

September 28, 2006

Mr. Walter Washington, Jr.
Chief, Maryland Section Southern
U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
Baltimore District
P.O. Box 1715
Baltimore, MD 21203 - 1715

Attn: Maria Lasek

Re: *Formal Section 7 Consultation Initiation; CENAB-OP-RMS (MHA FINANCIAL GROUP/FOXTAIL CROSSING) 06-60295-7, Dorchester County, MD*

Dear Mr. Washington:

This document transmits the Fish and Wildlife Service's (Service) biological opinion based on our review of the referenced project and its effects on the Delmarva fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger cinereus*) in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*). Your request for formal consultation was received on April 21, 2006.

This biological opinion is based on information provided in the March 3, 2006 project plat, the March 3, 2006 project description, field investigations, and other sources of information. A complete administrative record of this consultation is on file at the Chesapeake Bay Field Office in Annapolis, Maryland.

I. CONSULTATION HISTORY

The consultation history is provided in Appendix A.

II. BIOLOGICAL OPINION

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed project consists of permanently impacting approximately 6,382 square feet of forested and 1,815 square feet of emergent nontidal wetlands and approximately 773 linear feet of Waters of the United States for the construction of a residential subdivision with attendant features and a public park. The proposed project is located on Hudson Road in wetlands adjacent to and part of the tributary headwaters of Jenkins Creek within the city of Cambridge, Dorchester County, Maryland (Map 1).

MHA Financial Group has proposed to construct a residential development consisting of 122 townhomes, 76 senior apartments, a park, and associated project infrastructure within the incorporated limits of the City of Cambridge (Map 2). The project site consists of approximately ± 59.14 acres zoned as R-1 (Residential) and R-3 (Residential) and is located 2332 Hudson Road, Cambridge, Maryland 21613. The proposed project lies within a City of Cambridge Smartgrowth area and will comply with current zoning.

Existing site conditions consist of ± 42.25 acres of northern hardwood and oak-hickory forest along the north and east sides of the site. Typical tree species found onsite are *Acer rubrum*, *Fagus grandifolia*, *Quercus* sp. and *Carya* sp. On site forested areas have been classified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as Delmarva fox squirrel habitat. The remaining areas to the south and west consist of a farmstead including four vacant structures and maintained lawn area and ± 12.43 acres of agriculture field. The site is relatively flat ranging from approximately 11-14 feet above mean sea level. The site does not lie within areas designated as Chesapeake Bay Critical Areas. The nontidal wetlands and Waters of the U.S. that do exist onsite are found primarily in the forested areas; no 100-year floodplain exists onsite.

The proposed project has been designed with consideration of environmental resources including rare species, wetlands, and onsite forest. Proposed permanent project impacts are ± 8,197 square feet of nontidal wetlands, ± 21,010 square feet of nontidal wetland buffer, ± 773 linear feet of ditch (Waters of the U.S., 5,139 square feet), and 6.97 acres of Delmarva fox squirrel habitat clearing. Compensation for environmental impacts is proposed through the preservation of off-site Delmarva fox squirrel habitat. Development will be largely restricted to non-forested areas, and any forest clearing will be completed between May 16 and December 31 of any year. The project will be phased with the construction of the senior apartments occurring first followed by the townhomes and community park. The proposed community park will consist of an approximately 1,700 sq. ft tot lot as well as a trail. The trail will consist of a low impact pervious base material such as wood chips/mulch and installation will minimize any tree removal. The total length of the circular trail will be approximately 1,250 linear feet; 615 linear feet of trail will be located in the cleared area southwest of the tot lot, and the remaining 635 feet of trail will weave between existing trees, so no additional forest removal will occur.

The action area for this project is defined as all areas within the project property boundary (Tax Map 30C Parcel 12, Grid 8; and Tax map 30, Parcel 88, Grid 15). No impacts extend off-site.

STATUS OF THE SPECIES/CRITICAL HABITAT

Species /Critical Habitat Description -- Delmarva fox squirrels are large, heavy-bodied tree squirrels with full, fluffy tails. The DFS is a subspecies of fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger*), a species found throughout the eastern United States. The DFS resembles the gray squirrel (*Sciurus carolinensis*), however, gray squirrels are smaller, their tails are not as full, and their dorsal area is not as uniformly colored as DFS. Fox squirrels are more cursorial, less agile, slower, and more deliberate in their movements than are gray squirrels (Dozier and Hall 1944). When a fox squirrel moves from one tree to another, it usually descends to the ground rather than leaping from tree to tree as do gray squirrels.

In 1967, the DFS was listed as a federally endangered species due primarily to its disappearance from 90% of its former range. The dramatic decrease of this species is attributed to habitat loss resulting from forest clearing and changing land use patterns throughout its range (Taylor 1973), and possible over-hunting in the past. No critical habitat has been designated for this species.

