

Questions and Answers Relating to the Survey and Manage SEIS and ROD and Special Status/Sensitive Species Program Transition

(Updated June 30, 2004)

The following questions and answers (Q&As) were asked during two conference calls on April 20-21, 2004. The calls focused on the 2004 Survey and Manage (S&M) SEIS and ROD ("To Remove or Modify the Survey and Manage Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines in Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl") and Special Status/Sensitive Species Program (SSSP) transition effort in Forest Service (FS) Region (R) 5, R6, and California and Oregon/Washington (OR/WA) BLM. A few questions received from the field after the calls were also added. The Q&As have been separated into the following categories for ease of reference: List Updates and Processes, ROD Interpretations, Surveys, Budget, Database, and Misc. The item in parenthesis at the end of each question (i.e., Interagency, OR/WA BLM, R5, R6) refers to the organization for which the answer applies. As new questions are received, the Q&A will be added to this list.

A. List Updates and Processes

(A1) **Question:** When will the Region 6 list be updated? (FS R6)

Answer: The Region 6 Regional Forester's (RF) Sensitive Species list was updated with the S&M species for the Forests within the area of the Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP) via a letter from the RF dated April 26, 2004. The Forests outside the NWFP area were given a 30-day period to review the list and provide comments. The list will be updated for those Forests after the RO has reviewed the comments provided. In Region 6, NWFP area Forests have already been dealing with the former S&M species and we assumed they would be prepared to work with the S&M species right away. For the Forests outside the NWFP area, the S&M species represent new species and taxa so we are allowing time for review to assure that the information about whether these species are documented or suspected on the Forests is correct, and to acquire training and information about the species' habitat associations.

(A2) **Question:** How long is the delay for implementing the new sensitive species list for non-NWFP area Forests? (FS R6)

Answer: See the answer to Question 1. The list will be updated for the Forests outside the NWFP area after comments have been reviewed.

(A3) **Question:** Are mollusks being added to the sensitive species list? (FS R6)

Answer: Yes, 22 former S&M species of mollusks were added to the Region 6 list.

(A4) **Question:** Does the updated list reflect Oregon Natural Heritage Program (ONHP) rankings? (FS R6)

Answer: Yes, one of the factors used for evaluating whether former S&M species met the criteria for addition to the R6 RF's Sensitive Species list was the rankings provided by the ONHP.

(A5) **Question:** Will the RF's sensitive list be Forest specific or will it contain regional information? Will it account for locally common species? (FS R6)

Answer: The R6 updated list will be in the same format as in the past. Species will be listed based on whether they are suspected or documented by Forest.

(A6) Question: There are 23 new species on the R5 list. Is this a done deal for the NWFP area? (FS R5)

Answer: Yes, there are 23 species that meet the criteria for inclusion on the R5 RF's list. The criteria for adding species included global and state rankings as well as evaluation by taxa experts. Updating the list is similar to the process described for R6. The updated list for the NWFP area is scheduled to come out on Friday, April 23. The ROD did not add species to the RF's list. It only identified species that met the criteria for inclusion in the list. The R5 RO is requesting feedback on new information concerning species range region-wide as well as any training needs Forests foresee. More information on how Forests outside the NWFP area will implement the new list will be forthcoming after review of Forest feedback.

(A7) Question: The 1998 letter (R5 RF) indicates that if a species is listed as sensitive, it is sensitive on every forest where it occurs. Is this true? (FS R5/R6)

Answer: Yes. If a species is listed as sensitive, it will continue to be sensitive wherever it occurs. The RO tracks distribution by Forest so let the RO know if a Sensitive Species occurs on your Forest. If the Forests report all occurrences, it provides data that allows the RO to re-evaluate a species status if it is discovered in multiple locations. For R6, the Sensitive Species list identifies whether the species is documented or suspected to occur by Forest. The R6 list may also be delineated by state based on state rankings.

(A8) Question: How does Region 5 manage their "Watch List"? (FS R5)

Answer: The R5 "Watch List" is an informal policy for species that do not meet the criteria to be included on the regional Sensitive Species list. Generally Forests designate species that are of local interest. This might include species at the edge of their range, species for which there are taxonomic questions, or public concern. It is more commonly used by botanists. The "Watch List" is at the discretion of the Forest Supervisor and the lists vary by Forest. Data for "Watch List" species is usually submitted to the state Natural Heritage Database.

