



# United States Department of the Interior

## FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Ecological Services  
4625 Morse Road, Suite 104  
Columbus, Ohio 43230  
(614) 416-8993 / FAX (614) 416-8994

August 13, 2009

Timothy M. Hill  
Office of Environmental Services  
Ohio Department of Transportation  
P.O. Box 899  
Columbus, OH 43216-0899

TAILS: 31420-2009-F-0834 (PID 81587)

Attn: Donald Rostofer  
Chris Staron

RE: **HAS-250-11.72 (PID 81587)**

Dear Mr. Hill:

This letter is in response to your June 30, 2009 request, received in our office on July 1, 2009, for site-specific review pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, regarding rehabilitation of 2.38 miles of US-250 beginning approximately one-half mile east of Tappen Lake in Harrison County, Ohio. The project proposes to improve this section of US-250 by replacing 11 existing culverts, pavement, guardrails, and signs. The project will also involve the placement of rock channel protection. We understand that 9 unnamed tributaries of Standingstone Fork and approximately 0.087 acre of a category 1 wetland will be impacted by the project. In addition, a total of 30 trees will be cleared, including 22 potential Indiana bat roost trees. The trees to be removed are not part of a larger woodlot but are located within 0.5 mile of a permanent water source.

On January 26, 2007, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) issued a programmatic biological opinion (PBO) for the Ohio Department of Transportation's (ODOT) Statewide Transportation Program through January 2012. This PBO established a two-tiered consultation process for ODOT activities, with issuance of the programmatic opinion being Tier 1 and all subsequent site-specific project analyses constituting Tier 2 consultations. Under this tiered process, the Service will produce tiered biological opinions when it is determined that site-specific projects are likely to adversely affect federally listed species. When *may affect, not likely to adversely affect* determinations are made, the Service will review those projects and, if justified, provide written concurrence and section 7(a)(2) consultation will be considered completed for those site-specific projects.

In issuing the PBO (Tier 1 biological opinion), we evaluated the effects of all ODOT actions outlined in your Biological Assessment on the federally listed Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*). Your current request for Service review of the HAS-250-11.72 rehabilitation project is a Tier 2 consultation under the January 26, 2007, PBO. We have reviewed the information submitted by your office describing the effects of the proposed project on federally listed species. We concur with your determination that the action is *likely to adversely affect* the Indiana bat. As such, this review focuses on determining whether: (1) this proposed site-specific project falls within the scope of the Tier 1 PBO, (2) the effects of this proposed

action are consistent with those anticipated in the Tier 1 PBO, and (3) the appropriate conservation and mitigation measures identified in the biological assessment are adhered to.

That is, this letter serves as the Tier 2 biological opinion for the proposed HAS-250-11.72 rehabilitation project. As such, this letter also provides the level of incidental take that is anticipated and a cumulative tally of incidental take that has been authorized and exempted in the PBO.

#### **FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION ACT COMMENTS:**

We recommend that impacts to streams, wetlands, and other important habitats be mitigated. Additionally, natural buffers around streams and wetlands should be preserved to enhance beneficial functions. On projects that include plans to replace culverts, we recommend that they be placed to allow free movement of aquatic fauna. On projects that include plans to use riprap for channel protection, we recommend using native vegetation to control erosion, or, at a minimum, using native vegetation in combination with rock. That is, we recommend the use of natural channel design techniques where applicable and the maintenance of existing riparian habitat zones to the maximum extent possible.

The Service supports and recommends mitigation activities that reduce the likelihood of invasive plant spread and encourage native plant colonization. Prevention of non-native, invasive plant establishment is critical in maintaining high quality habitats. All disturbed areas in the project vicinity should be mulched and re-vegetated with native plant species.

