

## **FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**(FONSI)**

**Regarding**

### **The U.S Fish and Wildlife Service's Proposed Issuance of an Endangered Species Act Section 10(a)(1)(A) Enhancement of Survival Permit in Association with Implementation of the Safe Harbor Agreement for the Northern Spotted Owl Between Weyerhaeuser Company and the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service in the Oregon Coast Ranges Study Area of the Barred Owl Removal Experiment**

#### **Introduction**

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (NEPA), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service or USFWS) has completed an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed issuance of an Enhancement of Survival Permit (Permit) to Weyerhaeuser Company (Weyerhaeuser) to authorize the incidental take of the threatened northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*) in conjunction with their implementation of a Safe Harbor Agreement (SHA) for the spotted owl within the Oregon Coast Ranges Study Area (Study Area) of the Barred Owl Removal Experiment in Lane County, Oregon. USFWS issuance of the Permit would be done under the authority of section 10(a)(1)(A) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (ESA) (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and would be conditioned upon full and complete compliance with and implementation of the SHA.

The proposed Permit would authorize incidental take of the spotted owl on up to 16 currently unoccupied sites (all of which have not had resident spotted owls respond to surveys in three or more years) over the 10-year term of the Permit in return for USFWS and U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) researcher rights to access Weyerhaeuser lands and use Weyerhaeuser roads for barred owl surveys throughout the Study Area and removal of barred owls in the treatment portion of the Study Area. If the Barred Owl Removal Experiment needs to be extended to reach scientifically credible conclusions (for a maximum of an additional five years), the Permit may be extended by the same period, as analyzed in the EA.

In the EA, the Service evaluated the potential environmental effects associated with the proposed action described above and a No Action Alternative. Under the No Action Alternative, the Service would not enter into the SHA and would not issue the Permit. Under that alternative, Service and USGS researchers would not have access to Weyerhaeuser lands and roads in the Oregon Coast Ranges Study Area, and as a result, could not remove a potentially significant number of barred owls in the treatment area. In the absence of barred owl removal, spotted owls may not have the opportunity to re-occupy historic sites throughout the treatment area. This would undermine the objective of the Experiment, and may require an extension of the Experiment which in turn could delay work on a long-term barred owl management plan. Barred owls are one of the primary threats to the spotted owl's survival, and failure to manage barred owl populations could lead to extirpation of the spotted owl over large portions of its range, and the eventual extinction of the subspecies.

## **Decision and Rationale**

Based on our review of the SHA, the analyses in the EA, and consideration of public comments, we selected the Proposed Action because it:

- Supports the efficient and effective implementation of Recovery Action 29 under the final recovery plan for the spotted owl through implementation of the Barred Owl Removal Experiment.
- Supports collection of information the Service has identified as crucial for the future development of a barred owl management strategy that is essential for the survival and recovery of the spotted owl.
- Provides benefits to spotted owls that outweigh the potential adverse effects of the incidental take of the spotted owl authorized by the proposed Permit.

## **Council on Environmental Quality Analysis of Significance**

The primary purpose of preparing an environmental assessment under NEPA is to determine whether an action would have significant impacts on the human environment. If significant impacts may result from an action, then an environmental impact statement is required (40 CFR 1502.3). Whether an action exceeds a threshold of significance is determined by analyzing the context and the intensity of the action (40 CFR 1508.27). Context refers to the setting of the action and potential impacts of that action. The context of a significance determination may be society as a whole (human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, or the locality. Intensity refers to the severity of the impacts.

We considered the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the action alternative involving the issuance of an Enhancement of Survival Permit to the Oregon Department of Forestry on the Oregon Coast Ranges Study Area treatment area. Covered activities include forest operations and management activities. We have also considered public comments received during the comment period, none of which provided additional information that either changed the outcome of our analysis or required a finding that our action would have significant impact.

### **Context**

The issuance of the Permit to Weyerhaeuser would allow the company to continue to manage their forest lands as currently allowed under State and Federal law in the same manner as would occur if we do not issue the Permit. The Oregon Coast Ranges Study Area contains private lands, including commercial timberland, State forest lands, and Federal lands, with Federal lands representing the majority of the area (and containing 76 percent of the remaining nesting/roosting habitat for the spotted owl).

Under this Permit, Weyerhaeuser would be able to continue normal operations, potentially resulting in the removal of up to 1,072 acres of spotted owl nesting/roosting. This represents less than 2 percent of the 52,000 acres of nesting/roosting habitat available in the treatment portion of the Study Area and 0.2 percent of the nesting/roosting habitat in the Oregon Coast modeling region, one of 11 modeling regions in the range of the northern spotted owl. The Permit would

only apply to the 16 non-baseline spotted owl sites and areas where no spotted owls have ever responded despite over 20 years of surveys. Spotted owls have been located at 9 sites in the last 3 years. These sites are baseline sites, and no take is authorized for these sites.

The types of actions covered by the SHA and Permit for incidental take of spotted owls may potentially indirectly affect resources such as water quality and other species. However, due to the particular circumstances described below, this SHA and Permit would only change the timing of such impacts, not influence whether they occur or not.

All covered activities under this Agreement could be carried out at any time under current State laws and regulations. In the absence of issuance of the Permit, the non-baseline sites and areas are likely to remain occupied by barred owls and unavailable to spotted owls. With the absence of spotted owls, there is no prohibition against take and the covered activities would remain unrestricted.

The removal of barred owls in the treatment area may lead to reoccupancy of some of the non-baseline sites by spotted owls, which would result in the prohibition on take of these spotted owls and could impact some of the covered actions in the absence of a Permit. However, the Barred Owl Removal Experiment is a short-term action, with a maximum of 10 years of removal. Activities would only be potentially restricted for as long as spotted owls remain on these sites. Once removal ceases, we fully expect barred owls from the surrounding areas to reinvade the treatment area, barred owl populations to regain their current levels, and spotted owls to be again displaced within 3 to 5 years (USFWS 2013, p 173). At that time there will no longer be restrictions on any covered activities based on the ESA take prohibition.

