Shawn Zinszer  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Post Office Box 4970  
Jacksonville, Florida 32232-0019

Subject: Consultation Key for the Florida bonneted bat; 04EF2000-2014-I-0320-R001

Dear Mr. Zinszer:

This letter replaces the December 2013, Florida bonneted bat guidelines provided to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to assist your agency with effect determinations within the range of the Florida bonneted bat (*Eumops floridanus*). This October 2019 revision supersedes all prior versions. The enclosed *Florida Bonneted Bat Consultation Guidelines* and incorporated *Florida Bonneted Bat Consultation Key* (Key) are provided pursuant to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s (Service) authorities under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act) (87 Stat. 884; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). This letter, guidelines, and Key have been assigned Service Consultation Code: 41420-04EF2000-2014-I-0320-R001.

The purpose of the guidelines and Key is to aid the Corps (or other Federal action agency) in making appropriate effect determinations for the Florida bonneted bat under section 7 of the Act, and streamline informal consultation with the Service for the Florida bonneted bat when the proposed action is consistent with the Key. There is no requirement to use the Key. There will be cases when the use of the Key is not appropriate. These include, but are not limited to: where project specific information is outside of the scope of the Key, applicants do not wish to implement the identified survey or best management practices, or if there is new biological information about the species. In these cases, we recommend the Corps (or other Federal action agency) initiate traditional consultation pursuant to section 7 of the Act, and identify that consultation is being requested outside of the Key.

This Key uses type of habitat (*i.e.*, roosting or foraging), survey results, and project size as the basis for making determinations of “may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect” (MANLAA) and “may affect, and is likely to adversely affect” (LAA). The Key is structured to focus on the type(s) of habitat that will be affected by a project. When proposed project areas provide features that could support roosting of Florida bonneted bats, it is considered roosting habitat. If evaluation of roosting habitat determines that roosting is not likely, then the area is subsequently evaluated for its value to the species as foraging habitat.
Roosting habitat

The guidelines describe the features of roosting habitat. When a project is proposed in roosting habitat, the likelihood that roosting is occurring is evaluated through surveys (i.e., full acoustic or limited roost). When a roost is expected and the proposed activity will affect that roost, formal consultation is required. This is because the proposed activity is expected to take individuals through the destruction of the roost and the appropriate determination is that the project may affect, and is likely to adversely affect (LAA) the species. When roosting is expected, but all impacts to the roost can be avoided, and only foraging habitat (without roost structure) will be affected, the Service finds that it is reasonable to conclude that the proposed action is not likely to impair feeding, breeding, or sheltering. Thus, the proposed project may affect, but is not likely to affect the Florida bonneted bat (MANLAA).

The exception to this logic path is if the proposed action will affect more than 50 acres of foraging habitat in proximity to the roost. Under this scenario, we anticipate that the loss of the larger amount of foraging habitat near the roost could significantly impair feeding of young and overall breeding (i.e., LAA). Consequently, these projects would require formal consultation to analyze the effect of the incidental take.

If the roost surveys demonstrate that roosting is not likely, the project is then evaluated for its effects to foraging habitat. Our evaluation of these actions is described below. The exception is for projects less than or equal to 5 acres if a limited roost survey is conducted. Limited roost surveys rely on peeping and visual surveys to determine whether roosting is likely. On these small projects, this survey strategy is believed to be more economical and is considered a reasonable effort to evaluate the potential for roosting. The Service acknowledges that this approach is less reliable in evaluating the likelihood of roosting when it is not combined with acoustic surveys. Therefore, when limited roost surveys are conducted for projects that are less than or equal to 5 acres in size and the determination is that roosting is not likely, we conclude that the proposed project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the species (MANLAA).

Foraging habitat

The guidelines describe the features of foraging habitat. Data informing the home range size of the Florida bonneted bats is limited. Global Positioning System (GPS) and radio-telemetry data for Florida bonneted bats documents that they move large distances and likely have large home ranges. Data from recovered GPS satellite tags on Florida bonneted bats tagged at Babcock-Webb Wildlife Management Area (BWWMA) found the maximum distance detected from a capture site was 24.2 mi (38.9 km); the greatest path length travelled in a single night was 56.3 mi (90.6 km) (Ober 2016; Webb 2018a-b). At BWWMA, researchers found that most individual locations were within one mile of the roost (point of capture) (Ober 2015). Additional data collected during the month of December documented the mean maximum distance Florida bonneted bats (n=8) with tags traveled from the roost was 9.5 mi (Webb 2018b).

The Service recognizes that the movement information comes from only one site (BWWMA and vicinity), and data are from small numbers (n=20) of tagged individuals for only short periods of time (Webb 2018a-b). We expect that across the Florida bonneted bat’s range differences in
habitat quality, prey availability, and other factors will result in variable habitat use and home range sizes between locations. Foraging distances and home range sizes in high quality habitats are expected to be smaller while foraging distances and home range sizes in low quality habitats would be expected to be larger. Regardless, we use these studies as our best available information to evaluate when changes to foraging habitat may have an effect on the species ability to feed, breed, and shelter and subsequently result in incidental take. When considering where most of the nightly activity was observed, we calculate a foraging area centered on a roost with a 1 mile radius would include approximately 2,000 acres, and a foraging area centered on a 9.5 mile radius would encompass approximately 181,000 acres, on any given night.

Given the Service’s limited understanding of how the Florida bonneted bat moves throughout its home range and selects foraging areas, we choose to use 50 acres of habitat as a conservative estimate to when loss of foraging habitat may affect the fitness of an individual to the extent that it would impair feeding and breeding. Projects that would remove, destroy or convert less than 50 acres of Florida bonneted bat foraging habitat are expected to result in a loss of foraging opportunities; however, this decrease is not expected to significantly impair the ability of the individual to feed and breed. Consequently, projects impacting less than 50 acres of foraging habitat that implement the identified best management practices in the Key would be expected to avoid take, and the appropriate determination is that the project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the species (MANLAA).

Next, the Service incorporated the level of bat activity into our Key to evaluate when a foraging area may have greater value to the species. When surveys document high bat activity, we deduce that this area has increased value and importance to the species. Thus, when high bat activity is detected in parcels with greater than 50 acres of foraging habitat, we anticipate that the loss, destruction, or conversion of this habitat could significantly impair the ability of an individual to feed and breed (i.e., LAA); thus formal consultation is warranted.

If surveys do not indicate high bat activity, we anticipate that loss of this additional foraging habitat may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the species (MANLAA). This is because although the acreage is large, the area does not appear to be important at the landscape scale of nightly foraging. Therefore, its loss is not anticipated to significantly impair the ability of an individual to feed or breed.

The exception to this approach is for projects greater than 50 acres when they occur in potential roosting habitat that is not found to support roosting or high bat activity. Under this scenario, the Service concludes that the loss of the large acreage of suitable roosting habitat has the potential to significantly impair the ability of an individual to breed or shelter (i.e., LAA) because the species is cavities for roosting are expected to be limited range wide and the project will impair these limited opportunities for roosting.

Determinations

The Corps (or other Federal action agency) may reach one of several determinations when using this Key. Regardless of the determination, when acoustic bat surveys have been conducted, the Service requests that these survey results are provided to our office to increase our knowledge of
the species and improve our consultation process. Surveys results and reports should be transmitted to the Service at FBBsurveyreport@fws.gov or mail electronic file to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Attention Florida bonneted bat surveys, 1339 20th Street, Vero Beach, Florida 32960. When formal consultation is requested, survey results and reports should be submitted with the consultation request to verobeach@fws.gov.