(A9) Question: (a) Is the BLM SSSP policy past the expiration date? Can we keep procedures up-to-date? (b) Will the policy be revised again? (OR/WA BLM)

Answer: (a) The State Director signed a memo last March that extended the 1990 policy through September 2004. (b) Yes, the State Office will work towards keeping the policy current. The R6 RF and OR/WA BLM State Director have asked FS/BLM staff to review FS and BLM State Office Special Status/Sensitive Species policies to identify opportunities for increased consistency between the agencies' policies. This may result in a revision to address consistency and other issues.

(A10) Question: I looked for the updated SSSP list and it was not on the website. Will it be posted soon? (OR/WA BLM)

Answer: The list changes that resulted from the S&M ROD is being revised with district input on documented and suspected status and is not yet posted on the BLM intranet SSS list website. We will post the updated SSS list that includes the former S&M species on the intranet website when the revision is finalized under State Director signature.

(A11) Question: ONHP has a history of not always having the most current information? Is this a concern/scrutiny for SSSP? (FS R6)

Answer: FS R6 receives updated information from ONHP annually through an ongoing contract. They provide the best information available, and it is important for field units to provide data from

observations, surveys, etc. to assure ONHP has the most current information to evaluate a species' status and rank.

(A12) Question: ONHP needs a formalized process for how plants are rated. Ratings are not always considered. Can we suggest that ONHP institute a more thorough process for rating plants? (OR/WA BLM)

Answer: One of the efforts of the FS R6 and OR/WA BLM SSS programs is to improve coordination with the states of Oregon and Washington and Natural Heritage Program (NHP) to include more direct and organized interaction over species data and rankings. As part of this effort, we would work with NHP and the states to improve the structure of the joint process.

B. ROD Interpretations

(B1) **Question:** Did the EIS conclude no effect for the owl? (Interagency)

Answer: The FSEIS conclusion for the northern spotted owl was based on the Biological Assessment, which concluded may affect, not likely to adversely affect. The FWS was asked to concur with this determination.

(B2) **Question:** Even though the ROD does not apply to Eastside forests, will species that are added to the sensitive list affect Eastside forests? (FS R6, OR/WA BLM)

Answer: The ROD only amends resource management plans for Forests/BLM Districts within the NWFP area. The ROD itself does not change anything for eastside Forests/Districts. The update of the agency Special Status/Sensitive Species lists may affect Eastside Forests/Districts.

(B3) **Question:** Since the SSSP requirements are less stringent, if S&M requirements are met is there any canned language stating you would meet requirements under either scenario?

(Interagency)

Answer: There is no canned language. The S&M ROD on page 9 states that "Projects that are in development but have not yet fully complied with survey requirements of the Survey and Manage Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines may, at the discretion of the line officer responsible for the project decision, continue under those standards and guidelines or comply with the Special Status Species Policies for those Survey and Manage species that were added to the Special Status Species Programs." If the S&M standards and guidelines are met, then the FS Sensitive Species policy for completing Biological Evaluations (BEs) has also been met. No additional analysis would be completed. For OR/WA BLM the SSS policy requires a systematic, interdisciplinary evaluation in the NEPA decision-making process. The NEPA documents must disclose effects of actions on Bureau Sensitive (BS) and Assessment species.

(B4) **Question:** Will the RO help biologists/botanists complete BE's, see ROD pp. 18-19 (viability/diversity)? Federal actions for diversity infer that no action could make current situation worse. (FS R6)

Answer: The ROD did not change FS policies concerning Sensitive Species and the preparation of BEs. The ROD language on pages 18-19 refers to direct quotes from the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) planning regulations. The FS Sensitive Species Program is a proactive approach to conserving species, preventing a trend toward federal listing under the Endangered Species Act, providing for a diversity of plant and animal communities as part of our multiple use mandate, and maintaining viable populations as required by NFMA. The viability provision in the NFMA regulations apply to vertebrates. Departmental Regulation 9500-4 added viability for plants. RO staff is available to help the Forests with BEs as it has been in the past---to answer questions or provide training when requested.

(B5) **Question:** Under the diversity provision in the ROD (p. 19), the italic sections imply that we can reduce diversity to meet overall multiple use objectives. (FS R6)

Answer: The italic sections on page 19 of the ROD are direct quotes from the NFMA regulations. The regulations state that reduction in diversity "may be prescribed only where needed to meet overall multiple-use objectives."