If the USFWS does not issue the Permit, barred owls will not be removed from Weyerhaeuser lands within the treatment area for the remaining duration of the study. Without the removal of barred owls, spotted owls are highly unlikely to reoccupy many of these sites, there would be no take prohibitions, and activities would proceed at a normal rate. If spotted owls did manage to reoccupy some sites due to removal of barred owls on other adjacent ownerships, in the absence of a Permit Weyerhaeuser might have to delay implementation of some activities until the Experiment ends and barred owls reclaim the areas. However, Weyerhaeuser would still be able to conduct these activities at the end of the Experiment, a potential for a maximum 10 to 15 year delay. If USFWS issues the Permit, the covered activities would proceed at normal pace. Therefore, the primary effect of the issuance of the Permit would be to allow covered activities to continue that might otherwise be temporarily delayed (up to 15 years maximum). For these reasons, the SHA and Permit would not significantly affect these other resources and we have focused our analysis on the potential effects on northern spotted owls. As discussed above, the effects to barred owls from the Experiment were fully considered in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Barred Owl Removal Experiment (FEIS)(USFWS 2013).

### **Intensity**

Intensity, as defined by CEQ, refers to the severity of impact. The following 10 points identified by CEQ were considered in evaluating intensity: impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse; public health and safety; unique characteristics of the geographic area; highly

controversial impacts, uncertain, unique, or unknown risks; precedent-setting aspects; cumulative effects; effects on eligibility for listing in the national register of historic places; endangered species effects; and violation of environmental protection laws.

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. This Safe Harbor Agreement will result in the ability of USFWS and USGS to remove a larger proportion of the barred owls on the treatment portion of the Oregon Coast Ranges Study Area, likely resulting in a stronger response by spotted owls (more site occupancy) and stronger results, which in turn will support the development of a long term barred owl management strategy and contribute to the survival and recovery of the spotted owl. The removal will also temporarily protect the remaining territorial spotted owls within the treatment area. The permitting of covered activities that may impact currently unoccupied sites may have some minor negative effect on the occupancy and reproduction of those sites. However, in the absence of the Permit, USFWS and USGS would not have access to Weyerhaeuser lands and could not remove barred owls on these areas.

The primary effect of the Permit on other resources is to allow actions and effects to proceed as they would in the absence of the Permit. Without the Permit, even if we were able to conduct the Experiment without access to Weyerhaeuser lands and some of these sites are re-occupied by spotted owls, some of the spotted owl nesting/roosting habitat might not be available for some forest management activities for the duration of the Experiment and an estimated 5 years following the Experiment, the time period in which we expect barred owls to reinvade the area, re-establish their current population levels, and again displace the spotted owls. Thus, the primary effect on other resources is a short-term difference in the timing of activities.

2. Public health and safety. There are no risks to human health from the issuance of the Permit. In the EIS for the Experiment, we addressed human safety issues from the use of firearms to remove barred owls. We concluded that the risk to public health and safety is insignificant due to the use of shotguns by trained, authorized professionals only, and a tight removal protocol (USFWS 2013, pp. 193-4).

3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area (such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas). Under CEQ regulations, “unique characteristics” are generally limited to those that have been identified through the land use planning process or other legislative, regulatory, or planning process. There are no such lands associated with the covered activities under this Permit. The lands that would be covered by this Permit do not include historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

4. Highly Controversial Impacts. Controversy in this context means disagreement about the nature of the impacts to the environment, not expressions of opposition to the proposed action or preference among the alternatives. While the concept of removing, by use of a shotgun, a seemingly large number of an owl species is controversial, even if it is not native to the environment, there is little controversy about the nature of the impacts to the environment of this Experiment and this SHA. Issues raised in the comments have been addressed.

5. Uncertain, unique, or unknown risks. Barred owl removal has been conducted on Green Diamond lands in California as part of an experiment for many years, and in British Columbia as part of a management effort. The Hoopa Tribe has been removing barred owls on the Hoopa Reservation in California since 2013 as part of the Experiment. The risks for this type of work are well known.

6. Precedent-setting aspects. The removal of non-native wildlife, and even native species, is a common practice in the United States., This has included removal of owls in other circumstances, and the removal of one species is often done to contribute to the recovery of another. We have issued two Enhancement of Survival Permits for incidental take of spotted owls on other ownerships in the Oregon Coast Ranges Study Area. This action is not precedent setting.

7. Cumulative effects. As described by CEQ, significance may exist if it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant impact on the environment. We conducted a cumulative effects analysis in the EA and concluded that the issuance of the Permit still did not rise to the level of significance.

8. Effects on eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. As described by CEQ, this includes affects to districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or actions that may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources. No structures or areas eligible for listing under the National Register of Historic Places that could be affected by the issuance of this Permit. There are no known significant cultural or historic resources that would be affected by the covered actions on the lands that would be covered by the Permit.

9. Endangered species effects. This includes an evaluation of the degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the ESA. We analyzed the effects of issuance of the Permit on threatened and endangered species, and their critical habitat that may be affected by the proposed action. The Permit and SHA do not authorize any change in the requirements to address other listed species or critical habitat. We evaluated the effect of the issuance of the Permit and SHA on all listed species that occur in the area. We have determined there will be no impact to threatened or endangered species or their critical habitats, with the exception of the northern spotted owl. We conducted an intra-Service a Section 7 Consultation on the issuance of the Permit and SHA, and determined that the proposed action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of spotted owl. No spotted owl critical habitat is present in the action area, so critical habitat for the spotted owl will not be affected by the issuance of the proposed Permit.

Under the SHA and Permit, USFWS did not authorize and does not anticipate any take of any listed species other than the spotted owl that may temporarily return to non-baseline sites as a result of the Experiment. Take prohibitions provide a level of protection for listed species that may be present on the covered lands.

Marbled Murrelet: We evaluated the potential effect of the SHA and Permit on the marbled murrelet, which nests in the general area. We determined that the issuance of the Permit

represented no significant effect to the marbled murrelet. This SHA would not authorize any take of marbled murrelet and would not result in any changes to any requirements relative to Federal or State laws specific to murrelets. All existing requirements and prohibitions remain in effect. Under the SHA, Weyerhaeuser would be able to continue to operate as they are currently, consistent with all other applicable State and Federal Laws. The SHA does not allow for any activity that is not currently allowed under State and Federal law. There is no marbled murrelet critical habitat on Weyerhaeuser lands enrolled in this Safe Harbor Agreement.