No effect: If the use of the Key results in a determination of “no effect,” no further consultation is necessary with the Service. The Service recommends that the Corps (or other Federal action agency) documents the pathway used to reach the determination in the project record and proceeds with other species analyses as warranted.

May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect (MANLAA): In this Key we have identified two ways that consultation can conclude informally, MANLAA-P and MANLAA-C.

**MANLAA-P:** If the use of the Key results in a determination of “MANLAA-P,” the Service concurs with this determination based on the rationale provide above, and no further consultation is necessary for the effects of the proposed action on the Florida bonneted bat. The Service recommends that the Corps (or other Federal action agency) documents the pathway used to reach the determination in the project record and proceeds with other species analyses as warranted.

**MANLAA-C:** If the use of the Key results in a determination of MANLAA-C, further consultation with the Service is required to confirm that the Key has been used properly, and the Service concurs with the evaluation of the survey results. Survey results should be submitted with the consultation request.

May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect (LAA) - When the determination in the Key is “LAA” technical assistance with the Service and modifications to the proposed action may enable the project to be reevaluated and conclude with a MANLAA-C determination. Under other circumstance, “LAA” determinations will require formal consultation.

Working with the Fish and Wildlife Foundation of Florida, the Service has established a fund to support conservation and recovery for the Florida bonneted bat. Any project that has the potential to affect the Florida bonneted bat and/or its habitat is encouraged to make a voluntary contribution to this fund. If you would like additional information about how to make a contribution and how these monies are used to support Florida bonneted bat recovery please contact Ashleigh Blackford, Connie Cassler, or José Rivera at 772-562-3909.

This revised Key is effective immediately upon receipt by the Corps. Should circumstances change or new information become available regarding the Florida bonneted bat and/or implementation of the Key, the determinations herein may be reconsidered and this Key further revised or amended. We have established an email address to collect comments on the Key and the survey protocols at: FBBguidelines@fws.gov.
Thank you for your continued cooperation in the effort to conserve fish and wildlife resources. If you have any questions regarding this Key, please contact the South Florida Ecological Services Office at 772-562-3909.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Roxanna Hinzman
Field Supervisor
South Florida Ecological Services

Enclosure

Cc: electronic only
Corps, Jacksonville, Florida (Dale Beter, Muriel Blaisdell, Ingrid Gilbert, Alisa Zarbo, Melinda Charles-Hogan, Susan Kaynor, Krista Sabin, John Fellows)
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The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s South Florida Ecological Services Field Office (Service) developed the Florida Bonneted Bat Consultation Guidelines (Guidelines) to assist in avoiding and minimizing potential negative effects to roosting and foraging habitat, and assessing effects to the Florida bonneted bat (*Eumops floridanus*) from proposed projects. The Consultation Key within the Guidelines assists applicants in evaluating their proposed projects and identifying the appropriate consultation paths under sections 7 and 10 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Act), as amended (87 Stat. 884; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). These Guidelines are primarily for use in evaluating regulatory projects where development and land conversions are anticipated. These Guidelines focus on conserving roosting structures in natural and semi-natural environments. The following Consultation Area map (Figure 1 and Figure 2, Appendix A), Consultation Flowchart (Figure 3), Consultation Key, Survey Framework (Appendices B-C), and Best Management Practices (BMPs) (Appendix D) are based upon the best available scientific information. As more information is obtained, these Guidelines will be revised as appropriate. If you have comments, or suggestions on these Guidelines or the Survey Protocols (Appendix B and C), please email your comments to FBBguidelines@fws.gov. These comments will be reviewed and incorporated in an annual review.

Wherever possible, proposed development projects within the Consultation Area should be designed to avoid and minimize take of Florida bonneted bats and to retain their habitat. Applicants are encouraged to enter into early technical assistance/consultation with the Service so we may provide recommendations for avoiding and minimizing adverse effects. Although these Guidelines focus on the effects of a proposed action (*e.g.*, development) on natural habitat, (*i.e.*, non-urban), Appendix E also provides Best Management Practices for Land Management Projects.

If you are renovating an existing artificial structure (*e.g.*, building) within the urban environment with or without additional ground disturbing activities, these Guidelines do not apply. The Service is developing separate guidelines for consultation in these situations. Until the urban guidelines are complete, please contact the Service for additional guidance.

The final listing rule for the Florida bonneted bat (Service 2013) describes threats identified for the species. Habitat loss and degradation, as well as habitat modification, have historically affected the species. Florida bonneted bats are different from most other Florida bat species because they are reproductively active through most of the year, and their large size makes them capable of foraging long distances from their roost (Ober *et al.* 2016). Consequently, this species is vulnerable to disturbances around the roost during a greater portion of the year and considerations about foraging habitat extend further than the localized roost.
**Use of Consultation Area, Flowchart, and Key**

Figure 1 shows the Consultation Area for the Florida bonneted bat where this consultation guidance applies. For information on how the Consultation Area was delineated see Appendix A. The Consultation Flowchart (Figure 3) and Consultation Key direct project proponents through a series of couplets that will provide a conclusion or determination for potential effects to the Florida bonneted bat. Please Note: If additional listed species, or candidate or proposed species, or designated or proposed critical habitat may be affected, a separate evaluation will be needed for these species/critical habitats.

Currently, the Consultation Flowchart (Figure 3) and Consultation Key cannot be used for actions proposed within the urban development boundary in Miami-Dade and Broward County. The urban development boundary is part of the Consultation Area, but it is excluded from these Guidelines because Florida bonneted bats use this area differently (roosting largely in artificial structures), and small natural foraging areas are expected to be important. Applicants with projects in this area should contact the Service for further guidance and individual consultation.

Determinations may be either “no effect,” “may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect” (MANLAA), or “may affect, and is likely to adversely affect” (LAA). An applicant’s willingness and ability to alter project designs could sufficiently minimize effects to Florida bonneted bats and allow for a MANLAA determination for this species (informal consultation). The Service is available for early technical assistance/consultation to offer recommendations to assist in project design that will minimize effects. When take cannot be avoided, applicants and action agencies are encouraged to incorporate compensation to offset adverse effects. The Service can assist with identifying compensation options (e.g., conservation on site, conservation off-site, contributions to the Service’s Florida bonneted bat conservation fund, etc.).

**Using the Key and Consultation Flowchart**

- “No effect” determinations do not need Service concurrence.
- “May affect, but is not likely to adversely affect” MANLAA. Applicants will be expected to incorporate the appropriate BMPs to reach a MANLAA determination.
  - MANLAA-P (in blue in Consultation Flowchart) have programmatic concurrence through the transmittal letter of these Guidelines, and therefore no further consultation with the Service is necessary unless assistance is needed in interpreting survey results.
  - MANLAA-C (in black in Consultation Flowchart) determinations require further consultation with the Service.
- “May affect, and is likely to adversely affect” (LAA) determinations require consultation with the Service. Project modifications could change the LAA determinations in numbers 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 17 to MANLAA. When take cannot be avoided, LAA determinations will require a biological opinion.
- The Service requests copies of surveys used to support all determinations. If a survey is required by the Consultation Key and the final determination is “no effect” or “MANLAA-P”, send the survey to FBBsurveyreport@fws.gov, or mail electronic file to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Attention Florida bonneted bat surveys, 1339 20th Street, Vero Beach, Florida 32960. If a survey is required by the Consultation Key and the determination is “MANLAA-C” or “LAA”, submit the survey in the consultation request.
For the purpose of making a decision at Couplet 2: If any potential roosting structure is present, then the habitat is classified as potential roosting habitat, and the left half of the flowchart should be followed (see Figure 3). We recognize that roosting habitat may also be used by Florida bonneted bats for foraging. If the project site only consists of foraging habitat (i.e., no suitable roosting structures), then the right side of the flowchart should be followed beginning at step 13.

