

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Idaho State Office
1387 South Vinnell Way
Boise, Idaho 83709-1657

In Reply Refer To:
6840 (931) P

May 8, 2007

EMS
Instruction Memorandum No. ID-2007-048
Expires: 09/30/2008

To: District Managers

From: State Director

Subject: Interagency Implementation Team (IIT) (PACFISH/INFISH) Implementation
Monitoring for Fiscal Year (FY) 2007
DD: 12/31/07
DD: 01/15/08

Program Areas: 1150 Threatened and Endangered Species, 1120 Fisheries.

Purpose: Direction for implementing FY 2007 PACFISH/INFISH Biological Opinions (PIBO) Implementation Monitoring.

Policy/Action: This directive explains the Deputy Team's Monitoring Program requirements under PIBO for FY 2007.

1. LINK TO EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING: The PIBO Implementation Monitoring program provides critical input into the PIBO Effectiveness Monitoring (EM) project, therefore high priority is placed upon using the PIBO implementation module at the Designated Monitoring Areas (DMAs) used by the Effectiveness Monitoring Team. It is also critical that the DMAs selected for effectiveness monitoring conform exactly to the DMA locations used by the Field Offices for implementation monitoring. ***The protocol for selecting and monitoring DMAs is contained in Attachment 1.*** This year's Deputy Team Field Reviews will include an audit to assess compliance with this protocol. PIBO DMA sites will be selected for the field audit by the Regional Office/State Office member participating in the review.

In FY 2007, monitoring coordinators at the State/Regional Office will work with their counterparts at the field offices to assure that implementation monitoring is accomplished at the end of the season for each of the repeat DMA sites sampled by the EM Team this FY 2007 and for those sites planned for next FY 2008. ***A description of these sites is contained in the table in Attachment 2.*** For Idaho BLM, this includes 15 DMAs state-wide. This does not constitute an increase in the monitoring workload, because the PIBO sites can be included as part of the required sampling for at least 20 percent of the category I pasture use areas.

It is important that data collected at the PIBO repeat-site DMAs reflect the livestock use indicators applicable to stream banks and stream channels. Accordingly, the following requirements will apply to these DMAs:

- 1) Measurements will be on the greenline (first perennial vegetation above the channel);
- 2) Measurements must include, at minimum: 1. bank alteration; and 2. stubble height (unless livestock do not use herbaceous vegetation on the greenline). Where woody vegetation dominates the DMA with little or no herbaceous vegetation along the greenline, woody use (browse) should be measured, and may be sampled in lieu of stubble height; and
- 3) For Idaho BLM, these measures will be made using the MIM protocol in Idaho Technical Bulletin 2007-01.

MIM is available at the following WEB site:

http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/info/publications/technical_bulletins/tb_07-01.html

2. COMPLIANCE/NON-COMPLIANCE FEEDBACK: 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 (BO) for salmon, steelhead, and bull trout (PIBO). Line officers are accountable to ensure that actions they take are consistent with these requirements. Line managers need to receive and act upon the results of project level implementation monitoring. The monitoring module contains a “Non-compliance” questionnaire and report, which can be used to evaluate the need to modify or refine management actions for a particular activity. 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 projects under National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) decisions, and in compliance with local Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultations.

3. ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT: Findings of the University of Idaho’s Stubble Height Study Team are being implemented in Regions 1 and 4 of the Forest Service, and Idaho BLM. The requirement to implement the “Decision Tree” process of adaptive management was sent previously in Instruction Memorandum No. ID-2005-074. That directive will be updated and extended this year.

4. SAMPLING AND REPORTING FOR FY 2007: The sample scheme for FY 2007 is as follows.

Field units will use the PACFISH/INFISH Implementation Monitoring Module (available for download from the Rocky Mountain Research Station website shown below) for all authorized livestock grazing activities that have already been started on-the-ground or that have been completed during the current FY and fall within, AT LEAST; the following sample set:

- A. All grazing activities at DMAs within the 6th field Hydraulic Unit Codes (HUCs) selected for repeat monitoring by the EM Team in both FY-07 and FY-08. The EM

Team's 6th field HUCs, DMA coordinates, and DMA access information, and photos of each site can be found at the PIBO FTP site:

ftp://fsweb.gsc.wo.fs.fed.us/pub/PIBO_New/

- B. All prior FY non-compliance activities in the grazing program.
- C. Other Grazing activities:
 - 1) At least 20 percent of Module Category I pasture use areas per FY, based on field unit priorities with input from the Level 1 Team.
 - i. Field unit decides where to focus, although every Module Category I pasture use area should be sampled at least once within the life of the 10-year grazing permit.
 - ii. DMAs would be established and monitored only if the conditions in Attachment 1 are met, otherwise Implementation Monitoring would be for other purposes (e.g., use supervision, compliance with PACFISH/INFISH standards and guidelines, enclosure fence integrity, etc.).
 - 2) Any local implementation monitoring requirements for livestock grazing about which local Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultation requires reporting through the PACFISH/INFISH Implementation Monitoring Database.