Life History of the Species -- The Delmarva fox squirrel inhabits mature hardwood and mixed pine forests in the agricultural landscapes of the Delmarva Peninsula. Suitable DFS habitat consists of large (greater than 12" dbh) hard and soft mast producing trees such as oak (*Quercus* spp.), hickory (*Carya* spp.), beech, and pine (*Pinus* spp.) (Taylor 1976). Generally, DFS prefer forest stands with large trees, an expansive canopy, and sparse understory (Taylor 1976, Dueser *et al.* 1988, Paglione 1996). The large (mature) trees provide sites for cavity and leaf nests as well as mast, while the sparse understory is thought to enhance DFS foraging efficiency. Forest edge habitat is used extensively by DFS (Taylor 1976, Flyger and Smith 1980, and Paglione 1996) and the association of agricultural fields with forest edge may play an important role in the suitability of habitat for DFS. Agricultural crops such as corn, wheat, soybeans, oats, and other crops are readily used by DFS to supplement their diet when available (Allen 1943, Brown and Yeager 1945, Bakken 1952, Taylor 1976, Paglione 1996).

Delmarva fox squirrels use tree cavities (Allen 1952, Nixon and Hansen 1987) to provide maximum safety for young (nesting) and protection from cold and wet weather (shelter). They also construct nests of leaves and twigs (Dozier and Hall 1944, Allen 1952) which may vary from small day shelters and feeding platforms to large, well insulated rearing nests (Weigl *et al.* 1989). Nests are generally found in crotches of tree trunks, in tangles of vines, on a trunk, or situated towards the ends of larger branches (B.J. Larson, Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, pers. comm.).

Most mating occurs in late winter and early spring (Lustig and Flyger 1976). Gestation lasts approximately 44 days (Asdell 1964) and most young are born in February, March, and April. There is a smaller breeding period and birth peak in July and August. Litter size is one to six (mean: 4 (Dozier and Hall 1944); mean: 2.25 (Lustig and Flyger 1976); mean: 1.7 (Larson 1990)). Young are dependent on their mothers for approximately 3 months (Moore 1957). To protect breeding squirrels and their young, the recommended time of year restrictions for habitat disturbance are from January 1 through May 15, and July 1 through September 15.

Diets of southeastern fox squirrels and Delmarva fox squirrels include mast from a variety of trees, pine buds, staminate cones, pine seeds, berries, fungi, and insects (Moore 1957, Ha 1983, Weigl *et al.* 1989, Larson 1990, Humphrey and Jodice 1992). During much of the year, mast from mature trees (primarily from oak, hickory, beech, walnut) is a primary component of the fox squirrel diet (Weigl *et al.* 1989). During the spring, DFS feed extensively on tree buds and flowers, and will consume large quantities of fungi, insects, fruit, seeds, and occasionally bird eggs and young (USFWS 1983). At Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge (CHNWR), Larson (1990) found that DFS switched from reliance on pine and oak mast in the fall/early winter to heavy use of soft mast hardwoods (primarily maple) in the late winter and spring months. Like other southeastern fox squirrels, DFS feed largely on mature green pine cones during late summer and early fall until acorns and other hard mast become available in the fall (Moore 1957, Ha 1983, Weigl *et al.* 1989, Kantola and Humphrey 1990, Larson 1990). By late summer, DFS are often in poor condition due to low food availability in the spring and early summer (Kantola 1986, Weigl *et al.* 1989, Larson 1990). Further, although pine-seed crops are subject to failure, the magnitude of their year-to-year variation is not as great as acorn crops. Thus, pine seeds may be particularly important to squirrels during years of acorn mast failure (Kantola and Humphrey 1990).

Home range sizes for the DFS are related to habitat type, and variation within the subspecies is substantial. Flyger and Smith (1980) estimated mean home range size for DFS in an agricultural landscape (described as "a mixture of woodland and fields of corn or soybeans with narrow wooded strips 20-25 m wide between fields" with relatively open understory) as 30 ha, while home range for the CHNWR population varies from 1.4 to 12.8 ha, with a mean of 4.1 ha (Larson 1990). Home ranges also vary by season and sex of the animal. Male home ranges are usually larger (average 5.88 - 28.47 ha varying on location and season) than females (4.5 to 13.62 ha) (Paglione 1996). This sex variation was

especially pronounced in spring and early summer periods. Similar sexual differences in DFS home ranges were also found at CHNWR, with an average of 2.08 ha for females and 5.45 ha for males (Pednault-Willett 2002).

Home range sizes of other southeastern fox squirrels range from 9 to 19 ha for females and 20-32 ha for males (Hilliard 1979, Edwards 1986, Weigl *et al.* 1989, Kantola and Humphrey 1990). Average home ranges of southeastern fox squirrels are generally larger (>15 hectares; Hilliard 1979, Edwards 1986, Weigl *et al.* 1989) than those of midwestern fox squirrels (5 ha or less; Ha 1983). In general, this larger home range has been considered an adaptation to patchy landscapes (Ha 1983, Mace and Harvey 1983), and unpredictable seasonal food supply found in southeastern forests (Ha 1983, Weigl *et al.* 1989, Paglione 1996). Weigl *et al.* (1989) found that food supplies had the greatest influence on the ecology of southeastern fox squirrels, often affecting the size and location of their home range. Patterns of use within the home range have received relatively little study (Loeb and Moncrief 1993). However, Steele (1988) found that fox squirrels in North Carolina used much of their home range in July, but in August space use was reduced by more than 50% as squirrels began to feed extensively in selected longleaf pine trees.

