

United States  
Department of  
Agriculture  
Forest Service

United States  
Department of Commerce  
National Oceanic and  
Atmospheric  
Administration Fisheries

United States  
Department of  
the Interior  
Bureau of  
Land Management

United States  
Department of  
the Interior  
Fish and  
Wildlife Service

United States  
Environmental  
Protection Agency

---

**Reply to:** 2670(FS)/6841(BLM)

**Date:** December 22, 2005

BLM/FS/FWS/EPA/NOAA Fisheries-Memorandum

**To:** Forest Supervisors/District Managers (covered by the 1998 NMFS and USFWS Biological Opinions)  
**National Forests and BLM Districts:** FS - Bitterroot, Clearwater, Nez Perce, Salmon-Challis, Colville, Deschutes-Ochoco, Malheur, Wenatchee-Okanogan, Wallowa-Whitman, and Umatilla NFs, and Columbia River Gorge NSA. **BLM** - Salmon, Idaho Falls, Coeur d'Alene, Prineville, Vale (Malheur Resource Area), and Spokane Districts

**From:** Interagency Interior Columbia Basin Deputy Team (NMFS, USFWS, FS, BLM, EPA)

**Subject:** 1998 Salmon, Steelhead, and Bull Trout Biological Opinions - Line Manager Certification Report for 2005

**Reply Due February 24, 2006**

Enclosed is the annual Line Manager Certification Report (LMCR), which must be completed by February 24, 2006. The LMCRs provide a mechanism for documenting Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) administrative units' implementation and compliance with PACFISH and INFISH Standards & Guidelines, and the terms and conditions as described in the 1998 NMFS and USFWS Biological Opinions. Information will be compiled by FS Region, BLM State Office, and the Interior Columbia Basin scale. This information will assist the Deputy Team in identifying priority issues needing resolution, certify compliance with the legal requirements of the 1998 Opinions, more efficiently address FOIA requests, and assure the durability of PACFISH, INFISH, and the 1998 Opinions until replaced through plan revisions.

Our expectation is for the LMCRs to be completed by Forest Supervisors and BLM District Managers in coordination with NOAA Fisheries and USFWS, through Level 2 or similar interagency process. **Responses to the questions are to be shared and discussed with NOAA Fisheries and the USFWS prior to submission and signing of the LMCR by Forest Supervisors and BLM District Managers.**

The Line Manager Certification Report has been placed on a website. Please copy the URL to your web browser to access the Region Six (6) "Columbia River Basin (CRB) Anadromous and Resident Fish" page.

Directions: On the Forest Service, Region 6 CRB website ([www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish](http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish)), click on the "2005 Salmon, Steelhead, and Bull Trout Line Mangers Certification Report Form," download and save the file to your computer. **Completed reports are to be emailed to your Deputy Team member and, based on the FS Region or BLM State, to the following:**

**FS-R6 (Alan Christensen), FS-R1 (Eric Johnston), FS-R4 (Bill LeVere), BLM – OR/WA (Dorothy Mason), BLM-Idaho (Jon Foster.)**

The Deputies have agreed to make staff available to provide clarification or answer questions regarding the Line Certification Report. Please contact Linda Ulmer, FS CRB Coordinator, at 503-808-2929, or Dorothy Mason, Natural Resource Advisor, BLM OR/WA, at 541-523-1308 if you have any questions related to the purpose of this report.

*/s/ James W. Golden*

JAMES W. GOLDEN  
Deputy Regional Forester  
USDA Forest Service  
Pacific Northwest Region

*/s/ Susan Giannettino*

SUSAN GIANNETTINO  
Deputy State Director  
for Resource Services - Idaho  
USDI, Bureau of Land Management

*/s/ Mary Wagner*

MARY WAGNER  
Deputy Regional Forester  
USDA Forest Service  
Intermountain Region

*/s/ Michael S. Mottice*

MICHAEL S. MOTTICE  
Deputy State Director for Resource Planning,  
Use and Protection - Oregon/Washington  
USDI, Bureau of Land Management

*/s/ Kathleen A. McAllister*

KATHLEEN A. MCALLISTER  
Deputy Regional Forester  
USDA Forest Service  
Northern Region

Enclosure: Line Manager Certification Report Form

cc: Interior Columbia Basin Interagency Executive Team

Ron Kreizenbeck

Deputy Regional

Administrator

U.S. Environmental Protection  
Agency

Region 10

Michael R. Crouse

Assistant Regional

Administrator

Habitat Division, Northwest  
Region

NOAA Fisheries

Theresa Rabot

Assistant Regional Director

Region 1

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

## LINE MANAGER CERTIFICATION REPORT FORM

Please review the attached 1998 NMFS and USFWS requirements (Attachment A) for each of the following questions. **Only provide a supporting narrative on those questions for which you answered “no”. Response example provided in Attachment B.**

