

ATTACHMENT 4 - Survey and Manage Species Checklist and Tracking Forms

The Forest Service (FS) and Bureau of Land Management (BLM), referred to as the Agencies, are implementing the January 2001 *Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standards and Guidelines* (2001 ROD S&Gs) as modified by the 2011 Settlement Agreement in *Conservation Northwest v. Sherman et al.*, No-08-1067-JCC (W.D. Wash).

This is a Survey and Manage (S&M) species checklist and sample tracking format. The Agencies' Regional and State Offices intend for National Forest/BLM District units to use the checklist and format to account for Survey and Manage species in project planning. The examples in Table A do not list every S&M species that your specific National Forest/BLM District unit may need to consider or address, but instead displays a variety of different situations you may encounter on your unit.

Apply the following checklist and format. This checklist and format are tools; they are not intended to replace the effects analysis section of your National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document. Include the tracking forms in your project NEPA. If you include the tracking forms as an appendix to the NEPA document, summarize the project's S&M conformance with the 2001 ROD S&Gs in the NEPA document itself. If you have questions or believe your project has a high litigation risk, please work with the S&M Contact for your National Forest/BLM District and the appropriate program leads in your FS Regional or BLM State Office to finalize your tracking forms for greatest accuracy and defensibility.

CHECKLIST and DIRECTIONS

Species List:

- 1. For project decisions made between now and September 30, 2012, apply one of the following S&M species lists to your unit and project. For project decisions made after that date, please use b or c below. Identify which list applies to the project at the top of the tracking form.
 - a. 2001 S&M ROD Species List (Table 1-1, Standards and Guidelines, page 41-51);
 - b. 2011 Survey and Manage Settlement Agreement Species List, including species specific mitigation for Siskiyou Mountains salamander, the Scott Bar salamander, and the Great Grey Owl (Attachment 1, Settlement Agreement); or
 - c. No list (project complies with a Pechman Exemption and is therefore exempt from S&M pre-disturbance surveys and known site management).
Note: Projects using a 2011 Exemption may require application of a species list for purposes of known site management (see "Known Site Management" section below).
- 2. Double check S&M categories and species names for correctness and accuracy.

Survey Protocols:

- 1. Use survey protocols and any Annual Species Review (ASR) range extensions/contractions to determine if the project is in the species range, has suitable habitat, is a "habitat-disturbing activity" and, hence, needs pre-disturbance surveys.
- 2. Identify and list the survey protocols used. Note the survey protocol name in the preceding bullets to Table A.
- 3. Confirm survey results are entered into the appropriate Agency database.
- 4. Confirm forms are in the project record. The survey forms are evidence that surveys were conducted within protocol parameters and demonstrate survey findings.

□ **Survey Requirements:**

- 1. Include the following species in Table A:
 - a. Category A and C flora and fauna species known or suspected to occur within the National Forest/BLM District (pre-disturbance surveys).
 - b. Category B mollusk species known or suspected to occur within the National Forest/BLM District (pre-disturbance surveys/equivalent effort surveys).
 - c. Category E mollusk species (California) known or suspected to occur within the National Forest/BLM District (pre-disturbance surveys/equivalent effort surveys). This applies only when using the 2001 ROD list, and only to *Ancotrema voyanum* in California. Other Category E mollusk species on the 2001 S&M ROD Species List and 2011 Settlement Agreement Species List do not require equivalent effort surveys.
- 2. For habitat-disturbing projects within old-growth forests (2001 ROD S&Gs, pp. 79-80), list the following species in Table A:
 - a. Include Category B bryophyte and lichen species known or suspected to occur within the National Forest/BLM District (if your project has a Decision in FY06 or later and strategic surveys are not completed for the province that encompasses the project area, then equivalent effort surveys are required in old-growth habitat to be disturbed; 2001 ROD S&G, p. 9). Do not list the 8 lichen and bryophyte species where strategic surveys are considered complete. See IM-2006-38 for further information about these species and about Equivalent Effort surveys.
 - b. Include Category B fungi species known or suspected to occur within the National Forest/BLM District if your project has a Decision in FY11 or later (if your project has a Decision in FY06 or later and strategic surveys are not completed for the province that encompasses the project area, then equivalent effort surveys are required in old-growth habitat to be disturbed; 2001 ROD S&G, p. 9).
- 3. Although you are listing all species with pre-disturbance and equivalent effort survey requirements that are **known or suspected** within your National Forest/BLM District, Table A should reflect how the species information is applied to the [PROJECT] specifically. For instance, some of the species may be known or suspected within your National forest/BLM District, but the project may not be within the range of the species, and therefore the species is not known or suspected within the specific project.
- 4. Review consistency of responses in consecutive columns of Table A for a given species. If a project is not within the range of the species, you can't have suitable habitat in the project (i.e. doesn't make sense to put "No" in the first column for "within range of the species" and then have "Yes" in second column for "project contains suitable habitat").