Density estimates for the DFS include 0.7-0.98 DFS/ha at the CHNWR (Pednault-Willett 2002) and a range of 0.36 DFS/ha to 1.29 DFS/ha (Paglione 1996) from two sites at Blackwater National Wildlife Refuge. The high density at the Blackwater NWR site was attributed to the presence of "exceptional habitat composed of large mature pines and mixed hardwoods, with a clear understory and adjacent agricultural fields" (Paglione 1996). Density estimates for other southeastern fox squirrels vary from 8.4 squirrels/km² (0.08 squirrels/ha, Humphrey *et al.* 1985), 15.3-17.71 squirrels/km² (0.15-0.18 squirrels/ha, Tappe 1991), to 20.0 squirrels/km² (0.20 squirrels/ha, Hilliard 1979). Weigl *et al.* (1989) reported a mean density of 0.05 fox squirrels/ha (highest annual density of 0.35/ ha) in North Carolina; they inferred from the low densities generally exhibited by southeastern fox squirrels, that preservation of large habitat blocks would be necessary to support viable populations. Gray squirrels, potential competitors with fox squirrels, can reach densities of 15/ha (Gurnell 1983).

Distribution and Status -- Historically, DFS were distributed throughout the Delmarva Peninsula and into southeastern Pennsylvania and southern New Jersey (Taylor 1976). At the time of listing, in 1968, the range had decreased to only 10% of its original size on the Delmarva and remnant populations occurred in only four Maryland counties: Kent, Queen Anne's, Talbot, and Dorchester. Today, remnant populations continue in those counties but are also known to occur in Caroline County Maryland and western Sussex County, Delaware (USFWS 2003) and new sightings have occurred in areas where DFS were not previously reported. Translocations have figured prominently in the recovery program. Delmarva fox squirrels have been successfully reintroduced to 11 sites within their historical range in Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia, and now occupy a total of approximately 127,000 acres of occupied habitat.

The Delmarva fox squirrel range is thus considered to be expanding. The increasing size of the species' distribution, both the remnant portions and the portions established through translocations, indicate the species occupies a greater geographic area and occurs in a larger number of sites than at the time of listing. Monitoring of seven benchmark sites, where local populations were monitored within the existing range, indicates that populations within the range are generally stable (Duesser 1999, USFWS 2003). Comparisons of landowner surveys made in 1972 and 1985 also suggest a stable trend in populations within its range. Of 54 sites originally surveyed, one previously unoccupied site gained DFS and one previously occupied site lost DFS (Therres and Willey 1988). However, the original landowner survey did not include areas where the USFWS has documented new populations of DFS. Based on the expanded range and evidence of stable populations within its range, we consider the status of DFS to be increasing.

Threats to the Species -- Timber harvest, short-rotation pine forestry, and forest conversion to agriculture and/or structural development (housing, roads, and industry) constitute threats to the DFS and their habitats. The following information concerning these and other threats is taken from the DFS Recovery Plan (USFWS 1993) and the Status and Recovery Plan Update (USFWS 2003).

The human population within DFS historical range has increased significantly in recent years and this has resulted in corresponding increases in developed land and losses of agricultural and forest land. From 1985 to 1997, in the three counties where DFS are most abundant (Queen Anne's, Talbot and Dorchester), there has been an average annual increase in 1,078 acres/year of developed land. There has been a corresponding average annual loss of 343 acres of forest and 621 acres of agricultural land per year between 1985 and 1997 (Weller and Edwards 2001). Forest acres lost to development are permanent losses for the Delmarva fox squirrel.

The acreage of timber harvest on the Delmarva fluctuates from year to year but the average of six years of data in Dorchester County was 3,558 acres per year (USFWS 2003). The acres of timberland and DFS habitat that are present in any one year are not precisely measured and a better understanding or whether this rate of harvest is sustainable is needed. The acreage in short-rotation pine plantations is not well quantified, however, 58,000 acres of timber land, previously owned and managed by the pulp industry, have recently been donated to the State of Maryland to be managed in the future as sawtimber. This will enable DFS habitat to be established on land where frequent cutting previously prevented the growth of mature timber.

Forest pest infestations, including gypsy moths (*Lymantria dispar*) and southern pine beetles (*Dendroctonus frontalis*), also constitute a threat to DFS habitat because diseased trees die or are removed. Outbreaks tend to be localized but they can exacerbate losses of forest land.

