

**United States Department of the Interior
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
2321 West Royal Palm Road, Suite 103
Phoenix, Arizona 85021
Telephone: (602) 242-0210 FAX: (602) 242-2513**

AESO/SE
02-21-02-F-0177

April 4, 2003

Ms. Liz Agpaoa
Acting Forest Supervisor
Coconino National Forest
Supervisor's Office
2323 East Greenlaw Lane
Flagstaff, Arizona 86004-1810

Dear Ms Agpaoa:

This letter constitutes the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's biological opinion, based on our review of the wildfire suppression actions associated with the Tram Fire located on the Coconino National Forest, Coconino County, Arizona. This biological opinion analyzes the project's effects on the threatened Mexican spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis lucida*) (MSO) in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). We received your November 8, 2002, request for formal consultation on November 15, 2002. In this request, the Forest Service determined that suppression activities associated with the Tram Fire likely adversely affected the MSO.

This biological opinion is based on information provided in the November 8, 2002, Biological Assessment and Evaluation (BAE) and conversations with your staff, and other sources of information. Literature cited in this biological opinion is not a complete bibliography of all literature available on the MSO, wildfire suppression and its effects, or on other subjects considered in this opinion. A complete administrative record of this consultation is on file at this office.

CONSULTATION HISTORY

Informal consultation on the Tram Fire began on May 20, 2002, when the Forest Service notified us of the incident and requested emergency consultation. A discussion occurred between the Forest and a member of our staff during the incident, in efforts to minimize the effects of suppression activities on MSO. You requested formal consultation on November 15, 2002. We

responded in a letter dated December 11, 2002, that your consultation package was complete and formal consultation had been initiated.

BIOLOGICAL OPINION

DESCRIPTION OF THE EMERGENCY ACTION

The Tram Fire started on a small ridge to the south of the West Clear Creek Wilderness at approximately 1400 hours on May 19, 2002. This area is located approximately 65 miles southeast of Flagstaff, Arizona and six miles west of Clints Well. Ponderosa pine forests containing pockets of Gambel's oak are found on the ridges, while mixed conifer forests occupy the north-facing canyon walls and side drainages to the south. The fire was declared a suspicious start of human origin. The fire, driven by a moderate wind and feeding on drought stressed vegetation, burned rapidly to the north and east, towards West Clear Creek. Frequent torching and spotting were observed.

Suppression activities began with initial attack efforts by District personnel aided by a small dozer, air-tankers, engines with water tenders, and a couple 20-person fire suppression crews. In order to hold the fire to a minimum size, the area west of Forest Road 142F was burned out by suppression forces on the evening of May 19, 2002. Hand crews and helicopters worked to suppress hotspots within the interior of the fire, along the canyon wall, and in the canyon bottom. Many helicopter water drops were used along the uncontrolled northern edge of the fire.

Driven by high southwest winds, the fire size approached approximately 125 acres by evening. As the night progressed, burnout continued along the west flank, from Forest Road 142F. Concurrently, handline and dozer lines were constructed along the southern flank. The fire dropped into West Clear Creek along approximately 0.25 mile. At this time, a Type II team was called to manage the fire. A total of 377 firefighters and support personnel, 16 engines and water tenders, and 3 helicopters worked on the fire. The Tram Fire was officially declared contained on Thursday, May 23, 2002, at approximately 190 acres.

Rehabilitation of the Tram Fire burn area included waterbarring and pulling duff and slash onto dozer and hand lines; seeding the safety zone and a few dozer lines; and, adding drainage to roads used as dozer lines.

STATUS OF THE SPECIES

A detailed account of the taxonomy, biology, and reproductive characteristics of the MSO is found in the Final Rule listing the MSO as a threatened species (USDI 1993) and in the Recovery Plan (USDI 1995). The information provided in those documents is included herein by reference. Although the MSO's entire range covers a broad area of the southwestern United States and Mexico, the MSO does not occur uniformly throughout its range. Instead, it occurs in disjunct localities that correspond to isolated forested mountain systems, canyons, and in some

cases steep, rocky canyon lands. Surveys have revealed that the species has an affinity for older, well-structured forest, and the species is known to inhabit a physically diverse landscape in the southwestern United States and Mexico.

