



Fwd: I was going to wait until 11:59pm, but 4:59pm seemed easier...

King, Andrew <andrew_king@fws.gov>
To: FW3 Indiana Bat <indiana_bat@fws.gov>

Mon, Mar 11, 2013 at 4:31 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Slack, Ryan** <rslack@cecinc.com>
Date: Mon, Mar 11, 2013 at 4:58 PM
Subject: I was going to wait until 11:59pm, but 4:59pm seemed easier...
To: "Andrew_King@fws.gov" <Andrew_King@fws.gov>

Andy,

Thanks for the extended period to comment. I obviously needed almost every minute.

Ryan

Ryan A. Slack / Project Manager

Civil & Environmental Consultants, Inc.

530 E. Ohio Street, Suite G · Indianapolis IN 46204

Toll-Free: 877-746-0749 · Fax: 317-655-7778

Mobile: 317-476-1008 · <http://www.cecinc.com>

Senior Leadership · Integrated Services · Personal Business Relationships

This electronic communication and any attachments are intended solely for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is confidential, privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable law, including copyright law. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, you are prohibited from disclosing, reproducing, distributing, disseminating or otherwise using this transmission. Please promptly notify the sender by reply electronic communication and immediately delete this message from your system.



CEC USFWS Public Comments for the 2013 Indiana bat survey protocols.xlsx
15K

Reviewer's Name & Affiliation:

Ryan Slack, Lisa Walker, Brent Mock, Jack Basiger; Civil and Environmental Consultants, Inc.

Document Name	Page #	Comment
2013 Contingency Plan	1	CEC completed a project in West Virginia in 2012 that included acoustic detection at several sites in conjunction with mist netting. This survey was conducted in an area that a pregnant female Indiana bat had been captured in 2010. A total of 309 net nights of effort were completed at 47 of the highest suitable landowner accessible sites in a 5 mile radius buffer of the capture site. In conjunction with mist netting, 64 detector nights were completed with Anabat detectors at 32 sites. No Indiana bats were captured. Our report details a process that was used to narrow 69 bat calls identified by Echoclass as Indiana bat hits to five calls that we actually thought were Indiana bats. The USFWS agreed with our analysis of only five Indiana bat hits. Our report may provide a good example of how results would appear in a Contingency Plan environment. Further information on this project can be obtained from us or the USFWS Elkins Field Office. We think the results and levels of effort in an area of known presence might be of interest to the USFWS when developing the Contingency Plan.
2013 Contingency Plan	1	If we label anything that looks like forest cover on GIS as suitable habitat, do we need to conduct a ground survey? Or, can a ground survey be reserved for areas that look like forest on GIS but we want to exclude for whatever reason?
2014 Contingency Plan	1	Giving a surveyor the ability to use any software program combined with visual detection will put the burden of fault for false negatives and false positives on the surveyor and not the USFWS. A Contingency approach with little guidance on how to interpret calls/pulses/feeding buzzes could result in many false results especially false negatives because the correct scientific approach of using subjective evidence to establish the presence of a rare species would be to err on the side of it not being present. The opposite, more false positives than negatives, could be true for trying to detect a common species using the same subjective evidence. We think the Contingency Plan should be designed to only accomplish reasonable results. For example, if a software program designed to identify Indiana bat calls could not be developed, then possibly no one may have the ability to currently accomplish the objective. It is our opinion that acoustic detection is currently a good tool for establishing presence of the <i>Myotis</i> genus, and therefore whether or not to conduct a mist net survey for Indiana bats should be the only result after identifying the <i>Myotis</i> genus at a given site.

2013/2014 Draft Protocol	5	If one Indiana bat is acoustically detected over the course of 6 nights, we have to assume a maternity colony, but if we mist net and do not capture an Indiana bat, we could potentially suspect a bachelor colony with FWS approval. Are there habitat characteristics of maternity colony vs bachelor colony? Why can you assume males only after we don't capture any Indiana bats?
2013/2014 Draft Protocol	8	Should we now assume that we must include bridges and other non-tree potential summer roosts? Does this indicate that residential areas are now good bat habitat because they have structures that Indiana bats could "potentially" roost in?
2013/2014 Draft Protocol	12	40% of all bat calls must be identified to the species level for each detector on each survey night for the site to be deemed suitable. Is this backed up by statistics/literature?
2013/2014 Draft Protocol	14	For linear projects up to 100 meters wide: one site per kilometer. What do we use if it's wider? For example widening an interstate with tree clearing on both sides.
2013/2014 Draft Protocol	15	If an acoustic survey resulted in the documentation of Indiana bats and the project proponent has elected to continue with mist-netting surveys, then provide a draft Phase 3&4 mist-netting, radio-tracking, and emergence survey study plan for USFWS FO. To prevent a bottleneck of waiting for approvals from FWS, if we know the client will proceed with mist netting can we submit a generic Phase 3&4 study plan stating we will follow the protocol and include it with our Phase 2 acoustic study plan?
2013/2014 Draft Protocol	18	One positive acoustic site within a buffer circle = 10 net nights. Can that be broken up any way? For example if we could hypothetically monitor 5 nets in a 10 net night minimum rotation, we would be done with one site in two nights. Do we have to do consecutive nights? If we had enough permitted biologists and good net locations could we set up 10 nets and be finished with a site in one night?
2013/2014 Draft Protocol	3 and 8	It is clear that natural heritage requests will be required prior to each survey. Do we need to wait for the response before beginning any habitat surveys if needed? Top of page 3 suggests we have to wait. Bullet 4 on page 8 suggests we at least need the response but only before acoustic surveys begin.
2013/2014 Draft Protocol	3	So if no suitable habitat, assume we need to get USFWS to concur?