**Spotted Owls:** The SHA and Permit support Recovery Action 29 from the Revised Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl (USFWS 2011). As described in the **Context** section above, the Permit allows only the take of spotted owls that may temporarily reoccupy 16 currently-unoccupied spotted owl sites as a result of the removal of barred owls during the Experiment.

The SHA and Permit do not authorize take of spotted owls that occupy 9 currently-occupied sites in the treatment portion of the Study Area. These territorial spotted owls are more likely to maintain their territories due to the removal of competing barred owls, and therefore breed and contribute to future spotted owl populations. Thus the Experiment and this Permit are not likely to reduce the current territorial population of spotted owls in the treatment area and may, in fact, protect these sites from incursions by expanding barred owl populations during the removal period.

The spotted owls that may be incidentally taken under this Agreement would be reoccupying sites or areas where no resident spotted owls have been located for at least the last three years, despite extensive survey efforts. The most likely source of spotted owls that may reoccupy these sites are floaters (displaced or young non-territorial, non-breeding owls). We do not anticipate that any of the spotted owls currently occupying baseline sites would move onto non-baseline sites and therefore be incidentally taken under this Permit.

We have no evidence to suggest that floaters (non-territorial, non-breeding spotted owls) successfully breed unless they first become established on a territory. These individuals are unlikely to find and defend territory as long as barred owls remain in the area in their current densities. Thus, these non-territorial owls are not contributing to future generations and, in the absence of barred owl removal, will likely die without reproducing, providing no contribution to the future population of spotted owls. The removal of barred owls under the Experiment will likely allow some non-territorial spotted owls to temporarily establish territories and contribute to the regional spotted owl population. Of the 16 currently-unoccupied spotted owl sites that would be covered by the Permit, Weyerhaeuser owns less than 10 percent of the habitat on all sites, and less than 5 percent in on 8 of these sites. On 7 of the sites, Federal lands may contain sufficient habitat to support the spotted owls without contribution from Weyerhaeuser lands. Thus not all habitat removal on covered lands subject to the Safe Harbor Agreement may result in take of spotted owls.

The amount of habitat removal that would be covered by this Permit represents a very small portion (less than 2 percent) of the spotted owl habitat available in the Physiographic Province. Populations of spotted owls are generally addressed at the Physiographic Province or Modeling Region (regional) level. The 817 acres of spotted owl habitat covered by the Permit represents

0.135% of the estimated 606,800 acres of suitable spotted owl habitat in the Oregon Coast Ranges Physiographic Province, which represents one of the 12 identified recovery units for the northern spotted owl.

In developing the Experiment and analyzing the effect of the Experiment and this Safe Harbor Agreement, we did not anticipate long-term conservation contribution from the spotted owls that might reoccupy historic sites in the Study Area. The primary long-term conservation value of the Experiment, which this SHA and Permit supports, is the information the USFWS will gain about the feasibility and efficiency of removal as a tool for barred owl management. This information will be crucial for the development of long range barred owl management strategies for this Study area, as well as across the range of the spotted owl.

10. Violation of environmental protection laws. The issuance of the Permit will not violate any Federal, State, or local laws or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. The conditions of the Permit require Weyerhaeuser and USFWS to ensure that their respective activities under the Safe Harbor Agreement are consistent with applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations.

### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

Impacts to barred owls from the Experiment were addressed in the FEIS. For the following reasons, the USFWS concludes that the issuance of a Permit allowing incidental take of non-baseline spotted owls resulting from implementation of the Weyerhaeuser Safe Harbor Agreement will not significantly impact the human environment.

Potential impacts on the human environment from the Barred Owl Removal Experiment were analyzed in the FEIS for the Barred Owl Removal Experiment (USFWS 2013). We tiered this EA to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), including the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences (USFWS 2013, Chapter 3). The SHA does not change the analysis of effects of the Preferred Alternative in the FEIS for the Barred Owl Removal Experiment on barred owls, ongoing spotted owl demographic study areas, other species, the social environment, recreation and visitor use, costs of the Experiment, or the cultural environment. As noted in the FEIS Effects to the Economy, "[a]ny safe harbor agreements would lessen the effects described in the economic analysis" (USFWS 2013, p 452). Thus, the EA effects analysis focused on the effects of this SHA on the spotted owl.

Based on the information presented in the EA and the SHA, and consideration of public comments, we find that the proposed issuance of ESA section 10(a)(1)(A) Permit to Weyerhaeuser for incidental take of spotted owls that may reoccupy currently unoccupied (non-baseline) sites and areas as a result of the SHA is not likely to significantly affect the quality of the human environment for the following reasons:

1. The conservation value of the Barred Owl Removal Experiment, and this SHA which supports the Experiment, is the information the Service will gain about the feasibility and efficiency of removal as a tool for barred owl management. This information will be

crucial for the development of long range barred owl management strategies to support the survival and recovery of the spotted owl.

Without the SHA, Service and USGS researchers would lack access to important locations within the treatment area, creating pockets of barred owls within the treatment area. This would provide a source of barred owls to reoccupy spotted owl sites that had been cleared of barred owls under the removal Experiment, allowing barred owls to continue to displace spotted owls from these sites and areas, thus reducing the power of the Experiment to measure the utility of barred owl removal for purposes of conserving the spotted owl. This, in turn, may potentially lengthen the duration of the Barred Owl Removal Experiment in order to measure that utility.

Because spotted owls have been displaced from these sites and areas, likely by barred owls, all spotted owl habitat covered by the Permit is currently available for harvest by the Weyerhaeuser without ESA restrictions. Issuance of the Permit reduces their incentive to remove this habitat quickly to avoid potential regulatory complications from removal of barred owls from neighboring lands.

2. No take of spotted owls on currently occupied sites would be authorized under the proposed Permit. By providing Service and USGS access to lands and roads for the survey and removal of barred owls as part of the larger Barred Owl Removal Experiment, these spotted owl sites are more likely to remain occupied during the term of the Permit, that is, they are less likely to be overtaken by an increasing barred owl population. This provides at least short term protection for these sites, supporting survival and recovery of the spotted owl.