A reliable estimate of the numbers of owls throughout its entire range is not currently available (USDI 1995) and the quality and quantity of information regarding numbers of MSO vary by source. USDI (1991) reported a total of 2,160 owls throughout the United States. Fletcher (1990) calculated that 2,074 owls existed in Arizona and New Mexico. However, Ganey *et al.* (2000) estimates approximately $2,950 \pm 1,067$ (SE) MSOs in the Upper Gila Mountains RU alone.

The primary administrator of lands supporting the MSO in the United States is the Forest Service. Most owls have been found within Forest Service Region 3 (including 11 National Forests in Arizona and New Mexico). Forest Service Regions 2 and 4 (including 2 National Forests in Colorado and 3 in Utah) support fewer owls. According to the Recovery Plan, 91% of MSO known to exist in the United States between 1990 and 1993 occurred on lands administered by the Forest Service.

The U.S. range of the MSO has been divided into six recovery units (RU), as discussed in the Recovery Plan. The Recovery Plan reports an estimate of owl sites for 1990-1993. At that time, the greatest concentration of known owl sites in the United States occurred in the Upper Gila Mountains RU (55.9%), in which this project is located. Similarly, the Forest Service reported a total of approximately 980 protected activity centers (PACs) established on National Forest lands in the Southwestern Region, with 618 PACs (63%) in the Upper Gila Mountains RU (USDA Forest Service, Southwestern Region, December 19, 2002).

The Upper Gila Mountains RU is a relatively narrow band bounded on the north by the Colorado Plateau RU and to the south by the Basin and Range-West RU. The southern boundary of this RU includes the drainages below the Mogollon Rim in central and eastern Arizona. The eastern boundary extends to the Black, Mimbres, San Mateo, and Magdalena mountain ranges of New Mexico. The northern and western boundaries extend to the San Francisco Peaks and Bill Williams Mountain north and west of Flagstaff, Arizona. This is a topographically complex area consisting of steep foothills and high plateaus dissected by deep forested drainages. This RU can be considered a "transition zone" because it is an interface between two major biotic regions: the Colorado Plateau and Basin and Range Provinces (Wilson 1969). Most habitat within this RU is administered by the Kaibab, Coconino, Apache-Sitgreaves, Tonto, Cibola, and Gila national forests. The north half of the Fort Apache and northeast corner of the San Carlos Indian reservations are located in the center of this RU and also support MSOs.

The Upper Gila Mountains RU consists of pinyon/juniper woodland, ponderosa pine/mixed conifer forest, some spruce/fir forest, and deciduous riparian forest in mid- and lower-elevation canyon habitat. Climate is characterized by cold winters and over half the precipitation falls during the growing season. Much of the mature stand component on the gentle slopes

surrounding the canyons had been partially or completely harvested prior to the species' listing as threatened in 1993, however, MSO nesting habitat remains in steeper areas. MSO are widely distributed and use a variety of habitats within this RU. Owls most commonly nest and roost in mixed-conifer forests dominated by Douglas fir and/or white fir, and canyons with varying degrees of forest cover (Ganey and Balda 1989, USDI 1995). Owls also nest and roost in ponderosa pine-Gambel oak forest, where they are typically found in stands containing well-developed understories of Gambel oak (USDI 1995).

In 1996, we issued a biological opinion on Forest Service Region 3's adoption of the Recovery Plan recommendations through an amendment of their Forest Plans. In this non-jeopardy biological opinion, we anticipated that approximately 151 PACs would be affected by activities that would result in incidental take of MSOs, with 92 of those PACs located in the Upper Gila Mountains RU. To date, consultation on individual actions under the amended Forest Plans have resulted in 200 PACs adversely affected, with 89 of those in the Upper Gila Mountains RU.

In addition to actions proposed by the Forest Service, Region 3, we have also reviewed the impacts of actions proposed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Defense (including Air Force, Army, and Navy), Department of Energy, National Park Service, and Federal Highway Administration. These proposals have included timber sales, road construction, fire/ecosystem management projects (including prescribed natural and management ignited fires), livestock grazing, recreation activities, utility corridors, military and sightseeing overflights, and other activities. Only one of these projects (release of site-specific owl location information) has resulted in a biological opinion that the proposed action would likely jeopardize the continued existence of the MSO. In total, we have anticipated that approximately 282 PACs would be adversely impacted by Federal actions, with 147 of those in the Upper Gila Mountain RU.

ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

The environmental baseline includes past and present impacts of all Federal, State, or private actions in the action area, the anticipated impacts of all proposed Federal actions in the action area that have undergone formal or early section 7 consultation, and the impact of State and private actions which are contemporaneous with the consultation process. The environmental baseline defines the current status of the species and its habitat to provide a platform from which to assess the effects of the action now under consultation.

A. Status of the species within the action area

The Tram Fire occurred within the Upper Gila Mountains RU in the West Clear Creek Wilderness. There are multiple MSO PACs located within the West Clear Creek drainage. However, the fire and related suppression activities most likely impacted only the Tramway (#040434) and Maxwell (#040439) PACs. The survey history for both PACs is listed in Table 1. Both PACs have been consistently occupied for a decade.

Table 1. Survey history for the Tramway (#040434) and Maxwell (#040439) Protected Activity Centers (PACs).

Year	Tramway PAC (#040434)	Maxwell PAC (#040439)
1992	Pair, one young	No information
1993	Pair, nesting status unknown	Pair, one young
1994	Informally inventoried, no response	Pair, non-nesting
1995	No information	No information
1996	No information	Male roosting, nesting status unknown
1997	Male roosting, nesting status unknown	Pair, nesting status unknown
1998	No information	No information
1999	Single owl present	No information
2000	No information	No information
2001	Pair, nesting status unknown	Pair, nesting status unknown
2002	No information	No information

B. Factors affecting species’ environment within the action area

Factors affecting MSO habitat within the action area include both domestic and wild ungulate grazing. These activities have the potential to reduce the quality of MSO nesting, roosting, and foraging habitat, and may cause disturbance during the breeding season. The Tramway and Maxwell PACs are located within the Thirteen Mile Rock Range Allotment. At this time, we do not have information regarding livestock access and use of protected habitat within the PAC. However, most of the nesting habitat in these PACs is located on relatively steep slopes and is most likely not impacted by grazing. Both PACs are adjacent to, and include portions of, relatively flat areas with water sources that may be used by livestock. We are aware of fuels reduction projects planned in areas to the west and east of this area, but no projects currently ongoing within or adjacent to these PACs.

EFFECTS OF THE ACTION

This section includes an analysis of the direct and indirect effects of the actions taken to suppress the fire, together with the effects of other activities that are interrelated and interdependent with this action, that will be added to the environmental baseline.

In addition to the direct loss of MSO nesting and roosting habitat caused by a wildfire, effects to owls may also result from the actions taken to suppress the fire. In most cases it is difficult to differentiate effects caused by wildfire and those caused by suppression actions. In addition, while it is probable that additional habitat damage may have resulted had suppression actions not been taken, it is impossible to assess what may have happened in the absence of suppression activities. Thus, the discussion that follows describes the effects that may have resulted from the emergency action. We acknowledge that some of these possible effects may also have occurred in the absence of suppression activities.

Suppression actions that may have affected the MSO included the construction of hand and dozer line, back-burning to contain the wildfire and prevent its further growth, mop-up procedures, and the use of low-flying aircraft to drop water. Further, the high-level of human presence (>377 fire personnel) may have caused disturbance to MSO. Disturbance may have been caused by fire resource personnel digging fire lines, walking and igniting vegetation with drip torches, and monitoring fire conditions from the ground and air. Suppression activities occurred during the Mexican spotted owl breeding season, most likely while owlets were still in the nest. Human disturbance during the breeding season may result in failed reproductive efforts, abandonment of the nest, and/or starvation of young.

Hand line construction may result in MSO habitat modification and a significant loss of key habitat components. Trees removed as a result of hand line construction may lead to the loss of nest and/or roost trees, and possibly even active nests. Additional effects could include microhabitat alteration and increased edge effects along fire lines.

