

Appendix 10

Implementation Framework

Appendix 10 of the Supplemental Draft EIS is incorporated by reference, in accordance with 40 CFR 1500.4(j) and (o), 1502.21 and 1506.4. The incorporated material can be found on pages 10-1 through 10-22 in Volume 2 of the Supplemental Draft EIS. The content is briefly summarized below, with changes based on public comment and internal review following the summary.

Summary

This appendix includes four main sections: The Nature of Decisions; Implementation Process; Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adaptive Management Framework; and Challenges to Implementation. Additional sections have been added on the Implementation Organization and Implementation Monitoring Program.

Modifications Made to ICBEMP Supplemental Draft EIS

Appendix 10

Page/Column/Paragraph or
Table/Fig/Map/Photo

Change Made (bold = new; strikeout = delete)

10-21/left/1st para

Insert before References section:

Implementation Organization

An organization will be formed to implement the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project (ICBEMP) plan after the Record of Decision (ROD) is signed and is intended to be fully functioning within a year. It will include a basin monitoring coordinator and interagency monitoring review teams. The overall role of the implementation organization is to support the implementation of the management direction and to promote basin-wide scientific research, data management, monitoring, and issue resolution.

The implementation organization will have several functions, including:

- ♦ provide guidance to the field units for the five interagency partners (Bureau of Land Management [BLM], Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency [EPA], National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS], and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS]) to interpret the ROD, and to identify training needs and opportunities.
- ♦ help develop methods to transfer information from the broad-scale ICBEMP level to finer-scale field levels, identify budget needs, and promote consistent application of the management direction.
- ♦ maintain basin- and regional-scale information systems and disseminate information to field units, interagency and intergovernmental partners, interest groups, and the public.
- ♦ monitor the implementation of the ROD, which should help identify any needed changes in management direction.
- ♦ evaluate, interpret, and provide advice on basin-wide data standards.
- ♦ promote methods to ensure the most current data is available to guide on-the-ground project design and monitoring.
- ♦ address differences in interpretation of the management direction.

The following criteria will be used to create, evaluate, and manage the implementation organization:

- ♦ Build on the strengths and accountability mechanisms of the BLM, Forest Service, EPA, NMFS, and USFWS.
- ♦ Augment basin-wide staff within the five agencies only when needed to accomplish critical basin-wide tasks. All other tasks should be accomplished through existing organizations.
- ♦ Establish mechanisms to efficiently resolve interagency conflict, facilitate the timely incorporation of new scientific information, make interagency decisions at all levels of the organizations, and assure adherence to the intent of the ROD.

- ♦ Improve interagency and interregional coordination and collaboration to promote effective and efficient implementation at all organizational levels.
- ♦ Provide guidance to promote consistency in management direction implementation, monitoring, and adaptive management.
- ♦ Promote equitable sharing of costs among involved agencies and allow for flexibility to expand or contract the implementation organization to accommodate fluctuations in funding and management emphasis.
- ♦ Manage project-wide data needs at the appropriate scale and promote effective linkages to other data levels (scales).
- ♦ Provide encouragement, support, and consistent interpretation and delivery of concepts and direction to all field organizational levels.
- ♦ Provide incentives and recognize field unit accomplishments.

Implementation Monitoring Program

Objectives

The ICBEMP intent is to evaluate broad-scale monitoring data every five years to determine if the ROD is being implemented and if management practices are leading to achievement of broad-scale goals and objectives.

Monitoring and evaluation are necessary to achieve the short- and long-term goals of the management direction. Implementation monitoring determines whether planned activities have been implemented and whether the standards and objectives were followed. Implementation monitoring serves as an important anchoring point upon which to apply effectiveness monitoring and adaptive management. Separate effectiveness monitoring and adaptive management plans will be prepared and released after the Record of Decision is signed.