1. Have you implemented all Standards and Guidelines in INFISH and/or PACFISH ([www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish](http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish))? If not, explain what S&Gs were not implemented, why, and what mechanisms you are using to ensure that riparian management objectives can still be met?
2. To identify important places and priority actions for the conservation and restoration of ESA-listed salmonids (salmon, steelhead, bull trout), the 1998 NMFS and USFWS Biological Opinions require that various processes and assessments be utilized. Are all of those listed in the Attachment, Question 2 being used on your unit? (Y/N) If no, please explain why and identify what processes/assessments are being used.
3. The 1998 NMFS Biological Opinion identified various tools and processes (Attachment A, Question 3) to manage risk for ESA-listed salmon and steelhead. Are all of these being used on your unit? (Y/N) If no, please explain why and identify what tools/processes are being used to manage risk.
4. The 1998 Opinions identified various processes (Attachment A, Question 4) to ensure accountability and successful outcomes for ESA-listed salmonids through implementation of FS and BLM management actions.
  - a. Was the Certification Report completed in coordination with NOAA and USFWS through Level 2 or other process? (Y/N) If no, provide explanation;
  - b. Did you convene at least one interagency-interdisciplinary field review in the past calendar year to address ongoing implementation questions, management issues, or other actions that may affect salmon, steelhead, and bull trout? (Y/N) If no, provide explanation;
  - c. Can you demonstrate full compliance with the processes for successful outcomes identified in Attachment A, Question 4? (Y/N) If no, provide explanation;
  - d. Can you demonstrate full compliance with the previous (fiscal year's) sampling scheme for Implementation Monitoring of grazing allotments and upward reporting (Y/N). If no, provide explanation.
  - e. Adaptive Management - Can you demonstrate appropriate management response to monitoring results from previous fiscal year? (Y/N) If no, provide explanation.
5. Aquatic Habitat Restoration Accomplishments – List 2005 accomplishments in the section provided in Attachment A under Question 5.

***I have coordinated responses to these questions with USFWS and NOAA Fisheries field managers through Level 2 or other interagency processes.***

**Forest Supervisor or BLM District Manager Signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**National Forest or BLM-District:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Report Submitted on (Date)** \_\_\_\_\_

## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **Abbreviations- Origin of Legal Requirements**

(1) = NMFS 1998 Opinion (PACFISH) Term and Conditions

(2) = USFWS 1998 Opinion Term and Conditions

### **QUESTION 1: IMPLEMENTATION OF PACFISH/INFISH STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES**

PACFISH and INFISH Decision Notices require that relevant PACFISH and INFISH Standards and Guidelines (S&G) be used in the design and implementation of new and ongoing actions. PACFISH and INFISH Standards & Guidelines can also be accessed from the following website [www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish](http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish).

### **QUESTION 2: METHODS TO IDENTIFY IMPORTANT PLACES?**

#### ***Hierarchical Analysis***

- Conduct biennial programmatic reviews and/or project bundling by watershed or subbasin (every 2 years). (1)
- Completion of Sec 7 watershed baselines. (2)
- Prepare a schedule for completing Watershed Analysis with at least one per year per management unit using the 1995 Federal Guide Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale (EAWS). (1)
- Develop priorities and schedules for Watershed Analysis concurrently with restoration plans. Update annually. (2)
- Complete watershed analysis using the 6 step process (1995 Federal Guide – EAWS) (2) *Refer to July 29, 2004 Deputy Team letter Clarification for completing one Watershed Analysis and one Subbasin Assessment annually ([www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish](http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish))*
- Apply the results of watershed analysis to conclude that actions will either “meet” or “do not prevent attainment” of ACS objectives. Conclusion must be documented and supporting rationale provided. (2)
- Treat watersheds within the Upper Columbia and Snake River ESUs as key watersheds and as designated critical habitat. (1)
- Complete watershed analysis in INFISH priority watersheds. (2)
- Complete one subbasin assessment per year. (1) *Refer to July 29, 2004 Deputy Team letter Clarification for completing one Watershed Analysis and one Subbasin Assessment annually ([www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish](http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish))*
- Incorporate goals and objectives identified in subbasin assessments into action plans at the watershed scale. (*note: this mechanism is linked to NMFS Opinion, mechanism 5d.2 as a subbasin assessment is required prior to watershed analysis*). (1)
- Conduct biennial programmatic reviews and/or project bundling by watershed or subbasin (every 2 years). (1)
- Utilize information from multi-scale analyses with integration of IIT products at the local level in the development of subbasin reviews, watershed analyses, LRMP revisions/amendments and any restoration strategies (e.g., 2000 *Interim Restoration Strategy; Road Density Maps (updated), RDAT/Low Road Density Analysis; priority steelhead/salmon/bull trout watersheds*) to assist in determining the value of watersheds and subbasins in the conservation and recovery of ESA-listed salmonids and in the identification of restoration priorities;

#### ***Aquatic Habitat Restoration***

- Shift project planning from the site level to the watershed and subbasin scales to promote planning efficiencies. Apply these findings in design and implementation of priority actions.

