.	Ron Rhew/ Sandy Noble	FWS	503-231-6195 509-548-7573	ron_rhew@fws.gov sandra_m_noble@fws.gov
6.	Steve Grabowski/ Karl Stein	BLM- WO/ BLM-OR	208-373-4041 503-952-6418	sgrabows/blm.gov kstein@blm.gov
7.	Dan Duffield	FS-R4	801-625-5662	dduffield/r4@fs.fed.us
8.	Bill Putnam	FS-R1	406-329-3516	bputnam/r1@fs.fed.us
9.	Toni Tervooren	FS-R6	503-808-2258	ttervooren/r6pnw@fs.fed.us
10	Darwin Priebe	BLM-OR	503-952-6193	dpriebe@blm.gov

## MONITORING TASK TEAM

STATEMENT OF WORK: Develop monitoring plans for the PACFISH/INFISH related BO including baseline, implementation/compliance, effectiveness, and validation monitoring. The overall goal is to protect, maintain and restore species and their habitat to ensure that the current strategies (PACFISH/INFISH) are being interpreted and implemented correctly, accountability is enhanced, and the agencies are meeting desired objectives in an efficient and cost effective way. The intent of the strategy is to : (1) meet BioOp as well as other internal water and aquatic systems requirements (e.g. Clean Water Act); (2) build trust through collaboration and successful implementation of an agreed upon strategy; (3) demonstrate that the agencies are doing what they said they would do; (4) develop a processes for continuous improvement; (5) develop a consistent approach between FS/BLM regions and regulatory agencies; (6) identify a feedback loop to evaluate Policy, Standards and Guidelines and

BMP's; (7) put in place trackable procedures for each responsible agency and level; (8) develop a computerized data base for score cards and or reports cards to facilitate summarization reporting and subsampling; and (9) improve efficiency of cooperation between all involved parties.

Assure that team products are developed in coordination and collaboration with field units, as appropriate, depending on the level of specific management unit information needed and the extent to which field units will be expected to implement task team products. Assure that team products, especially those related to effectiveness and validation monitoring, are coordinated with the ICBEMP monitoring team. Specific action items relevant to these broad tasks are found in the 1998 BioOps on the LRMPs are summarized in Tables 2-5.

**Team Members**  
 (\* Team Leaders)

	<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>PHONE #</u>	<u>E-MAIL ADDRESS</u>
1.	Sandy Noble	FWS	509-548-7573	sandra_m_noble@fws.gov
2.	Kim Kratz	NMFS	503-231-2155	kim.kratz@noaa.gov
3.	Bob Ries	NMFS	208-378-5647	bob.ries@noaa.gov
4.	Mike Pellant	BLM-ID	208-373-3823	mpellant@id.blm.gov
5.	Karl Stein	BLM-OR	503-952-6418	kstein@blm.gov
6.	Steve Grabowski	BLM-WO	208-373-4041	sgrabos/blm.gov
7.	Jeff Kershner	FS-R4	801-797-2500	jkershner/r4@fs.fed.us
8.	Dick Lindenmuth	FS-R6	503-808-2273	dlindenmuth/r6@fs.fed.us
9.	Linda Ulmer	FS-R1	406-329-3507	lulmer/r1@fs.fed.us
10	Lynn Decker*	USFS-R4	801-625-5668	ldecker/r4@fs.fed.gov
.				
11	Kerry Overton*	USFS-RMRS	208-373-4357	koverton/rmrs_boise@fs.fed.us
.				
12	Chuck Quimby	USFS-RB-WNF	541-523-6391	cquimby/r6pnw,wallowawhitman@fs.fed.us
.				
13	Jeff Blackwood	USFS-UNF	541-278-3716	jblackwood/r6pnw,umatilla@fs.fed.us
.				

Note: EPA representative may be added to coordinate on Clean Water Act issues.

**KEY/PRIORITY WATERSHEDS/UNROADED AREAS TASK TEAM**

STATEMENT OF WORK: Identify a network of watersheds for the protection and management of listed salmon, steelhead, and bull trout within the Columbia and Klamath River basins. Develop a common understanding of the management strategies for establishing the priority watershed network. Coordinate with ICBEMP management team to ensure team products are compatible with the long-term priority watershed network expected to be designated in the ICBEMP Record of Decision. Coordinate with the ICBEMP Management Team to ensure consistency in interpretation and application of data and understanding of objectives for watersheds. Coordinate with Restoration and Road Data Base Tasks Teams to minimize duplication of effort and share data to meet the goals of each task team. Assure that

team products are developed in coordination and collaboration with field units, as appropriate, depending on the level of specific management unit information needed and the extent to which field units will be expected to implement task team products. Specific action items relevant to these broad tasks are found in the 1998 BioOps on the LRMPs and are summarized in Tables 2-5.

Team Members  
 (\* Team Leader)

	<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>PHONE #</u>	<u>E-MAIL ADDRESS</u>
1.	CRB Fish Managers (ad hoc)			
2.	Lew Brown	BLM-ID	208-769-5040	L1brown@id.blm.gov
3.	Dorothy Mason	BLM-OR	541-523-1308	d1mason@blm.gov
4.	Denise Hahn/ Ralph Browning	NMFS	208-378-5696	denise.hahn@noaa.gov ralph.browning@noaa.gov
5.	Phil Mattson/ Bob Davis	FS-R6 FS-R4	503-808-2266 801-625-5275	pmattson/r6pnw@fs.fed.us bdavis/r4@fs.fed.us
6.	Tom Pettigrew	FS-R1	406-329-3175	tpettigrew/r1@fs.fed.us
7.	Steve Kozel	FS-R4	208-334- 1770x135	skozel/r4,icbemp@fs.fed.us
8.	Bruce Rieman	FS-RMRS	208-373-4380	brieman/rmrs_boise@fs.fed. us
9.	Ron Rhew	FWS	503-231-6179	ron_rhew@fws.gov
10	Jack Williams	FS-R4	208-373-4100	jwilliams/r4@fs.fed.us
11	Gordon Haugen*	FS-R6	503-808-2929	ghaugen/r6pnw@fs.fed.us

PACFISH/INFISH FIELD IMPLEMENTATION TEAM

STATEMENT OF WORK: Establish a frame work for evaluating the implementation of the PACFISH/INFISH amended LRMPs and related BAs and BioOps. Field reviews will be scheduled for the FY 1999 field season. Assure that team products are developed in coordination and collaboration with field units, as appropriate, depending on the level of specific management unit information needed and the extent to which field units will be expected to implement task team products. Specific action items relevant to these broad tasks are found in the 1998 BioOps on the LRMPs and are summarized in Tables 2-5. Participation of outside agencies such as tribal governments, Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Authority and Northwest Power Planning Council will be considered in shaping the evaluation criteria.