The implementation monitoring program for this EIS will:

- ♦ Establish a suite of monitoring questions that directly relate to the standards and objectives.
- ♦ Develop measurable indicators to address the monitoring questions.
- ♦ Create a definition or vision of “successful” implementation.
- ♦ Use statistically sound procedures for answering the monitoring questions (where appropriate).

Participants

The Executive Steering Committee (ESC) will provide broad oversight regarding the implementation monitoring program, formally approving and identifying issues/concerns to be reviewed each year, and will establish priorities for implementation monitoring.

Modifications Made to ICBEMP Supplemental Draft EIS Appendix 10 (Continued)

Page/Column/Paragraph or
Table/Fig/Map/Photo

Change Made (bold = new; strikeout = delete)

The implementation organization will include a basin monitoring coordinator and interagency monitoring review teams. The monitoring review teams, formed annually on an *ad hoc* basis, will manage the ROD implementation monitoring program. This includes developing implementation questions, an unbiased sampling program, and standardized evaluation methods. These teams will conduct field reviews, synthesizing the results into reports. The basin monitoring coordinator will compile the reports into an annual basin implementation report and present it to the ESC. The coordinator will also help the ESC communicate the results of the annual reviews to the field units and guide the application of any direction resulting from the report.

The involved agencies will work with other federal and state agencies, advisory councils, state and local governments, tribes, and other stakeholders to identify concerns regarding implementation of the ROD. Involved agency field units will provide the basin monitoring coordinator and monitoring review teams with the information needed to support that year's annual implementation monitoring program, and will help share the results of implementation monitoring with the public. Field units will also provide staff to serve on the monitoring review teams.

Actions

The following sequence of implementation monitoring will occur annually (see timeline on page 10-10):

1. Concerns with implementing the ROD will be identified at all levels of the involved agencies and through consultation with state, local, and tribal governments; and Resource Advisory Councils and Provincial Advisory Committees. These concerns will be provided to the basin monitoring coordinator, who will summarize the concerns and recommend which ones should be presented to the ESC for further action.
2. The ESC will review and prioritize the list of concerns to be addressed that year. The basin monitoring coordinator and monitoring review teams will use the list to develop a set of monitoring questions to be addressed. These questions will then be applied to a randomly selected sample of related projects and activities throughout the ICBEMP project area.
3. The monitoring review teams will evaluate the selected activities/projects, summarize their findings, and provide the findings to the basin monitoring coordinator. The coordinator will synthesize that year's implementation monitoring activities into an annual basin implementation report.

4. The annual basin implementation report will be presented to the ESC with a summary of the previous year's implementation progress and recommended corrective actions.
5. The ESC may determine that additional monitoring is necessary for a particular concern addressed in a previous year's report. This additional monitoring would be included in the current year's sampling program and basin implementation report.

Selecting Activities

The overall process for selecting which activities, projects and processes to monitor involves four steps: collect concerns; develop questions; identify the kinds of land use activities or projects to be sampled; and select the specific activities or projects to be sampled.

Criteria for selecting the concerns include:

- ♦ Is the project/activity of concern a result of or affected by implementation of the ROD?
- ♦ Is there sufficient interest in the concern to warrant review?
- ♦ Can implementation monitoring questions be developed that lead to a clear answer as to whether or not the management direction was followed?

The next stage involves defining the sampling population for projects or activities. Some projects/activities, such as timber sales or road reconstruction, are site-specific and can be readily defined and listed. Other activities, such as dispersed camping in riparian areas and livestock grazing, are not as site-specific, and therefore, more difficult to define and list. However, both types of actions can be sampled using a *stratified random sample* approach.

For example, if timber sales are of concern, the first step is to define the sample *population* of timber sales. The population is all the active sales in the ICBEMP project area since the ROD was signed. Then, depending upon the concern, additional selection strata may be added (for example, there may only be a concern with "large" sales).