□ **Known Site Management:**

(Note: Although applying a 2011 Exemption excuses pre-disturbance surveys, known site management may be required – see Settlement Agreement Table 1 for specific known site management direction.)

- 1. Include in Table A, any species with **known sites that occur within the project area**.
 - Indicate what site management the unit implemented and what information the National Forest/BLM District utilized in determining appropriate site management (management recommendations, conservation assessments, species fact sheets, Appendix J-2, etc.). Be specific when describing exact management applied; for example, “placed a 100 ft. no-activity area around the site (source citation).”
- 2. For Category D and E species, only the “Sites Known or Found” and “Site Management” sections of Table A need to be filled out (all other fields should be N/A).
 - Indicate what site management the unit implemented and what information the National Forest/BLM District utilized in determining appropriate site management (management

recommendations, conservation assessments, species fact sheets, Appendix J-2, etc.). Be specific when describing exact management applied; for example, “placed a 100 ft. no-activity area around the site (source citation).”

- 3. For species not requiring site management (non-high priority sites, occasional site of a rare species not needed for persistence, Category F species), indicate that site management is not required and why.

(Note: While a “yes/no/NA” answer is sufficient in the column titled “Site Management” for Table A, provide the more detailed information identified above in 1-3 in either a footnote to Table A or the Statement of Compliance-Summary of Survey Results section at the end of the form.)

Information Regarding Unique Circumstances:

Use the footnotes section of Table A for information that describes unique circumstances in your National Forest/BLM District or for further clarification. Don't use them to restate something that is already clear from the table. For example, it may be helpful to more completely explain that the range of the species bi-sects the National Forest/BLM District and the specific project is outside the range.

Final Statement of Compliance:

Include a summary in the Statement of Compliance to include identification of:

- 1. Species list applied
- 2. Species surveyed
- 3. Species found or with known sites in the project area
- 4. Information demonstrating application of management recommendations
 - Identify the management recommendation or other information utilized.
 - Clearly describe on-the-ground application of known site management. What management/protective measures were specifically applied to provide for the persistence of the species at the known site.

Survey & Manage Tracking Form:

Wildlife Species Survey and Site Management Summary

FS Forest Name – District Name or BLM District Name –Field Office 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: 2011 Settlement Agreement

(NOTE: Examples here apply the 2011 Settlement Agreement species list and reflect a variety of different projects/project types in order to display the variety of documentation the field unit will need to complete. Examples applying the 2001 ROD Species List maybe different.)

Table A: Survey & Manage Wildlife Species

The [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] compiled the species listed below from the 2011 Settlement Agreement Attachment 1. The list includes those vertebrate and invertebrate species with pre-disturbance survey requirements (Category A, B, or C species), whose known or suspected range includes the [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] according to:

- [LIST REFERENCES FOR SURVEY PROTOCOLS USED FOR RANGE, HABITAT AND SURVEY METHODOLOGY.]

This list also includes any Category D, E, or F species with known sites located within the [PROJECT AREA.] Applicable management recommendations include:

- [LIST THE MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS OR OTHER INFORMATION THAT HAVE BEEN USED TO MANAGE ANY KNOWN SITES, AND THAT THE SITE MANAGEMENT IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THOSE MRs/THAT INFORMATION.]