#### Description of the Proposed Action

Pages 1-2 of your letter, as well as the supporting documentation, include the location and a thorough description of the proposed action. The action, as proposed, involves the rehabilitation of 2.38 miles of US-250 in Harrison County, Ohio. The purpose of this project is to rehabilitate the existing roadway in order to maintain a safe route of travel. Thirty trees will be removed by the project, including 22 trees that exhibit characteristics that indicate potential summer roost habitat for the Indiana bat. ODOT will implement the following conservation measures to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate adverse impacts to the Indiana bat: 1) any unavoidable tree removal will take place between September 15 and April 15 to avoid direct impacts (A-1), and 2) protection of land/habitat through conservation easements or deed restriction to offset loss of suitable habitat (M-1).

The Service appreciates ODOT's commitment to follow **conservation measure A-1** of the Programmatic Consultation for this project, under which trees within the project area will be cleared only between 15 September and 15 April. **Please note that the Service encourages the use of revised guidelines of tree removal between 30 September and 1 April**, as Indiana bats have been observed arriving at their traditional summer areas earlier in the spring and staying longer in the fall than previously documented.

As stated in your letter, ODOT will be subtracting this project's impacts to wooded habitat from their Atwood Mitigation Site on Conotton Creek in Holmes County, Ohio. We understand that **1.5 acres of riparian tree corridor** will be subtracted from the remaining amount of treed area at this Perpetual Environmental Resource Easement property and that this acreage will then be unavailable to mitigate future project impacts. Upon subtraction of the 1.5 acres for this project, 1.28 acres of wooded riparian habitat will remain at the Atwood Mitigation Site for future mitigation.

### Status of the Species

Species description, distribution, life history, population dynamics, and status are fully described on pages 13-26 for the Indiana bat in the PBO and are hereby incorporated by reference. Since the issuance of the PBO in 2007, there has been no change in the status of the species.

Species descriptions, life histories, population dynamics, status and distributions are fully described on pages 23-30 for the Indiana bat in the PBO and are hereby incorporated by reference. The most recent population estimate indicates 468,184 Indiana bats occur rangewide (King 2008). The current revised Indiana Bat Recovery Plan: First Revision (2007) delineates recovery units based on population discreteness, differences in population trends, and broad level differences in land-use and macrohabitats. There are currently four recovery units for the Indiana bat: Ozark-Central, Midwest, Appalachian Mountains, and Northeast. All of Ohio falls within the Midwest Recovery Unit.

In 2007, white nose syndrome (WNS) was found to fatally affect several species of bats, including the Indiana bat in eastern hibernacula. To date, WNS is known from New York, Massachusetts, Vermont, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New Hampshire, and Connecticut (all within the Northeast Recovery Unit). Roughly 70,000 Indiana bats, approximately 15% of the total population, occur in the affected states and are vulnerable to WNS at this time. The extent of the impact this syndrome may have on the species rangewide is uncertain but based on our current limited understanding of WNS, we expect mortality of bats at affected sites to be high (personal communication, L. Pruitt, 2008).

### Environmental Baseline

The environmental baseline for the species listed above was fully described on pages 21-26 of the PBO and is hereby incorporated by reference. Since the issuance of the PBO in 2007, there has been no change in the environmental baseline.

### *Status of the species within the action area*

Since the issuance of the PBO in 2007, there have been no new Indiana bat capture records within the vicinity of this project. Your documentation states that suitable habitat exists within the action area, thus we are assuming presence.

### Effects of the Action

Based on analysis of the information provided in your letter and supporting documentation for the HAS-250-11.72 rehabilitation project and our review of available habitat surrounding the project area, we have determined that the effects of the proposed action are consistent with those contemplated and fully described on pages 31-35 of the PBO. Adverse effects to the Indiana bat from this project could occur due to the removal of 30 trees, including 22 potential roost trees. As no trees exhibiting characteristics of maternity roost habitat will be removed for the project, the Service anticipates that any effects on an extant maternity colony will be insignificant. In addition, implementation of seasonal cutting restrictions will avoid direct adverse effects to individual bats.