Team Members:  
 (\*Team Coordinator)

	<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>PHONE #</u>	<u>E-MAIL ADDRESS</u>
1.	Mike Crouse/ Dorothy Mason	BLM-OR	503-952-6525 208-373-4049	mcrouse@blm.gov d1mason@blm.gov
2.	Gordon Haugen	FS-R6	503-808-2929	ghaugen/r6pnw@fs.fed.us

3.	Sandy Noble	FWS	509-548-7573	sandra_m_noble@fws.gov
4.	Bob Ries	NMFS	208-378-5647	bob.ries@noaa.gov
5.	Jeff Blackwood	FS-R6	541-278-3760	jblackwood/r6pnw,umatilla
6.	Greg Yuncevich	BLM-ID	208-962-3256	gyuncevi@id.blm.gov
7.	Al Horton	FS-R6	503-808-2262	ahorton/r6pnw@fs.fed.us
8.	Joe Stringer	FS-R4	801-625-5441	joe stringer/r4@fs.fed.us
9.	Rick Stowell	FS-R1	406-329-3287	rstowell/ri@fs.fed.us
10.	Dave Heller	FS-R6	503-808-2994	dheller/r6pnw/@fs.fed.us
11.	Dan Duffield	FS-R4	801-625-5662	dduffield/r4@fs.fed.us

Note: In developing the criteria for the evaluations team composition, external team participation, reporting results criteria for evaluating units, etc., will be developed by the Monitoring Task Team.

### FOREST AND BLM DISTRICT RESPONSIBILITIES

There are numerous tasks in the 1998 BioOps on the LRMPs for which the local Forest Service and BLM field units are responsible for implementation. Specific action items relevant to these broad tasks are found in the 1998 BioOps on the LRMPs and are summarized in Tables 2-5. Attachments one and two are provided to facilitate implementation of the steelhead and bull trout BiOps.

*Table 2. Nine recommendations from the 9/16/97 LRMP BA on five anadromous species (items numbered down the left side of the table). Teams responsible for implementing the tasks are listed across the top of the table; an "X" in the column notes that team is lead on that task (NA means not applicable).*

Recommendation #	IIT	Roads	Restoration	Monitoring	Key/Priority Watershed	PAC/INFISH Field Implementation	FS/BLM Field Units
1.	X						
2.	NA						
3.							X
4.							R-4 only
5.			X				
6.							X
7.				X			
8.							X
9.							X

Note: Attachment 1 contains a detailed summary of tasks and timelines for these 9 items (8/17/98 letter from NMFS to FS/BLM).

*Table 3. Terms and conditions from the 6/19/98 LRMP BioOp for five anadromous species (numbered items down the left side of table). Teams responsible for implementing the tasks are listed across the top of the table. An "X" in the column notes that team is lead on that task; a number in the column (1, 2 or 3) indicates that team is lead (1), but that the other team(s) (2 or 3) also has responsibility for the task.*

T & C	IIT	Roads	Restoration	Monitoring	Key/Priority	PAC/INFISH	FS/BLM
-------	-----	-------	-------------	------------	--------------	------------	--------

#					Watershed	Field Implementation	Field Units
1.a.	X						
1.b.					X		
1.c.	2						1
1.d.				X			
1.d.1.				X			
1.d.2.				X			
1.d.3.						X	
2.a.1.				X			
2.a.2.				X			
2.b.1.		X					
2.b.2.		2	1				
2.b.3.		X					
2.c.							X
3.					X		
3.a.					X		
3.b.					X		
3.c.	3		2		1		
3.d.	X						
4.							X
5.a.	2						1
5.b.			X				
5.c.	2						1
5.d.	X						

Note: Attachment 1 contains a detailed summary of these tasks and timelines (8/17/98 letter from NMFS to FS/BLM).

Table 4. FS/BLM "commitments" (numbered items down left side of table) contained in the 6/19/98 amendment to the LRMP BA for bull trout. Teams responsible for implementing the tasks are listed across the top of the table. An "X" in the column notes that team is lead on that task; a number in the column (1 or 2) indicates that team is lead (1), but that the other team (2) also has responsibility for the task.

FS/BLM Commitments	IIT	Roads	Restoration	Monitoring	Key/Priority Watershed	PAC/INFISH Field Implementation	FS/BLM Field Units
1.			X				
2.a.							X
2.a.i.		X					
2.a.ii.		2	1				
2.a.iii.							X
2.b.							X
3.a.					X		

3.b.					X		
3.c.							X
3.d.	2						1
4.							X
5.				X			
5.a.				X			
5.b.				X			
5.c.				X			
5.d.	2					1	
6.a.					X		
6.b.	X				X?	X?	
6.b.1.	X						
6.b.2.	X						
7.							X

Note: FWS will consider development of a tracking mechanism for tasks and timelines similar to the NMFS letter to BLM/FS (8/17/98). Once developed, this mechanism would also become an attachment to the Charter.