When all the qualifiers defining the population are agreed to, the basin monitoring coordinator will ask field units to submit a list of projects meeting the criteria. Once a list is developed, sampling intensity will be decided (that is, how many projects must be evaluated) so that a determination of compliance can be reached. This sampling intensity will vary with concern sensitivity and the types of projects or activities being evaluated. The most important aspect of the sampling process is that a non-biased selection of projects and activities is achieved.

Modifications Made to ICBEMP Supplemental Draft EIS Appendix 10 (Continued)

Page/Column/Paragraph or
Table/Fig/Map/Photo

Change Made (bold = new; strikeout = delete)

Potential Monitoring Questions

The following questions are examples. They will be further refined as the monitoring plan is finalized.

Subbasin Review

- ♦ Was a Subbasin Review conducted for the area?
- ♦ Was the Subbasin Review Guide followed?
- ♦ Was the subbasin identified as a high restoration priority subbasin? If yes, was Subbasin Review completed within three years of the signing of the ROD?
- ♦ If a Subbasin Review was completed, was it used to:
 - prioritize and provide context for EAWS?
 - identify the schedule for completing EAWS in high restoration priority subbasins?
 - identify opportunities for future activities and land use plan amendments/revisions?
 - provide context for assessing cumulative effects?
 - identify data gaps?
 - identify opportunities to pool resources?
- ♦ If no Subbasin Review has been completed, and the subbasin has less than five percent BLM/Forest Service ownership, did the agency(ies) initiate collaboration with tribal governments, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and Environmental Protection Agency to discuss the general condition of resources, the potential to reduce risks, and other ecosystem management issues?

Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale (EAWS)

- ♦ Has an EAWS been completed for the watershed in which the activity/concern is located?
- ♦ Was the *Federal Guide for Watershed Analysis* (Regional Inter-agency Executive Committee 1995) followed? Was there inter-agency and tribal government coordination?
- ♦ If EAWS was completed, was it used to:
 - address resource conditions, risks, and opportunities?
 - provide context and focus for site-specific NEPA analysis, decision-making, implementation, and monitoring?

Page/Column/Paragraph or
Table/Fig/Map/Photo

Change Made (bold = new; strikeout = delete)

- assist with the estimation of direct, indirect, and cumulative effects?
- ♦ If no EAWS was completed, is there a potential for activities to negatively impact listed or proposed aquatic species or their habitats or the source habitats within T watersheds that have declined substantially in geographic extent from the historical to current period?

Adaptive Management

- ♦ Did the field unit conducting the program/activity of concern conduct implementation and/or effectiveness monitoring for the program/activity?
- ♦ If yes, were the results of monitoring summarized and used to confirm expected outcomes or make recommendations for revisions to management strategies?

Road Management

- ♦ Has a roads analysis been completed in the area of interest?
- ♦ If yes, was it incorporated into or conducted concurrently with EAWS?
- ♦ Were affected tribes and/or local governments consulted during the roads analysis?
- ♦ Has an Access and Travel Management Plan or other transportation plan been developed or updated for the area?
- ♦ If a road was constructed, was it located outside riparian conservation areas (RCAs)? If within an RCA, what alternatives were considered prior to making the decision of where to locate the road? Was Endangered Species Act consultation conducted, if necessary, prior to construction?
- ♦ If a new road was constructed that crosses a stream, what mitigating measures were applied? Were fish passage and channel stability considerations built into the design on the crossing?
- ♦ Was the roads analysis used to set priorities for reducing the adverse effects of the road system in the area of interest? Have actions been undertaken to address those priorities?

Grazing Management

- ♦ Have all pasture/use areas been categorized according to condition, by allotment?
- ♦ Have monitoring areas been identified, by pasture/use area, and do they accurately represent riparian or stream channel conditions?