Accidental DFS mortality is most frequently attributed to being struck by automobiles and to a limited extent by hunters who mistake DFS for gray squirrels. Although unsubstantiated, over hunting of DFS is thought to have contributed to past declines. Illegal hunting is not considered a threat at this time.

Recovery Goals and Objectives -- The following provides information on the current recovery goals and objectives for downlisting or delisting the species that are outlined in both the DFS Recovery Plan (USFWS 1993) and the DFS Status and Recovery Plan Update (USFWS 2003).

For the reclassification of the DFS from endangered to threatened, ecological requirements and distribution within the natural range must be fully understood, the seven benchmark populations must be stable or expanding for at least five years and ten new colonies must be established within the historical range. The DFS will be considered for delisting when (besides having met the reclassification criteria) the following elements have been achieved: (1) five post-1990 colonies are established outside the remaining natural range, (2) periodic monitoring shows that 80% of translocated populations have persisted over the full period of recovery, and at least 75% of these populations are not declining, (3) mechanisms that ensure perpetuation of suitable habitat at a level sufficient to allow desired distribution is in place within all counties in which the species occurs and (4) mechanisms are in place to ensure protection and monitoring of new populations, to allow for expansion, and to provide inter-population corridors to permit gene flow among populations (USFWS 1993).

The previous biological opinions completed for this species are provided in Appendix B.

ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

Status of Species in Action Area -- Delmarva fox squirrels occupy at least 90,252 acres of forested habitat in Dorchester County. Delmarva fox squirrels were captured in the northwestern corner of the forested parcel within the action area during a trapping effort for a neighboring property in 2003 (trapping performed by Three-Square Wildlife Services). Occupied Delmarva fox squirrel habitat has also been identified in the majority of the forested areas along the south side of MD Route 343 (Map 3). Based on site visits, home range sizes, and adjacent sightings of DFS, the Service considers the project site appropriate habitat and occupied by DFS. Several other projects both immediately east and west of the action area have completed or are undergoing consultation with the Chesapeake Bay Field Office for effects on Delmarva fox squirrels (Map 4).

EFFECTS OF THE ACTION

Direct Effects

The project's direct effects result from the permanent clearing of 6.97 acres of DFS habitat, and the noise and disturbance associated with this action (Map 2). All forested areas with characteristics consistent with DFS habitat will be assumed occupied for this analysis. Impacts to the DFS associated with the clearing operation may result from direct mortality of individual DFS, and harm and harassment resulting in either individual take or population declines due to diminishing habitat quantity and quality. Adverse effects on DFS are expected to result from take occurring during habitat removal and from the loss of valuable habitat following clearing. Direct mortality of individuals could be greatly reduced if clearing occurs outside the breeding season, when natal squirrels are particularly vulnerable.

Habitat losses caused by residential development are usually permanent and have effects that can result in take. Adverse effects may include: increased predation, increased intra- and interspecific competition, reduced ability to disperse, intensified consequences of catastrophic events (e.g. drought, flooding, ice storms, fire, disease), decreased reproductive success, and decreased carrying capacity resulting from decreased availability of nesting and shelter sites and food.

In addition, adults and young may temporarily avoid use of habitat adjacent to clearing sites because of noise and disturbance. This may result in decreased survival and reproductive success through decreased availability of shelter sites and food.

The proposed project will contribute to loss of habitat supporting DFS nesting and foraging by clearing 6.97 acres of forested DFS habitat. However, this loss will be offset by the placement of at least 26.24 acres of occupied forested habitat off-site in perpetual conservation easements to protect habitat features of value to DFS.

Indirect Effects

Degradation of habitat within 150 feet of new roads and structures -- As land-use changes affect available habitats across the landscape, populations of DFS may decrease throughout the range. Urban and suburban development precludes regeneration of forest habitats or associated agricultural foraging habitat, and DFS are not usually found in suburban or urban settings.

The project's principal indirect effect will occur on 2.13 acres on the northern end of the development, where roads and structures are adjacent to occupied Delmarva fox squirrel habitat (Map 2). We anticipate that even though the 2.13 acres of degraded habitat will continue to be present (i.e. will not be cleared), the use of these acres by DFS will greatly diminish, or the survivorship of DFS in these areas will be decreased.

Increased Physical Barriers to Dispersal and Mobility -- Roads or other physical barriers such as houses, waterways, fences, and walls may impair the mobility of DFS and make them more susceptible to direct take (mortality) due to predation or reduced access to food and water (Taylor 1976, Poole 1993, Paglione 1996). Lack of ability to disperse may lead DFS populations to exceed the carrying capacity of the available habitat, resulting in intensified intra-specific competition and a decline in general fitness and reproductive rates. Also, small isolated populations, can not be replenished by dispersing individuals from other populations and thus have a greater risk of extirpation (local extinction). The significance of the Foxtail Crossing development as a potential barrier to dispersal is currently unknown. It is assumed that DFS are currently moving across Route 343 to areas south, although the frequency of this behavior is unknown. The placement of a major development and associated features at the southern end of this occupied parcel may decrease the likelihood of DFS movement, and thus reproductive exchange, with populations south of Route 343. Though the Foxtail Crossing development may act as physical barrier or deterrent to DFS dispersal and mobility, there is no way to be able to meaningfully measure, detect, or evaluate this effect.

