

## PACFISH/INFISH Standards and Guidelines Questions

The following questions are provided to assist with answering Line Manger Certification Report (LMCR) Question #1: “**Have you implemented all applicable Standards and Guidelines in INFISH and/or PACFISH?**”

Link to PACFISH & INFISH documents can be found at: [www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish/documents/](http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/fish/documents/)

All questions apply to **both** INFISH and PACFISH unless otherwise noted (1) = PACFISH and (2) = INFISH. Consider questions in relation to the time period since your last LMCR was completed. Typically the LMCR should be completed annually.

### RMOs and RHCAs

- Were land management strategies, practices, and actions designed and implemented so as not to prevent attainment of Riparian Management Objectives (RMOs), and minimize disturbance of riparian ground cover and vegetation?
- Were Riparian Habitat Conservation areas (RHCA) delineated according to PACFISH and/or INFISH direction on all projects?

### Timber Management

- TM1. Was timber harvest, including fuel wood cutting, prohibited in RHCAs? If not, was the activity covered by the exceptions in TM1a or TM1b? If required, was a watershed analysis completed?

### Roads Management

- RF1. Did unit cooperate with Federal, Tribal, State, and county agencies, and cost-share partners to achieve consistency in road design, operation, and maintenance necessary to attain RMOs?
- RF2a. Was a watershed analysis completed prior to construction of a new road or landing in RHCAs? (1)
- RF2a. Was a watershed analysis completed prior to construction of a new road or landing in a priority watershed? (2)
- RF2b. Were road and landing locations minimized in RHCAs?
- RF2c. Is there a Road Management Plan or a Transportation Monitoring Plan? Does it include the items listed in RF2c1-7?
- RF2d. Is the road designed to avoid sediment delivery to streams from the road surface?
- RF2e. Is the road designed to avoid disruption of natural hydrologic flow paths?
- RF2f. Was side casting of soils and snow avoided?
- RF3. Was the influence of each road on the RMOs determined?
- RF3a. Has reconstruction occurred on road drainage features that do not meet design criteria of operation and maintenance standards, or that have been shown to be less effective than designed for controlling sediment delivery, or that retard attainment of RMOs?
- RF3a. Has reconstruction occurred on road and drainage features that do not protect designated critical habitat for listed anadromous fish from increased sedimentation? (1)

- RF3a. Has reconstruction occurred on road and drainage features that do not protect priority watersheds from increased sedimentation? (2)
- RF3b. Was prioritizing reconstruction based on the current and potential damage to listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish and their priority watersheds; the ecological value of the riparian resources affected; and the feasibility of options such as helicopter logging and road relocation out of RHCAs?
- RF3c. If a road has been identified as not being needed for future management activities has it been scheduled for appropriate actions to remove it from use as a road and stabilized based on current and potential damage to listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- RF4. Were culverts, bridges, and other stream crossings constructed or improved to accommodate a 100-year flood, including associated bedload and debris, where those improvements would/do impose a risk to riparian conditions?
- RF4. Was the priority for upgrading existing crossings based on risks to listed anadromous fish and their designated critical habitat and/or priority watersheds and the ecological value of the riparian resources affected?
- RF4. Were crossings constructed or maintained to prevent diversion of streamflow out of the channel and down the road in the event of crossing failure?
- RF5. Is fish passage provided and maintained at all road crossings of existing and potential fish-bearing streams?

### **Grazing Management**

- GM1. Have grazing practices that retard or prevent attainment of RMOs or are likely to adversely affect listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish been modified or suspended?
- GM1. Have management practices been prescribed to meet the requirement of the project specific ESA consultation?
- GM1. Have the annual operating instructions/license/permit incorporate requirements from PACFISH and INFISH?
- GM1. Have annual operation instructions/license/permit been written to incorporate the relevant triggers, objectives, requirements and guidelines of the forest plan/Resource Management Plan?
- GM2. Were new livestock facilities located outside of RHCAs? Are existing livestock facilities not preventing the attainment of RMOs?
- GM3. Was livestock trailing, bedding, watering, salting, loading, and other handling efforts limited to those areas and times that would not retard or prevent attainment of RMOs or are likely to adversely affect listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- GM4. Was wild horse and burro management adjusted to avoid impacts that prevent attainment of RMOs or are likely to adversely affect listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?