(B6) Question: What are rare and uncommon species since the analytical assumption is based on those distinctions? (Interagency)

Answer: The analytical assumptions in the FSEIS were based on the S&M rarity categories. Rare species were those listed in Categories A, B, and E; Uncommon species were listed in Categories C, D, and F. This analytical assumption was made in the FSEIS to help effects writers evaluate how species moving to SSSP might fare, and what kind of management could be expected for them. Volume II, Appendix 1 of the FSEIS describes the criteria that were used to designate species as rare or uncommon under S&M. The analytical assumptions in the FSEIS were applied only the former S&M species. Under SSSP, there are no longer formal designations for rare and uncommon species.

(B7) Question: On page 6 of the ROD it is stated, "the assumption used in the final SEIS for managing known sites under the SSSP was that sites needed to prevent a listing under the Endangered Species Act would be managed. For species currently included in the Survey and Manage Categories A, B, and E (which require management of all known sites), it is anticipated that only in rare cases would a site not be needed to prevent a listing." In other words, this is saying we should protect the old S&M species that were listed as Categories A, B, and E. Several Category B fungi are now Bureau Tracking (BT) species on the draft OR/WA BLM SSS list. However, as I understand wording elsewhere for the SSSP, BT species do not need to be managed. Which is it? (BLM OR/WA)

Answer: Under the assumptions in the FSEIS, BT species were not given any management or conservation weight, so the effects writers assumed that BT species would not have sites managed. The FSEIS and SSS policy states that BT "are not Special Status Species for management purposes". So, for former Category B species determined to be BT, it is not required to manage sites, but each field manager may determine how or whether to manage sites for BT species.

(B8) Question: The 2004 ROD has language describing assumptions for species considered practical to survey for, and whether field surveys are likely to be used as a tool or not. Applying the assumptions in the FSEIS and ROD means that field surveys as a tool are only likely to be used for one species of fungi; the remaining fungi were considered not practical to survey for under S&M, and hence, the assumption is they are not likely under SSSP. However, there are several BS fungi on the SSS list. Under Bureau policy, don't we survey for BS species if we think we have habitat or know that they are present in a project area? (BLM OR/WA)

Answer: The FSEIS, ROD, and recent ROD implementation letter all emphasize the assumption that if field surveys were not practical under S&M, they are not expected to be used under SSSP. The overall assumption is that field units would not use field surveys as a tool for all but one species of fungi. OR/WA BLM SSS policy, as clarified in IM No. OR-2003-054 by the State Director, directs districts to assess species' effects by various tools including, but not limited to: habitat examination; habitat evaluation; evaluation of species-habitat associations and presence of suitable or potential habitat; review of existing survey records, inventories, and spatial data; utilization of professional research, literature and other technology transfer sources; or use of expertise, both internal and external, that is based on documented, substantiated professional rationale; or project survey and monitoring based on technically sound and logistically feasible methods. Each field unit will need to assess the degree and effort needed to provide information to conduct an informed evaluation of a project impact upon a species, including what tools are needed. Field managers, with input from technical staff, will make this determination.

C. Surveys

(C1) **Question:** Do we need to use the survey protocols created under S&M for those species now determined to be sensitive? (FS R6, OR/WA BLM)

Answer: No, the survey protocols transmitted under the S&M Standards and Guidelines are not required to be used by field units. For R6 and OR/WA BLM these protocols will be slightly modified and transmitted to the field as one tool field units may utilize if a determination is made that field surveys are needed. These new documents will provide information about survey methodology, species taxonomy and ecology that field units may consider, but use of the protocols will not be required.

(C2) **Question:** When will strategic surveys results be available and in what form? (FS R6, OR/WA BLM)

Answer: The Random Grid surveys conducted under the Strategic Survey Program have been completed, except for the red tree vole. For all but the red tree vole, an interpretation of these results is a high priority for completion this fiscal year (FY). The interpretation of the results will likely be transmitted in a General Technical Report (GTR) by the end of the calendar year. For red tree vole, completion of the surveys is expected by the end of the FY, with an interpretation of the results by late spring 2005. Results from the Random Grid surveys (actual sites found) have been documented in a database available on the Interagency Species Management System (ISMS) website. Other Strategic Survey work, besides the Random Grid, is ongoing and will continue into FY05. A continuation of these types of surveys was determined useful and applicable to species that move into the SSSP. These results are also available on the ISMS website.