For couplets 11 and 12: Potential roosting habitat is considered Florida bonneted bat foraging habitat when a determination is made that roosting is not likely.
Figure 1. Florida Bonneted Bat Consultation Area. Hatched area (Figure 2) identifies the urban development boundary in Miami-Dade and Broward County. Applicants with projects in this area should contact the Service for specific guidance addressing this area and individual consultation. The Consultation Key should not be used for projects in this area.
Figure 2. Urban development boundary in Miami-Dade and Broward County. The Consultation Key should not be used for projects in this area. Applicants with projects in this South Florida Urban Bat Area should contact the Service for specific guidance addressing this area and individual consultation.
Florida Bonneted Bat Consultation Key#

Use the following key to evaluate potential effects to the Florida bonneted bat (FBB) from the proposed project. Refer to the Glossary as needed.

1a. Proposed project or land use change is partially or wholly within the Consultation Area (Figure 1)..................Go to 2
1b. Proposed project or land use change is wholly outside of the Consultation Area (Figure 1)...............................No Effect

2a. Potential FBB roosting habitat exists within the project area...............................................................Go to 3
2b. No potential FBB roosting habitat exists within the project area..............................................................Go to 13

3a. Project size/footprint* ≤ 5 acres (2 hectares)..........................Conduct Limited Roost Survey (Appendix C) then Go to 4
3b. Project size/footprint* > 5 acres (2 hectares)..................Conduct Full Acoustic/Roost Surveys (Appendix B) then Go to 6

4a. Results show FBB roosting is likely ...........................................................................................................Go to 5
4b. Results do not show FBB roosting is likely..............................................................................................Go to 5

5a. Project will affect roosting habitat......................................................LAA+ Further consultation with the Service required.
5b. Project will not affect roosting habitat......................................................MANLAA-C with required BMPs (Appendix D). Further consultation with the Service required.

6a. Results show some FBB activity..........................................................Go to 7
6b. Results show no FBB activity.................................................................No Effect

7a. Results show FBB roosting is likely..............................................................Go to 8
7b. Results do not show FBB roosting is likely..............................................................Go to 8

8a. Project will not affect roosting habitat..............................................................Go to 9
8b. Project will affect roosting habitat..............................................................LAA+ Further consultation with the Service required.

9a. Project will affect* > 50 acres (20 hectares) (wetlands and uplands) of foraging habitat.........................LAA+ Further consultation with the Service required.
9b. Project will affect* ≤ 50 acres (20 hectares) (wetlands and uplands) of foraging habitat.........................MANLAA-C with required BMPs (Appendix D). Further consultation with the Service required.

10a. Results show high FBB activity/use........................................................................................................Go to 11
10b. Results do not show high FBB activity/use.........................................................................................Go to 11

11a. Project will affect* > 50 acres (20 hectares) (wetlands and uplands) of FBB habitat (roosting and/or foraging).......................LAA+ Further consultation with the Service required.
11b. Project will affect* ≤ 50 acres (20 hectares) (wetlands and uplands) of FBB habitat (roosting and/or foraging).......................MANLAA-C with required BMPs (Appendix D). Further consultation with the Service required.

12a. Project will affect* > 50 acres (20 hectares) (wetlands and uplands) of FBB habitat.......................LAA+ Further consultation with the Service required.
12b. Project will affect* ≤ 50 acres (20 hectares) (wetlands and uplands) of FBB habitat.......................MANLAA-P if BMPs (Appendix D) used and survey reports are submitted. Programmatic concurrence.
13a. FBB foraging habitat exists within the project area and foraging habitat will be affected. ................................................................. Go to 14
13b. FBB foraging habitat exists within the project area and foraging habitat will not be affected OR no FBB foraging habitat exists within the project area ................................................................................. No Effect

14a. Project size* > 50 acres (20 hectares) (wetlands and uplands) ................................................................. Go to 15
14b. Project size* ≤ 50 acres (20 hectares) (wetlands and uplands) ................................ MANLAA-P if BMPs (Appendix D) used. Programmatic concurrence.

15a. Project is within 8 miles (12.9 kilometers) of high quality potential roosting areas^ .................. Conduct Full Acoustic Survey (Appendix B) and Go to 16
15b. Project is not within 8 miles (12.9 kilometers) of high quality potential roosting area^ .................. MANLAA-P if BMPs (Appendix D) used. Programmatic concurrence.

16a. Results show some FBB activity ......................................................................................................................... Go to 17
16b. Results show no FBB activity ........................................................................................................................... No Effect

17a. Results show high FBB activity/use .................................................................................................................. LAA+ Further consultation with the Service required.
17b. Results do not show high FBB activity/use ..................................................................................................... MANLAA-P if BMPs (Appendix D) used and survey reports submitted. Programmatic concurrence.

* If you are within the urban environment and you are renovating an existing artificial structure (with or without additional ground disturbing activities), these Guidelines do not apply. The Service is developing separate guidelines for consultation in these situations. Until the urban guidelines are complete, please contact the Service for additional guidance
*Includes wetlands and uplands that are going to be altered along with a 250- foot (76.2- meter) buffer around these areas if the parcel is larger than the altered area.
+Project modifications could change the LAA determinations in numbers 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 17 to MANLAA determinations.
^Determining if high quality potential roosting areas are within 8 mi (12.9 km) of a project is intended to be a desk-top exercise looking at most recent aerial imagery, not a field exercise.
Figure 3. Florida bonneted bat Consultation Flowchart. “No effect” determinations do not need Service concurrence. “May affect, but not likely to adversely affect”, MANLAA-P, in blue have programmatic concurrence through the transmittal letter of these Guidelines, and therefore no further consultation with the Service is necessary unless assistance is needed in interpreting survey results. MANLAA-C determinations in black require further consultation with the Service. Applicants are expected to incorporate the appropriate BMPs to reach a MANLAA determination. “May affect, and is likely to adversely affect”, LAA, (also in black) determinations require consultation with the Service. Further consultation with the Service may identify project modifications that could change the LAA determinations in numbers 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 17 to MANLAA determinations. The Service requests Florida bonneted bat survey reports for all determinations.
GLOSSARY

**BMPs** – Best Management Practices. Recommendations for actions to conserve roosting and foraging habitat to be implemented before, during, and after proposed development, land use changes, and land management activities.

**FBB Activity** – Florida bonneted bat (FBB) activity is when any Florida bonneted bat calls are recorded during an acoustic survey or human observers see or hear Florida bonneted bats on a site.