Adult male and non-reproductive female Indiana bats may be indirectly exposed to loss of roosting habitat. In general, effects on these individual bats would be less severe than the effects associated with individuals of maternity colonies. Adult male and non-reproductive female Indiana bats are not subject to the physiological demands of pregnancy and rearing young.

Males and non-reproductive females typically roost alone or occasionally in small groups. When these individuals are displaced from roosts they must utilize alternative roosts or seek out new roosts. Because these individuals are not functioning as members of maternity colonies, they do not face the challenge of reforming as a colony. Roost tree requirements for non-reproductive Indiana bats are less specific whereas maternity colonies generally require larger roost trees to accommodate multiple members of a

colony. Therefore, it is anticipated that adverse indirect effects to non-reproductive bats will be less than the effects to reproductively active females. The Service anticipates that indirect effects to non-reproductive Indiana bats from the loss of roosting habitat will be insignificant.

We are not aware of any non-federal actions in the action area that are reasonably certain to occur. Thus, we do not anticipate any cumulative effects associated with this project.

#### Conclusion

We believe the proposed HAS-250-11.72 rehabilitation project is consistent with the PBO. After reviewing site specific information, including 1) the scope of the project, 2) the environmental baseline, 3) the status of the Indiana bat and its assumed presence within the project area, 4) the effects of the action, and 5) any cumulative effects, it is the Service's biological opinion that this project is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Indiana bat.

#### Incidental Take Statement

The Service anticipates that the proposed action will result in incidental take associated with projects in the East management unit. Incidental take for this project is 1.5 acres, resulting in the cumulative incidental take of 55.61 for this management unit. This project, added to the cumulative total of incidental take for the implementation of ODOT's Statewide Transportation Program, is well within the level of incidental take anticipated in the PBO through 2012 (see table below).

<b>Management Unit</b>	<b>IT anticipated in PBO</b>	<b>IT for this project</b>	<b>Cumulative IT granted to date</b>
West	1,565 acres	0 acres	63.39 acres
Central	2,280 acres	0 acres	11.32 acres
Northeast	4,679 acres	0 acres	125.35 acres
East	6,370 acres	1.5 acres	55.61 acres
South	7,224 acres	0 acres	44.20 acres
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>22,118 acres</b>	<b>1.5 acres</b>	<b>299.87 acres</b>

We determined that this level of anticipated and exempted take of Indiana bats from the proposed project, in conjunction with the other actions taken by ODOT pursuant to the PBO to date, is not likely to result in jeopardy to the species.

We understand that ODOT is implementing all pertinent Indiana bat conservation measures, specifically A-1 and M-1 stipulated in the Biological Assessment on pages 29-31. In addition, ODOT is monitoring the extent of incidental take that occurs on a project-by-project basis. These measures will minimize the impact of the anticipated incidental take.

This fulfills your section 7(a)(2) requirements for this action. However, should the proposed project be modified or the level of take identified above be exceeded, ODOT should promptly reinitiate consultation as outlined in 50 CFR 402.16. 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 continued implementation of ODOT's Statewide Transportation Program and projects predicated upon it may affect listed species in a manner or to an extent not considered in this opinion; (3) the continued implementation of ODOT's Statewide Transportation Program and projects predicated upon it are subsequently modified in a manner that cause an effect to federally listed species 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. Requests for reinitiation, or questions regarding reinitiation, should be directed to the U.S. Fish Wildlife Service's Ohio Field Office.

We appreciate your continued efforts to ensure that this project is consistent with all provisions outlined in the Biological Assessment and PBO. If you have any questions regarding our response or if you need additional information, please contact Karen Hallberg at extension 23.

Sincerely,



Mary Knapp, Ph.D.  
Field Supervisor

cc: ODNR, DOW, SCEA Unit, Columbus, OH  
Ohio Regulatory Transportation Office, Columbus, OH