Cumulative Effects -- Cumulative effects include the effects of future State, local, or private actions that are reasonably certain to occur in the action area. We are not aware of any such actions planned in the action area. Future federal actions that are unrelated to the proposed action are not considered in this biological opinion because they require separate consultation pursuant to section 7 of the ESA.

CONCLUSION

Regulations implementing Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA (50 CFR 402) require the Service to formulate its biological opinion as to whether a Federal action that is the subject of consultation, taken together with cumulative effects, is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or the adverse modification of critical habitat. "Jeopardize the continued existence of" is defined by this regulation as "to engage in an action that reasonably would be expected, directly or indirectly, to reduce appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of a listed species in the wild by reducing the reproduction, numbers, or distribution of that species."

The Delmarva fox squirrel's current range encompasses 127,000 acres across eight counties in Maryland, and one county each in Delaware and Virginia (USFWS 2003). However, the large majority of DFS sites occur in the tri-county area of Queen Annes, Talbot, and Dorchester County, Maryland (USFWS 2003). Since 1999, this is the 14th non-jeopardy biological opinion anticipating take of the Delmarva fox squirrel to be completed on commercial and residential development activities (Appendix B). The 14 biological opinions have anticipated approximately 191.81 acres of impacts that include permanent removal of DFS habitat and/or long-term degradation of habitat due to roads or use of erected structures (human activity). However, these projects also provided 320 acres of permanent protection of DFS habitat in the vicinity of the projects to offset these habitat losses.

The impacts associated with the proposed project were evaluated within the context of the following: the large amount of remaining suitable habitat (USFWS 2003), the relatively stable trend of DFS across their

known range (USFWS 2003), the terms and conditions provided in past biological opinions that reduce the amount of take, and the fact that the DFS habitat to be lost or degraded as a result of this project represents less than 1% of Delmarva fox squirrel habitat in Maryland. Based upon these considerations, the Service concludes that approval and funding of this project, as proposed, is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the DFS. No critical habitat has been designated for this species; therefore, none will be affected.

III. INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT

Sections 4(d) and 9 of the Endangered Species Act prohibit taking (harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect, or attempt to engage in any such conduct) of listed species of fish or wildlife without a special exemption. Harm is further defined to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing behavioral patterns such as breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Harass is defined as actions that create the likelihood of injury to listed species to such an extent to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding or seeking shelter. Incidental take is any take of listed species that results from, but is not the purpose of, carrying out an otherwise lawful activity conducted by the Federal agency or the applicant. Under the terms of section 7(b)(4) and section 7(o)(2), taking that is incidental to and not intended as part of the agency action is not considered a prohibited taking provided that such taking is in compliance with the terms and conditions of this Incidental Take Statement.

AMOUNT OR EXTENT OF TAKE

The Service expects incidental take of Delmarva fox squirrels as a result of this project's direct and indirect impacts will be difficult to detect, as the behavioral patterns that will inexorably be impaired or disrupted (breeding, feeding, or sheltering) would require extensive and consistent surveys to observe, and injured or killed individuals will be difficult to locate due to their small size, cryptic nature, and vagility.

The Service expects 9.1 acres of Delmarva fox squirrel habitat to be impacted as a result of the construction and subsequent use of Foxtail Crossing (Map 2). The incidental take resulting from this loss is expected to be in the form of "harm" and "harassment," as defined in the introductory passage of this incidental take statement. The removal of 6.97 acres of habitat may cause DFS to crowd into adjacent habitat, increasing risk of predation and competition for food and shelter and potentially resulting in injury or death. Additionally, vehicles and unrestrained pets can kill adults and young. This is most likely to occur to DFS living in the 2.13 acres of habitat within 150' of roads and homes. Acres of habitat lost through direct and indirect impacts will be the index measured to monitor incidental take of this species, and is not expected to exceed 6.97 acres of permanent habitat removal, and 2.13 acres of habitat degradation.

REASONABLE AND PRUDENT MEASURES

The measures described below are nondiscretionary, and must be implemented by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) as specified by the Terms and Conditions below so that they become binding conditions of their project approval or project agreement with the MHA Financial Group in order for the exemption in Section 7(o)(2) to apply. The USACE has a continuing duty to regulate the activity covered by this incidental take statement. If the USACE (1) fails to require the applicants to adhere to the terms

and conditions of the incidental take statement through enforceable terms, and/or (2) fails to retain oversight to ensure compliance with these terms and conditions, the protective coverage of Section 7(o)(2) may lapse. The Service considers the following reasonable and prudent measures to be necessary and appropriate to minimize take of DFS:

- (1) Cutting and clearing of trees must be conducted outside the primary DFS breeding season (January 1 to May 15 of any year) to minimize mortality to females and young.
- (2) Conservation easements for permanent protection of the off-site DFS conservation areas must be finalized prior to initiation of any forest clearing activities in DFS habitat.
- (3) Access to on-site DFS habitat must be provided for future U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or Service-approved monitoring efforts.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

In order to be exempt from the prohibitions of section 9 of the Act, the USACE and applicant must comply with the following terms and conditions, which implement the reasonable and prudent measures described above and outline required reporting/monitoring requirements. These terms and conditions are non-discretionary.