*Table 5. Terms and conditions from the 8/14/98 LRMP BioOp for bull trout in the Columbia and Klamath Basins (numbered items down the left side of table). Teams responsible for implementing the tasks are listed across the top of the table. An "X" in the column notes that team is lead on that task; a number in the column (1 or 2) indicates that team is lead (1), but that the other team (2) also has responsibility for the task.*

T & C #	IIT	Roads	Restoration	Monitoring	Key/Priority Watershed	PAC/INFISH Field Implementation	FS/BLM Field Units
1.	X						
2.							X
3.							X
4.				X			
a.				X			
b.				X			
c.	2					1	
5.		X					
a.		X					
b.		2					1
c.		X					
d.	X						
6.							BLM only
7.							X
8.							X
9.							X
10.							X

11.							X
12.							X
13.							X
14.							X
a.							X
i.							X
ii.							X
b.							X

Note: FWS will consider development of a tracking mechanism for tasks and timelines similar to the NMFS letter to BLM/FS (8/17/98). Once developed, this mechanism would also become an attachment to the Charter.

## ATTACHMENT 1

8/17/98 Letter from NMFS to FS/BLM  
 Providing Materials to Facilitate Implementation of  
 Requirements of the 1998 LRMP BioOp

Jack Blackwell  
Acting Regional Forester, Region 4  
U.S. Forest Service  
324 25th Street  
Ogden, Utah 84401

Robert Williams  
Regional Forester, Region 6  
U.S. Forest Service  
P.O. Box 3623  
Portland, Oregon 97208

Dale Bosworth  
Regional Forester, Region 1  
U.S. Forest Service  
P.O. Box 7669  
Missoula, Montana 59807

Elaine Zielinski  
State Director  
Bureau of Land Management  
P.O. Box 2965  
Portland, Oregon 97208-0039

Martha Hahn  
State Director  
Bureau of Land Management  
1378 S. Vinnell Way  
Boise, Idaho 83709

Northwest Region  
7600 Sand Point Way, N.E.  
Bin C15700, Building 1  
Seattle, Washington 98115-0070

Re: Materials to Facilitate Implementation of Requirements in June 22, 1998, Biological Opinion on Continued Implementation of Land and Resource Management Plans in the Upper Columbia and Snake River Basins

Dear Sirs and Mesdames:

This letter is a follow-up to National Marine Fisheries Service's (NMFS) issuance of the June 22, 1998, biological opinion (Opinion) on the subject actions and is intended to facilitate implementation of the Opinion. The Opinion and September 16, 1997, biological assessment (BA) evaluated effects on listed salmon and steelhead of 18 U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP). The agencies developed various requirements to strengthen and focus species and habitat protection and restoration efforts during the extended application of interim strategies pending completion of the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP). The full description of these requirements is in the Opinion, primarily in the Reinitiation of Consultation section (p. 59-60), Incidental Take Statement (p. 68-73), and Appendices 1 and 2 (p. 75-90). The text below and three enclosed tables are an abbreviated version of these requirements, and are designed to assist your agencies in prioritizing and scheduling tasks for implementation and in tracking accomplishments. Staff from your agencies found a draft version of this letter to be a useful planning tool when it was released at a July 9, 1998, meeting in Portland.

The NMFS will collaborate with USFS and BLM in developing and reviewing accomplishments identified in the Opinion and summarized in the enclosures to determine whether the Opinion is being implemented as intended. The Opinion directs NMFS to closely monitor these actions as identified in the Reinitiation of Consultation section. Among other triggers for reinitiation, consultation must be reinitiated if NMFS' semi-annual assessment, PACFISH Field Review reports, or other evidence shows interim direction (including the proposed action and mechanisms in the BA/Opinion, as well as ongoing direction developed prior to the BA/Opinion) is not being implemented or not implemented consistently. If corrective action is not taken within 30 days, consultation must be reinitiated. The NMFS will use the

regulatory timelines identified in the Incidental Take Statement to track completion dates. The dates included under each mechanism are important interagency checkpoints to ensure that each deliverable stays on track.

The USFS, BLM, NMFS, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) have started to form an aquatic implementation team to oversee the tasks in NMFS' LRMP Opinion and a similar Opinion which USFWS is finalizing for bull trout. This team is also seeking efficiencies in developing these tasks in step with the aquatic conservation strategy which is currently being formulated for ICBEMP. The NMFS agrees with this team's goal of efficient implementation of the various strategies; however, it will be important that this effort not hamper the meeting of timelines required by NMFS' Opinion. Where tasks may be significantly delayed related to bull trout or ICBEMP efforts, the NMFS Opinion should be de-coupled from these other efforts.

The NMFS appreciates the efforts of your staffs during the LRMP consultation to assist NMFS in addressing several key issues influencing the survival and recovery of listed salmon and steelhead. The NMFS looks forward to building on the hard work put into the consultation, and assisting your staffs in accomplishing the tasks described in the Opinion.

Sincerely,

William Stelle, Jr.  
Regional Administrator

cc:  
M. Dombeck, USFS  
R. Schmitten, NMFS  
P. Shay, BLM

bcc:

F/NWO - K. Cunningham

F/PR8 - Craig Johnson

F/NWO3 - File Copy

SRHBO - File Copy

GCNW - M. Eames and M. Rowland

troyer:strach:biotask.:8-11-98

Addresses for cc:

Michael Dombeck, Chief

U.S. Forest Service

14th and Independence St

Washington, DC 20090-6090

Rollie Schmitten

Assistant Administrator for Fisheries

National Marine Fisheries Service

1315 East-West Highway

Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Patrick Shay, Director

Bureau of Land Management

Washington, DC 20240

Enclosure 1

**1998 LRMP Opinion Mechanisms for Extended Implementation of PACFISH**

(format)

Regulatory Reporting Date	Date Received:		
Mechanism (#s correspond to Opinion Appendix 2)	Inter-agency Check-point	Expectation Achieved <sup>1</sup> ? (Yes/No/Partly)	

November 1998	Deliverable Received:		
1a. Develop mechanism for accountability and implementation of plan-level direction.	October 20, 1998		
1b. Establish priority watersheds for steelhead.	August 21, 1998		
1c. Review fiscal year work program for attainment of fish conservation measures; identify shortfalls; given shortfalls, mutually develop strategy to implement aquatic conservation measures.	By March 1 each year		
1d. Implement monitoring commensurate with on-the-ground activities and provide feedback to NMFS on the effects of the activities.			
1d.1. Review NMFS' 1995 LRMP Opinion expectations when updating the PACFISH monitoring strategy.			
1d.2. Activate the PACFISH monitoring subgroup to develop monitoring strategy commensurate with activity, funding, and staffing levels.	October 20, 1998		
1d.3. Improve implementation of PACFISH by, for example, expanding regional, state, line officer involvement in oversight and review.			