Burnout and backfiring operations may include backfiring from a control point or line, felling dangerous trees and/or snags with potential to spread flames up slopes, clearing or piling brush and downed fuel near the control feature, and limbing and thinning trees to reduce ladder fuels. In certain situations, pre-burn preparation is not possible to implement and the line is set on fire downslope to burn fuels in the path of an approaching wildfire, resulting in the consumption and removal of fuels. Back-burning conducted in MSO habitat can result in the loss of key habitat components, contribute to general disturbance and smoke inhalation, and possibly result in the death of owls.

Noise from all air operations, especially low-flying aircraft dropping water or retardant, can contribute to the disturbance of MSO. Low-level flights have the greatest potential to disturb owls, because they move slowly and are relatively noisy (Delaney *et al.* 1997). Delaney *et al.* (1999) evaluated the effects of helicopter overflights on MSO in the Lincoln National Forest, New Mexico. Owl territories were randomly presented with one of three helicopter flight profiles, including 50 feet vertical, 100 feet vertical/100 feet lateral, and 200 feet vertical. As the distance to the helicopter decreased, owl flush response increased. In addition, owls did not flush in response to helicopters beyond 345 feet, and no owls flushed during the incubation and nestling phases. Net differences in prey deliveries for the 24-hour periods after and before noise manipulations were highly correlated with stimulus distance. Delaney *et al.* (1999) estimated

that the threshold for negative effect on prey deliveries was 315 feet. On average, an alert response (i.e., head movements) was elicited when helicopters approached within 1,330 feet, but no response was noted when helicopters were beyond 2,165 feet from an owl. Short duration, single pass aircraft flights appeared to have little effect on spotted owls, and diurnal flights affected owls less than nocturnal flights. Although the effects of overflights may vary with locations, specific conditions, and aircraft type, the following management implications emerged from the results of Delaney *et al.* (1997, 1999):

1. A 345-foot hemispherical management/protective zone should minimize, and possibly eliminate, spotted owl flush response and negative effects to prey delivery rates associated with helicopter overflights.
2. Flights over MSO should be separated by at least seven days.
3. Overflights should be limited to diurnal flights if possible, and nocturnal flights, particularly within three hours of sunrise or sunset, should be minimized.
4. Helicopter flights near roosts or nests that are single pass and of short duration may be less disturbing than other flight maneuvers such as circling, hovering, landing, etc.

The Recovery Plan for the Mexican Spotted Owl does not provide recommendations on overflights; however, Fish and Wildlife Service policy is to limit disturbing activities within 1,320 feet (0.25 mile) of nest sites during the breeding season (March 1 through August 31). This corresponds well with Delaney *et al.*'s 1,330-foot threshold for alert responses to helicopter flights. In addition to disturbance by low-level aircraft, MSO could also be impacted through death or injury by water or retardant drops if nest or roosts receive direct hits.

Tramway PAC

The Tram Fire boundary lies almost entirely within the Tramway PAC (#040434). The 1992 nest location for this PAC is outside the fire, in the bottom of West Clear Creek. This nest site was not physically impacted by the fire or fire suppression activities, but the potential for disturbance was very high during helicopter operations from May 20 through May 23, 2002. The 1993 pair roost location (nesting status unknown) was consumed by wildfire during the first day (May 19, 2002) and is within the area of the greatest fire intensity. A crown fire in this area killed all trees in the draw. The 1997 roost location is also within the fire perimeter, in an area that burned out all ground vegetation and downed woody material. This area experienced heavy suppression activity, with helicopters dropping water and ground crews felling burning snags. Approximately 1 mile of hand line and 1 mile of dozer line were built within the PAC boundary. In addition, approximately 45-50 PAC acres were burned during the burn-out (the total number of acres burned in the backfire operation was not included, but based on the map, an acreage figure was estimated).

Maxwell PAC

Due to rapid response and intensive fire suppression, the fire did not reach the Maxwell PAC. A safety zone and dozer line (approximately 0.25 mile in length) is located in and near the western edge of the PAC. These measures were taken to ensure fire-fighter safety in the event that the fire jumped the eastern control line (this scenario did not occur). The area is approximately 700 feet from the 1996 roost location (male, nesting status unknown), and 0.25 mile from the 1993 nest site.