3. The Permit will authorize only the removal of spotted owls that may reoccupy non-baseline sites or areas where resident spotted owls have not been detected in the last three years despite extensive surveys. These sites and areas are unlikely to be reoccupied by spotted owls unless barred owls are removed from the area. Any non-baseline sites that become occupied by spotted owls during the Experiment would likely be lost as barred owls repopulate the area following the end of the removal Experiment. The spotted owls that may reoccupy these sites will come from the non-territorial floater population. These individuals are not reproductive and not contributing to the future spotted owl populations, and will remain so unless sites are open for recolonization by the removal of barred owls. The removal of barred owls provides an opportunity for some of these individuals to gain a territory and reproduce during the course of the Experiment, thus contributing to the future spotted owl population.

4. After conducting a review under section 7 of the ESA, the Service concluded that issuance of the Permit for the SHA would not be likely to cause an appreciable reduction in the likelihood of survival and recovery of the spotted owl (USFWS 2016c). The Service reached his conclusion because any adverse impacts caused by take of the spotted owl that is authorized under the proposed Permit will be tempered by the temporary beneficial effects of allowing spotted owls to re-occupy historic sites and by enhancing the credibility of the Experiment to inform the development of a large scale and long-

term barred owl management strategy. As noted above, the proposed Permit action is consistent with the final recovery plan for the spotted owl.

5. The actual amount of spotted owl habitat that may be affected under this Agreement and Permit represents a very small portion of the spotted owl nesting/roosting habitat regionally and an even smaller portion rangewide. This represents a very small impact on the regional forest environment.

6. The primary effect of this SHA and Permit is a minor change in the timing of the covered activities on the enrolled lands and would not influence whether these activities occur or not. All covered activities under this Agreement could be carried out, immediately or in the near future, under current State laws and regulations. In the absence of the Permit, the non-baseline sites and areas are highly likely to remain occupied by barred owls and unavailable to spotted owls. With the absence of spotted owls, there is no prohibition against take and the covered activities would remain unrestricted. The removal of barred owls, and any reoccupancy of sites by spotted owls is temporary. Barred owl removal is estimated to continue for between 4 and 10 years under the Experiment. Once the removal ceases, barred owls will quickly reinvade the area and we anticipate spotted owls will again be displaced. At that time there will no longer be restrictions on any covered activities based on the take prohibition. Thus, the effect of the SHA and Permit would be that the covered activities could occur during the Permit term even if the Experiment results in spotted owl occupancy of these sites. In the absence of the Permit activities might otherwise be delayed until barred owls re-occupy the site after the Experiment has ended.

7. The issuance of an incidental take permit only allows take that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, the carrying out of an otherwise lawful activity. (50 CFR 17.3.). Thus, issuance of this Permit does not permit any activity that does not conform to Federal and State Laws.

### **Public Involvement and Comments Received**

The Service conducted extensive scoping and outreach on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Barred Owl Removal Experiment (USFWS 2013, pp. 7-8; 188-193; and 343-350). We established a Barred Owl Stakeholder Group including a broad range of environmental, animal welfare, and industry groups; Federal, State, and local governments; and Native American Tribes to assist with early scoping. We conducted public comment periods for scoping on the draft EIS, including one public meeting, five public webinars, and meetings with affected Federal agencies. We mailed notices of the availability of the draft EIS to over 600 individuals and organizations.

On February 22, 2016, we issued a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register (81 FR 8739) for the draft SHA and draft EA for public review. A 30-day public review and comment period closed March 23, 2016. The draft SHA and draft EA were available on the website of and in hard copy from the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office in Portland, Oregon. We received three public comments from one individual and two non-governmental organizations. The

individual's comment was not substantive. The remaining comments were concerned about the potential loss of spotted owl habitat under the SHA. For a detailed description of substantive comments and Service responses please see Appendix A.


### **Changes Made Between the Draft and Final EA**


A few changes were made to the EA to address public comments and incorporate new information. We added some additional information on the potential effects of incidental take of the spotted owl, and added some clarification on the information already provided. We expanded on the Cumulative Effects analysis to discuss some potential future SHAs in the affected area, though these future SHA actions have not yet reached the level of being reasonably foreseeable.

### **Conclusion**

Based upon my review and evaluation of the information contained in the EA, SHA, and other supporting documents cited herein, I have determined that issuance of the Enhancement of Survival Permit and implementation of the SHA, as proposed, is not a major Federal action that will significantly affect the quality of the human environment within the meaning of Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Accordingly, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement on the Proposed Action is not required.

Documents used in preparation of this Finding of No Significant Impact include the EA (USFWS 2016a), SHA (USFWS 2016b), and Intra-Service Section 7 Biological Opinion (USFWS 2016c). All documents are incorporated herein by reference, as described in 40 CFR 1508.13. All supporting documents are on file and available for public inspection, by appointment, at: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office, 2600 SE 98<sup>th</sup> Ave, Suite 100, Portland, Oregon, 97266; telephone (503) 231-6179.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Theresa Rabot  
Deputy Regional Director, Region 1  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

### **Supporting References**

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2011. Revised Recovery Plan for the Spotted Owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon.

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2013. Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Experimental Removal of Barred Owls to Benefit Threatened Spotted Owls. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon.

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2016a. Final Environmental Assessment Draft Environmental Assessment for the Weyerhaeuser Safe Harbor Agreement. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon.

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2016b. Final Safe Harbor Agreement for the Northern Spotted Owl between Weyerhaeuser Company and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the Oregon Coast Ranges Study Area of the Barred Owl Removal Experiment. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon.

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2016c. Biological Opinion on Biological Opinion Regarding the Issuance of an Enhancement of Survival Permit in Conjunction with the Implementation of a Safe Harbor Agreement for the Northern Spotted Owl between Weyerhaeuser Company and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon.

## Appendix A- Public Comments and Responses

### NEPA Compliance

**Comment 1:** Friends of Animals stated that the Barred Owl Removal Experiment and corresponding Safe Harbor Agreement constitute a major federal action, and as such FWS must prepare an EIS. They also stated that the USFWS should have evaluated the application and Safe Harbor Agreement concurrently with the Barred Owl Removal Experiment.