January 15, 1999	Deliverable Received:		
2a.1. Improve and monitor grazing strategies to meet PACFISH standard GM-1. An interagency group will develop stratified monitoring plans and link these to adaptive management of grazing to ensure compliance with PACFISH.	Prior to 1999 Grazing Season		
2a.2. Monitoring plans in 2a.1. will be fully implemented beginning in 1999. Alternative monitoring approach may be approved by the interagency team. Without approved monitoring, only grazing allowed is that which level 1 team deems "not likely to adversely affect."	1999 Grazing Season		
2b.1. Provide NMFS with road inventories on the management units using existing information and road definitions. Provide missing information within two years.	October 20, 1998/ June 22, 2000		
2b.2. Collaborate with NMFS in developing multi-year road restoration strategies for priority watersheds			
2b.3. Annually update road inventories	October 20 each year		

1.

	2c. Conduct biannual programmatic reviews and/or project bundling by watershed or subbasin. Provide updated environmental baseline using best available information; group, analyze, and submit the ensuing two years' projects in these biannual reviews.	January 15, 1999 and each subsequent year	
September 1, 1999	Deliverable Received:		
	3. Convene team of agencies technical experts and research scientists to guide an assessment of unroaded and low density roaded areas in relation to conservation of listed salmon and steelhead. Assessment will include items below.		
	3a. Provide descriptions, locations, and maps of unroaded and low density roaded areas, and existing information on the relative habitat value of the areas for anadromous fish.	October 1, 1998	
	3b. Summarize existing management direction in these areas.	October 1, 1998	
	3c. Technical/research team reviews this information and makes recommendations to senior managers regarding at a minimum: need for additional habitat protection; risks to listed fish from developmental activities; priorities for subbasin assessments and watershed analyses; connectivity between areas; and restoration priorities. Proposed roading of these areas not submitted for consultation until this mechanism is completed.	March 1, 1999	
	3d. Provide a mutually agreed on strategy to accomplish any additional habitat protections recommended by the technical/research team.	September 1, 1999	
	4. Exercise existing authorities per ESA section 7(a)(1) to protect critical habitat from activities associated with laws that may conflict w/ ESA (e.g. ANILCA, Ditch Act, mining laws, etc.)	Effective June 22, 1998	
Annually, Beginning May 1999	Deliverable Received:		
	5a. Adhere to special management considerations for South Fork Salmon, Middle Fork Salmon, and Selway River subbasins (refer to enclosure 2, action item 4) via consultation streamlining and accountability mechanism 1a., above.	Effective June 22, 1998	
	5b. Develop multi-year strategies to accelerate restoration of habitat for listed anadromous fish in the Snake and upper Columbia River basin priority watersheds. Include specific projects, incorporating restoration opportunities from mechanisms 2 and 3, above. Strategy provides basis for implementation of restoration in 1999 and subsequent years	March 1, 1999	
	5c. Provide schedule for completion of at least one watershed analysis per management unit per year beginning in 1999. When available, subbasin assessments (mechanism 5d.3.) should be used to prioritize watersheds for analysis.	September 20, 1998	
	5d. In the event that ICBEMP may not be implemented by the 2000 field season, begin providing and implementing components of a long term strategy listed below.		
	5d.1. Initiate basin reviews for the Snake and upper Columbia River basins. Review will include: delineation of migration corridors, metapopulations, and subpopulations of listed salmon and steelhead; subbasin priorities for further review based on value for, and level of risk to the listed fish; and determination if other subbasins warrant the special management considerations described in proposed action item 4 (refer to enclosure 2). Develop strategy to provide any protection deemed necessary for additional subbasins within 6 months following basin review.	December 15, 1999	

5d.2. Complete one subbasin assessment per management unit per year. Priorities for assessment provided by basin review. Mutually agree on protocols and products for these assessments.	May 1, 2000, and each year thereafter	
5d.3. Develop action plans at watershed scale based on goals and objectives identified in subbasin assessments. This should be coordinated with the restoration strategies in 5c., above.		

<sup>1</sup> The expectation is that all deliverables will meet the regulatory timeline, and be scientifically credible and legally defensible.

## Enclosure 2

### Proposed Action Items (BA Recommendations adopted as part of the plan-level action)

Action Item (#s correspond to Opinion Appendix 1)	Timeframe	Implementation check
1. Continue applying NMFS 1995 BO and all subsequent related direction, and extend application to the Clearwater and upper Columbia River basins.	Effective starting September 1997	NMFS' implementation check by December 22, 1998, and every 6 months thereafter
2. Extend to steelhead the 17 project-specific Opinions already developed for salmon.	The agencies will use current direction (plan-level and consultation streamlining) to complete consultations on these projects	
3. Consult on ongoing actions using consultation streamlining direction and NMFS' matrix. Prior to the consultations an interagency team will modify the matrix as needed for the Snake River and upper Columbia River basins.	Approximately August 21, 1998	
4. Apply special management considerations for management of the South Fork Salmon River, Middle Fork Salmon River, and the Selway River subbasins. These measures include restrictions on road building, timber harvest, grazing, and recreation activities. Specific fire management and riparian area management techniques are required. Emphasis is placed on road closures, obliterations, and repairs to reduce the effects of existing roads on the listed species (Opinion pp. 78-80).	Effective as of September 1997	NMFS' implementation check by December 22, 1998, and every 6 months thereafter
5. Accelerate restoration of steelhead habitat in the Snake River basin. Mutually develop and fund restoration.	Effective September 1997	NMFS' implementation check by December 22, 1998, and every 6 months thereafter
6. Review commercial and non-commercial recreational boating and floating for adverse effects on steelhead spawning; eliminate/minimize effects. Review recreational facilities as ongoing actions.	Effective September 1997	NMFS' implementation check by December 22, 1998, and every 6 months thereafter
7. Strengthen monitoring and commitment to insure PACFISH is properly implemented; includes increased emphasis and scheduling of watershed analysis	Effective September 1997	NMFS' implementation check by December 22, 1998, and every 6 months thereafter
8. Treat watersheds within range of the two steelhead ESUs as key watersheds and designated critical habitat	Effective September 1997	NMFS' implementation check by December 22, 1998, and every 6 months thereafter
9. Adopt these items (1-8, above) for an indefinite period pending adoption of new, long-term programmatic direction	Effective September 1997. Duration of these items as part of the interim approach depends on when consultation on LRMPs must be reinitiated (refer to Opinion, p.59-60)	