(C3) **Question:** On page 9 of the ROD it says, "No additional survey work is required for projects that have fully complied with the current Survey and Manage" For species added to SSSP that previously did not require surveys such as Category E, do we now need to survey for them if surveys are practical? And if not, how do we cover this situation in a BE? (Interagency)

Answer: Field surveys are not required for any of the Special Status/Sensitive species; instead they are one tool to utilize when evaluating the impact of a project upon a species. If a field unit determines that field surveys for a species are practical to complete, then field level surveys could be another tool to utilize when determining project impacts. For OR/WA BLM, also see information in answer B8 on tools to assess effects.

(C4) **Question:** We have existing contracts to complete pre-project surveys. How do we handle them? (Interagency)

Answer: Each unit will need to decide how to proceed. Consider the species that are included and whether they are included in the updated SSSP lists. Surveys are not required for species that were not added to your Agency SSSP. For those species added to SSSP, field surveys are one tool to utilize in determining project effects, but they are not required. Additionally consult with your contracting officer to determine the degree to which you could modify existing contracts, if possible.

(C5) Question: Surveys are a tool. If surveys were practical under S&M, then they are likely under SSSP. When surveys are not practical, what level of assessment is needed? (Interagency)

Answer: Field level botanists and biologists should conduct the level of assessment needed to make a recommendation as to the potential for the project to impact the species, and to make a determination as to whether the project may contribute to a trend towards loss of viability or contribute to the need to list. This type of assessment can take many forms including, but not limited to: habitat examination; habitat evaluation; evaluation of species-habitat associations and presence of suitable or potential habitat; review of existing survey records, inventories, and spatial data; utilization of professional research, literature and other technology transfer sources; or use of expertise, both internal and external, that is based on documented, substantiated professional rationale.

D. Budget

(D1) **Question:** Will there be funding to the field? (OR/WA BLM)

Answer: There is a large array of funding at both SO/RO and field levels. Project funding will be determined by local line officers.

(D2) **Question:** In the past, costs were borne at the district level, which caused unit costs to increase because of surveys and data entry. How do you see unit cost changing? Will costs for I SMS and/or NRI S be included in unit costs? Or, will they be funded through other money? (FS R6)

Answer: There will no longer be a large, centralized budget in the RO as there was with S&M. Money will be allocated to field with various considerations. I SMS data entry is part of project costs. Unit costs are likely to decline because there are fewer species to manage and the wide array of tools available for pre-project clearances should reduce the amount of field surveys. There should be funds in the budget to switch from S&M to SSSP.

(D3) **Question:** When you discuss doubling the Sensitive Species Program, and increased emphasis on Conservation Assessment and Strategies, are you considering them as earmarks or part of regular allocation? (FS R5)

Answer: For Region 5 there will be earmarks for FY 05 and 06.

(D4) **Question:** How are the agencies going to prioritize money for the field? Will it be based on species? On outputs? On needs (i.e. training, surveys)? (FS R6, OR/WA BLM)

Answer: There is an interagency group that will look at this question. For R6 and OR/WA BLM allocations will move in a couple of different ways; "off the top" expense will be less than in past for S&M. For field units in the NWFP area, unit costs are expected to be less than under S&M. Outside the NWFP area, unit costs are expected to increase as a result of consideration of former S&M species in project analyses. For R6 and OR/WA BLM we will be looking at a species prioritization process, Conservation Assessments/Strategies, and inventories as a basis for prioritization and distribution of available funds for the funding of Regional and State-level efforts for implementation at the district level.

(D5) **Question:** Will there be earmarks or allocations for OR/WA BLM? (OR/WA BLM)

Answer: There is an expectation that funding for inventories and Conservation Assessments and Strategies will be sent to the FS and BLM units for completion of the work or for contract administration. The agencies will jointly determine locations for the work contingent upon program and species priorities, staff availability, and the feasibility of accomplishing the work. However, these funds are not for field-level project evaluations.

(D6) **Question:** For some species that are buffered, there is no monitoring in place to determine if the buffers really work. Will there be funding for this? (OR/WA BLM)

Answer: NWFP level monitoring efforts are unchanged by this decision. If a unit decides monitoring is important to the project, it should be included in the proposed action. This is part of project costs.

E. Database

(E1) **Question:** In looking at a broader scale for species range, individual forests are not able to track key information for line officers. (FS R6, OR/WA BLM)

Answer: Region 6 and OR/WA BLM will be working on development of broad-scale inventories and Conservation Assessments for sensitive species, which will provide a more defensible basis and context for evaluation of impacts at the project level. We will also be developing an interagency geo-spatial database.