**FORAGING HABITAT** - Comprised of relatively open (i.e., uncluttered or reduced numbers of obstacles, such as fewer tree branches and leaves, in the flight environment) areas to find and catch prey, and sources of drinking water. In order to find and catch prey, Florida bonneted bats forage in areas with a reduced number of obstacles. This includes: open fresh water, permanent or seasonal freshwater wetlands, within and above wetland and upland forests, wetland and upland shrub, and agricultural lands (Bailey et al. 2017). In urban and residential areas drinking water, prey base, and suitable foraging can be found at golf courses, parking lots, and parks in addition to relatively small patches of natural habitat.

**FULL ACOUSTIC/ROOST SURVEY** - This is a comprehensive survey that will involve systematic acoustic surveys (i.e., surveys conducted 30 minutes prior to sunset to 30 minutes after sunrise, over multiple consecutive nights). Depending upon acoustic results and habitat type, targeted roost searches through thorough visual inspection using a tree-top camera system or observations at emergence (e.g., looking and listening for bats to come out of tree cavities around sunset) or more acoustic surveys may be necessary. See Appendix B for a full description.

**HIGH FBB ACTIVITY/USE** - High Florida bonneted bat (FBB) activity/use or importance of an area can be defined using several parameters (e.g., types of calls, numbers of calls). An area will be considered to have high FBB activity/use if ANY of the following are found: (a) multiple FBB feeding buzzes are detected; (b) FBB social calls are recorded; (c) large numbers of Florida bonneted bat calls (9 or more) are recorded throughout one night. Each of these parameters is considered to indicate that an area is actively used and important to FBBs, however, the Service will further evaluate the activity/use of the area within the context of the site (i.e., spatial distribution of calls, site acreage, habitat on site, as well as adjacent habitat) and provide additional guidance.

**HIGH QUALITY POTENTIAL ROOSTING AREAS** - Sizable areas (>50 acres) [20 hectares] that contain large amounts of high-quality, natural roosting structure – (e.g., predominantly native, mature trees; especially pine flatwoods or other areas with a large number of cavity trees, tree hollows, or high woodpecker activity).

**LAA** - May Affect, and is Likely to Adversely Affect. The appropriate conclusion if any adverse effect to listed species may occur as a direct or indirect result of the proposed action or its interrelated or interdependent actions, and the effect is not: discountable, insignificant, or
beneficial [see definition of “may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect” (MANLAA)]. In the event the overall effect of the proposed action is beneficial to the listed species, but also is likely to cause some adverse effects, then the proposed action is “likely to adversely affect” the listed species. If incidental take is anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed action, an “is likely to adversely affect” (LAA) determination should be made. An “is likely to adversely affect” determination requires the initiation of formal section 7 consultation.

**LIMITED ROOST SURVEY** - This is a reduced survey that may include the following methods: acoustics, observations at emergence (e.g., looking and listening for bats to come out of tree cavities around sunset), and visual inspection of trees with cavities or loose bark using tree-top cameras (or combination of these methods). Methods are fairly flexible and dependent upon composition and configuration of project site and willingness and ability of applicant and partners to conserve roosting structures on site. See also Appendix C for a full description.

**MANLAA** - May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect. The appropriate conclusion when effects on listed species are expected to be discountable, insignificant, or completely beneficial. Beneficial effects are contemporaneous positive effects without any adverse effects to the species. Insignificant effects relate to the size of the impact and should never reach the scale where take occurs. Discountable effects are those extremely unlikely to occur. Based on best judgment, a person would not: (1) be able to meaningfully measure, detect, or evaluate insignificant effects; or (2) expect discountable effects to occur. To use these Guidelines and Consultation Key applicants must incorporate the appropriate BMPs (Appendix D) to reach a MANLAA determination.

In this Consultation Key we have identified two ways that consultation can conclude informally, MANLAA-P and MANLAA-C:

**MANLAA-P**: programmatic concurrence is provided through the transmittal letter of these Guidelines, no additional consultation is required with the Service for Florida bonneted bats. All survey results must be submitted to Service.

**MANLAA-C**: further consultation with the Service is required to confirm that the Consultation Key has been used properly, and the Service concurs with the evaluation of the survey results. Request for consultation must include survey results.

**NO EFFECT** - The appropriate conclusion when the action agency determines its proposed action will not affect listed species or designated critical habitat.

**POTENTIAL ROOSTING HABITAT** - Includes forest and other areas with tall, mature trees or other areas with suitable roost structures (e.g., utility poles, artificial structures). Forest is defined as all types including: pine flatwoods, scrubby flatwoods, pine rocklands, royal palm hammocks, mixed or hardwood hammocks, cypress, sand pine scrub, or other forest types. (Forrest types currently include exotic forests such as melaleuca, please contact the Service for additional guidance as needed). More specifically, this includes habitat in which suitable structural features for breeding and sheltering are present. In general, roosting habitat contains one or more of the following structures: tree snags, and trees with cavities, hollows, deformities, decay, crevices, or loose bark. Structural characteristics are of primary importance.
Florida bonneted bats have been found roosting in habitat with the following structural features, but may also occur outside of these parameters:

- trees greater than 33 feet (10 meters) in height, greater than 8 inches (20 centimeters) in diameter at breast height (DBH), with cavity elevations higher than 16 feet (5 meters) above ground level (Braun de Torrez 2019);
- areas with a high incidence of large or mature live trees with various deformities (e.g., large cavities, hollows, broken tops, loose bark, and other evidence of decay) (e.g., pine flatwoods);
- rock crevices (e.g., limestone in Miami-Dade County); and/or
- artificial structures, mimicking natural roosting conditions (e.g., bat houses, utility poles, buildings), situated in natural or semi-natural habitats.

In order for a building to be considered a roosting structure, it should be a minimum of 15 feet high and contain one or more of the following features: chimneys, gaps in soffits, gaps along gutters, or other structural gaps or crevices (outward entrance approximately 1 inch (2.5 centimeters) in size or greater. Structures similar to the above (e.g., bridges, culverts, minimum of 15 feet high) are expected to also provide roosting habitat, based upon the species’ morphology and behavior (Keeley and Tuttle 1999). Florida bonneted bat roosts will be situated in areas with sufficient open space for these bats to fly (e.g., open or semi-open canopy, canopy gaps, above the canopy, and edges which provide relatively uncluttered conditions [i.e., reduced numbers of obstacles, such as fewer tree branches and leaves, in the flight environment]).

For the purpose of this Consultation Key: Roosting habitat refers to habitat with structures that can be used for daytime and maternity roosting. Roosting at night between periods of foraging can occur in a broader range of structure types. For the purposes of this guidance we are focusing on day roosting habitat.

ROOSTING IS LIKELY—Determining likelihood of roosting is challenging. The Service has provided the following definition for the express purpose of these Guidelines. Researchers use additional cues to assist in locating roosts. As additional indicators are identified and described we expect our Guidelines will be improved.

In this Consultation Key the Service will consider the following evidence indicative that roosting is likely nearby (i.e., reasonably certain to occur) if ANY of the following are documented: (a) Florida bonneted bat calls are recorded within 30 minutes before sunset to 1½ hours following sunset or within 1½ hours before sunrise; (b) emergence calls are recorded; (c) human observers see (or hear) Florida bonneted bats flying from or to potential roosts; (d) human observers see and identify Florida bonneted bats within a natural roost or artificial roost; and/or (e) other bat sign (e.g., guano, staining, etc.) is found that is identified to be Florida bonneted bat through additional follow-up.