**Enclosure 3**

**Chronological Listing by Interagency Checkpoint**

<b>Regulatory Reporting Date</b>		
	<b>Mechanism (#s correspond to Opinion Appendix 2)</b>	<b>Inter-agency Check-point</b>
November 1998	Deliverable Received:	
	Review fiscal year work program for attainment of fish conservation measures; identify shortfalls; given shortfalls, mutually develop strategy to implement aquatic conservation measures.	By March 1 each year
	Establish priority watersheds for steelhead.	August 21, 1998
	Activate the PACFISH monitoring subgroup to develop monitoring strategy commensurate with activity, funding, and staffing levels.	October 20, 1998
	Develop mechanism for accountability and implementation of plan-level direction.	October 20, 1998
	Implement monitoring commensurate with on-the-ground activities and provide feedback to NMFS on the effects of the activities.	
	Review NMFS' 1995 LRMP Opinion expectations when updating the PACFISH monitoring strategy.	
	Improve implementation of PACFISH by, for example, expanding regional, state, line officer involvement in oversight and review.	
January 15, 1999	Deliverable Received:	
	Provide NMFS with road inventories on the management units using existing information and road definitions. Provide missing information within two years.	October 20, 1998/ June 22, 2000
	Annually update road inventories	October 20 each year
	Improve and monitor grazing strategies to meet PACFISH standard GM-1. An interagency group will develop stratified monitoring plans and link these to adaptive management of grazing to ensure compliance with PACFISH.	Prior to 1999 Grazing Season
	Monitoring plans in 2a.1. will be fully implemented beginning in 1999. Alternative monitoring approach may be approved by the interagency team. Without approved monitoring, only grazing allowed is that which level 1 team deems "not likely to adversely affect."	1999 Grazing Season
	Collaborate with NMFS in developing multi-year road restoration strategies for priority watersheds	
Annually, Beginning May 1999	Deliverable Received:	
	Adhere to special management considerations for South Fork Salmon, Middle Fork Salmon, and Selway River subbasins (refer to enclosure 2, action item 4) via consultation streamlining and accountability mechanism 1a., above.	Effective June 22, 1998
	Provide schedule for completion of at least one watershed analysis per management unit per year beginning in 1999. When available, subbasin assessments (mechanism 5d.3. ) should be used to prioritize watersheds for analysis.	September 20, 1998
	Develop multi-year strategies to accelerate restoration of habitat for listed anadromous fish in the Snake and upper Columbia River basin priority watersheds. Include specific projects, incorporating restoration opportunities from mechanisms 2 and 3, above. Strategy provides basis for implementation of restoration in 1999 and subsequent years	March 1, 1999
	Initiate basin reviews for the Snake and upper Columbia River basins. Review will include: delineation of migration corridors, metapopulations, and subpopulations of listed salmon and steelhead; subbasin priorities for further review based on value for, and level of risk to the listed fish; and determination if other subbasins warrant the special management considerations described in	December 15, 1999

	proposed action item 4 (refer to enclosure 2). Develop strategy to provide any protection deemed necessary for additional subbasins within 6 months following basin review.	
	Complete one subbasin assessment per management unit per year. Priorities for assessment provided by basin review. Mutually agree on protocols and products for these assessments.	May 1, 2000, and each year thereafter
	In the event that ICBEMP may not be implemented by the 2000 field season, begin providing and implementing components of a long term strategy listed below.	
	Develop action plans at watershed scale based on goals and objectives identified in subbasin assessments. This should be coordinated with the restoration strategies in 5c., above.	
September 1, 1999	Deliverable Received:	
	Exercise existing authorities per ESA section 7(a)(1) to protect critical habitat from activities associated with laws that may conflict w/ ESA (e.g. ANILCA, Ditch Act, mining laws, etc.)	Effective June 22, 1998
	Provide descriptions, locations, and maps of unroaded and low density roaded areas, and existing information on the relative habitat value of the areas for anadromous fish.	October 1, 1998
	Summarize existing management direction in these areas.	October 1, 1998
	Technical/research team reviews this information and makes recommendations to senior managers regarding at a minimum: need for additional habitat protection; risks to listed fish from developmental activities; priorities for subbasin assessments and watershed analyses; connectivity between areas; and restoration priorities. Proposed roading of these areas not submitted for consultation until this mechanism is completed.	March 1, 1999
	Provide a mutually agreed on strategy to accomplish any additional habitat protections recommended by the technical/research team.	September 1, 1999
	Convene team of agencies technical experts and research scientists to guide an assessment of unroaded and low density roaded areas in relation to conservation of listed salmon and steelhead. Assessment will include items below.	