EXAMPLE TABLE

Species	S&M Category	Survey Triggers			Survey Results			Site Management
		Within Range of the Species ?	Contains Suitable habitat?	Habitat Disturbing*?	Surveys Required ?	Survey Date (month/year)	Sites Known or Found?	
Vertebrates								
List Category D, E, and F species if there are known sites within the Project Area <i>Example: Siskiyou Mountains salamander (Plethodon storm, north range)</i>	Off ¹	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	2 ¹ Strategic Surveys 2002	Yes ¹
Great Gray Owl (<i>Strix nebulosa</i>)	C	Yes	No ²	No	No	N/A	0	N/A

Larch mountain salamander (<i>Plethodon larselli</i>)	A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	3/10 and 10/10	0	N/A
Red Tree Vole (<i>Arborimus longicaudus</i>)	C	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	6/2010	1	Yes ⁴
Mollusks								
List Category B mollusks <i>Example: Siskiyou Sideband (Monadenia chaceana)</i>	B ⁵	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	March and Sept 2010	1	No ⁶
Crater Lake Tightcoil (<i>Pristiloma arcticum crateris</i>)	A	Yes	Yes	No	No	May 2005 ⁷	0	N/A

*"Habitat disturbing" and thereby a trigger for surveys as defined in the 2001 ROD S&Gs (p. 22).

N/A = Not Applicable

¹ This species is covered by a Conservation Strategy in the northern part of the species range. According to mitigation described in the 2011 Settlement Agreement Species List, Survey and Manage no longer applies to this species in the northern part of the range. There are two known sites identified through Strategic Surveys completed in 2002, and the [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] applied the Conservation Strategy for management of these sites. In this particular case, the [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] applied a 100 foot no-activity radius surrounding occupied habitat; consequently removing sale units 4a and 10b from the sale.

² Pre-disturbance surveys for Great Gray Owls are not required since there is no suitable nesting habitat within the project area or within proximity of the project area that would be impacted by disturbance. The required habitat characteristics of suitable habitat include: (1) large diameter nest trees, (2) forest for roosting cover, and (3) proximity [within 600 feet] 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; and mitigation language in the 2011 Settlement Agreement Species List). The stands in XX do not have proximity to natural-openings ≥ 10 acres (Name, staff review, 2011) 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).

⁴ One site of this species was located during surveys. [The NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] delineated a 10 acre habitat area of the best habitat surrounding the active nest (*Management Recommendations for the Oregon Red Tree Vole *Arborimus longicaudus*, Version 2.0*, September 27, 2000). The [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] dropped Unit 12 due to the habitat area overlap with the unit.

⁵ Equivalent-effort pre-disturbance surveys are required for this species.

⁶ One site of this species was located during surveys. However, the location of the known site would preclude the [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] from meeting the project objective of replacing a trail bridge. Management of the known site would require the [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] to not cut down smaller diameter trees to allow placement of the new bridge structure to span the 100 year flood plain. The project cannot occur unless this access can be developed.

Therefore, the [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] has utilized the flexibility in the 2011 Settlement Agreement from Table 1, to exempt management of this known site.

⁷Suitable 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. Significant negative affects to the micro-climate of this habitat within the Riparian Reserve will not occur so there is no trigger for surveys. Although pre-disturbance surveys for this species were not required (since the habitat for this species would not be impacted), protocol mollusk surveys were completed May 2005. No Crater Lake tightcoil sites were discovered.

Statement of Compliance. The [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] applied the 2011 Settlement Agreement Species List to the XX project, completing pre-disturbance surveys and management of known sites (Table A) required by Survey Protocols and Management Recommendations 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 (2001 ROD S&Gs)*.

[SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS] Project surveys discovered sites for two Survey and Manage wildlife species:

- Red Tree Vole: 2010 Pre-disturbance surveys identified one site. In accordance with the Management Recommendations for the Oregon Red Tree Vole *Arborimus longicaudus*, Version 2.0 (September, 2000) a 10 acre habitat area of the best habitat surrounding the active nest was delineated and resulted in dropping Unit 12 due to the habitat area overlap with the unit.
- Siskiyou Sideband: 2010 Equivalent effort surveys identified one site. Location of the known site would preclude the [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] from meeting the project objective as described in Table A Footnote 6; therefore I have utilized the flexibility in the 2011 Settlement Agreement (Table 1) to exempt management of this known site.