(E2) **Question:** Will Region 5 units continue to have access to I SMS data? The data will be useful both in completing Conservation Assessments and cumulative effects analysis. (FS R5)

Answer: I SMS data will continue to be available to all units.

(E3) **Question:** What do the field offices outside of the NWFP area do with the information when they find former S&M species that are now in the SSSP? (FS R6, OR/WA BLM)

Answer: The OR/WA BLM and R6 field offices outside of the NWFP areas will not use I SMS. Continue to store data in the same manner as is currently done for species that are in the SSSP.

- OR/WA BLM: I SMS will be replaced by the Geographic Biotic Observations ArcGIS application (GeoBOB) in the first quarter of FY05. OR/WA BLM Westside units will use GeoBOB for a large segment of the SSS and some T/E species. The Executives will make a final determination on whether the Eastside offices will use GeoBOB later this FY.
- FS R6 offices will begin using NRI S Fauna and TES Plants early in FY05 when I SMS is replaced by GeoBOB. If Fauna and TES Plants are not ready for some reason, timing adjustments to when they make the switch can be made to assure continued data management capability.

(E4) **Question:** Now that the ROD is signed, what do the field offices within the NWFP area do with information they have collected on former S&M species? (FS R5/R6, OR/WA BLM)

Answer:

- FS R5: Use I SMS for all sites discovered prior to April 21, 2004 (ROD implementation date). Use NRI S Fauna and an interim plants database (until TES Plants is available for general use) for all sensitive species occurrences discovered after that date.
- BLM (OR/WA/CA field offices included in the NWFP area) and FS R6: Use I SMS for all S&M species sites discovered prior to April 21, 2004. Use I SMS for all sites discovered between April 22, 2004 and September 30, 2004 for the species transferring from the S&M program to the SSSP.
- BLM: I SMS will be replaced by GeoBOB, in the first quarter of FY05. OR/WA BLM Westside, and possibly Eastside will use GeoBOB for a large segment of the SSS and some T/E species. The Executives will make a final determination on how widespread the use of GeoBOB will be later this FY.
- At the choice of the field offices, can also use I SMS for incidentally discovered sites of former S&M species that did not transfer to SSSP. The database may also be used for existing SSSP species that fit the I SMS data model and that have site definitions consistent with those currently used in I SMS. Species from other Classes/Orders/Families that do not have a site definition should not be entered into I SMS.
- R6 FS offices will begin using Fauna and TES Plants early in FY05 when I SMS is replaced by GeoBOB. If the offices are not ready for some reason to use Fauna and TES Plants, adjustments may be made to the timing for making the switch to ensure continued data management capability.

(E5) **Question:** Will there be another I SMS corporate shapefile merge? If so, when will it occur and which offices should participate? (FS R5/R6, OR/WA BLM)

Answer: Look for a memo in mid-August, which will announce the official date of the last I SMS corporate shapefile merge. The merge is tentatively scheduled for late September or early October. In the meantime, field offices should enter new data and clean up their existing I SMS shapefile errors to facilitate the data migration process. All FS offices in R6 and R5 as well as BLM offices in OR/WA and CA within the NWFP area will need to participate in the merge if they have new or corrected shapefiles.

F. Misc.

(F1) **Question:** Are BS species considered to be rare? (OR/WA BLM)

Answer: When we refer to rare species in the FSEIS and ROD we mean S&M Categories A, B, and E. The S&M categories are described in the Final SEIS, Volume II, Appendix 1. Both rare and uncommon species meet the criteria for inclusion in SSS program. The OR/WA Bureau Sensitive species are equated to ONHP List 1 plant and animal species which are defined as the taxa that are threatened with extinction or presumed to be extinct throughout their range; and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Sensitive animal species that are vulnerable or declining and are likely to become endangered or threatened in a significant portion of their ranges within the state without cooperative management or removal of threats.

(F2) **Question:** Fungi are now on the BS list. We don't know much about them and we are not doing surveys because they are impractical. How do we address these species in a NEPA document when we lack knowledge? (OR/WA BLM)

Answer: For OR/WA BLM, the State Office, in conjunction with field manager representatives and additional field level biologist/botanist input, is drafting direction for FY04 that would ensure that BLM actions will not contribute to the need to list these species. Field units will be able to tier to that direction when completing their project level evaluations. The direction will be evaluated for use in FY05.