**Response:** Federal agencies are required to conduct an analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for proposed Federal actions. If the significance of the environmental effects is uncertain, the agency may conduct an Environmental Assessment (EA) to determine if an EIS is required. We conducted such an analysis, provided for public comment, and have reached the conclusion that the action of issuing an Enhancement of Survival Permit for the Northern Spotted Owl, Weyerhaeuser will have no significant impact on the human environment and does not require the preparation of an EIS.

The Final EIS for the Barred Owl Removal Experiment (FEIS) was completed and a decision signed in September 2013. In that FEIS, we stated that “[i]n the removal areas, the Service will explore the potential for Safe Harbor Agreements with nonfederal landowners willing to cooperate with the experiment” (USFWS 2013, p. 218). We also responded to a comment on the FEIS noting that we had not analyzed the effects of safe harbor agreements in our economic analysis (USFWS 2013, p 452). As we noted in our response, safe harbor agreements are applicant driven, voluntary, and would be developed with individual landowners specific to their individual situation, therefore we could not reasonably anticipate the number, extent, or contents of such agreements at that time. Our earliest discussions with landowners concerning Safe Harbor Agreements did not begin until February of 2015. We could not have reasonably included an analysis of this Safe Harbor Agreements with the FEIS for the Barred Owl Removal Experiment. Thus, this analysis evaluates effects not reasonably foreseeable at the time of the FEIS.

**Comment 2:** Friends of Animals did not consider the EA to contain a reasonable range of alternatives that would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the human environment. Specifically, they stated that USFWS omitted several reasonable alternatives from its analysis including: 1) studying the interaction between barred owls and spotted owls without removal; and 2) preserving additional habitat for northern spotted owls as part of the Safe Harbor Agreement.

**Response:** The option of studying the interaction between barred owls and spotted owls without removal was considered in the FEIS on the Barred Owl Removal Experiment and is described in Section 2.3 -- Alternatives Considered and Dismissed from Detailed Analysis, in particular Section 2.3.5 -- Studies of Species Interaction without Removal (USFWS 2013, p 48.)

Safe Harbor Agreements are applicant driven and include discussions and negotiations between the USFWS and the applicant. Early in the process, several minor modifications to the action alternative were discussed and rejected as not meeting the purpose and need of the action, the

goals of Weyerhaeuser or the goals of the Service (by not providing for a net conservation benefit.) These include the following:

**Longer permit duration:** We discussed a permit duration that would run past 2025, or more than 5 years following the cessation of the barred owl removal Experiment. The USFWS anticipates that the barred owl populations on the Study Area will return to the pre-experiment levels at the end of the Permit in 2025. At that point, any spotted owls remaining on the landscape are not present due to the diminished barred owl population resulting from the removal Experiment, and we do not believe it would be appropriate to authorize take under this Safe Harbor Agreement. Because we do not yet have hard data to test our assumption on return to pre-removal conditions within 5 years, we will consider extending the Permit if barred owls have not returned to pre-experiment levels by 2025.

**Shorter permit duration:** We considered a permit duration of 5 years, ending with the end of barred owl removal. This would not meet Weyerhaeuser's goal of retaining the current level of regulatory restriction on the management of their lands. The effects of the barred owl removal do not evaporate at the end of the barred owl removal. It will take time, an estimated three to five years, before barred owl populations will recover to pre-removal levels. The presence of spotted owls on non-baseline sites immediately following the removal portion of the Experiment would reflect the effects of the Experiment. Under this approach, Weyerhaeuser would be burdened with additional restrictions on their lands as a result of their participation in the Safe Harbor Agreement. This did not meet the goals of the Weyerhaeuser and would provide an incentive to the Weyerhaeuser to harvest these lands quickly, before the end of the Permit. This approach could lead to smaller amounts of habitat on the landscape over a shorter time.

**Maintain habitat in the site center or nesting stand for duration of the Experiment:** This approach would result in increased restrictions on the Weyerhaeuser's lands if spotted owls occupied a site center or nest stand on the Weyerhaeuser's land. This did not meet the goals of the Weyerhaeuser. It is also very unlikely that this would be invoked as there are no known historic site centers on the Weyerhaeuser's lands. While 25 Thiessen polygons (a representation of the home range of spotted owls using a site) overlap Weyerhaeuser lands or operational areas, none of the nest stand or site centers of these sites are located on Weyerhaeuser's enrolled lands. Based on the results from the Green Diamond barred owl removal study (Diller et al. 2014), spotted owls generally reoccupy historic site centers. If spotted owls do nest on Weyerhaeuser lands, Weyerhaeuser is willing to protect these nest stands while spotted owls were actively nesting or raising young.

**Comment 3:** Friends of Animals stated that USFWS should consider and disclose the ethical impacts of its proposed actions. They stated that “[t]he EA or EIS should include a serious discussion of the ethical implications of the proposed action, killing barred owls and destroying the habitat of and harassing spotted owls.” They also stated that “[i]n order to make an informed decision and include the public in the decision making process, FWS must include a detailed discussion of the impacts of its proposed action on owls as well as other wildlife affected by its activities.”

**Response:** In the FEIS for the Barred Owl Removal Experiment, the USFWS detailed our extensive efforts to examine social issues, including ethical issues (Section 3.6, USFWS 2013).

pp 188-194). We incorporated this information by reference in the EA. The ethical issues of the Safe Harbor Agreement are functionally the same as the issues addressed in the EIS.

**Comment 4:** Cascadia Wildlands stated that USFWS must consider all impacts to listed and candidate species under the ESA, and all species under NEPA prior to a final decision, implying that this was not done.

**Response:** The USFWS considered the effects of the Experiment on all species, including candidate and listed species, in the EIS (USFWS 2013), incorporated by reference in the EA. USFWS also considered the effect of the issuance of the Permit on all threatened and endangered species through the Intra-Service Section 7 Consultation on the Proposed Issuance of the Permit under the Safe Harbor Agreement.

**Comment 5:** Cascadia Wildlands stated that the USFWS considered the fact that barred owls will eventually repopulate the treatment area and displace any spotted owls that have reoccupied the non-baseline sites as **mitigation** [emphasis added].