In addition, there are two known sites in the project area for the Siskiyou Mountains Salamander. Previously a Category D vertebrate species, this species now requires species specific mitigation as outlined in the Survey & Manage 2011 Settlement Agreement Species List. Two sites were identified in the project area from 2002 Strategic Surveys. Application of management in accordance with the Conservation Strategy for Siskiyou Mountains Salamander (2007) resulted in the removal of two units from the sale (Units 4a and 10b).

NAME, Wildlife Biologist
NAME District or Field Office

Date

Survey & Manage Tracking Form:

Botany Species Survey and Site Management Summary

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: 2011 Settlement Agreement

(NOTE: Examples here apply the 2011 Settlement Agreement species list and reflect a variety of different projects/project types in order to display the variety of documentation the field unit will need to complete. Examples applying the 2001 ROD Species List maybe different.)

Table A. Survey & Manage Botany Species

The [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] compiled the species listed below from the 2011 Settlement Agreement Attachment 1. This includes those vascular and non-vascular plant species with pre-disturbance survey requirements (Category A or C species), whose known or suspected range includes the [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] according to:

- [LIST REFERENCES FOR SURVEY PROTOCOLS USED FOR RANGE, HABITAT AND SURVEY METHODOLOGY.]

[IF THE PROJECT IS a HABITAT-DISTURBING ACTIVITY IN OLD-GROWTH] This list also includes species with Equivalent Effort pre-disturbance survey requirements, including Category B lichen and bryophytes (if project decision was signed after FY05) and Category B fungi species (if project decision was signed after FY10) whose known or suspected range includes the [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] according to:

- [LIST REFERENCES FOR SURVEY PROTOCOLS USED FOR RANGE, HABITAT AND SURVEY METHODOLOGY.]

This list also includes any Category B, D, E, or F species with known sites located within the [PROJECT AREA.] Applicable management recommendations include:

- [LIST THE MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS OR OTHER INFORMATION THAT HAVE BEEN USED TO MANAGE ANY KNOWN SITES, AND THAT THE SITE MANAGEMENT IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THOSE MRs/THAT INFORMATION.]

EXAMPLE TABLE

Species	S&M Category	Survey Triggers			Survey Results			Site Management
		Within Range of the Species ?	Contains Suitable habitat?	Habitat Disturbing*?	Surveys Required?	Survey Date (month/year)	Sites Known or Found?	
<p>List any Category D, E or F species, if there are known sites within the project area.</p> <p>Example: <i>Clavariadelphus truncatus</i></p>	<p>D, E, F</p> <p>Example: D¹</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	1	Yes ²
<p>List Category B lichens and bryophytes with Strategic Surveys completed (and no Equivalent Effort Surveys required). Site management is still required for these species, in all habitat types.</p> <p>Example: <i>Diplophyllum plicatum</i></p>	B ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	1	Yes ⁴
<p>List Category B lichens and bryophytes with Strategic Surveys NOT completed (and Equivalent Effort Surveys required), as well as all Category B Fungi</p> <p>Example: <i>Bryoria subcana</i></p>	B ⁵	No	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	N/A	N/A
<p>Another Example: <i>Thorluna dissimilis</i></p>	B ⁶	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	April 2010	0	No
Fungi								
<i>Bridgeoporus nobillissimus</i>	A	Yes	No	N/A	No	N/A	0	No
Lichens								