In addition to the aforementioned events, researchers consider roosting likely in an area when (1) large numbers of Florida bonneted bat calls are recorded throughout the night (e.g., ≥ 25 files per night at a single acoustic station when 5 second file lengths are recorded); (2) large numbers of FBB calls are recorded over multiple nights (e.g., an average of ≥ 20 files per night from a single detector when 5 second file lengths are recorded); or (3) social calls are recorded. Because social calls and large numbers of calls recorded over one or more nights can be indicative of high
FBB activity/use or when roosting is likely, the Service is choosing not to use these as indicators to make the determination that roosting is likely. Instead we are relying on the indicators that are only expected to occur at or very close to a roost location [(a)-(e) above].

**TAKE** - to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect or attempt to engage in any such conduct. [ESA §3(19)] Harm is further defined by the Service to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing behavioral patterns such as breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Harass is defined by the Service as actions that create the likelihood of injury to listed species to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding or sheltering. [50 CFR §17.3].
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Appendix A. Delineation and Justification for Consultation Area

The Consultation Area (Figure 1) represents the general range of the species. The Consultation Area represents the area within which consideration should be given to potential effects to Florida bonneted bats from proposed projects or actions. Coordination and consultation with the Service helps to determine whether proposed actions and activities may affect listed species. This Consultation Area defines the area where proposed actions and activities may affect the Florida bonneted bat.

This area was delineated using confirmed presence data, key habitat features, reasonable flight distances and home range sizes. Where data were lacking, we used available occupancy models that predict probability of occurrence (Bailey et al. 2017). Below we describe how each one of these data sources was used to determine the overall Consultation Area.

**Presence data:** Presence data included locations for: (1) confirmed Florida bonneted bat acoustic detections; (2) known roost sites (occupied or formerly occupied; includes natural roosts, bat houses, and utility poles); (3) live Florida bonneted bats observed or found injured; (4) live Florida bonneted bats captured during research activities; and (5) Florida bonneted bats reported as dead. The Geographic Information Systems (GIS) dataset incorporates information from January 2003 to May 2019.

The vast majority of the presence data came from acoustic surveys. The species’ audible, low frequency, distinct, echolocation calls are conducive for acoustic surveys. However, there are limitations in the range of detection from ultrasonic devices, and the fast, high-flying habits of this species can confound this. Overall, detection probabilities for Florida bonneted bats are generally considered to be low. For example, in one study designed to investigate the distribution and environmental associations of Florida bonneted bat, Bailey et al. 2017 found overall nightly detection probability was 0.29. Based on the estimated detection probabilities in that study, it would take 9 survey nights (1 detector per night) to determine with 95% certainty whether Florida bonneted bat are present at a sampling point. Positive acoustic detection data are extremely valuable. However, it is important to recognize that there are issues with false negatives due to limitations of equipment, low detection probabilities, difference in detection due to prey availability and seasonal movement over the landscape, and in some circumstances improperly conducted surveys (i.e., short duration or in unsuitable weather conditions).

**Key habitat features:** We considered important physical and biological features with a focus on potential roosting habitat and applied key concepts of bat conservation (i.e., need to conserve roosting habitat, foraging habitat, and prey base). To date, all known natural Florida bonneted bat roosts (n=19 have been found in live trees and snags of the following types: slash pine, longleaf pine, royal palm, and cypress (Braun de Torrez 2018). Several of the recent roost discoveries are located in fire-maintained vegetation communities, and it appears that Florida bonneted bats are fire-adapted and can benefit from prescribed burn regimes that closely mimic historical fire patterns (Ober et al. 2018).

From a landscape and roosting perspective, we consider key habitat features to include forested areas and other areas with mature trees, wetlands, areas used by red-cockaded woodpeckers
(Picoides borealis; RCW), and fire-managed and other conservation areas. However, recent work suggests that Florida bonneted bats do not use pinelands more than other land cover types (Bailey et al. 2017). In fact, Bailey et al. 2017 detected Florida bonneted bats in all land cover types investigated in their study (e.g., agricultural, developed, upland, and wetland). For the purposes of these consultation guidelines, we are focusing on the conservation of potential roosting habitats across the species’ range. However, we also recognize the need for comprehensive consideration of foraging habitats, habitat connectivity, and long-term suitability.

Flight distances and home range sizes: Like most bats, Florida bonneted bats are colonial central-place foragers that exploit distant and scattered resources (Rainho and Palmeirim 2011). Morphological characteristics (narrow wings, high wing-aspect ratio) make Eumops spp. well-adapted for efficient, low-cost, swift, and prolonged flight in open areas (Findley et al. 1972, Norberg and Rayner 1987). Other Eumops including Underwood’s mastiff bat (Eumops underwoodi), and Greater mastiff bat or Western mastiff bat (Eumops perotis) are known to forage and/or travel distances ranging from 6.2 miles to 62 miles from the roost with multiple studies documenting flight distances approximately 15-18 miles from the roost (Tibbitts et al 2002, Vaugh 1959 as cited in Best et al. 1996, Siders et al. 1999, Siders 2005, Vaughan 1959 as cited in Siders 2005.)

Like other Eumops, Florida bonneted bats are strong fliers, capable of travelling long distances (Belwood 1992). Recent Global Positioning System (GPS) and radio-telemetry data for Florida bonneted bats documents that they also move large distances and likely have large home ranges. Data from recovered GPS satellite tags on Florida bonneted bats tagged at Babcock-Webb Wildlife Management Area (WMA), found the maximum distance detected from a capture site was 24.2 mi (38.9 km); the greatest path length travelled in a single night was 56.3 mi (90.6 km) (Ober 2016; Webb 2018a-b). Additional data collected during the month of December documented the mean maximum distance of Florida bonneted bats (n=8) with tags traveled from the roost was 9.5 mi (Webb 2018b). The Service recognizes that the movement information comes from only one site (Babcock-Webb WMA and vicinity), and data are from small numbers (n=20) of tagged individuals for only short periods of time (Webb 2018a-b). We expect that across the Florida bonneted bat’s range differences in habitat quality, prey availability, and other factors will result in variable habitat use and home range sizes between locations. Foraging distances and home range sizes in high quality habitats are expected to be smaller while foraging distances and home range sizes in low quality habitat would be expected to be larger. Consequently, because Babcock-Webb WMA provides high quality roosting habitat, this movement data could represent the low end of individual flight distances from a roost.

Given the species’ morphology and habits (e.g., central-place forager) and considering available movement data from other Eumops and Florida bonneted bats discussed above, we opted to use 15 miles (24 km) as a reasonable estimate of the distance Florida bonneted bats would be expected to travel from a roost on any given night. For the purposes of delineating a majority of the Consultation Area, we used available confirmed presence point location data and extended out 15 miles (24 km), with modifications for habitat features (as described above). As more movement data are obtained and made available, this distance estimate may change in the future.

Occupancy model – Research by Bailey et al. (2017) indicates the species’ range is larger than previously known. Their model performed well across a large portion of the previously known
range when considering confirmed Florid bonneted bat locations; thus it is anticipated to be useful where limited information is available for the species.