### **Recreation Management**

- RM1. Has the recreation facility, new or existing, been designed, constructed, and operated in a manner that does not retard or prevent attainment or the RMOs and avoids adverse effects on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?

- RM1. Was watershed analysis completed prior to construction for new recreation facilities located in RHCAs?
- RM2. Have all recreation (dispersed or developed) practices of occupancy that retard or prevent attainment of RMOs or adversely affect listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish been adjusted or eliminated?
- RM3. If management of the recreation activity is addressed by Wild and scenic River, Wilderness, or other recreation management plans, has attainment of RMOs and potential effects on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish been addressed in the management plan?

### **Minerals Management**

- MM1. Have mineral operations minimized adverse effects to listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- MM1. Where activities identified in the Plan of Operation would retard attainment of RMOs or adversely impact listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish have all practicable measures consistent with mineral operation regulations been required to maintain and protect fish and their habitats that may be affected?
- MM1. Where reclamation bonds are required do they provide for the cost of stabilizing, rehabilitating, and reclaiming the area of operations?
- MM2. Were structures, support facilities, and roads related to mineral operations located outside of RHCAs?
- MM2. For structures, support facilities, and roads related to mineral operations that could not be practicably located outside of the RHCA are there provisions in the plan of operation to minimize adverse effects to listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- MM2. Have roads that are no longer required for mineral or land management activities been closed, obliterated, and revegetated?
- MM3. For solid and sanitary mining waste facilities that could not be practicably located outside of the RHCA, have all items listed in MM3a-e been included in the plan of operation and implemented during mining activities to prevent release of hazardous or toxic materials into the environment and minimize adverse effects to listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- MM4. For leasable operations is surface occupancy outside of the RHCA for oil, gas, and geothermal exploration and development activities?
- MM4. For leasable operations that are located within the RHCA has it been determined that the operations, facilities, and activities will not retard or prevent attainment or the RMOs and that they avoid adverse effects on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- MM5. Are sand and gravel operations located and operated in a manner that does not retard or prevent attainment or the RMOs and avoids adverse effects on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- MM6. Have inspection, monitoring, and reporting requirements for all authorized mineral activities been developed?
- MM6. Have the results of inspection and monitoring been evaluated and have the results been applied to modify mineral plans, leases, or permits as needed to eliminate impacts

that prevent attainment of RMOs and avoid adverse effects on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?

### **Fire/Fuels Management**

- FM1. Were fuel treatment and fire suppression strategies, practices, and actions designed and implemented so as not to prevent attainment of RMOs, and to minimize disturbance of riparian ground cover and vegetation?
- FM2. Were incident bases, camps, helibases, staging areas, helispots, and other centers for incident activities located outside of RHCA's?
- FM2. If it was necessary to locate bases, camps, helibases, staging areas, helispots, and other centers for incident activities within an RHCA, was an exemption granted by a resource advisor who prescribed the location, use conditions, and rehabilitation requirements with avoidance of adverse effects to listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- FM2. During pre-suppression planning was an interdisciplinary team, including a fish biologist, utilized to predetermine incident base and helibase locations with avoidance of potential adverse effects to listed fish species a primary goal?
- FM3. Was the application and delivery of chemical retardant, foam, or additives done in a manner to avoid surface waters?
- FM4. Were prescribed burn projects and prescriptions designed to contribute to the attainment of the RMOs?
- FM5. Was an emergency rehabilitation team established to develop a rehabilitation treatment plan to attain RMOs and avoid adverse effects on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish whenever RHCAs were determined to be significantly damaged by a wildfire or subsequent management actions?