**Response:** Cascadia Wildlands misread the sentence in the draft SHA, assuming that the word mitigate was referring to mitigation as described in NEPA and Safe Harbor regulations in terms of actions carried out by the applicant as mitigation to any impacts. We used the word in this sentence in its English meaning -- to lessen. We have replaced this word with a synonym so as to not be confused with meanings, such as providing some type of off-setting compensation.

### **Baseline Determination**

**Comment 6:** Cascadia Wildlands stated that the approach to determination of the baseline used in this Safe Harbor Agreement conflicts with the policy, based on their combined reading of the Safe Harbor Agreement Policy and Habitat Conservation Plan Handbook. They contend that according to these documents, habitat degradation must include commitments to preserve habitat on site or nearby. They also point out that the Safe Harbor Agreement Policy requires the document detail where and when benefits would accrue, and that the policy referenced benefits occurring on the enrolled property.

**Response:** Cascadia Wildlands used policy and direction from the Habitat Conservation Plan Handbook and applied it to Safe Harbor Agreements. Their contention that the conservation benefit for any habitat degradation must be offset by the preservation of habitat on site or in close proximity is specific to Habitat Conservation Plans, which unlike Safe Harbor Agreements, allow for the take of currently existing individuals of a listed species. There is no comparable requirement or recommendation for Safe Harbor Agreements. Baseline for a Safe Harbor Agreement can be set in a number of ways. While this may include the condition of habitat, it can alternately be based on the existing level of use of the area by the species. In our case, we had the information to determine the level of use and chose to use this information to define the baseline, consistent with the policy. In the Weyerhaeuser SHA all recently occupied sites are identified as part of the baseline and no take of spotted owls on these sites is authorized.

Additionally, Cascadia Wildlands claims that the Safe Harbor Policy references benefits occurring on the enrolled property is not based in the language of the policy. For example, the policy requires that the agreement will “[i]dentify management actions that would be undertaken to accomplish the expected net conservation benefits to the species, where and when the benefits would be achieved, and the agreed upon time frames these management actions will remain in effect to achieve the anticipated net conservation benefits...” There is nothing that prevents benefits from occurring beyond the enrolled property boundaries.

Under the Safe Harbor Policy, net benefits can take many forms, including but not limited to “reduction of habitat fragmentation rates; maintenance restoration or enhancement of habitats; maintenance or increase of population numbers or distribution; reduction of the effects of catastrophic events; establishment of buffers for protected areas; **and establishment of areas to test and develop new and innovative conservation strategies.**” [emphasis added]. The Experiment will provide for short term population stability or increases, and definitely falls under the “. . . test and develop new and innovative conservation strategies.” Conducting the Experiment in as timely and effective manner possible represents a significant benefit that will contribute to the spotted owl’s recovery over time.

In addition, benefits will also occur on the enrolled property. Issuance of the Permit to Weyerhaeuser will allow the removal of barred owls on Weyerhaeuser lands, which may actually protect the remaining territorial spotted owls from incursions by expanding barred owl populations during the removal period. The removal of barred owls and the potential reoccupancy by spotted owls of sites in the vicinity of the enrolled properties may result in reproduction, resulting in additional spotted owls being produced that would not occur in the absence of the Experiment. Finally, information gathered from this Experiment may be useful in managing spotted owl populations in the vicinity of the enrolled properties.

**Comment 7:** Cascadia Wildlands noted that all of the non-baseline sites have historic responses from spotted owls. They requested that all spotted owl sites be included in the baseline, assuming that they either continue to be used by spotted owls for nesting, roosting, or foraging or provide valuable areas for recolonization.

**Response:** The USFWS defined the spotted owl sites based on the presence of spotted owls at some time in the past. Thus, the commenters are correct that all site centers, baseline or non-baseline, have some history of spotted owl response. Spotted owl surveys in this area are conducted to very high standards, and have been for over 2 decades. The lack of response from a site over multiple years is indicative of a site that is not being used by a territorial spotted owl. If barred owls are using the site, it is highly unlikely that spotted owls are also maintaining a territorial presence. It is possible that non-territorial spotted owls (floaters) may use the area at times, though there is no sure method to detect them and no way to determine the importance of a stand for these birds as they move around frequently. For the definition of baseline sites the USFWS used any response from any resident spotted owl in the past three years to define occupancy. The non-baseline areas may be useful for recolonization, but only if the barred owls that displaced the original spotted owls are removed.

**Comment 8:** Cascadia Wildlands recommended the USFWS use a longer period of survey data to define current use of the sites. They suggest we assume the highest level of historical occupancy, rather than use the most recent 3 years of data to define the current occupancy of each site. They point to statements in past publications noting that sites may go unoccupied for more than three years and be subsequently reoccupied by spotted owls and state that surveys can be inaccurate over short time periods. They state that we are treating site centers that are surveyed and unoccupied for three years as lacking in conservation value for spotted owls.

**Response:** Safe Harbor Agreements are designed to allow landowners who voluntarily contribute to recovery of the covered species to “incidentally take” individuals that represent an increase in the population as a result of the actions under Safe Harbor Agreement, as long as this does not result in a drop below the baseline condition at the time of the Safe Harbor Agreement. After consideration and evaluation of the current conditions on the removal portion of the Oregon Coast Ranges Study Area, we believe that using the data from the past three years of extensive spotted owl surveys best describes the current condition of spotted owls in the area for the reasons explained below.

Cascadia Wildlands point to Dugger et al. (2009) report which noted that, based on survey data collected between 1990 and 2002, some spotted owl sites were unoccupied for more than three years before spotted owls returned. However, this survey data was collected at a time when barred owl populations were still at relatively low levels in the Study Area and the effects of competition from barred owls was not yet realized. In more recent work in the area by Dr. J. David Wiens following radio-marked spotted and barred owls, no spotted owls were observed residing in territories once barred owls had established on the site (J. Wiens 2016, Pers. Comm.). Barred owl populations are now very high in the Oregon Coast Ranges Study Area. Preliminary results from the initial surveys of barred owls for the Barred Owl Removal Experiment indicate there was an average of 1.9 pairs of barred owls per historic spotted owl site, and over 88 percent of the areas surveyed were inhabited by barred owls. (J. Wiens et al. February 2016 presentation). Thus, it is highly unlikely that spotted owls would be able to recolonize these areas without the removal of barred owls, greatly reducing their potential to provide any short or long term conservation value for spotted owls.