We used the model output from Bailey et al. (2017) to more closely examine areas where we are data-deficient (i.e., areas where survey information is particularly lacking). We considered 0.27 probability of occurrence a filter for high likelihood of occurrence because 0.27 was the model output for Babcock-Webb WMA, an area where Florida bonneted bats are known to occupy and heavily use. Large portions of Sarasota, Martin, and Palm Beach counties were identified as having probability of occurrence of 0.27. The consultation area should include areas where the species has a high likelihood of occurring. Based on this reasoned approach, all of Sarasota County, portions of Martin County, and greater parts of Palm Beach County were included in the Consultation Area.

We recognize that there are areas in the northern portion of the range where the model is less successful predicting occurrence based on the known Florida bonneted bat locations (i.e., the model predicts low likelihood of occurrence on Avon Park Air Force range, where the species is known to roost). Consequently, the Service is proactively working with partners to conduct surveys in the areas added based on the model to confirm that inclusion of these portions of the aforementioned counties is appropriate. The Consultation Area may be adjusted based on changes in this information.
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Appendix B: Full Acoustic / Roost Survey Framework

**Purpose:** The purpose of this survey is to: (1) determine if Florida bonneted bats are likely to be actively roosting or using the site; (2) locate active roost(s) and avoid the loss of the structure, if possible; and, (3) avoid or minimize the take of individuals. In some cases, changes in project designs or activities can help avoid and minimize take. For example, project proponents may be able to retain suspected roosts or conserve roosting and foraging habitats. Changing the timing or nature of activities can also help reduce the losses of non-volant young or effects to pregnant or lactating females. If properly conducted, acoustic surveys are the most effective way to determine presence and assess habitat use. If the applicant is unable to follow or does not want to follow the Full Acoustic/Roost Survey framework when recommended according to the Key, the Corps (or other Action Agency) will not be able to use these Guidelines and will need to provide a biologically supported rational using the best available information for their determination in their request for consultation.

**General Description:** This is a comprehensive survey effort, and robust acoustic surveys (i.e., surveys conducted 30 minutes prior to sunset to 30 minutes after sunrise, over multiple nights) are a fundamental component of the approach. Depending upon acoustic results and habitat type, it may also include: observations at emergence (e.g., emergence surveys during which observers look and listen for bats to come out of roost structures around sunset), visual inspection of trees/snags (i.e., those with cavities, hollows, and loose bark) and other roost structures with tree-top cameras, or follow-up targeted acoustic surveys. Methods are dependent upon composition and configuration of project site and willingness and ability of applicant and partners to conserve roosting and foraging habitats on site.

**General Survey Protocol:**

[Note: The Service will provide more information in separate detailed survey protocols in the near future. This will include specific information on: detector types, placement, orientation, verification of proper functioning, analysis, reporting requirements, etc.]

- Approach is intended for project sites > 5 acres (2 hectares).
- For sites containing roosting habitat, acoustic surveys should primarily focus on assessing roosting habitat within the project site that will be lost or modified (i.e., areas that will not be conserved), and locations on the property within 250 feet (76.2 meters) of areas that will not be conserved. This will help avoid or minimize the loss of an active roost and individuals. Secondly, since part of the purpose is to determine if Florida bonneted bats are using the site, acoustic devices should also be placed near open water and wetlands to maximize chances of detection and aid in assessing foraging habitat that may be lost.
- For sites that do not contain ANY roosting habitat, but do contain foraging habitat (see Figure 3 - Consultation Flowchart and Key, Step 2 [no], Step 13 [yes]), efforts should focus on assessing foraging habitat within the project site that will be lost or modified (i.e., areas that will not be conserved).
- Acoustic surveys should be performed by those who are trained and experienced in setting up, operating, and maintaining acoustic equipment; and retrieving, saving,
analyzing, and interpreting data. Surveyors should have completed one or more of the available bat acoustic courses/workshops, or be able to show similar on-the-job or academic experience (Service 2018).

- Due to the variation in the quality of recordings, the influence of clutter, the changing performances of software packages over time, and other factors, manual verification is recommended (Loeb et al. 2015). Files that are identified to species from auto-ID programs must be visually reviewed and manually verified by experienced personnel.
- Acoustic devices should be set up to record from 30 minutes prior to sunset to 30 minutes after sunrise for multiple nights, under suitable weather conditions.
- Acoustic surveys can be conducted any time of year as long as weather conditions meet the criteria. If any of the following weather conditions exist at a survey site during acoustic sampling, note the time and duration of such conditions, and repeat the acoustic sampling effort for that night: (a) temperatures fall below 65°F (18.3°C) during the first 5 hours of survey period; (b) precipitation, including rain and/or fog, that exceeds 30 minutes or continues intermittently during the first 5 hours of the survey period; and (c) sustained wind speeds greater than 9 miles/hour (4 meters/second; 3 on Beaufort scale) for 30 minutes or more during the first 5 hours of the survey period (Service 2018). At a minimum, nightly weather conditions for survey sites should be checked using the nearest NOAA National Weather Service station and summarized in the survey reports. Although not required at this time, it has been demonstrated that conducting surveys on warm nights late in the spring can help maximize detection probabilities (Ober et al. 2016; Bailey et al. 2017).
- Acoustic devices should be calibrated and properly placed. Microphones should be directed away from surrounding vegetation, not beneath tree canopy, away from electrical wires and transmission lines, away from echo-producing surfaces, and away from external noises. Directional microphones should be aimed to sample the majority of the flight path/zone. Omnidirectional microphones should be deployed on a pole in the center of the flight path/zone and oriented horizontally. For monitoring possible roost sites, microphones should be directed to maximize likelihood of detection.
- To standardize recordings, acoustic device recordings should have a 2-second trigger window and a maximum file length of 15 seconds.
- The number of acoustic survey sites and nights needed for the assessment is dependent upon the overall acreage of suitable habitat proposed to be impacted by the action.
  - For non-linear projects, a minimum of 16 detector nights per 20 acres of suitable habitat expected to be impacted is recommended.
  - For linear projects (e.g., roadways, transmission lines), a minimum of five detector nights per 0.6 mi (0.97 km) is recommended. Detectors can be moved to multiple locations within each kilometer surveyed, but must remain in a single location throughout any given night.
  - For any site, and in particular for sites > 250 acres, please contact the Service to assist in designing an appropriate approach.
- If results of acoustic surveys show high Florida bonneted bat activity or Florida bonneted bat roosting likely (e.g., high activity early in the evening) (see definitions in Glossary), follow-up methods such as emergence surveys, visual inspection of the roosting structures, or follow-up acoustic surveys are recommended to locate potential roosts. Using a combination of methods may be helpful.
For bat emergence surveys, multiple observers should be stationed at potential roosts if weather conditions (as above) are suitable. Surveyors should be quietly stationed 30 minutes before sunset so they are ready to look and listen for emerging FBBs from sunset to 1½ hours after sunset. When conducting emergence surveys it is best to orient observers so that the roost is silhouetted in the remaining daylight; facing west can help maximize the ability to notice movement of animals out of a roost structure.

Visual inspection of trees with cavities and loose bark during the day may be helpful. Active RCW trees should not be visually inspected during the RCW breeding season (April 15 through June 15).

Visual inspection alone is not recommended due to the potential for roosts to be too high for cameras to reach, too small for cameras to fit, or shaped in a way that contents are out of view (Braun de Torrez et al. 2016).