### **Lands**

- LH1. Were in-stream flows and habitat conditions required for hydroelectric and other surface water development proposals that maintain or restore riparian resources, favorable channel conditions, and fish passage, reproduction, and growth?
- LH1. Did coordination with the appropriate State agencies occur to address in-stream flows and habitat conditions for hydroelectric and other surface water development proposals?
- LH1. During relicensing of hydroelectric projects were written and timely license conditions provided to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to address fish passage, flows, and habitat conditions that maintain/restore riparian resources and channel integrity? Were relicensing projects coordinated with the appropriate State agencies?
- LH2. Were new hydroelectric ancillary facilities under the FS or the BLM authority located outside of RHCAs?
- LH2. If under the FS or the BLM authority have existing hydroelectric facilities that must be located in the RHCA been located, operated, and maintained to avoid effects that would retard or prevent attainment of RMOs and avoid adverse effects on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- LH2. Where existing hydroelectric ancillary facilities in RHCAs cannot meet RMOs, have recommendations been provided to FERC to relocate facilities?

- LH3. Have leases, permits, rights-of-way, and easements been issued in such a way as to avoid effects that would retard or prevent attainment of the RMOs and avoid adverse effects on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- LH3. Where authority to do so was retained, have existing leases, permits, rights-of-way, and easements been adjusted to eliminate effects that would retard or prevent attainment of the RMOs and avoid adverse effects on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- LH3. Where the authority to adjust leases, permits, rights-of-way, and easements was not retained, have negotiations occurred to make changes to eliminate effects that would retard or prevent attainment of the RMOs and avoid adverse effects on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- LH3. Was priority for modifying existing leases, permits, rights-of-way, and easements based on the current and potential adverse effects on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish and the value of the riparian resources affected?
- LH4. Was land acquisition, exchange, or conservation easement used to meet RMOs and facilitate restoration of fish stocks and other species at risk of extinction?

#### **General Riparian Area Management**

- RA1. Were Federal, Tribal, State, and local governments identified and did cooperation occur to secure in-stream flows needed to maintain riparian resources, channel conditions, and aquatic habitat?
- RA2. Were trees felled in RHCAs? Were they a safety risk? Did they meet the exceptions under TM1? Were the felled trees kept on site to meet woody debris objectives?
- RA3. Were herbicides, pesticides, toxicants, and other chemicals applied in a manner that does not retard or prevent attainment of RMOs and avoids adverse effects to listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- RA4. Was all storage of fuels and other toxicants located outside of RHCAs?
- RA4. Did refueling occur outside of RHCAs? If refueling sites were within a RHCA were they approved by the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management and did they have an approved spill containment plan?
- RA5. Were water drafting sites located to avoid adverse effects on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish and in-stream flow, and in a manner that would not retard or prevent attainment of the RMOs?

#### **Watershed and Habitat Restoration**

- WR1. Were watershed restoration projects designed and implemented in a manner that promotes long-term ecological integrity of ecosystems, conserves the genetic integrity of native species, and contributes to attainment of RMOs?
- WR2. Did cooperation occur with Federal, Tribal, State, and local agencies, and private land owners to develop watershed-based Coordinated Resource Management Plans (CRMPs) or other cooperative agreements to meet RMOs?
- WR3. Was planned restoration only to mitigate existing problems, not to mitigate the effects of proposed activities? (1)

### **Fisheries and Wildlife Restoration**

- FW1. Were fish and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement actions designed and implemented in a manner that contributes to attainment of the RMOs?
- FW2. Were fish and wildlife interpretive and other user-enhancement facilities designed, constructed, and operated in a manner that does not retard or prevent attainment to RMOs or adversely affect listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?
- FW2. For existing fish and wildlife interpretive and other user-enhancement facilities located inside RHCAs, are RMOs being met and adverse effects on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish avoided? If not, are these facilities being relocated or closed?
- FW3. Were wild ungulate impacts that prevent attainment of RMOs and/or adversely affect listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish identified and eliminated? Did cooperation with Federal, Tribal, and State wildlife management agencies occur?
- FW4. Has cooperation with Federal, Tribal, and State fish management agencies occurred to identify and eliminate adverse effects associated with habitat manipulation, fish stocking, fish harvest and poaching on listed fish, designated critical habitat, and/or inland native fish?