1

## ATTACHMENT 2

### TABLES PREPARED BY THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE TO FACILITATE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1998 BIOLOGICAL OPINION ON BULL TROUT

#### USFWS BIOLOGICAL OPINION

For the

Effects to Bull Trout from Continued Implementation of Land and Resource Management Plans and Resource Management Plans as Amended by the Interim Strategy for Managing Fish-producing Watershed in Eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho, Western Montana, and Portions of Nevada (INFISH), and the Interim Strategy for Managing Anadromous Fish-producing Watersheds in Eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho, and Portions of California (PACFISH)

August 14, 1998

**REASONABLE AND PRUDENT MEASURES**

Continued LRMP Implementation, page 94

Land Management Agency Reporting Date		Date Received:
Requirement (#s correspond to Reasonable and Prudent Measures, page 94, of the FWS bull trout BO signed August 14, 1998)	Interagency Check Point	Expectation Achieved (Yes/No/Partly)
1. Apply the review criteria described on pages C-3 through C-9 of the PACFISH ROD (USDA and USDI 1995a), and A-1 through A-6 of the INFISH FONSI (USDA 1995) to ensure that proposed actions are fully consistent with applicable standards and guidelines and ACS objectives.		
2. Utilize the Level 1 team consultation process and apply the bull trout Matrix~ or a similar approach as agreed to by the agencies (USFS, BLM, and the Service; Appendices 2, 3, and 6) to evaluate actions to determine the potential effects of bull trout, and to assure interagency coordination to complete the consultation process. In addition, update the environmental baseline at the section 7 watershed scale to include proposed actions once consultation is concluded.		
3. In collaboration with the Service, develop a mechanism for improved monitoring accountability and oversight of management actions that affect bull trout or their habitats, designed to meet the applicable objectives, standards and guidelines of PACFISH and INFISH.		
4. Together with the Service, collaborate in development of multi-year road restoration strategies for key, priority and special emphasis watersheds.		
5. In collaboration with the Service, conduct a comprehensive review of existing unroaded and low density roaded areas throughout the Columbia River and Klamath River bull trout DPSs and determine their importance for the long-term conservation of bull trout. The information will serve as the foundation of a conservation strategy based on the protection of existing high quality habitat with the necessary connectivity between these areas.		

The following reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions become mandatory when and where found appropriate through formal consultation, and prescribed by the Service in a site-specific biological opinion.

**WATERSHED AND HABITAT RESTORATION ACTIONS**

6. Apply the results of watershed analysis where required or applicable, and consider expected benefits to bull trout during the design and prioritization of instream habitat enhancement and restoration projects, culvert replacement upgrades, and road decommissioning actions. Assess proposed watershed and habitat restoration actions to ensure that potential short term adverse effects to bull trout are outweighed by long-term benefits.		
7. Ensure that the timing of any work within intermittent or perennial stream channels associated with these projects is designed to minimize/reduce short-term adverse effects to aquatic habitat and bull trout.		
8. Apply relevant PACFISH and INFISH objectives, standards and		

guidelines, and relevant aspects of the June 19, 1998, additional commitments in design and implementation of watershed and habitat restoration actions.		
--	--	--

**ROAD CONSTRUCTION ACTIONS**

9. Avoid, reduce or minimize the adverse effects of road construction, reconstruction and maintenance on bull trout habitat components; particularly water quality, flow and hydrology, and channel condition and dynamics.		
---	--	--

**LIVESTOCK GRAZING ACTIONS**

10. Review, modify, and implement annual operating instructions or term grazing permits for those allotments/leases which encompass streams known or expected to contain bull trout addressed in this BO to meet appropriate PACFISH or INFISH objectives.		
11. Develop and implement grazing management plans and practices in areas of known or suspected bull trout spawning to minimize/reduce trampling of redds and other direct and indirect effects that may result in take of the species.		
12. As allotment management plans are amended or revised, modify the AMPs to meet appropriate PACFISH or INFISH objectives.		

**MINING ACTIONS**

13. Minimize/Reduce the adverse effects of mining actions, including placer mining, recreational suction dredging, and gold panning, that result in take of the species by implementing all relevant standards and guidelines (e.g., MM-1, MM-2, etc.).		
---	--	--

**TIMBER MANAGEMENT ACTIONS**

14. Analyze, design, and implement timber harvest activities to address impacts from the action on water quality, habitat access, habitat elements, channel condition and dynamics, stream flow, hydrology, and watershed conditions.		
---	--	--

**TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

Continued LRMP Implementation, page 96

Land Management Agency Reporting Date	Date Received:	
Requirement (#s correspond to Terms and Conditions, page 96, of the FWS bull trout BO signed August 14, 1998)	Interagency Check Point	Expectation Achieved (Yes/No/Partly)
December 1, 1998		
1. The USFS and BLM will develop, in cooperation with the Service, time lines and a schedule for completion of aspects of the additional commitments contained in the June 19, 1998, amendment to the BA where they are not currently described.		
2. To ensure that proposed actions designed in accordance with relevant standards and guidelines are in fact consistent with PACFISH and INFISH ACS objectives, USFS and BLM decision makers will apply the results of watershed analysis and other relevant information to conclude that actions either meet or do not prevent attainment~ of the ACS objectives. The conclusion must be documented and supporting rationale provided. Examples of tools for the documentation include, but are not limited to materials provided at interagency workshops on the bull trout conference process (e.g. the bull trout matrix and outline for watershed Base) and Adequate		