If roosting is suspected on site, use tree-top cameras during the day to search those trees/snags or other structures that have potential roost features (i.e., cavities, hollows, crevices, or other structure for permanent shelter). If unsuccessful (e.g., cannot see entire contents within a given cavity, cannot reach cavity, cannot see full extent of cavity) OR occupied roosts are found with the tree-top camera within the area in which high Florida bonneted bat activity/likely Florida bonneted bats roosting were identified, we recommend emergence surveys and/or acoustics to verify occupancy and/or identify bat species.

Provide report showing effort, methods, weather conditions, findings, and summary of acoustic data relating to Florida bonneted bats (e.g., # of calls, time of calls, and station number) organized by the date on which the data were collected. Sonograms of all calls with signatures at or below 20kHz shall be included in the report. The report shall be provided to the Corps project manager assigned to the project for which the survey was conducted and to the Service via the email address verobeach@fws.gov. Raw acoustic data should be provided to the Service for all surveys. Raw acoustic data should be provided as “all raw data” and “all raw data with signatures at or below 20kHz”. Data can be submitted to the Service via flash drive, memory stick, or hard drive. Data can be submitted digitally to verobeach@fws.gov or via mail to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Attn: Florida bonneted bat data manager, 1339 20th Street, Vero Beach, Florida 32960.

Negative surveys are valid for 1 year after completion of the survey.

If you have comments, or suggestions on this survey protocols, please email your comments to FBBguidelines@fws.gov. These comments will be reviewed and incorporated in an annual review.
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Appendix C: Limited Roost Survey Framework

Purpose: The purpose of this survey is to: (1) determine if Florida bonneted bats are likely to be actively roosting within suitable structures on-site; (2) locate active roost(s) and avoid the loss of the structure, if possible; and, (3) avoid or minimize the take of individuals. In some cases, changes in project designs or activities can help avoid and minimize take. For example, applicants and partners may be able to retain the suspected roosts or conserve roosting and foraging habitats. Changing the timing of activities can also help reduce the losses of non-volant young or effects to pregnant or lactating females.

General Description: This is a reduced survey effort that may include the following methods: visual inspection of trees/snags (i.e., those with cavities, hollows, and loose bark) and other roost structures with tree-top cameras, observations at emergence (e.g., emergence surveys during which observers look and listen for bats to come out of roost structures around sunset), acoustic surveys, or a combination of these methods. Methods are fairly flexible and dependent upon composition and configuration of project site and willingness and ability of applicant and partners to conserve roosting habitat on site.

General Survey Protocol:

[Note: The Service will provide more information in separate, detailed survey protocols in the near future. This will include specific information on: detector types, placement, orientation, verification of proper functioning, analysis, reporting requirements, etc.]

- Approach is intended only for small project sites (i.e., sites ≤ 5 acres [2 hectares]).
- Efforts should focus on assessing potential roosting structures within the project site that will be lost or modified (i.e., areas that will not be conserved), or are located on the property within 250 feet (76.2 meters) of areas that will not be conserved.

Identification of potential roost structures

- This step is necessary prior to any of the methods that follow.
- Run line transects through roosting habitat close enough that all trees and snags are easily inspected. Transect spacing will vary with habitat structure and season from a maximum of 91 m (300 ft) between transects in very open pine stands to 46 m (150 ft) or less in areas with dense mid-story. Transects should be oriented north to south, to optimize cavity detectability because many RCW cavity entrances are oriented in a westerly direction (Service 2004).
- Visually inspect all trees and snags or other structures for evidence of cavities, hollows, crevices that can be used for permanent shelter. Using binoculars, examine structures for cavities, loose bark, hollows, or other crevices that are large enough for Florida bonneted bats (diameter of opening > or = to 1 inch (2.5 cm) (Braun de Torrez et al. 2016).
- When potential roosting structures are found, record their location in the field using a Global Positioning System (GPS) unit.

Visual Inspection of trees and snags with tree-top cameras

- Visually inspect all cavities using a video probe (peeper) and assess the cavity contents.
Active RCW trees should not be visually inspected during the RCW breeding season (April 15 through June 15).

- Visual inspection alone is valid only when the entire cavity is observed and the contents can be identified. Typically, acoustics at emergence will also be needed to definitively identify bat species, if bats are present or suspected.
- If bats are suspected, or if contents cannot be determined, or if the entire cavity cannot be observed with the video probe; follow methods for an Acoustic Survey or an Emergence Survey (below). If the Corps (or other action agency) or applicant does not wish to conduct acoustic or emergence surveys, the Corps (or other action agency) cannot use the key and must request formal consultation with the Service.
- Record tree species or type of cavity structure, tree diameter and height, cavity height, cavity orientation and cavity contents.

**Emergence Surveys**

- For bat emergence surveys, multiple observers should be stationed at potential roosts if weather conditions (as described below in Acoustic Surveys) are suitable.
- Surveyors should be quietly stationed 30 minutes prior to sunset so they are ready to look and listen for emerging Florida bonneted bats from sunset to 1½ hours after sunset.
- When conducting emergence surveys it is best to orient observers so that the roost is silhouetted in the remaining daylight; facing west can help maximize the ability to notice movement of animals out of a roost structure.
- Record number of bats that emerged, the time of emergence, and if bat calls were heard.

**Acoustic surveys**

- Acoustic surveys should be performed by those who are trained and experienced in setting up, operating, and maintaining acoustic equipment; and retrieving, saving, analyzing, and interpreting data. Surveyors should have completed one or more of the available bat acoustic courses/workshops, or be able to show similar on-the-job or academic experience (Service 2018).
- Due to the variation in the quality of recordings, the influence of clutter, and the changing performances of software packages over time, and other factors, manual verification is recommended (Loeb et al. 2015). Files that are identified to species from auto-ID programs must be visually reviewed and manually verified by experienced personnel.
- Acoustic devices should be set up to record from 30 minutes prior to sunset to 30 minutes after sunrise for multiple nights, under suitable weather conditions.
- Acoustic surveys can be conducted any time of year as long as weather conditions meet the criteria. If any of the following weather conditions exist at a survey site during acoustic sampling, note the time and duration of such conditions, and repeat the acoustic sampling effort for that night: (a) temperatures fall below 65°F (18.3°C) during the first 5 hours of survey period; (b) precipitation, including rain and/or fog, that exceeds 30 minutes or continues intermittently during the first 5 hours of the survey period; and (c) sustained wind speeds greater than 9 miles/hour (4 meters/second; 3 on Beaufort scale) for 30 minutes or more during the first 5 hours of the survey period (Service 2018). At a minimum, nightly weather conditions for survey sites should be checked using the nearest NOAA National Weather Service station and summarized in the survey reports.

Although not required at this time, it has been demonstrated that conducting surveys on
warm nights late in the spring can help maximize detection probabilities (Ober et al. 2016; Bailey et al. 2017).

- Acoustic devices should be calibrated and properly placed. Microphones should be directed away from surrounding vegetation, not beneath tree canopy, away from electrical wires and transmission lines, away from echo-producing surfaces, and away from external noises. Directional microphones should be aimed to sample the majority of the flight path/zone. Omnidirectional microphones should be deployed on a pole in the center of the flight path/zone and oriented horizontally. For monitoring possible roost sites, microphones should be directed to maximize likelihood of detection.

- To standardize recordings, acoustic device recordings should have a 2-second trigger window and a maximum file length of 15 seconds.

