



MaryAnn High  
<mhigh@fs.fed.us>

08/25/2006 03:47 PM

To Clay\_Fletcher@fws.gov

cc Alison\_BeckHaas@fws.gov, Joanne M Bonn  
<jmbonn@fs.fed.us>, Michelle M Godawa  
<mgodawa@fs.fed.us>, Scott A Russell

bcc

Subject Re: Fw: Amended Lynx CA--Corrections to Table of NFs?

Clay, as far as I can determine, we don't meet the criteria for "occupied" habitat as defined in the "Occupied Mapped Lynx Habitat Amendment to the Canada Lynx Conservation Agreement" signed May, 2006. Here's why:

1.) The 2 verified lynx obs. or records since 1999 that are required to meet the first criteria have to be physical remains, live-capture, DNA samples, or photos. I know of none of these since 1999.

2.) The second criteria requires evidence of lynx reproduction, which, to my knowledge, we also don't have.

That said, I have no doubt we have lynx on the Forest. There have been several credible reports I'm aware of since the 80's and they continue, with the latest one only last month, July, 2006 on the Clearwater district by a Forest archaeologist. Some of the earlier reports are on the Salmon River district which is pretty far south for their range. I reported one of those myself in 1987 in the Slate Creek drainage and another Salmon River district employee reported one in Race Creek that same year. In 1998, a retired Idaho Dept. Fish and Game conservation officer reported another one on the Salmon River in the Nut Basin area.

IDFG collected a lynx carcass that had been accidentally trapped in Earthquake Basin on the Clearwater District- I believe in the 80's or early 90's. Historical records from the Moose Creek and Red River districts document active lynx trapping along with more recent, incidental, but credible, sighting reports.

The Clearwater NF is listed as occupied, probably as a result of the photo Dan Davis got a few years back in the Lochsa- adjacent to the Nez Perce NF. Clearly, there is no physical barrier to lynx between the Clearwater and Nez Perce NF's.

Interestingly, the Nez Perce is the only Forest listed as "unoccupied" that wasn't included in the National Lynx Survey. All other designated "unoccupied" Forests were included in the survey.

But, what I don't understand is why it matters whether mapped habitat is occupied or not, when the whole point is to recover a "threatened" species, rare by definition, by providing suitable habitat for that species to use for recovery....if you don't conserve the habitat, you will ensure it is never occupied. The "Canada Lynx Conservation Agreement", May, 2005, says that "measures will be taken to reduce or eliminate effects or risks to the species and its occupied habitat pending amendments to Forest Plans....and "measures to minimize incidental take of lynx....will apply only to proposed actions in occupied lynx habitat." I just spoke to Alan Dohmen, revision biologist, about what happens with lynx re this agreement, once our pending Forest plan revision is final. He is unclear and suggested it would be a good topic of discussion with Kristi Swisher, new R1 wildlife lead.

This whole designation of occupied vs. unoccupied habitat seems rather

unnecessary, especially when the survey results are based on one point in time and lynx have legs and can move around pretty well. And even more curious, the amendment specifically excludes consideration of "historic" (pre 1999) occupation by lynx in determining occupancy.... when the species is currently designated as "threatened". Again, isn't recovery the whole point in dealing with listed species?

Obviously, there is something driving this amendment that has nothing to do with lynx conservation.....surprise, surprise!

-Mary Ann

Clay\_Fletcher@fws  
.gov

08/25/2006 11:39  
AM

To  
Joanne M Bonn <jmbonn@fs.fed.us>,  
MaryAnn High <mhigh@fs.fed.us>,  
Michelle M Godawa  
<mgodawa@fs.fed.us>, Scott A  
Russell <sarussell@fs.fed.us>  
CC  
Alison\_BeckHaas@fws.gov  
Subject  
Fw: Amended Lynx CA--Corrections to  
Table of NFs?

Hi Folks - In responding to Alison's email, are there any verified lynx sightings or other hard evidence to support changing the Nez Perce from unoccupied to occupied. If so please let us know. Have a great weekend.