<i>Bryoria pseudocapillaris</i>	A	No	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
<i>Bryoria spiralifera</i>	A	No	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
<i>Hypogymnia duplicata</i>	C	No	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
<i>Leptogium cyanescens</i>	A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nov. 2010	0	N/A
<i>Lobaria linita</i>	A	Yes	No	N/A	No	N/A	0	No
<i>Nephroma occultum</i>	A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nov. 2010	1	No ⁷
<i>Niebla cephalota</i>	A	No	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
<i>Pseudocyphellaria perpetua</i>	A	Yes	No	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
<i>Pseudocyphellaria rainierensis</i>	A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Nov. 2010	0	N/A
<i>Teloschistes flavicans</i>	A	No	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
Bryophytes								
<i>Schistostega pennata</i>	A	No	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
<i>Tetraphis geniculata</i>	A	Yes	No	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
Vascular Plants								
<i>Botrychium minganense</i>	A	Yes	No	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
<i>Botrychium montanum</i>	A	No	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
<i>Coptis asplenifolia</i>	A	No	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
<i>Coptis trifolia</i>	A	No	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
<i>Corydalis aquae-gelidae</i>	A	No	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
<i>Cypripedium fasciculatum</i>	C	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	June 2010	0	N/A
<i>Cypripedium montanum</i>	C	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	June 2010	0	N/A
<i>Eucephalis vialis</i>	A	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Aug. 2010	0	N/A
<i>Galium kamtschaticum</i>	A	No	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	0	N/A
<i>Plantanthera orbiculata</i> var. <i>orbiculata</i>	C	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Aug. 2010	1	Yes ⁸

*“Habitat disturbing” and thereby a trigger for surveys as defined in the 2001 ROD S&Gs (p. 22).

N/A = Not applicable

¹ Pre-project surveys are not required for Category D species.

² A 50 foot no activity area was delineated around this site in Unit 3c.

³ Strategic surveys were completed for this species, and no Equivalent Effort surveys are required (IM-2006-038).

⁴ A site discovered during strategic surveys in 2005 was located within the project area. A 50 foot no activity area was delineated around this site in Unit 3a.

⁵ Strategic surveys have not been completed for this species; however, the project is not located within the range of the species, and hence Equivalent Effort surveys are not required.

⁶ Strategic Surveys have not been completed for this species; the project is within old growth, and since the Decision for this project is after September 30, 2005, Equivalent Effort surveys for this species are required.

⁷ One site of this species was located during surveys. However, the location of the known site would preclude the [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] from meeting the project objective of replacing a trail bridge. Management of the known site would require the [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] to not cut down smaller diameter trees to allow placement of the new bridge structure to span the 100 year flood plain. The project cannot occur unless this access can be developed. Therefore, the [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] has utilized the flexibility in the 2011 Settlement Agreement from Table 1, to exempt management of this known site.

⁸ A 150 foot no activity area was delineated around this site in Unit 12b.

Statement of Compliance. The [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] applied the 2011 Settlement Agreement Species List to the XX project, completing pre-disturbance surveys, (equivalent effort surveys, [IF IN OLD GROWTH FOREST]) and management of known sites (Table A) required by Survey Protocols and Management Recommendations 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*.

[SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS] Project surveys discovered sites for two Survey and Manage botany species:

- Category A Lichen (*Nephroma occultum*): 2010 Pre-disturbance survey identified one site on an older tree adjacent to a patch of small deciduous trees near an existing opening. Location of the site would preclude the [NATIONAL FOREST/BLM DISTRICT] from meeting the project objective as described in Table A Footnote 7, therefore I have utilized the flexibility in the 2011 Settlement Agreement (Table 1) to exempt management of this known site.
- Category C Vascular Plant (*Plantanthera orbiculata* var. *orbiculata*): 2010 Pre-disturbance surveys identified one site located within the northeast corner of unit 12b. Delineated a 50 foot no activity area around the site (*Management Recommendations for Vascular Plants* (January 20, 1999)).

Known sites are present within the project for two additional species:

- Category D Fungi (*Clavariadelphus truncates*): 2001 and 2002 Strategic Surveys located one site. *Delineated a 50 foot no activity area* site based on information utilized from the *Conservation Assessment for Fungi in Regions 5&6 and OR/WA/CA BLM* (July 2007).
- Category B Bryophyte (*Diplophyllum plicatum*): 2001 and 2002 Strategic Surveys located one site. Implemented the *Management Recommendations for Bryophytes* by utilizing the *Conservation Assessment for 11 species of Bryophytes (2005)* and the *Species Fact Sheet for Diplophyllum plicatum (May 2009)* to delineate a 50 foot no activity area.

NAME, Botanist
NAME District or Field Office

Date