- Acoustic surveys should be conducted over a minimum of four nights.

- If acoustic devices cannot be left in place for the entire night for multiple nights as above, then a combination of short acoustic surveys (from sunset and extending for 1½ hours), stationed observers for emergence surveys or visual inspection of trees/snags with tree-top cameras may be acceptable. Contact the Service for guidance under this circumstance.

### Reporting

- Provide report showing effort, methods, weather conditions, findings, and summary of acoustic data relating to Florida bonneted bat by date (e.g., # of calls, time of calls). Sonograms of all calls with signatures at or below 20kHz shall be included in the report. The report shall be provided to the Corps project manager assigned to the project for which the survey was conducted and to the Service via the email address verobeach@fws.gov. **Raw acoustic data should be provided to the Service for all surveys.** Raw acoustic data should be provided as “all raw data” and “all raw data with signatures at or below 20kHz”. Data can be submitted to the Service via flash drive, memory stick, or hard drive. Data can be submitted digitally to verobeach@fws.gov or via mail to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Attn: Florida bonneted bat data manager, 1339 20th Street, Vero Beach, Florida 32960.

- Negative surveys are valid for 1 year after completion of the survey

If you have comments, or suggestions on this survey protocols, please email your comments to FBBguidelines@fws.gov. These comments will be reviewed and incorporated in an annual review.
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Appendix D: Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Development Projects

Ongoing research and monitoring will continue to increase the understanding of the Florida bonneted bat and its habitat needs and will continue to inform habitat and species management recommendations. These BMPs incorporate what is known about the species and also include recommendations that are beneficial to all bat species in Florida. These BMPs are intended to provide recommendations for improving conditions for use by Florida bonneted bats, and to help conserve Florida bonneted bats that may be foraging or roosting in an area.

The BMPs required to reach a “may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect” (MANLAA) determination vary depending on the couplet from the Consultation Key used to reach that particular MANLAA. The requirements for each couplet are provided below followed by the list of BMPs. If the applicant is unable or does not want to do the required BMPs, then the Corps (or other Action Agency) will not be able to use this Guidance and formal consultation with the Service is required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Couplet Number for MANLAA from Consultation Key</th>
<th>Required BMPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>BMP number 1 if more than 3 months has occurred between the survey and start of the project, and any 3 BMPs out of BMPs 4 through 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>BMP number 2, and any 3 BMPs out of BMPs 3 through 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>BMPs number 2 and 3, and any 4 BMPs out of BMPs 5 through 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11b</td>
<td>BMPs number 1 and 4, and any 4 BMPs out of BMPs 5 through 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b</td>
<td>BMP number 1, and any 3 BMPs out of BMPs 3 through 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b</td>
<td>Any 2 BMPs out of BMPs 3 through 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>Any 3 BMPs out of BMPs 3 through 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b</td>
<td>Any 4 BMPs out of BMPs 3 through 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BMPs for development, construction, and other general activities:**

1. If potential roost trees or structures need to be removed, check cavities for bats within 30 days prior to removal of trees, snags, or structures. When possible, remove structure outside of breeding season (e.g., January 1 – April 15). If evidence of use by any bat species is observed, discontinue removal efforts in that area and coordinate with the Service on how to proceed.
2. When using heavy equipment, establish a 250 foot (76 m) buffer around known or suspected roosts to limit disturbance to roosting bats.
3. For every 5 acres of impact, retain a minimum of 1.0 acre of native vegetation. If upland habitat is impacted, then upland habitat with native vegetation should be retained.
4. For every 5 acres of impact, retain a minimum of 0.25 acre of native vegetation. If upland habitat is impacted, then upland habitat with native vegetation should be retained.
5. Conserve open freshwater and wetland habitats to promote foraging opportunities and avoid impacting water quality. Created/restored habitat should be designed to replace the function of native habitat.
6. Conserve and/or enhance riparian habitat. A 50-ft (15.2 m) buffer is recommended around water bodies and stream edges. In cases where artificial water bodies (i.e., stormwater ponds) are created, enhance edges with native plantings especially in cases in which wetland habitat was affected.

7. Avoid or limit widespread application of insecticides (e.g., mosquito control, agricultural pest control) in areas where Florida bonneted bats are known or expected to forage or roost.

8. Conserve natural vegetation to promote insect diversity, availability, and abundance. For example, retain or restore 25% of the parcel in native contiguous vegetation.

9. Retain mature trees and snags that could provide roosting habitat. These may include live trees of various sizes and dead or dying trees with cavities, hollows, crevices, and loose bark. See “Roosting Habitat” in “Background” above.

10. Protect known Florida bonneted bat roost trees, snags or structures and trees or snags that have been historically used by Florida bonneted bats for roosting, even if not currently occupied, by retaining a 250 foot (76 m) disturbance buffer around the roost tree, snag, or structure to ensure that roost sites remain suitable for use in the future.

11. Avoid and minimize the use of artificial lighting, retain natural light conditions, and install wildlife friendly lighting (i.e., downward facing and lowest lumens possible). Avoid permanent night-time lighting to the greatest extent practicable.

12. Incorporate engineering designs that discourage bats from using buildings or structures. If Florida bonneted bats take residence within a structure, contact the Service and Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission prior to attempting removal or when conducting maintenance activities on the structure.

13. Use or allow prescribed fire to promote foraging habitat.
Appendix E: Additional Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Land Management Projects

Ecological Land Management

The Service reviews and develops Ecological Land Management projects that use land management activities to restore and maintain native, natural communities that are beneficial to bats. These activities include prescribed fire, mechanical treatments to reduce vegetation densities, timber thinning to promote forest health, trail maintenance, and the treatment of exotic vegetation. The following BMPs provide recommendations for conserving Florida bonneted bat roosting and foraging habitat during ecological land management activities. The Service recommends incorporating these BMP into ecological land management plans.

If potential roost trees need to be removed, check cavities for bats prior to removal of trees or snags. If evidence of use by any bat species is observed, discontinue removal efforts in that area and coordinate with the Service on how to proceed.

Ecological Land Management BMPs:

- Protect potential roosting habitat during ecological land management activities, if feasible. Avoid removing trees or snags with cavities.
- Rake and/or manually clear vegetation around the base of known or suspected roost trees to remove fuel prior to prescribed burning.
- If possible, use ignition techniques such as spot fires or backing fire to limit the intensity of fire around the base of the tree or snag containing the roost. The purpose of this action is to prevent the known or suspected roost tree or snag from catching fire and also to attempt to limit the exposure of the roosting bats to heat and smoke. A 250-ft (76 m) buffer is recommended.
- If prescribed fire is being implemented to benefit Florida bonneted bats, Braun de Torrez et al. (2018) noted that fire in the dry/spring season could be most beneficial.
- When creating firebreaks or conducting fire-related mechanical treatment, mark and avoid any known or suspected bat roosts.
- When using heavy equipment, establish a buffer of 250 feet (76 m) around known roosts to limit disturbance to roosting bats.
- Establish forest management efforts to maintain tree species and size class diversity to ensure long-term supply of potential roost sites.
- For every 5 acres (2 hectares) of timber that is harvested, retain a clump of trees 1-2 acres (0.4 - 0.8 hectare) in size containing potential roost trees, especially pines and royal palms (live or dead). Additionally, large snags in open canopy should be preserved.
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