Clay

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
1387 S. Vinnell Way, Room 368  
Boise, ID 83709  
(208) 378-5256; fax (208) 378-5262  
clay\_fletcher@fws.gov

----- Forwarded by Clay Fletcher/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI on 08/25/2006 12:30 PM  
-----

Alison Beck  
Haas/ESBO/R1/FWS/  
DOI

08/23/2006 04:06

To  
clay\_fletcher@FWS.GOV, Sandi  
Arena/SEID/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS, Larry

PM

Dickerson/SEID/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS

cc

gary\_burton@fws.gov

Subject

Fw: Amended Lynx CA--Corrections to  
Table of NFs?

This string of e-mail is about the opportunity to make corrections to the CA table of NFs as occupied/unoccupied/not covered.

Clay--Do we have anything that would provide a basis for amending the table in the new lynx CA to show the Nez Perce as occupied? Can we discuss when you return?

Sandi--I hadn't read this e-mail when i sent you a note on this subject a few minutes ago. Should we recommend that the SCNF be changed to occupied--do you think the data is there? How should we proceed?

Larry--A question just occurred to me--didn't the CTNF complete LRMP Revision a couple of years ago? Should they be on the list of NFs that the CA doesn't apply to because they've completed revision?

ABH

Alison Beck Haas

Division Chief--Contaminants, Consultation, Habitat Conservation

Snake River Fish and Wildlife Office

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

1387 South Vinnell Way

Boise, Idaho 83709

Phone (208)378-5384 Fax (208)378-5262

----- Forwarded by Alison Beck Haas/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI on 08/23/2006 03:52 PM

-----

Mark

Robertson/ESBO/R1

/FWS/DOI

08/22/2006 01:48

PM

To

Clay Fletcher/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS,  
Johnna Roy/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS,  
Ally Turner/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS,  
Ray Vizgirdas/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS,  
Ted Koch/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS,  
Alison Beck  
Haas/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS

cc

Barbara Chaney/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS

Subject

Fw: Amended Lynx CA--Corrections?

Hey folks,

Please look at the email string below and consider any new information. If there is any new information pertinent to changing the "occupied" status of a Forest, I'll collect it and make sure it gets to where it needs to get. I'm not sure if there will be any opportunity for other comments, but we may be able to simply keep a list of comments for ourselves in case an opportunity arises in the future. Thanks.

+++++

Mark Robertson  
Snake River Fish and Wildlife Office  
Fish and Wildlife Service  
1387 S. Vinnell Way, Suite 368  
Boise, ID 83709  
(208)378-5287; fax (208)378-5262  
mark\_robertson@fws.gov

+++++

----- Forwarded by Mark Robertson/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI on 08/22/2006 01:04 PM

-----

Jeff  
Foss/ESBO/R1/FWS/  
DOI

08/22/2006 12:43  
PM

mark\_robertson@fws.gov

ted\_koch@fws.gov

To

cc

Subject

Fw: Amended Lynx CA--Corrections?

FYI, in an effort to keep things moving while Alison is out.

Thanks

jeff

---

Jeff Foss  
Field Supervisor  
Snake River Fish and Wildlife Offices (Boise-Chubbuck-Salmon)  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
1387 S. Vinnell Way, Suite 368  
(208) 685-6953, Fax (208) 378-5262  
e-mail: jeff\_foss@fws.gov

----- Forwarded by Jeff Foss/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI on 08/22/2006 12:42 PM -----

Susan  
Martin/UCRB/R1/FW  
S/DOI

Ken Berg/WWO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS, Kemper

To

08/21/2006 02:07  
PM

McMaster/OSO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS, Jeff  
Foss/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS

cc

Larry Salata/RO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS,  
Alison Beck  
Haas/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS

Subject

Fw: Amended Lynx CA--Corrections?