Modifications Made to ICBEMP Supplemental Draft EIS Appendix 10 (Continued)

Page/Column/Paragraph or
Table/Fig/Map/Photo

Change Made (bold = new; strikeout = delete)

- ♦ Have the following items been considered in developing grazing management systems to meet aquatic/riparian and terrestrial outcomes, by pasture/use area:
 - timing of livestock use
 - grazing intensity
 - frequency of grazing
 - duration of grazing
- ♦ Have management practices been prescribed to meet requirements of project-specific Endangered Species Act consultation?
- ♦ Was there a “no effect” determination on the pasture/use area/allotment?

Sampling Intensity Considerations

Sampling intensity can be adjusted if a review of the previous year’s results demonstrates that another approach is needed. The random sampling strategy may be adjusted to include additional field units that were not reviewed in previous years.

Budget realities must also be considered when determining the intensity of monitoring required for a particular concern. At the beginning of each fiscal year, agencies will agree to a preliminary implementation program budget. Once the concerns to be examined in the annual reviews are identified, various sampling options will be developed, with an estimated budget for each. The options and their costs will be presented to the ESC.

Field Review Expectations

1. The monitoring review teams will operate in an open forum that provides for exchange of ideas, information, and expertise.
2. Teams are encouraged to group project reviews for efficiency, and to conduct reviews that require no more than two days on a particular project, including time for field visits.
3. Each team will appoint a team leader who will coordinate schedules among the team and with field units, and facilitate completion of field reviews in the field season.
4. Teams and the basin monitoring coordinator are responsible for obtaining the necessary resources and background information from field units to adequately review the selected project or activity. This information must be made available by the field units for team review prior to the field visit. Information needed by the teams include project and activity NEPA documents, EAWS, and appropriate Subbasin Reviews.

5. The monitoring review teams will develop the questions to address the identified concerns and will use these questions to evaluate compliance with the ROD.
6. Following the field reviews, each team will prepare a written report summarizing the results of their review of each project/activity. The reports are to include:
 - A brief description of the project(s) or action(s) reviewed.
 - A list of monitoring questions and the responses.
 - Highlights of the process used in the review.
 - Findings and recommendations.
 - Overall assessment of project compliance with the ROD.
 - Identification of new topics for the following year or other follow-up actions.
 - A summary of program expenditures.

Analysis and Reporting Requirements

The basin monitoring coordinator will review all monitoring review team reports, assess overall compliance with the ROD, and prepare summary for the ESC on each concern that was evaluated. This summary can suggest ways to improve consistency of reports, identify weaknesses in the implementation monitoring process, make recommendations regarding needed changes in current management direction, or outline new management recommendations to improve future implementation of the ROD. The results of this review will become part of the annual implementation monitoring report, which will be presented to the ESC and be made available to involved agencies and the public.

The basin monitoring coordinator is also responsible to complete a multi-year report (every five years) summarizing the annual reporting data; make findings regarding progress and weaknesses; and state needs for adaptive management to correct deficiencies in implementation.

Relationship to Other Monitoring Activities

The ICBEMP implementation monitoring program is designed to be consistent with the Northwest Forest Plan implementation monitoring process.

This implementation monitoring program replaces the PACFISH/INFISH monitoring requirements; however, some PACFISH/INFISH requirements are incorporated into this monitoring program.

Other ongoing monitoring efforts for special projects and research activities that are not associated with ICBEMP will continue. Where possible, these efforts will be merged with the ICBEMP monitoring program to improve efficiency and avoid duplication.

Modifications Made to ICBEMP Supplemental Draft EIS

Appendix 10 (Continued)

Annual Implementation Monitoring Time Line

August-September

Identification of Concerns

October

Basin monitoring coordinator
provides concerns to ESC.

January

ESC identifies priority concerns.

February

Basin monitoring coordinator and monitoring review
teams develop list of questions and request list of
potential projects.

March

Field units provide lists of projects to
the basin monitoring coordinator.

April

Basin monitoring coordinator and teams
select sites for field review.

May-August

Monitoring Review Teams complete field reviews
during summer and submit reports by September.

October

Basin monitoring coordinator completes annual
report and submits the report to the ESC.