(F3) **Question:** What management is needed for species that were in Categories E and F? (Interagency)

Answer: The ROD (p. 6) states, "The assumption used in the final SEIS for managing known sites under the Special Status Species Programs was that sites needed to prevent listing under the Endangered Species Act would be managed. For species currently included in Categories A, B, and E (which require management of all known sites), it is anticipated that only in rare cases would a site not be needed to prevent listing. For species currently included in Survey and Manage Categories C and D (which require the management of only high priority sites), it is anticipated that loss of some sites would not contribute to a need to list. Authority to disturb special status species sites lies with the agency official who is responsible for authorizing the proposed habitat-disturbing activity." There is no assumption in the SEIS for the management of former Category F species. Species in Category F were considered "uncommon" like Categories C and D but were not placed in either of these two categories because there was insufficient information to determine one or more of the Basic Criteria (whether the species was located in the NWFP, was closely associated with late-successional and old-growth forests, or had a concern for persistence).

Based on these assumptions, it is expected that all known sites would be managed to prevent a trend towards listing for Special Status/Sensitive Species that were formerly in Categories A, B, or E, as long as they are on Special Status/Sensitive Species lists, except in rare cases. All known sites are not expected to be managed to prevent a trend towards listing for SSS that were formerly in Categories C, D, and F. Conservation Strategies are being planned for former Categories C, D, and F species to provide guidance to field units on the selection of sites necessary to prevent a trend towards listing. Until that time, agency officials who are responsible for authorizing the proposed habitat-disturbing activity have discretion in the selection of sites necessary for management.

(F4) Question: Is it true that U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) may change what is considered a species of concern? What happens if a species is Bureau Assessment or BT and FWS considers it a species of concern? Does ONHP look at species of concern? (OR/WA BLM)

Answer: According to the Oregon Field Office of the USFWS there is no National direction in USFWS on species of concern. ONHP does look at species of concern, but being a species of concern does not give the species extra weight with the Heritage ranking. The species must stand on its own merit in ONHP ranking.

(F5) Question: Will the development of new SSSP tools include input from ecologists? (FS R6)

Answer: Skills of ecologists as well as biologists and botanists will be involved in the development and review of SSSP tools where appropriate.

(F6) Question: How will you include field units and field managers in the discussions? (Interagency)

Answer: We will provide periodic updates to the field that summarize progress on tasks, decisions, Q&As, and other topics. An SSSP website is being developed. We will also target field managers and specialists to review and provide input on ongoing tasks. For example we currently have participants from different field units involve in the development of tools to assist field level biologists/botanists. The FS R6 and BLM OR/WA are initiating work on a communication plan.

(F7) Question: The transition team is working on Conservation Assessments. How will they become Conservation Strategies? Strategies are probably the more effective tool. (Interagency)

Answer: Our first priority is to develop Conservation Assessments and broad-scale inventories for priority sensitive species to establish baseline data. Conservation Strategies will synthesize and apply the assessment and inventory information. Strategies will be developed either by teams of agency personnel or through contracts.

(F8) Question: What happens with the planned Annual Species Review for FY 04? (Interagency)

Answer: The Annual Species Review planned for spring 2004 has been cancelled.

(F9) Question: Are there plans at the BLM State Office to help districts with NEPA documentation? Maybe something similar to the Forest Service guidance for completing BE's. (OR/WA BLM)

Answer: The State Office is drafting a memo specific to BLM OR/WA that will provide guidelines for NEPA documentation. That memo should be issued sometime in the next few weeks. BLM does not have the same kind of policy/direction as the Forest Service, and does not intend to issue anything as standardized as a BE. The State Office is looking at options and will provide some tools for use during NEPA analysis.

ACRONYMS

BE	Biological Evaluation
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BS	Bureau Sensitive (BLM)
BT	Bureau Tracking (BLM)
FS	Forest Service
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FSEIS	Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
GeoBOB	Geographic Biotic Conservation GIS Application
GTR	General Technical Report
NFMA	National Forest Management Act
NHP	Natural Heritage Program
NWFP	Northwest Forest Plan
ONHP	Oregon Natural Heritage Program
Q&As	Questions and Answers
R5	Forest Service Region 5
R6	Forest Service Region 6
RF	Regional Forester
RO	Regional Office
ROD	Record of Decision
SEIS	Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
S&M	Survey and Manage Program
SSS	Special Status Species
SSSP	Special Status/Sensitive Species Programs
FY	Fiscal Year