The 20 percent sample of Category I pasture use areas, identified in 3. may be inclusive of samples collected for: 1. The PIBO repeat-site DMAs; 2. all prior FY non-compliance activities in the grazing program; and 3. any local implementation monitoring requirements for grazing about which local ESA consultation requires reporting through the PACFISH/INFISH Implementation Monitoring Database.

Field units are encouraged to use the PACFISH/INFISH Implementation Monitoring Database to record and report stream/riparian-related implementation monitoring requirements for activities other than grazing or outside of the requirements of PACFISH, INFISH and the BOs. It has been designed to accommodate requirements other than PACFISH or INFISH standards.

5. DATABASE: The Implementation Monitoring Database is available on-line at the PACFISH/INFISH web site:

http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/boise/research/techtrans/projects/pacfish_home.shtml

Field units will enter all sample data collected under the requirements of item 4 (above) into the Implementation Monitoring Database.

6. COORDINATION: As in previous FYs, the Implementation Monitoring Program will rely on coordination between the Implementation Monitoring Task Team members and Field Unit Coordinators. Field Unit Coordinators are the local point of contact for those aspects of the monitoring program, including training, that are not activity specific. The Regional or State

counterparts, members of the Implementation Monitoring Task Team, and Field Unit Coordinators are listed in Attachment 3.

Timeframe: Data should be entered into the PACFISH/INFISH Implementation Monitoring Database by December 31, 2007, with submission of the files to the central location by January 15, 2008.

Manual/Handbook Sections Affected: No manual/handbook sections are affected.

Coordination: This Instruction Memorandum has been coordinated with members of the PACFISH/INFISH Monitoring Task Team.

Contact: If you have questions about the Module and its implementation in 2007, or if your Field Unit Coordinator or his/her phone number has changed, please contact Tim Burton at (208) 373-3819.

Boise District with Union: Management is reminded to notify and satisfy any bargaining requirements prior to implementation.

Signed
Thomas H. Dyer
State Director

Authenticated
Teresa Atkinson
Staff Assistant (931)

Attachments

- 1 - DMA Protocol (3 pp.)
- 2 - Name and location of all PIBO sites to be visited in 2007 (by office). (1 p.)
- 3 - Implementation Monitoring Contacts (1 p.)

cc:

State Director, Montana
Field Manager, Missoula FO
Field Manager, Coeur d'Alene FO
Field Manager, Cottonwood FO
Field Manager, Salmon FO
Field Manager, Challis FO
Field Manager, Idaho Falls FO
Field Manager, Jarbidge FO
Field Manager, Four Rivers FO
Linda Ulmer, CRB Coordinator

ATTACHMENT 1. PIBO IMPLEMENTATION MONITORING PROTOCOL FOR ESTABLISHING DESIGNATED MONITORING AREAS

Preliminary considerations in setting up the designated monitoring area (DMA):

Legally inaccessible locations: For scattered tracts of federal land, those areas less than about 200 acres in size and completely surrounded by private land, where access is impossible or extremely difficult, do NOT establish a DMA (Implementation Monitoring (IM) Manual, Appendix E1).

Little or no livestock access or use: By definition, a DMA “contains impacts that result principally from livestock grazing”. If livestock do not access the stream, then do NOT establish a DMA.

Use an ID Team: “It is preferable that DMA’s, as well as their associated endpoint indicator, be identified in an interdisciplinary fashion, including specialists knowledgeable in fish habitat requirements, channel processes, riparian vegetation, and livestock grazing management.”