- (1) Tree cutting and clearing shall not be conducted during the primary DFS breeding season (January 1 through May 15); if possible the secondary breeding season (July 1 through September 15) will also be avoided.
- (2) Prior to timber cutting or clearing of trees in DFS habitat, the MHA Financial Group shall finalize a conservation easement, to be held by a third party, and shall provide legally and financially binding assurances that at least 26.24 acres of off-site wooded DFS habitat, at a site approved by the Service, will be preserved in perpetuity as habitat for DFS (Map 5). This action will be assured by recording the conservation easements designating the protection of the habitat for the DFS in the record of deeds at the Dorchester County Lands Records Office/Courthouse in Cambridge, Maryland.
- (3) The deeds and associated conservation easements will address prohibitions on the removal of living trees, construction of permanent structures, and squirrel hunting and any other measures necessary to protect and maintain habitat for DFS in perpetuity for the off-site conservation easement. Language for the conservation easement will be submitted to and approved by the Service before being filed. The Service must approve any changes to the terms of the conservation easement.
- (4) The USACE shall take all necessary measures, including the incorporation of special assurance requirements in their agreement with the MHA Financial Group, to insure the protection of the 26.24 acres of wooded DFS conservation habitat referred to above and in the project description.
- (5) Although no monitoring plan is associated with this development project, access must be granted to habitat remaining on-site in the event of future Service or Service-approved DFS monitoring efforts.

Reporting Requirements

- The applicants shall notify the Service upon start-up and completion of project construction at the address given below:

Chesapeake Bay Field Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
177 Admiral Cochrane Drive
Annapolis, MD 21401
Phone (410) 573-4550

- Upon locating a dead, injured, or sick DFS, notification must be made to nearest USFWS Law Enforcement Office at:

Division of Law Enforcement
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
177 Admiral Cochrane Drive
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
Phone (410) 573-4514

Care should be taken in handling sick or injured individuals and in the preservation of specimens in the best possible state for later analysis of cause of death or injury.

The reasonable and prudent measures, with their implementing terms and conditions, are designed to minimize the impact of incidental take that might otherwise result from the proposed action. The Service understands that no more than 6.97 acres of Delmarva fox squirrel habitat will be permanently lost, and no more than 2.13 acres of Delmarva fox squirrel habitat will be degraded, as a result of this project. If, during the course of the action, this level of habitat loss is exceeded, this loss and the associated incidental take represent new information requiring reinitiation of consultation and review of the reasonable and prudent measures provided. The Federal agency must immediately provide an explanation of the causes of the taking and review with the Service the need for possible modification of the reasonable and prudent measures.

V. REINITIATION - CLOSING STATEMENT

This concludes formal consultation on the action outlined in the US Army Corps of Engineers request letter dated April 18, 2006. As provided in 50 CFR 402.16, reinitiation of formal consultation is required where discretionary USACE 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 action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not considered in this opinion; (3) the action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species or critical habitat 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.

For this biological opinion the incidental take would be exceeded when the take exceeds that expected from removing 6.97 acres or degrading 2.13 of DFS habitat, which is what has been exempted from the prohibitions of section 9 by this opinion. The Service appreciates the cooperation of the USACE during this consultation. For further coordination please contact Mary Ratnaswamy of this office at (410) 573-4541.

Sincerely,

John Wolflin
Supervisor

Enclosures

cc: Mike Thabault, Assistant Regional Director, Ecological Services, Hadley, MA
Martin Miller, Chief, Division of Threatened and Endangered Species, Hadley, MA
Glenn Therres, Maryland Department of Natural Resources
David Fang, MHA Financial Group, Inc., Fallston, MD
Jason Traband, CAN Engineers, Forest Hill, MD

