Re: Summer survey questions

1 message

Shellenberger, Pamela <pamela_shellenberger@fws.gov> Tue, May 14, 2013 at 2:19 PM
To: Mike Cooper <mcooper@vesperenvironmental.com>

Mike,

According to the information I read in the guidance document, you should not take a hybrid approach. They are working on this approach, however, but it is not in the guidance at this time. Please let me know if you have any questions, I know you will be starting tomorrow and this is very late minute for all of us.

Thank you,

Pamela Shellenberger
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
315 South Allen Street
State College, PA 16801
814-234-4090 x241
814-234-0748 (f)
http://fws.gov/northeast/pafo/index.html

Due to an imposed hiring freeze and the inability to back fill positions, we are experiencing increased project review times (a minimum of 60 days) and response times to phone calls and emails. Please be patient; we will address projects in the order in which they are received.

On Wed, May 8, 2013 at 4:22 PM, Mike Cooper <mcooper@vesperenvironmental.com> wrote:

> Hi Pam,
>
> As you can see in the study design sent out as an attachment yesterday, a majority of the project area consists of a mix of ag. fields and woodlots providing sites along tree lines that are more suitable to acoustic surveys. Those sites located within a stream or wood road corridor will be mist netted taking advantage of the natural funneling they provide. We believe this "hybrid" approach will offer the best of both methods. Is this acceptable?
>
> Regards,
> Mike
>
> On 5/8/2013 1:11 PM, Shellenberger, Pamela wrote:
>
>> Are you concerned that there might not be appropriate netting areas in the project's limit of disturbance?
>>
>> Pamela Shellenberger
>> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
>> 315 South Allen Street
>> State College, PA 16801
>> 814-234-4090 x241
>> 814-234-0748 (f)
>> http://fws.gov/northeast/pafo/index.html
>>
>> ***Due to an imposed hiring freeze and the inability to back fill positions, we are experiencing increased project review times (a minimum of 60 days) and response times to phone calls and emails. Please be patient; we will address projects in the order in which they are received.***
>>
>> On Wed, May 1, 2013 at 1:03 PM, <mcooper@vesperenvironmental.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Hi Pam,
>>>
>>> One last question regarding the new protocol (ok-maybe it won't be the last), can we take a hybrid approach and conduct acoustics on some of the project sites and net the remaining sites?
>>>
>>> Thank you for all of your help.
>>> Mike
>>> Quoting "Shellenberger, Pamela" <pamela_shellenberger@fws.gov>:

Quoting "Shellenberger, Pamela" <pamela_shellenberger@fws.gov>:

> Mike,
>
> These are good questions.
>
> 1. This is correct. For linear projects: a minimum of 2 detector nights/km of suitable habitat.
>
> 2. PA is accepting netting or acoustic, correct.
>
> 3. At this time, the QIBS and BI roles are maintained.
>
> 4. According to the protocol: If no detections of probable Indiana bats by any candidate programs used in analysis,* then no further summer surveys necessary.*
> *
> *
> *- *According to the protocol: If detections of probable Indiana bats by any candidate programs used in analysis, then
>
> i) proceed to *Step 7* for qualitative ID; *OR*
>
> ii) assume presence of Indiana bats and coordinate with the USFWS FO(s); *OR*
>
> iii) assume presence and proceed to *Phase 3*.
>
> - From Mike Armstrong: If the consultant used the acoustic only option for their P/A survey, had myotid calls, then had positive Indiana bat calls after running two programs, then they can either assume presence of Indiana bats and proceed with the consultation or continue analysis by having someone qualified to qualitatively evaluate the acoustic results to confirm or refute the Indiana bat calls. If they assume presence or qualitatively confirm those calls are likely Indiana bat calls and would like to use the Phase 3 mist-netting to attempt to capture those documented bats, then they can mist-net at whatever level of effort they wish. Presence has already been confirmed for the project at this point. They can not "switch" their determination to absence from mist-netting by following Phase 3 netting. They could only confirm absence of Indiana bats through mist-netting by following Phase 2 netting.
>
> I hope this helps!
>
> Thanks,
>
> **
>
> **
>
> Pamela Shellenberger
> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
> 315 South Allen Street
> State College, PA 16801
> 814-234-4090 x241
> 814-234-0748 (f)
> http://fws.gov/northeast/pafo/index.html
>
> ***Due to an imposed hiring freeze and the inability to back fill positions, we are experiencing increased project review times (a minimum of 60 days) and response times to phone calls and emails. Please be patient; we will address projects in the order in which they are received.***
>
> On Tue, Apr 30, 2013 at 2:53 PM, <mcooper@vesperenvironmental.com> wrote:
>
> > Hi Pam,

I apologize for the phone tag and believe this may be the best method of communication. Please find below a few question regarding the newest Ibat protocol released by USFWS.

1. Is the new minimum effort for acoustics 2 detector nights per 1km of linear projects? I know that is what's stated in the new protocol, but I needed confirmation because of it representing such a significant change from the earlier drafts.

2. Is PA accepting netting or acoustics as outlined by the new Ibat protocol?

3. Are the QIBS and BI roles maintained under this new protocol?

4. Let us say that acoustics are conducted in an area of PA that has no record of Ibat presence and a myotid call is recorded. We then follow the protocol and perform call analysis using two different software packages (Sonobat and Echoclass).

If both software class it as something other than an Ibat, then is no further effort required?

If both or one of the software packages class it as an Ibat, do we have to assume presence or can we move to teh old "phase 3" and net?

If so, what would the minimum level of effort be and if no Ibats are collected would no further effort be required?

I apoologize for all the questions. We are just trying to get a clearer picture of what is expected. Thank you for your time.

Regards,
Mike

Quoting "Shellenberger, Pamela" <pamela_shellenberger@fws.gov>**:

Hi Mike,

Just returning the voice message that you left for me this morning. Let me know what I can do to help you.

Thanks,
Pamela Shellenberger
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
315 South Allen Street
State College, PA 16801
814-234-4090 x241
814-234-0748 (f)
http://fws.gov/northeast/pafo/**index.html<http://fws.gov/northeast/pafo/index.html>

***Due to an imposed hiring freeze and the inability to back fill positions, we are experiencing increased project review times (a minimum of
60 days) and response times to phone calls and emails. Please be patient; we will address projects in the order in which they are received.***

--
Michael Cooper
Manager
Vesper Environmental, LLC
108 Laurel Street
Hurley, NY 12443
845.594.6718
mcooper@vesperenvironmental.com