Protocol for setting up the DMA:

I. For all Category I pasture use areas (“those associated with any RHCA that occurs entirely or partially within a 6th field HUC/subwatershed containing ESA-listed fish species - salmon, steelhead, bull trout - or designated or proposed critical habitat.” IM Manual, p. 15):

- Step 1. Determine if livestock have access to the stream.
- Step 2. If livestock DO NOT have access (e.g., enclosure, steep canyon, heavy downed-timber, etc.) a designated monitoring area (DMA) is NOT established. At a minimum, PACFISH/INFISH standards and guidelines compliance monitoring is required, even if a DMA is not established. Lacking a DMA, implement any of the following kinds of monitoring depending upon which is appropriate to the situation:
 - Use supervision and livestock access;
 - Photos documenting lack of access to the stream;
 - Fence integrity;
 - Compliance with the standards and guidelines of PACFISH/INFISH.
- Step 3. If livestock DO have access to the stream:
 - Locate a DMA where livestock are using areas adjacent to the stream.
 - Locate the DMA where livestock use is relatively high, following the premise that if proper management occurs on the DMA, the remainder of the pasture or use area will also be managed within requirements.
 - Select a reach that is most critical in influencing listed fish species.
 - Select a reach that has the greatest potential to respond to management.
 - Avoid reaches that are compounded by other uses (e.g., wild horses, dispersed camping, developed campgrounds, road crossings, etc.).
 - Avoid reaches that are impervious to disturbance (e.g., bedrock or boulder armored stream channels). Reaches in boulder/bedrock that historically contained

floodplains of finer substrates, and have the potential to re-build streambanks and stream terraces of finer material, may be established as DMA's for monitoring long-term recovery.

- Avoid water gaps, cattle crossings, and other localized concentrations of livestock that were established intentionally.

II. DMA Location Protocol

- Step 1. Record the UTM coordinate on-site at the downstream end of the reach using GPS. Also record the projection (e.g., NAD27).
- Step 2. Permanently monument the downstream end of the DMA reach using post, marker, rebar, etc.
- Step 3. Take a picture of the downstream end of the reach.
- Step 4. Prepare a site map or sketch with distinctive features of the site; or delineate the reach on a high-resolution aerial photograph (e.g., National Agricultural Image Project – NAIP).
- Step 5. Using GPS, measure the upstream Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) coordinate on-site, or record the thalweg distance from the downstream monument to the upstream end.

III. DMA Reach Definition

- Step 1. Measure the reach using the exact same distance as used by the PIBO EM Project: 120 meters thalweg length.
- Step 2. Measure implementation monitoring indicators (e.g., stubble height, bank alteration, woody browse) on both sides of the stream reach.
 - Exclude islands.
 - Measure on the greenline or first perennial vegetation above the channel.
 - Use an established protocol (e.g., MIM, Interagency Tech Reference, Winward 2000, etc., as suggested by the National Riparian Service Team – see the NRST's Riparian Vegetation Monitoring Protocol Report of 2/19/05).

IV. Questions & Answers

- **What if the DMA is altered/lost due to construction of a beaver dam?** The DMA reach is re-located to an appropriate section of channel. Select a reach that most duplicates the characteristics of the previous DMA. Use the data from the previous DMA and conduct a site-visit to find a reasonable comparison.
- **What if the DMA is altered by a flood that changes the channel condition or moves it to a new location.** Flood disturbance is a natural process that must be factored into any long-term monitoring scheme. Normally you would retain the existing DMA reach location, unless the new channel makes monitoring more effective in another location, based on the criteria for DMA location listed above.
- **What if reaches with relatively higher livestock use do not coincide with any reach that is sensitive with respect to listed fish habitat?** Select the reach that has relatively high livestock use.

- **What if the watershed does not contain ESA-listed fish, do I still need a DMA?** DMAs in Category II pasture use areas are optional under the Biological Opinions, however implementation monitoring is strongly encouraged in Category II pasture use areas being monitored by the PIBO EM Project. If a field unit gives a DMA location to the EM Project, it is expected that that DMA will also receive implementation monitoring.
- **We have numerous Category I pasture use areas and simply cannot establish a DMA on all of them. What if PIBO EM selects one of those in which we have not established a DMA?** Monitoring at PIBO EM sites is the priority for PIBO Implementation Monitoring. Allocation of resources to monitoring is the decision of the line officer. If for any reason you are not capable of implementation monitoring in a HUC selected by the PIBO EM Project, and that HUC contains livestock grazing in any riparian habitat conservation area, do NOT provide a DMA location to the PIBO EM Project. Once a DMA is provided to the EM Project, implementation monitoring at that DMA is mandatory. If possible, resolve this deficiency with the line manager.
- **When do I have to use the Implementation Monitoring Module?** All Implementation Monitoring data collected at EM Project DMAs must be reported using the Module. That includes PACFISH/INFISH standards and guides compliance, use supervision, spot checks, DMA monitoring results, fence integrity, livestock access evaluations, unauthorized use, and any other kind of implementation monitoring relevant to livestock management of the pasture.
- **What if my DMA is not properly located?** The DMA should be re-located if it is not positioned where it can assess change due to management. The ID Team must ask itself, does monitoring at the DMA truly reflect the effect of grazing management in this pasture? If not, move it. Whenever a DMA is re-located, the first year's assessment of the new DMA should be calibrated with the old DMA. Endpoint measurements at both the old and new DMAs should be made concurrently and compared to evaluate trend information.
- **Do I really need to take all of these steps to locate a DMA?** Yes most of the time, to address the key monitoring questions. In a minority of cases, livestock use intensity and stream habitat sensitivity are distributed evenly over the length of the pasture. In such instances the site can be randomly located.