LITERATURE CITED

- Adams, C.E. 1973. Population dynamics of fox squirrels, *Sciurus niger*, in selected areas in Seward County, Nebraska. Ph.D. thesis. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE. 116 pp.
- Allen, G.M. 1943. Extinct and vanishing mammals of the Western Hemisphere, with marine species of all the oceans. American Committee for International Wild Life Protection, Special Publication 11.
- Allen, J.M. 1952. Gray and fox squirrel management in Indiana. Indiana Department of Conservation, P-R Bulletin 1.
- Asdell, S.A. 1964. Patterns of mammalian reproduction. 2nd Edition. Cornell University Press. 670 pp.
- Bakken, A. 1952. Interrelationships of *Sciurus carolinensis* (Gmelin) and *Sciurus niger* (Linnaeus) in mixed populations. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison
- Brown, L.G. and L.E. Yeager. 1945. Fox squirrels and gray squirrels in Illinois. Illinois Natural History Survey Bulletin. 23:449-536.
- Colin, W.F. 1957. Alabama squirrel investigations 1949-1953. Alabama Department of Conservation, Pittman-Robertson Project Final Report W-25-R. 83 pp.
- Donohoe, R.W. and R.O. Beal. 1972. Squirrel behavior determined by radio-telemetry. Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Ohio Fish and Wildlife Report 2. 20 pp.
- Dozier, H.L. and H.E. Hall. 1944. Observations on the Bryant fox squirrel. *Sciurus niger bryanti* Bailey. Maryland Conservation 21:2-7.
- Dueser, R.D., J.L. Dooley and G.J. Taylor. 1988. Habitat structure, forest composition and landscape dimensions as components of habitat suitability for the Delmarva fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger cinereus*). Pp. 414-421, in Management of amphibians, reptiles and small mammals in North America (R. Szaro, ed.). U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Technical Report RM-166.
- Dueser, R.D. 1999. Analysis of Delmarva fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger cinereus*) benchmark population data (1991-1998). Report to USFWS, Chesapeake Bay Field Office, Annapolis, MD. Contract 5141070512A.
- Edwards, J.W., D.C. Guynn, and M.R. Lennartz. 1989. Habitat use by southern fox squirrel in coastal South Carolina. Proceedings Annual Conference of Southeastern Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. 43:337-345.
- Edwards, J.W. 1986. Habitat utilization by southern fox squirrel in coastal South Carolina. M.S. thesis, Clemson University, South Carolina. 52 pp.
- Flyger, V. and D.A. Smith. 1980. A comparison of Delmarva fox squirrel and gray squirrel habitats and home range. Transactions of the Northeastern Section of the Wildlife Society. 37:19-22.
- Frieswyk, T.S. And D.M. DiGiovanni. 1988. Forest Statistics for Maryland - 1976 and 1986. USDA Forest Service Resource Bulletin NE-107. Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, Broomhall, PA.
- Golley, F.B. 1962. Mammals of Georgia. University of Georgia Press, Athens.
- Gurnell, J. 1983. Squirrel numbers and the abundance of tree seeds. Mammal Review 13:133-148.
- Ha, J.C. 1983. Food supply and home range in the fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger*). M.S. thesis, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina. 32 pp.
- Hilliard, T.H. 1979. Radio-telemetry of fox squirrels in the Georgia Coastal Plain. M.S. thesis, University of Georgia, Athens. 102 pp.
- Humphrey, S.R. and P.G.R. Jodice. 1992. Big Cypress fox squirrel. *Sciurus niger avicennia*. Pp. 224-233, in Rare and endangered biota of Florida. Volume I. Mammals (S.R. Humphrey, ed.). University Press of Florida, Gainesville. 392 pp.
- Kantola, A.T. and S.R. Humphrey. 1990. Habitat use by Sherman's fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger shermani*) in Florida. Journal of Mammalogy. 71:411-419.
- Kantola, A.T. 1986. Fox squirrel home range and mast crops in Florida. M.S. thesis, University of

- Florida, Gainesville. 67 pp.
- Larson, B.J. 1990. Habitat utilization, population dynamics and long-term viability in an insular population of Delmarva fox squirrels (*Sciurus niger cinereus*). M.S. thesis, University of Virginia. 87 pp.
- Loeb, S.C. and N.D. Moncrief. 1993. The biology of fox squirrels (*Sciurus niger*) in the Southeast: A review. Pgs. 1-19 in Proceedings of the Second Symposium on Southeastern Fox Squirrels, *Sciurus niger* (N.D. Moncrief, J.W. Edwards, P.A. Tappe, eds.). Virginia Museum of Natural History. Special Publication Number 1.
- Lustig, L.W. and V. Flyger. 1976. Observations and suggested management practices for the endangered Delmarva fox squirrel. Proceedings of the 29th Annual Conference of the Southeastern Association of Game Fish Commissioners 29:433-440.
- Mace, G.M. and P.H. Harvey. 1983. Energetic constraints on home range size. American Naturalist 121:120-132.
- Maryland Office of Planning. 1990. Maryland's land 1973-1990, a changing resource. Baltimore, MD.
- Moore, J.C. 1957. The natural history of the fox squirrel, *Sciurus niger shermani*. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History. 113:7-71.
- Nixon, C.M. and L.P. Hansen. 1987. Managing forests to maintain populations of gray and fox squirrels. Illinois Department of Conservation Technical Bulletin. 5:1-35.
- Paglione, L.J. 1996. Population status and habitat management of Delmarva fox squirrels. M.S. thesis, University of Massachusetts. 98 pp.
- Pednault-Willet, K.D. 2002. Determining the population size and habitat use of the endangered Delmarva fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger cinereus*) following an infestation of the southern pine beetle (*Dendroctonus frontalis*) at Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge. MS thesis, Univ. of Maryland, Eastern Shore. 160 pp.
- Smith, C.C. and D. Follmer. 1972. Food preferences of squirrels. Ecology. 53:82-91.
- Steele, M.A. 1988. Patch use and foraging behavior by the fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger*): tests of theoretical predictions. PhD. dissertation, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, 220 pp.
- Tappe, P.A. 1991. Capture-recapture methods for estimating southern fox squirrel abundance. Ph.D. dissertation, Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina. 92 pp.
- Taylor, G.J. 1973. Present status and habitat survey of the Delmarva fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger cinereus*) with a discussion of reasons for its decline. Proceedings of the Southeastern Association of Game and Fish Commissions. 27:278-289.
- Taylor, G.J. 1976. Range determination and habitat description of the Delmarva fox squirrel in Maryland. M.S. thesis, University of Maryland, College Park. 76 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1983. Delmarva fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger cinereus*) recovery plan, first revision. Newton Corner, Massachusetts. 49 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1993. Delmarva fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger cinereus*) recovery plan, second revision. Hadley, Massachusetts. 110 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2003. Status and Recovery Plan Update for the Delmarva fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger cinereus*). Hadley, Massachusetts. 36 pp.
- Weigl, P.D., M.A. Steele, L.J. Sherman, J.C. Ha, and T.S. Sharpe. 1989. The ecology of the fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger*) in North Carolina: Implications for survival in the Southeast. Bulletin of the Tall Timbers Research Station. 24:1-93.
- Weller, D. and N. Edwards. 2001. Maryland's changing land use: past, present, and future. Maryland Office of Planning. Baltimore, MD 83 pp.