- For watershed and aquatic habitat restoration actions: Ensure that proposed actions are designed to provide for long-term habitat benefits while avoiding/reducing short-term impacts, and utilize information and recommendations from environmental baselines and results of Matrix Checklist {note: intent is to ensure that actions, especially restoration actions, would be conducted with a watershed view of benefits to bull trout and other species}. (2)
- Accelerate aquatic habitat restoration in the Snake and Upper Columbia ESUs. (1)

### **Roads**

- **Continue updating road inventories at the field level every other year in a format that can be consolidated at the state and regional level (2)**
- *Road Evaluation and Planning* – Apply RF2, RF3 (2)
- *Road Construction (2)*
  1. Avoid or minimize Incidental Take by applying PACFISH & INFISH Standards & Guidelines for road construction and decommissioning;
  2. New roads in Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas (RHCAs) shall be constructed only where Watershed Analysis has been completed.

### **QUESTION 3: RISK MANAGEMENT**

- Implement monitoring commensurate with level of on-the-ground activities and provide feedback to NMFS (annual Implementation Monitoring reports). (1)
- Fully comply with fiscal year IIT Implementation Monitoring sampling scheme for grazing and use this information to adjust grazing strategies (P/I Standard GM-1) where riparian objectives are not being met. (1)
- Measures identified in NMFS's 1995 Biological Opinions and all subsequent related direction in FS and BLM plans are required to be extended to all plans in those portions of the Upper Columbia and Snake River basin ESUs for which ESA Section 7 consultation was not initiated for salmon. This includes, but is not limited to, designation of high priority watersheds and consultation on all ongoing federal actions that may affect steelhead. (1)
- Use special management considerations in the Selway, SF Salmon, MF Salmon including those described for roads, Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas (RHCAs), and Fire//Timber/Grazing/Recreation Management. (1)
- Review effects to steelhead from commercial permits, non-commercial boating, and floating. Review all recreational facilities as ongoing federal actions and modify if causing adverse effects. (1)

### **QUESTION 4: ENSURING ACCOUNTABILITY/OUTCOMES**

Accountability and oversight mechanism for implementation of requirements at the field unit level:

- Provide for interagency and multi-level representation in ongoing field level and provide feedback to your Deputy on implementation issues and how this information was incorporated into revised management strategies. (1)
- Provide for an annual, interagency review of your administrative unit's fiscal year work program to ensure attainment of fish conservation measures. Use this process to reach consensus on the priority of these actions and identify shortfalls in funding/staffing and potential adjustment necessary to management actions. (1)
- Requires that a strategy be mutually developed and implemented when funding or other priorities prevent full implementation of aquatic conservation measures. (1)
- Use NMFS Matrix and Level I teams, and review ongoing activities when new species are listed or critical habitat is designated. (1)

- Use Level 1 streamlining; bull trout watershed consultation approach (1/27/98) letter of direction, new information, and bull trout Checklist/Matrix of Pathways & Indicators (or similar agreed-to approach) to ensure that an interagency, interdisciplinary process is used in the design and evaluation of all proposed actions that may affect bull trout. (2)

**QUESTION 5 – AQUATIC HABITAT RESTORATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS – Salmon, Steelhead, and Bull trout**

**BLM:**

1. # Miles of Stream/Riparian Treatments (JG) \_\_\_\_\_
2. # Stream/Riparian Projects Completed (JH) \_\_\_\_\_
3. # Stream/Riparian projects Maintained (JI) \_\_\_\_\_
4. # Miles of Stream/Riparian Inventories (BU) \_\_\_\_\_
5. # Miles of Stream/Riparian Monitored (MO) \_\_\_\_\_

**Forest Service:**

1. # Miles of Stream Improved \_\_\_\_\_
2. # Acres of Lake Improved \_\_\_\_\_
3. # Acres of Watershed Improved \_\_\_\_\_
4. # Miles of Stream Inventoried (Physical) \_\_\_\_\_
5. # Miles of Stream Inventoried (Biotic) \_\_\_\_\_

**ATTACHMENT B**

**Response Example:**

**Question #4d**

Question 4 -The 1998 Opinions identified various processes that are described in the Attachment (under Question 4) to ensure accountability and successful outcomes for ESA-listed salmonids through implementation of FS and BLM management actions. Please document your response to the following questions:

**4 d:** Can you demonstrate **full** compliance with the previous year (fiscal year) sampling scheme for Implementation Monitoring of grazing allotments and upward reporting (Y/N). If no, provide explanation.

Response: No, two of the allotments that fell within the Implementation Monitoring sampling scheme for 2005 were not monitored due to numerous wildfires on the forest. To complete the monitoring requirements for 2005, Level 2 has agreed that these will be added to those required in the 2006 IM sampling scheme.