

**FOR INTERNAL AGENCY USE ONLY**

**February 9, 2006**

**ATTACHMENT 1**

**SAMPLE FORMAT – WILDLIFE**

**Directions:**

1. Use the 2003 Annual Species Review List of species as the complete Survey and Manage (S&M) species list. Disclosure of information for species removed through the ASR process is not required.
2. Ensure survey forms used to display survey (s) was (were) conducted within protocol parameters are a part of the project record.
3. Table A should include all S&M pre-disturbance survey species **known or suspected** to occur within the National Forest/BLM District, and should document any known sites for Category B, D, E, and F species. The 17 non-fungi category B species requiring “equivalent effort” surveys should also be identified for projects in old growth (for definition see 2001 ROD glossary, p. 79-80) with decisions after 10/1/05 and documented in Table A if surveys were required. See examples in first two rows of Table A below. In the case of potential Category B, D, E, or F species, the Field Unit need only fill in the XX in the Mitigation column (other info provided in the example row is true in all instances).
4. If there are known sites for any species, indicate what site management was done and that it was in compliance with the 2001 ROD (as amended) and the management recommendations for the species (as per the example below or by attaching the Known Site Form). Be specific, for example, “placed a 100 ft. no-activity area around the site”.
5. Level of detail provided in footnotes on range and habitat to be determined by local Administrative Unit based on need (see Wildlife footnote 1 for detailed example).

**2001 ROD Compliance Review: Survey & Manage Wildlife Species**

Environmental Analysis File

BLM District Name –Field Office Name or FS Forest Name – District Name

**Project Name:** i.e. Timber Sale/Fuels Project/Other Project Name

**Prepared By:** Name

**Project Type:** i.e. Regeneration Harvest & Commercial Thinning

**Date:** Date

**Location:** i.e. Township and Range Coordinates

**S&M List Date:** December 2003

**Table A: Survey & Manage Species Known and Suspected on the BLM DISTRICT NAME or FS FOREST NAME.** Species listed below were compiled from the 2003 Annual Species Review (IM-OR-2004-034) and incorporates those vertebrate and invertebrate species whose known or suspected range includes the BLM DISTRICT NAME OR FS FOREST NAME according to: INCLUDE REFERENCE TO SURVEY PROTOCOLS USED FOR RANGE, HABITAT AND SURVEY METHODOLOGY. (IF THERE ARE NO KNOWN CATEGORY B, D, E, AND F, STATE SO.)

Species	S&M Category	Survey Triggers			Survey Results			Site Management
		Within Range of the Species?	Project Contains Suitable habitat?	Project may negatively affect species/habitat?	Surveys Required?	Survey Date (month/year)	Sites Known or Found?	
List Category B, D, E or F species (list only if there are known sites)	B, D, E, F	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	Yes	XX
List Category B (equivalent effort surveys needed – list only if they meet criteria in #3 of directions)	B	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Aug. 2005	No	No
<b>Vertebrates</b>								
Great Gray Owl ( <i>Strix nebulosa</i> )	A	Yes	No <sup>2</sup>	No	No <sup>2</sup>	No	0	None
Red Tree Vole ( <i>Arborimus longicaudus</i> )	C	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	July 2002	Yes	Yes <sup>3</sup>
<b>Mollusks</b>								

**FOR INTERNAL AGENCY USE ONLY**

**February 9, 2006**

**ATTACHMENT 1**

Siskiyou Sideband ( <i>Monadenia chaceana</i> )	B <sup>4</sup>	No	No	No	No <sup>4</sup>	No	0	None
Crater Lake Tightcoil ( <i>Pristiloma arcticum crateris</i> )	A	Yes	Yes <sup>5</sup>	No <sup>5</sup>	No	May 1999	0	None

<sup>1</sup> N/A = Not Applicable

<sup>2</sup> Pre-disturbance surveys for great gray owls are not required since there is no suitable nesting habitat within the project area. The required habitat characteristics of suitable habitat include: (1) large diameter nest trees, (2) forest for roosting cover, and (3) proximity [within 200m] to openings that could be used as foraging areas (*Survey Protocol for the Great Gray Owl within the range of the Northwest Forest Plan v3.0*, January 12, 2004). The stands in XXX do not have proximity to natural-openings  $\geq$  10 acres (Name, staff review, 2006) and pre-disturbance surveys are not suggested in suitable nesting habitat adjacent to man-made openings at this time (pg. 14, *Survey Protocol for the Great Gray Owl within the range of the Northwest Forest Plan v3.0*, January 12, 2004).

<sup>3</sup> One active nest found. A 10-acre area of mature forest surrounding the nest was identified and the 10 acres was removed from the unit boundary in accordance with the management recommendations for this species.

<sup>4</sup> Equivalent-effort pre-disturbance surveys are required for the Siskiyou Sideband (IM-OR-2004-034). However, the Swiftwater Resource Area is outside of the known range of this species and equivalent-effort surveys are therefore not required (*Survey Protocol for S&M Terrestrial Mollusk Species v3.0*, 2003).

<sup>5</sup> Suitable habitat for the Crater Lake tightcoil is "perennially wet situations in mature conifer forests, among rushes, mosses and other surface vegetation or under rocks and woody debris within 10 meters of open water in wetlands, springs, seeps and riparian areas..." (pg. 43, *Survey Protocol for S&M Terrestrial Mollusk Species v3.0*, 2003). Within the project, suitable habitat is confined to the stream-side areas that are contained within Riparian Reserves in the regeneration harvest units. Adverse modification to the micro-climate of this habitat within the Riparian Reserve will not occur. Furthermore, protocol mollusk surveys were completed May 1999 and no Crater Lake tightcoil sites were discovered.

**Statement of Compliance.** Pre-disturbance surveys and management of known sites required by protocol standards to comply with the *2001 Record of Decision and Standard and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines* (as the 2001 ROD was amended or modified as of March 21, 2004) were completed for PROJECT NAME. PROJECT NAME also complies with any site management for any Category B, D, and E species as identified in the 2001 ROD (as modified). (OR "There are no known Category B, D, E, and F species within the NAME project area.")

PROVIDE SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS (*i.e. There are currently no known sites of Survey & Manage species that require management within the project area.*)

Therefore, based on the preceding information (refer to Table A above) regarding the status of surveys and site management for Survey & Manage wildlife species, it is my determination that PROJECT NAME complies with the provisions of the *2001 Record of Decision and Standard and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines* (as the 2001 ROD was amended or modified as of March 21, 2004). For the foregoing reasons, this contract is in compliance with the 2001 ROD as stated in Point (3) on page 14 of the January 9, 2006, Court order in Northwest Ecosystem Alliance et al. v. Rey et al.

\_\_\_\_\_  
NAME, Field Manager or District Ranger  
NAME Field Office or District

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date