#### **Recommended Conservation Strategy for Golden-cheeked Warblers**



#### **Role of the BAT**

Provide input on biological matters of the HCP

Assist in:
(1) the calculation of harm to the endangered species; and
(2) the sizing and configuring of the habita preserves.

#### **Calculation of Harm**

The GCW is threatened by: Loss of Habitat Degredation of Habitat Predators associated with fragmentation Fragmentation

#### **Calculation of Harm**



#### Introduction

Time and effort is warranted

Expense is warranted

Note on Contributing to Recovery: The more we do, the sooner we can de-list the species

Warning about too little Take Authorization

Issues that we considered

Fragmentation Encroachment Disease Transmission Predators Catastrophic events Management challenges Range of the species

1 Big Property:
Easier to manage
No fragmentation
Good source of new birds

Very vulnerable to catastrophe Very expensive Not practical Not regionally helpful

Many little properties: Buffered against catastrophe More easily obtained Less expensive Spread throughout Range

Difficult to manage Highly fragmented, little connection No guarantee of high reproduction

Recommendation is to combine 2 approaches:

- Set a **goal** of protecting at least 1 big block in each county (except Blanco)
- A block could be 5,000-10,000 acres
- A block may be combined with existing lands
- Obtain the rest wherever you can in whatever pieces you can (500 acros r

Recommendation

- Ensure conservation in Bexar County to address threats (required)
  - Obtain easements wherever you can
- Set priorities to have at least 1 block in



#### **Mitigation Ratio**

3:1 in Bexar County, but only 60% must be mitigated within Bexar County + Buffer

Buffer Bexar County by 5 miles for mitigation purposes

The remainder can be anywhere in the Plan Area

2:1 for all other mitigation

#### Mitigation is a sliding scale

	Auth	norized T	ake	(habitat acres)			
	Bexar	Other	Total	Bexar	Other	Total	
Scen 1	12,000	16,000	28,000	21,600	46,400	68,000	
Scen 2	8,000	7,361	15,361	14,400	24,322	38,722	

\* The CAC should consider how much Take they want in the Plan \*

#### Mitigation is a sliding scale

# Total Size (incl. buffers) Bexar Other Total Scenario 1 27,000 58,000 85,000 Scenario 2 18,000 30,403 48,403

#### Restrictions

Use existing properties as building blocks

New Take requires New Protection (Limit the existing properties used as credit to 10% of entire effort)



#### **Karst Conservation Program** For SEP HCP CAC, 15 November 2010



Jean Krejca

### Bexar County Nine Listed Karst Invertebrates

#### • Six Arachnids:

Rhadine exilis

- *Cicurina madla* (Madla Cave Meshweaver)
- Cicurina venii (Bracken Bat Cave Meshweaver)
- Cicurina vespera (Govt. Canyon Bat Cave Meshweaver)
- Cicurina baronia (Robber Baron Cave Meshweaver)
- Neoleptoneta microps (Govt. Canyon Bat Cave Spider)
- Texella cokendolpheri (Cokendolpher Cave Harvestman)
- Three Beetles:
  - *Rhadine exilis* (No Common Name)
  - Rhadine infernalis (No Common Name)
  - Batrisodes (Excavodes) venyivi (Helotes Mold Beetle)

Species	Common Name	# of Known Localities	SEP HCP Category	
Rhadine exilis	Unnamed ground beetle	52	1	
Rhadine infernalis	Unnamed ground beetle	36	1	
Batrisodes venyivi	Helotes mold beetle	8	2	
Texella cokendolpheri	Cokendolpher cave harvestman	1	2	
Neoleptoneta microps	Government Canyon Bat Cave spider	2	2	
Cicurina baronia	Robber Baron Cave meshweaver	2	2	
Cicurina madla	Madla Cave meshweaver	8**	1	
Cicurina venii	Bracken Bat Cave meshweaver	1	2	
Cicurina vespera	Government Canyon Bat Cave meshweaver	1	2	
		10 C 10 10	a strange	

#### Participation

- Only in Karst zones 1-4
- These zones delineated based on geology and species' ranges
- More karst exists in the rest of the SEP HCP area, but there are not endangered karst species there





Karst Faunal Regions (KFRs): six regions Karst Faunal Areas (KFAs): preserves w/in KFRs Take authorized only in KFRs with 3 KFAs



#### Rationale # 1. taxonomic uncertainty



#### Rationale # 2. lack of information on



#### Rationale # 3. lack of recent information on species boundaries



Image courtesy of James Reddell, drawn by Pierre Paquin

#### **KFA Standards:**

High humidity Stable temps Water quality (surface and subsurface) Low RIFA predation Healthy Cave cricket popn Natural quantities of native plant and animals on surface Adjacent features for cricket metapopulation dynamics Good connectivity with mesocaverns Minimum acreages

# **Step 1: conduct initial karst feature survey per USFWS** (2006) protocols



#### Step 2: determine suitable habitat per USFWS (2006) protocols







If species not confirmed present, pay minimal fee for coverage for features encountered during construction



- If species confirmed present, either:
- **1. Avoid impacts**
- 2. mitigate on-site (establish a KFA)
- **3.** Mitigate off-site (pay a karst mitigation fee)





If species confirmed present, avoid impacts (#1) or:

2. on-site mitigation (set aside land)

**3.** off-site mitigation (pay fees)



## If species confirmed present, pay fees (#3), using one of two methods:

"Bullseye" method

Impact area 1: 0 to 150 feet = very high cost

Impact area 2: 150 to approx 345 ft = high cost "Survey" method

Cave footprint: very high cost

Surface, subsurface drainage basin and cricket foraging area: high cost