Documentation for Changes to ACS.		
3. To ensure that an interagency, interdisciplinary process is used to implement management direction in the LRMPs, utilize the Level 1 team streamlining consultation process; the bull trout watershed consultation approach as outlined in the January 27, 1998, letter of direction and as updated by any new, revised interagency direction; and apply the bull trout Checklist and Matrix of Pathways and Indicators (USFWS 1998), or a similar agreed upon approach, to evaluate all proposed actions that may affect the bull trout.		
4. Through interagency coordination, develop stratified monitoring plans (e.g. at the watershed or subbasin scales) to evaluate impacts of management actions to bull trout. The management program areas to address and a <b>schedule</b> for their development will be agreed to by the interagency team. The plans should address, at a minimum, both compliance and effectiveness monitoring.		
4.a. Develop these plans by subbasin, through use of an interagency group, to maximize the utility of monitoring information through a coordinated effort and a defensible sampling design. The interagency groups should establish objectives for the monitoring plans in accordance with PACFISH and INFISH.		
4.b. Goals for the monitoring plans should include maximizing the effectiveness of limited monitoring funds, identifying appropriate scales and levels of monitoring necessary to determine if management actions are meeting PACFISH and INFISH direction, allowing for flexibility as funding and activities change, and identifying how monitoring results should be used to make management adjustments.		
4.c. Fully implement the monitoring plans by ensuring monitoring schedules are developed and implemented, with agreement between the USFS, BLM, and the Service. If these mutually agreed upon schedules can not be followed, an alternative approach will be developed and agreed to by the interagency group.		
5. In collaboration with the Service, the USFS and BLM will develop and implement guidance for use by administrative units for minimizing/reducing effects of road management programs on bull trout. Issues that should be addressed in this guidance document include, but are not limited to, road construction, reconstruction, removal, obliteration and decommissioning as well as an assessment of unroaded and low density roaded areas in relation to conservation of bull trout. The exact scope, format and detail of this guidance document should be decided through interagency discussions. Following are items for consideration in completing this task:		
5.a. Convene an interagency technical team of experts and research scientists to guide an assessment of road construction and management, including unroaded and low density roaded areas in relation to conservation of bull trout.		
5.b. Provide descriptions, location, and maps of unroaded and low density roaded areas, and existing information on the relative habitat value of the areas for bull trout.		
5.c. The technical/research team will summarize and review existing management direction and make recommendations to senior agency managers regarding at a minimum: need for additional habitat protection; risks to bull trout from developmental activities; priority for subbasin assessments and watershed analyses connectivity between areas; and restoration priorities.		

5.d. Provide a mutually agreed upon strategy to accomplish any additional habitat protections recommended by the technical/research team.		
---	--	--

Within Ten Calendar Days Respond to Mining Notices		
For mining operations on BLM-administered lands that are not required to have an approved Plan of Operation (see CFR §3809.1-4), respond to all mining notices within 10 calendar days by advising the operator that the mining activity shall not cause take of bull trout unless the operator has first obtained an incidental take permit under section 10 of the ESA. BLM will advise the operator of what actions are needed to prevent adverse impacts to bull trout and their habitat.		

The following terms and conditions will become mandatory when and where found appropriate through formal consultation, and prescribed, by the Service, in a site-specific biological opinion.

**WATERSHED AND HABITAT RESTORATION ACTIONS**

7. Provide documentation of information and criteria used to design and prioritize actions to demonstrate that the timing of in-channel work associated with the subject projects will minimize short-term adverse effects to aquatic habitat, and to demonstrate compliance with applicable objectives and standards and guidelines of the ACSs.		
8. To ensure that proposed actions are designed to provide for long-term habitat benefits while avoiding, minimizing or reducing short-term impacts, utilize information and recommendations from completed watershed analysis reports, the most current watershed scale environmental baseline and the determination of effects of proposed actions using the bull trout Matrix and Checklist, or an agreed upon approach.		

**ROAD CONSTRUCTION ACTIONS**

9. To avoid or minimize incidental take associated with the adverse effects of road construction, reconstruction and maintenance on water quality, flow and hydrology, and channel condition and dynamics, each administrative unit shall apply the pertinent standards and guidelines for road construction and decommissioning as described in the LRMPs, as amended by PACFISH and INFISH.		
10. New roads (temporary, semi-permanent or permanent) in RHCAs shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible, and shall be constructed only where watershed and analyses have been completed to document that the roads would not prevent attainment of ACS objectives.		

**LIVESTOCK GRAZING ACTIONS**

11. When reviewing and modifying grazing actions to minimize/reduce incidental take, amend livestock grazing annual operating instructions, term grazing permits or leases to incorporate appropriate criteria for evaluating ecological conditions of affected areas to ensure attainment of ACS objectives. The evaluation criteria should be developed by USFS and/or BLM range and other interdisciplinary specialists, in coordination with the Service through Level 1 teams.		
12. Implement management actions, as appropriate, to minimize the impact of livestock grazing in known bull trout spawning areas. Some actions which may be considered include numbers of animals, timing		

and duration of grazing, herding, fencing or riparian areas, or upland water sites.		
---	--	--

**MINING ACTIONS**

13. For mining operations where the administrative unit has discretion to require a Plan of Operations, require such a plan if the mining operation has the potential to adversely affect bull trout. Ensure that the plan complies with applicable minerals management standards and guidelines for the ACS.		
---	--	--

**TIMBER MANAGEMENT ACTIONS**

14. Analyze, design, and implement timber harvest activities to meet the requirements of PACFISH and INFISH, and such additional measures as needed to minimize/reduce incidental take of bull trout, through incorporation of the following terms and conditions as appropriate for site specific conditions:		
14.a. Evaluate effects to bull trout and develop mitigation measures.		
14.a.i. Utilize the indicators for bull trout habitat needs contained in the bull trout matrix (Appendix 2), or a similar evaluation tool agreed upon by the agencies;		
14. a. ii. Utilize information from: the scientific literature; models, validated with local data wherever possible; and on-site studies to evaluate slope stability, and landslide hazard and risk;		
14.b. Develop and implement approaches that address and minimize potential incidental take of bull trout from fuel storage and transportation associated with timber harvest actions.		

INTERAGENCY MEMORANDUM  
TO AMEND THE BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT  
FOR THE  
PACFISH/INFISH LRMP SECTION 7 CONSULTATION  
ON BULL TROUT

Land Management Agency Reporting Date		Date Received:	
Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) commitments (#s correspond to June 19, 1998, interagency memorandum)	Interagency Check Point	Expectation Achieved (Yes/No/Partly)	

**I. RESTORATION AND IMPROVEMENT**

March 1, 1999		Date Received:	
Initial strategy development to be completed, including:			
A. The integration and coordination of restoration, protection and evaluation measures (construction/maintenance, flood repair, watershed, and fish habitat improvements, etc.)			
B. The achievement of restoration objectives at multiple scales (DPS, metapopulation watershed)			
C. Restoration opportunities will be identified through an agreed upon approach using existing funding, information and programs, and incorporating new information as it becomes available.			