Because even under the best of circumstances, spotted owls may not always respond to call surveys, all protocol surveys to date include at least two years of survey data to make a firm determination of current spotted owl presence. The spotted owl’s response to the presence of barred owls may have reduced their propensity to respond to call surveys further. Therefore, we used the results of the last three years of spotted owl protocol surveys to determine current occupancy. For the purposes of this SHA, spotted owl sites on which annual surveys detected the presence of at least one resident spotted owl over the last three years (2013-2015) were be considered to support current spotted owls.

## Safe Harbor Agreement Policy

**Comment 9:** Friends of Animals stated that “[i]f northern spotted owl habitat is destroyed as part of the Experiment, as proposed in the Safe Harbor Agreement, then no benefit can come from conducting the Barred Owl Removal Experiment.” They note that the loss of habitat would have long term effects while the Experiment is short term.

**Response:** The Barred Owl Removal Experiment will end when we acquire the information needed to answer the questions posed in the FEIS, specifically when we have sufficient information to determine the efficacy and efficiency of barred owl removal as a management tool for spotted owl conservation. The information from this Experiment is one of the critical missing pieces of information the USFWS identified as needed as part of an effort to determine what we can, and should, do to manage barred owl populations to allow the survival of the threatened Northern Spotted Owl. While the Experiment may be short term (maximum of 10 years), the information gained will have long term effects on the survival and recovery of the spotted owl.

**Comment 10:** Cascadia Wildlands stated that the logging of 16 or more site centers would guarantee the decline of the local population and not provide a net conservation benefit.

**Response:** None of the historic site centers fall on Weyerhaeuser land, and therefore none of the historic site centers would be logged under this Safe Harbor Agreement. These site centers are already currently unoccupied and not contributing to the local breeding population. Under this SHA, logging may occur within the Thiessen polygon defining the home range.

**Comment 11:** Cascadia Wildlands stated that trading spotted owls and their habitat for **intangible and uncertain benefits of an experiment** [emphasis added] is risky and sets a dangerous precedent.

**Response:** The USFWS has extensively explained the need for and value of the Experiment in the Recovery Plan (USFWS 2011), EIS for the Barred Owl Removal Experiment (USFWS 2013), and as summarized in the EA for the Safe Harbor Agreement and the Agreement itself. This Experiment was designed by the USFWS to answer a specific management question, and provide information to assist in addressing the primary short-term threat to the survival of the northern spotted owl. Under these circumstances, the USFWS has documented the value of the Experiment.

**Comment 12:** Friends of Animals contend that “[b]ecause FWS has never analyzed how information from the Barred Owl Removal Experiment could lead to a long term strategy to conserve northern spotted owls, no reasonable person could conclude that the Experiment or the safe harbor agreement promote northern spotted owl conservation or recovery. They contended that the USFWS did not show how the data gathered as a result of this SHA contributes to the conservation of spotted owls. The commenter also claims that failure of the USFWS to lay out a plan for future management based on the Experiment and analyze how the Experiment would lead to a long-term strategy to conserve spotted owls makes it such that no reasonable person could conclude that the Experiment or the Safe Harbor Agreement will promote spotted owl recovery.

Friends of Animals also claims that the USFWS did not define what constitutes a successful Experiment, the basis for the Safe Harbor Agreement contribution to the conservation of the species. They also stated that the Experiment itself was not expected to provide long term conservation, based on the statement in the FEIS that the USFWS “did not anticipate long-term conservation value from the spotted owls that might reoccupy historic sites in the Study Area.” (USFWS 2013, p 11, 16).

**Response:** The 2011 Revised Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl clearly identified the need for the information that would be provided from the Barred Owl Removal Experiment (Recovery Action (RA) 29), in part to implement RA 30 - Manage to reduce the negative effects of barred owls on spotted owls so that Recovery Criterion 1 can be met. RA 30 describes the potential for management that could include “. . . local or large-scale control of barred owl population, and/or other activities at present unforeseen but informed by research results.” (USFWS 2011, p. III-65).

The FEIS for the Barred Owl Removal Experiment describes the purpose and need for the information that the Experiment will provide and the importance of this Experiment. Friends of Animals erroneously assumed that because we stated that we did not anticipate long term conservation value from the individual spotted owls that may temporarily reoccupy the historic sites where spotted owls had not responded for at least three years, this meant that the study itself had no long term conservation value. In fact, the long term conservation value of the Experiment lies in the information on the effectiveness of removal as a tool for improving spotted owl population dynamics.

This Safe Harbor Agreement contributes to our ability to remove the majority of barred owls from the treatment area. In the absence of this Agreement, USFWS would lack access to important areas within the treatment area. The lack of access for barred owl surveys and removal on Weyerhaeuser lands and roads could create pockets of barred owls within the treatment area, providing a source of barred owls to reoccupy spotted owl sites following removal, continue displacing spotted owls from these sites, reducing the power of the Experiment to detect the effect, and thereby lengthen the duration of the study.

The importance of this Experiment to the recovery of the Northern Spotted Owl is described in the Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl (USFWS 2011) and the EIS for the Barred Owl Removal Experiment (USFWS 2013), as well as in the EA for this Safe Harbor Agreement (Section 1.1 to 1.2) and the Safe Harbor Agreement (Section 4.3). The importance of permission to access using Weyerhaeuser roads and lands, and remove barred owls from Weyerhaeuser lands is described in the EA (Section 3).

**Comment 13:** Cascadia Wildlands expressed concern over what they view as a species-wide scope of the analysis of net conservation benefit, believing this dilutes consideration of local effects and recommended we not consider the value of the Experiment as a whole in the analysis of net conservation benefit. They opined that the acquisition of scientific information does not meet the net conservation benefit requirement.