The Tram Fire did not physically impact the Maxwell PAC. Suppression activities likely disturbed nesting owls, especially if the owls were using the 1993 nest site, which lies within the West Clear Creek Canyon, where helicopter activity was very high from May 20 through May 23, 2002. However, based on the location of the fire boundary, most helicopter overflights likely occurred at least 0.25 mile from the 1993 nest site and known roost sites.

Possible Effects of the Wildfire

The Tram Fire caused most of the physical impacts to the Tramway PAC. Approximately 150 acres of the PAC were burned in a moderate to high intensity fire. Though the fire did not crown out within the PAC, individual trees received up to 100% scorch. Many of the trees that did not die immediately during the fire will die within the next year or two. These dead trees will provide future snags and logs. In addition, all ground vegetation and downed coarse woody debris was consumed by the fire. A crown fire burned through approximately 20 to 25 PAC acres. The fire removed most ground vegetation and downed woody material on the remaining 165 acres of the burned area (125 acres within the PAC). Pockets of trees were scorched, and will likely die, other areas received light to moderate scorch and the trees will likely survive.

Wildfires within owl habitat during the breeding season may result in the direct death of adult and young MSOs. Death of MSOs may also occur due to loss of nest/roost trees caused by crown fires. If a wildfire occurs in such habitat during the breeding season, the fire may result in the loss of owl nests as well as young owls which may not be able to fly to safety. In addition, the effects of smoke on adult and young owls is largely unknown and may directly affect the health of owls or the ability of owls to forage successfully, and therefore may affect the ability of adults to survive and/or successfully fledge young. The result of a stand-replacement wildfire in large areas of nest/roost habitat would include the loss of the use of that habitat by MSOs for the year of the action and well into the future.

Effects of wildfires include the loss of MSO prey habitat components such as herbaceous cover, down logs, and snags. The effects of fire on the prey base of the MSO are complex and are likely dependent on the prey species involved, the variations in fire characteristics, and in the prey habitat involved. Fire intensity, size, and behavior are influenced by numerous factors such as vegetation type, moisture, fuel loads, weather, season, and topography. Fire can effectively alter vegetation structure and composition thereby affecting small-mammal habitat. The initial effects of fire are likely to be detrimental to rodent populations both through direct mortality and as cover and plant forage species are reduced.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Cumulative effects include the effects of future State, local, or private actions that are reasonably certain to occur in the action area considered in this biological opinion. Future Federal actions are subject to the consultation requirements established under section 7 and, therefore, are not considered cumulative to the proposed action. Future actions within the project area that are reasonably certain to occur include recreation, fuels reduction treatments and/or commercial logging on the adjacent private land, increased development and other associated actions. These activities have the potential to reduce the quality of MSO nesting, roosting, and foraging habitat, cause disturbance to breeding MSOs, and therefore contribute as cumulative effects to the proposed action. However, because of the predominant occurrence of MSOs on Federal lands in this area, and because of the role of the respective Federal agencies in administering the habitat of the MSO, actions to be implemented in the future by non-Federal entities on non-Federal lands are considered to be of minor impact to the owl population.

Conclusion

After reviewing the current status of the MSO, the environmental baseline for the action area, the effects of the action, and the cumulative effects, it is our biological opinion that the suppression action conducted for the Tram Fire did not likely jeopardize the continued existence of the MSO. This conclusion is based on the following:

1. As reported in the BAE, suppression actions were restricted to two PACs.
2. Suppression actions likely resulted in short-term disturbance and/or harm and harassment to the Tramway and Maxwell PACs and did not impact the long-term viability of the sites for spotted owls.

INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT

Section 9 of the Act and Federal regulations pursuant to section 4(d) of the Act prohibit the take of endangered and threatened species, respectively, without special exemption. "Take" is defined under section 3 of the Act as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. "Harm" is further defined by regulation (50 CFR 17.3) to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or sheltering. "Harass" is defined under 50 CFR 17.3 as intentional or negligent actions that create the likelihood of injury to listed species to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding or sheltering. "Incidental take" is defined under 50 CFR 402.02 as take that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity. Under the terms of section 7(b)(4) and section 7(o)(2) of the Act, taking that is incidental to, and not intended as part of, the agency action is not considered to be prohibited taking under the Act provided that such taking is in compliance with the terms and conditions of an Incidental Take Statement.