The newly amended lynx conservation agreement (below, amended in May 2006), is going to be extended. This provides us an opportunity to give input to Table 1, which lists the Forests that currently meet the definition of "occupied". Please see the note below from Bridget Fahey, R-6 (lead for lynx). Do you have any info (i.e. on Forest planning processes, or recent surveys or research) that would lead to any changes in the Table?

Please get any info to me by August 31, and I'll send ONE list of notes to Bridget, from Region 1. THANKS!

Susan Martin, Project Leader  
Upper Columbia Fish & Wildlife Office  
11103 E. Montgomery Drive  
Spokane, WA 99206  
Phone: 509-893-8015  
Fax: 509-891-6748  
E-mail: Susan.Martin@fws.gov

----- Forwarded by Susan Martin/UCRB/R1/FWS/DOI on 08/21/2006 01:02 PM

-----

Bridget Fahey

To: Lori  
Nordstrom/R6/FWS/DOI@FWS, Anne Vandehey/R6/FWS/DOI@FWS, Susan  
08/16/2006 03:16  
Martin/UCRB/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS,  
Bryon Holt/UCRB/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS, Alison Beck  
PM  
Haas/ESBO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS,  
Larry Salata/RO/R1/FWS/DOI@FWS

cc:

Subject: Fw: Amended Lynx CA

I am working with the USFS Washington Office to extend the deadline on the conservation agreement. We are working on doing this now rather than waiting until closer to the December deadline to support our final rule for lynx CH. The language in the text of the agreement itself is not subject to change; however, we are fixing some problems in Table 1 where it shows forests considered to be occupied, unoccupied, and where plans have been amended. If you know of any mistakes or have received new information on lynx presence please let me know. See Nancy's message below for 2 errors,

and review the table (attached in the conservation agreement amendment) for others.

(See attached file: Lynx Conservation Agreement Amendment.pdf)

----- Forwarded by Bridget Fahey/R6/FWS/DOI on 08/16/2006 04:09 PM -----

civerson@fs.fed.us  
s

07/17/2006 07:55  
AM

nwarren@fs.fed.us

jclaar@fs.fed.us,  
Bridget\_Fahey@fws.gov,  
mbosch@fs.fed.us

To

cc

Subject

Re: Amended Lynx CA

Nancy - thanks for the reminder. The Lynx CA needs to be extended (beyond Dec. 06) to support the Critical Habitat final rule. It also needs to be revised to address these corrections and any new revisions that have/will take place.

\*\*\*\*\*

Chris Iverson, Assistant Director Wildlife, TES, Rare Plants, Planning  
Forest Service, Stop Code 1121, 1400 Independence Ave, SW  
Washington, D.C. 20250-1121  
202-205-3199, fax: 205-1599  
civerson@fs.fed.us

\*\*\*\*\*

Nancy  
Warren/R2/USDAFS

07/12/2006 02:17  
PM

James Claar/R1/USDAFS@FSNOTES,  
Chris Iverson/WO/USDAFS@FSNOTES

To

cc

Subject

Amended Lynx CA

Table 1 has a couple of errors that I was not successful in getting corrected. One of our bios recently reminded me of this again. When the CA is next reissued, next December I guess, perhaps we could make a couple of corrections to the amendment at that time. Could you please file this away so we don't forget?

1) The Routt is missing from the Southern Rockies "occupied" list. It's not too surprising that there was some confusion, because the Medicine Bow and Routt are administratively combined but have separate Forest Plans: Routt was revised in 1997 w/out lynx guidance, while the MedBow was revised in 2002 with lynx guidance.

2) Bighorn should be on the list of Forest Plans that have been amended or revised with lynx guidance and no longer subject to the CA.

Thanks!

Nancy Warren  
Threatened, Endangered & Sensitive Species Program Leader  
USDA Forest Service - Rocky Mountain Region  
(303) 275-5064  
nwarren@fs.fed.us

(See attached file: Lynx Conservation Agreement Amendment.pdf)



Lynx Conservation Agreement Amendment.pdf