Appendix A: Consultation History

<u>Date</u>	<u>Description</u>
8/18/05	CBFO performs site visit (present: Charisa Morris and Jason Traband)
10/06/05	Initial meeting for this project site between Chesapeake Bay Field Office (CBFO: Charisa Morris, Cherry Keller) and project proponents (David Fang, Jason Traband, and Doug Kopeck)
12/14/05	First draft of General Development Plan/Biological Evaluation (BE) received by CBFO
12/15/05	Meeting between CBFO and project proponents: Luthy property and prior project titled "Cambridge II" to be combined into "Foxtail Crossing"
12/16/05	11/24/04 MD DNR list request response sent to CBFO from project proponents
03/03/06	Revised plat and BE received by CBFO by email
03/21/06	3 rd Revision of plat, BE, and 3/1/06 Conservation Bank letter of Intent received by CBFO
04/03/06	CBFO sends Take Summary to US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
04/21/06	CBFO receives USACE request to initiate formal consultation (dated 4/18/06)
05/03/06	CBFO responds to USACE with a "receipt of initiation" letter, stating the 135 day due date of September 1, 2006.

Appendix B: Previous biological opinions completed for Delmarva fox squirrel (*Sciurus niger cinereus*)
by the Chesapeake Bay Field Office.

PROJECT ID	COUNTY	STATE	YEAR	Approximate ACRES TAKEN
<i>CBFO-TE-S7-MP</i>	<i>Dorchester</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>1999</i>	<i>1.25</i>
<i>CBFO-TE-S7-HP</i>	<i>Queen Annes</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>1999</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>CBFO-TE-S7-05-003:FTC</i>	<i>Queen Annes</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>1999</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>CBFO-TE-S7-05-081:CA</i>	<i>Dorchester</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>1999</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>CBFO-TE-S7-IM</i>	<i>Talbot</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>11.38</i>
<i>CBFO-TE-S7-BC</i>	<i>Talbot</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>6.93</i>
<i>CBFO-TE-S7-BN</i>	<i>Dorchester</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>CBFO-TE-S7-CNWR</i>	<i>Accomack</i>	<i>VA</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>10.37</i>
<i>CBFO-TE-S7-05-028:SF</i>	<i>Talbot</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>4.65</i>
<i>CBFO-TE-S7-05-029:SC</i>	<i>Talbot</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>15.22</i>
<i>CBFO-TE-S7-05-013:EV</i>	<i>Talbot</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>12.15</i>
<i>CBFO-TE-S7-05-004:EA</i>	<i>Talbot</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>CBFO-TE-S7-05-008:USF</i>	<i>Queen Annes</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>69.7</i>
			<i>TOTAL=</i>	<i>191.81 acres</i>
<i>Foxtail Crossing</i>	<i>Dorchester</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>+9.1 = 200.91 acres</i>

FWS Log No: *CBFO-TE-S7-05-106*
Date Started: *10/6/05*
Ecosystem: *CB/SR*
Applicant: *MHA Financial Group, Inc.*
1414 Falls Crest Drive
Fallston, MD 21047
Action Agency: *US Army Corp of Engineers*
Project Title: *Foxtail Crossing*
County: *Dorchester County*

Z:/endfed/morris/projects/maryland/dfs/foxtailcrossing/foxtailcrossingBO.doc