For the purpose of evaluating incidental take of MSO from the action under consultation, incidental take can be anticipated as either the direct mortality of individual birds, or the alteration of habitat that affects behavior (i.e. breeding or foraging) of birds to such a degree that the birds are considered lost as viable members of the population and thus “taken.” They may fail to breed, fail to successfully rear young, raise less fit young, or desert the area because of disturbance or because habitat no longer meets the owl’s needs.

In past Biological Opinions, we used the management territory to quantify incidental take thresholds for the MSO (see Biological Opinions provided to the Forest Service from August 23, 1993 through 1995). The current section 7 consultation policy provides for incidental take if an activity comprises the integrity of a PAC. Actions outside PACs will generally not be considered incidental take, except in cases when areas that may support owls have not been adequately surveyed.

Using available information as summarized within this document, we have identified conditions of possible incidental take for the MSO associated with suppression activity in the Tramway PAC. Although it is possible that some effects to the PAC may have resulted from the wildfire itself, it is the effects of the suppression actions which must be addressed in this emergency consultation. Based on the best available information concerning the MSO, habitat needs of the species, the project description, and information furnished by the Forest Service, take is anticipated for the MSO as a result of the following:

1. Four days of helicopter flights occurred directly over the Tramway PAC. Therefore, it is possible that water and retardant drops, which occurred over the PAC and which most likely resulted in broken tree tops and limbs and fallen snags, may have resulted in disturbance or injury to MSO. In addition, helicopters flew over the known roost locations on multiple occasions, which may have resulted in disturbance to owls at the site.
2. Construction of approximately one mile of dozer line and one mile of hand line within the Tramway PAC may have resulted in disturbance or injury to MSO and most likely removed large trees, snags, and coarse woody debris from the PAC thus reducing its suitability for nesting and/or roosting. In addition, greater than 377 personnel were working within the PAC for three to four days.

We do not anticipate any incidental take for MSO associated with the Maxwell PAC. Although approximately 1000 feet of dozer line (estimated distance from map) was constructed within the Maxwell PAC, the dozer line was located approximately 0.25 mile from the known nest site and all but one known roost site. In addition, the majority of the PAC was topographically shielded from noise that was produced by dozers. The Maxwell PAC also was not impacted by the number of personnel that worked within the Tramway PAC.

Amount or Extent of Take Anticipated

This biological opinion anticipates the following forms and amount of take in regard to the emergency action:

One pair of MSO and/or associated juveniles in the form of direct mortality, harm, and/or harassment associated with the Tramway PAC during the 2002 breeding season.

Effect of the Take

In this biological opinion, we determined that this level of anticipated take is not likely to result in jeopardy to the MSO.

Incidental take statements in emergency consultations do not include reasonable and prudent measures or terms and conditions to minimize take unless the agency has an on-going action related to the emergency (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1998). The Forest Service has not advised us of any on-going actions related to the emergency.

The Fish and Wildlife Service will not refer the incidental take of any migratory bird or bald eagle for prosecution under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, as amended (16 U.S.C. Sections 703-712), or the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940, as amended (16 U.S.C. Sections 668-668d).

DISPOSITION OF DEAD, INJURED, OR SICK MSO

Upon locating a dead, injured, or sick spotted owl, initial notification must be made to the Service's Law Enforcement Office, 2450 West Broadway Suite #113, Mesa, Arizona 85202 (telephone: 480/967-7900) within three working days of its finding. Written notification must be made within five calendar days and should include the date, time, and location of the animal, a photograph, if possible, and any other pertinent information. The notification shall be sent to the Law Enforcement Office with a copy to this office. Care must be taken in handling sick or injured animals to ensure effective treatment and care, and in handling specimens to preserve the biological material in the best possible state. If possible, the remains of intact owl(s) shall be provided to this office. If the remains of the owl(s) are not intact or are not collected, the information noted above shall be obtained and the carcass left in place. Injured animals should be transported to a qualified veterinarian by an authorized biologist. Should the treated owl(s) survive, the Service should be contacted regarding the final disposition of the animal.

CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Section 7(a)(1) of the Act directs Federal agencies to utilize their authorities to further the purposes of Act by carrying out conservation programs for the benefit of endangered and threatened species. Conservation recommendations are discretionary agency activities to minimize or avoid adverse effects of a proposed action on listed species or critical habitat, to help implement recovery plans, or to develop information.

1. We recommend that the Tramway and Maxwell MSO PACs be monitored annually for at least five years and that the results of the monitoring be provided to us.
2. We recommend that the Forest Service pursue the completion of a forest-wide consultation on wildland fire use for resource benefit and wildfire suppression activities.
3. We recommend that the Forest Service pursue monitoring and research opportunities to determine actual effects to, and recovery of, MSO habitat from the wildfire, and particularly in relation to future site occupancy.

In order to keep us informed of actions minimizing or avoiding adverse effects or benefitting listed species or their habitat, we request notification of the implementation of any conservation recommendations.

REINITIATION - CLOSING STATEMENT

This concludes formal consultation on the action outlined in this biological opinion. As provided in 50 CFR §402.16, reinitiation of formal consultation is required where discretionary Federal agency involvement or control over the action has been retained (or is authorized by law) and if: (1) the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded; (2) new information reveals effects of the agency action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not considered in this opinion; (3) the agency action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species or critical habitat that was not considered in this opinion; or (4) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the action. In instances where the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded, any operations causing such take must cease pending reinitiation.

We appreciate your consideration of the threatened Mexican spotted owl. For further information, please contact Shaula Hedwall of our Flagstaff Suboffice at (928) 226-1811 or Brenda Smith at (928) 226-0614. Please refer to the consultation number 02-21-02-F-0177 in future correspondence concerning this project.

Sincerely,

/s/ Steven L. Spangle
Field Supervisor

Ms. Liz Agpaoa

13

cc: Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, NM (ARD-ES)
Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service, New Mexico Field Office, Albuquerque, NM
District Ranger, Mogollon Rim Ranger District, Happy Jack, AZ (Attn: Larry Sears)
Wildlife Staff, Mogollon Rim Ranger District, Happy Jack, AZ (Attn: Cathy Taylor)
Forest Supervisor, Coconino National Forest, Flagstaff, AZ (Attn: Cecelia Overby)

John Kennedy, Habitat Branch, Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, AZ

W:\Shaula Hedwall\Tram Wildfire Emergency Suppression.wpd:egg

LITERATURE CITED

- Delaney, D.K., T.G. Grubb, and L.L. Pater. 1997. Effects of helicopter noise on nesting Mexican spotted owls. A report to U.S. Air Force 49 CES/CEV, Holloman Air Force Base. Project order No. CE P.O. 95-4. 49pp.
- Delaney, D.K., T.G. Grubb, P.Beier, L.L. Pater, M. Hildegard Reiser. 1999. Effects of helicopter noise on Mexican spotted owls. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 63:60-76.
- Fletcher, K. 1990. Habitat used, abundance, and distribution of the Mexican spotted owl, *Strix occidentalis lucida*, on National Forest System Lands. U.S. Forest Service, Southwestern Region, Albuquerque, New Mexico. 78 pp.
- Ganey, J.L., G.C. White, A.B. Franklin, J.P. Ward, Jr., and D.C. Bowden. 2000. A pilot study on monitoring populations of Mexican spotted owls in Arizona and New Mexico: second interim report. 41 pp.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southwestern Region. 2001. Biological Assessment and Evaluation, Urban Interface Fuel Treatment, February 28, 2001. 271 pp.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1991. Mexican spotted owl status review. Endangered species report 20. Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1993. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; final rule to list the Mexican spotted owl as threatened. Federal Register. 58:14248-14271.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. 1995. Recovery Plan for the Mexican Spotted Owl. Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Ward, J.P. and D. Salas. 2000. Adequacy of roost locations for defining buffers around Mexican spotted owl nests. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 28(3):688-698.
- Wilson, E.D. 1969. A resume of the geology of Arizona. University of Arizona Press, Tucson. 140 pp.