ATTACHMENT 2. Name and location of all PIBO sites to be visited in 2007 (by office).

Year	RchID	Group	Sub-watershed (Order)	RchName	Stream	Region/BLM State	Forest/BLM District	District/BLM Field Office	UTMZone	botUTME	botUTMN
2002	408	69	1	069-01-K-I1-02	Mcculley	ID BLM	Coeur dAlene	Cottonwood	11	553741	5073519
2002	409	69	5	069-05-K-I1-02	Telcher	ID BLM	Coeur dAlene	Cottonwood	11	542457	5090404
2002	410	69	6	069-06-K-I1-02	Packers	ID BLM	Coeur dAlene	Cottonwood	11	543578	5088764
2002	411	69	7	069-07-K-I1-02	Cottonwood	ID BLM	Coeur dAlene	Cottonwood	11	528079	5085630
2002	412	69	9	069-09-K-I1-02	Divide	ID BLM	Coeur dAlene	Cottonwood	11	522254	5078964
2002	413	69	10	069-10-K-I1-02	Deer	ID BLM	Coeur dAlene	Cottonwood	11	523479	5098947
2002	414	69	11	069-11-K-I1-02	Burnt	ID BLM	Coeur dAlene	Cottonwood	11	535581	5090822
2002	514	83	7	083-07-IK-M2-02	Little Elk	ID BLM	Coeur dAlene	Cottonwood	11	619305	5082068
2002	689	94	19	094-19-K-I1-02	Burnt	ID BLM	Idaho Falls	Challis	12	288664	4893744
2003	698	97	2	097-02-K-I2-03	Cow	ID BLM	Idaho Falls	Challis	12	263709	4958162
2003	718	97	17	097-17-K-I1-03	Allison	ID BLM	Idaho Falls	Challis	12	265192	4961262
2003	896	111	5	111-05-K-I3-03	Darling	ID BLM	Idaho Falls	Challis	11	716285	4940880
2003	902	111	13	111-13-K-I2-03	Mill	ID BLM	Idaho Falls	Challis	11	716051	4937172
2003	699	97	4	097-04-IK-I3-03	Little Morgan	ID BLM	Idaho Falls	Salmon	12	268025	4949417
2002	682	94	12	094-12-K-I1-02	Sawmill	ID BLM	Idaho Falls	Upper Snake	12	314191	4905551

ATTACHMENT 3. Implementation Monitoring Contacts

Implementation Monitoring Task Team

OFFICE REPRESENTED	NAME	PHONE
USFS Region 1	Ann Carlson	406-329-3087
USFS Region 4	Cynthia Tait	801-625-5358
USFS Region 6	Dan Fissell	541- 467-5117
USFS CRB Anadromous Fish Coordinator	Linda Ulmer	503-808-2929
BLM ID and BLM MT	Tim Burton	208-373-3819
BLM OR/WA	Al Doelker	503-808-6067
NOAA Pacific Northwest	Kim Kratz	503-231-2155
USFWS Region 1	Clay Fletcher	208-378-5256
EPA Region 10	Don Martin	208-665-0458
PIBO	Eric Archer	435-755-3565
RMRS	Kerry Overton	208-373-4357

Idaho/Montana BLM Field Unit Coordinators

NAME	OFFICE REPRESENTED	PHONE
Cindy Weston	Coeur d'Alene	(208) 769-5000
Craig Johnson	Cottonwood	(208) 962-3688
Jude Trapani	Salmon	(208) 756-5475
Cliff Tipton	Challis	(208) 524-7509
Arn Berglund	Idaho Falls	(208) 524-7228
Kate Forster	Jarbidge – Twin Falls	(208) 736-2350
Allen Tartar	Four Rivers	(208) 384-3300
Jo Christensen	Missoula	(406) 329-3721