**II. STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES**

The Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) will complete prior commitments in the PACFISH and INFISH decisions, and use the conclusion in the PACFISH/INFISH reviews and the land management plan biological assessment (BA) for bull trout.	Date Received:
---	----------------

II. A. Achievement of standards for road evaluation and planning (PACFISH AND INFISH standards RF-2 and RF-3)		
---	--	--

December 14, 1998 (within 120 days of BO signature)		Date Received:	
II. A. 1. FS and BLM will provide road inventories on the management units in the three bull trout DPSs, including a description of road definitions and survey methodology used.			
II. A. 1. Road inventory information gaps will be identified. A schedule will be developed to provide information to the FWS within two years.			

December 14, 2000		Date Received:	
II. A. 1. Information identified will be provided to the USFWS.			
II. A. 2. <b>Development of Restoration Strategies in Collaboration with FWS and NMFS</b>			

Strategies will serve as the primary framework for implementation of integrated restoration activities.		
Information to be used in strategies includes watershed analyses, road inventories, and other appropriate information.		
II. A. 2. <b>Restoration strategies</b> will be used to:		
1. Identify processes needing attention		
2. Prioritize key locations and project types		
3. Address implementation and scheduling issues		
4. Provide a preliminary estimate of costs		

II. A. 3. <b>Road Inventories</b>		
Continue updating the road inventories.		
New road inventory information should include a description of road definitions and survey methodology used (as above).		
II. B. Achievement of PACFISH/INFISH RF-4 and RF-5, GM-2, RM-1, and MM-2. These include commitments made in the aquatic strategies for culvert replacement, fish passage, grazing facilities, in RHCAs, recreation facilities, and minerals management.	Date Received:	

### III. KEY AND PRIORITY WATERSHED NETWORKS

Reexamine the structure and function of these networks to ensure the protection and recovery of bull trout metapopulations.	Date Received:	
III. A. Identify and clarify the primary functions of key, priority, and special emphasis watersheds.		

October 14, 1998 (within 60 days of BO signature)	Date Received:	
III. B. Identify special emphasis watersheds to ensure a comprehensive refugia network.		

III. C. Complete watershed analyses in existing INFISH priority watersheds, and special emphasis watersheds (PACFISH and INFISH standards TM-1, RF-2, RM-1)(in 3b above). Project decisions will be guided by the results of watershed analysis.		
III. D. Priorities and schedules for watershed analyses will be developed concurrently with #I (above). These will be updated annually.		

### IV. WATERSHED ANALYSIS

Watershed analysis will be conducted according to Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale?, Field Guide for Watershed Analysis, 1995, as updated.		
Watershed analysis will be undertaken to generate an information base and recommendations for use in project planning.		

### V. MONITORING

The FS and BLM will develop a mechanism for improved monitoring accountability and oversight. The goals are to improve monitoring efforts, to make the level of monitoring commensurate with the level of on-the-ground activities, and to provide feedback on the effects of activities.	
---	--

V. A. NMFS? expectations for monitoring in the 1995 LRMP Opinion (section IX.I. and Appendices A-10) will be considered when updating the PACFISH monitoring strategy.		
--	--	--

December 14, 1998 (within 120 days of BO signature)	Date Received:
---	----------------

V. B. Activate the PACFISH interagency effectiveness monitoring subgroup including areas covered by INFISH to develop a monitoring strategy including a range of monitoring alternatives commensurate with anticipated land management activity levels, funding, and staffing levels.		
---	--	--

V. C. Incorporate INFISH areas into PACFISH implementation monitoring efforts.		
V. D. Improve the current implementation monitoring process by expanding regional/state level USFS/BLM line officer involvement in PACFISH/INFISH implementation oversight and review.		

**VI. LONG-TERM CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY**

The FS and BLM will use their authorities in carrying out programs for the conservation of endangered and threatened species as consistent with Section 7 a(1) of ESA.	Date Received:
--	----------------

VI. A. The FS and BLM will develop a conservation approach to protect and restore existing high quality habitats and the connectivity between them using PACFISH, INFISH, watershed analysis and other information.  The FS and BLM will review existing roadless and low density areas (as defined in ICBEMP science assessment team) to assess their importance to listed species habitat.		
--	--	--

VI. B. The FS and BLM will develop a mechanism for improved accountability and oversight to ensure PACFISH and INFISH direction is fully implemented as a foundation for the development of a long-term conservation and recovery strategy.  Interagency collaboration in the development of this mechanism is necessary to ensure a common understanding of expectations.		
--	--	--

December 14, 1998 (within 120 days of BO signature)	Date Received:
---	----------------

VI. B. 1. The FS and BLM will provide a mechanism that ensures full implementation of programmatic aquatic conservation measures at all organizational levels for the bull trout species addressed in the BA Effects to Bull Trout, Short Nose Sucker, Lost River Sucker, and Warner Sucker of Land and Resource Management Plans, and Associated Federal Actions on National Forests and Bureau of Land Management Resource Areas in the Columbia River, Klamath River,		
--	--	--

and Jarbidge River Basins. June 15, 1998".		
<p>VI. B. 2. The FS and BLM will provide a strategy which will be used if funding or priorities prevent full implementation of the aquatic conservation measures.</p> <p>Annually, upon receipt of their initial budgets, the FS and BLM will review the fiscal year priorities and program of work for attainment of fish conservation measures.</p> <p>Following the review of fiscal year priorities, the FS and BLM will identify the highest priority work for available funds, and identify and document significant shortfalls in funding or staffing.</p>		

**VII. COMPLETION OF ESA SECTION 7 CONSULTATIONS**

May 1, 1999	Date Received	
<p>The FS and BLM, in coordination with the FWS, will complete section 7 consultations at the watershed level.</p> <p>The watershed consultations will follow the approach agreed to in the January 27, 1998 letter of direction on bull trout conferencing, with modifications as agreed to by the agencies.</p> <p>After the effective date of the bull trout listing, and until the watershed consultations are completed, all ongoing and proposed actions must conform to INFISH and PACFISH guidelines and these seven commitments.</p>		