**Response:** The USFWS, in determining the effects of the proposed Safe Harbor Agreement and in evaluating the potential net conservation benefits, evaluated the contribution of the Agreement to the spotted owl at multiple levels, including the enrolled lands, treatment portion of the Study Area, the province in which the removal is occurring, and species wide. The definition of net conservation benefit in our policy includes the statement that “[n]et conservation benefits must be sufficient to contribute, either directly or indirectly, to the recovery of the covered species.” 64 FR 32722. Recovery is a regional or species-wide concept and to analyze the effect on recovery, a larger scope of analysis is required. Specific to this Safe Harbor Agreement, the Agreement is directly contributing to the implementation of Recovery Action 29, identified as a high priority in the 2011 Recovery Plan for the Northern Spotted Owl (USFWS 2011). Thus the level of analysis of net conservation benefit is completely appropriate. And the fact that this Safe Harbor Agreement is contributing to recovery of the species argues for the net conservation benefit. We have provided some additional clarification on the conservation benefits of the Safe Harbor Agreements at the local level.

**Comment 14:** Cascadia Wildlands suggested that the Service is directly equating the value of the Experiment to acres of habitat. They also asked if there was a conservation benefit if the Experiment was unsuccessful.

**Response:** The USFWS, in the EA, analyzes the effects of the harvest of spotted owl habitat in the non-baseline sites and areas. Cascadia Wildlands erroneously assumes the USFWS was using a mitigation formula based on habitat. In fact, the contribution to the recovery of the species is based on the value of the Experimental results.

Yes, there is a conservation benefit if the Experiment is not successful in increasing spotted owl populations or improving spotted owl population trends. With conclusive negative results, we would not be pursuing the use of this tool on barred owl management in the future

**Comment 15:** Cascadia Wildlands stated that they believe the USFWS's statutory and regulatory authority, guiding policy, and pattern of practice demonstrate that the baseline should consist of all suitable northern spotted owl habitat, regardless of whether that habitat is currently occupied. The commenter notes that the regulatory definition of baseline condition reads "population estimates and distribution and/or habitat characteristics and determined area of the enrolled property that sustain seasonal or permanent use by the covered species at the time the Safe Harbor Agreement is executed between the Services and the property owner." They interpret this as requiring USFWS to include all habitat of the species and point to some past Safe Harbor Agreements to support this contention. They note that two other Safe Harbor Agreements for the spotted owl in Washington and Oregon used habitat as a measure of baseline. They state that “In referencing seasonal use, the definition makes clear that the habitat at issue need not be permanently occupied, but rather simply of conservation value to the listed species.”

**Response:** Cascadia Wildlands misrepresented the requirements of the USFWS regulatory authority and policy when they stated that “[t]he Service’s statutory and regulatory authority, guiding policy, and pattern of practice demonstrate that the baseline should consist of all suitable northern spotted owl habitat, regardless of whether that habitat is currently occupied.” As stated in the final Safe Harbor Agreement Policy, “[t]he Services intend to provide flexibility during

implementation of the policy by providing that baseline conditions will be mutually agreed upon by the participating landowner and the Services, and will be determined by using either population numbers of listed species or occupied habitat acreage, or both. (64 FR 32719). In fact, the policy goes on to describe population numbers as a preferred approach. “The Services, or appropriate cooperators, with the concurrence of the participating property owner, will describe the baseline conditions for the enrolled property in terms appropriate for the covered species such as number and location of individual animals, if determinable, . . . To the extent determinable, the parties to the Agreement must identify and agree on the degree to which the enrolled property is inhabited, permanently or seasonally, by the covered species. . . . For species that are extremely difficult to survey and quantify, an estimate and an indirect measure (e.g., number of suitable acres of habitat of the species) is acceptable and should be based on the best available techniques and information (64 FR 32723-4).”

Spotted owls are relatively easy to survey and survey methods have a high probability of locating resident or territorial individuals, even in the presence of barred owls. The area covered by the Safe Harbor Agreement has been extensively surveyed for over two decades, providing high quality information on past and current population levels. Thus, we chose to use information from these surveys to define baseline in terms of currently-occupied spotted owl sites. Cascadia Wildlands noted that most Safe Harbor Agreements focus on habitat as a measure of baseline, including two in Washington and Oregon specific to spotted owls. The use of habitat as a surrogate for populations is certainly an acceptable approach for determining the baseline condition, particularly where population data is limited, and may be appropriate in the cited cases. They also pointed to the description of baseline as including “. . . existing habitat areas or characteristics that support the species covered at the time of the Agreement, and other appropriate attributes.” This is an option, but is not required as the initial part of the sentence refers to the population measure (64 FR 32723).

The Safe Harbor Agreement Policy does refer to baseline as including area with permanent or seasonal use. Spotted owls are strongly territorial, staying on their territories year-round and not making seasonal movements to other locations or habitat. Thus, the concept of seasonal use is not consistent with the life history of the spotted owl. While dispersing and floater (non-territorial, non-breeding) spotted owls may make intermittent use of forest stands of various conditions as they move through and survive in the forest, the likelihood that they use a particular stand, or rely on that stand for their survival is very low. Studies of dispersing spotted owls show that they move around fairly regularly and over large areas. In the determination of baseline for this Safe Harbor Agreement, we considered any site with even one resident spotted owl response in three years of surveys to be occupied. Thus, if a floater or dispersing spotted owl chooses to settle and respond to surveys, the site is considered occupied even if it later moves on.

### **Analysis of Effects to Spotted Owls and the Experimental Results**

**Comment 16:** Cascadia Wildlands and Friends of Animals questioned whether the loss of habitat resulting from this SHA will bias the experimental results and whether changes in habitat in the treatment or control area may confound the results. Friends of Animals pointed out that the purpose of the Experiment is to allow spotted owls greater access to suitable habitat so that they can live and reproduce in habitat that would otherwise remain unavailable due to barred owl

occupancy. They questioned how the USFWS would be able to detect if barred owl control was working in light of the loss of habitat during the Experiment.

**Response:** Cascadia Wildlands and Friends of Animals provided no evidence that the level of habitat loss under this Permit would negate any benefit of the Barred Owl Removal Experiment. The models used to generate the spotted owl population trends, the basis for determining the impact of barred owl removal on spotted owl populations, include habitat as a covariate. This allows us to estimate the impact habitat loss (or gain) has on the observed rates of population change. The analyses in Dugger et al. (2016) demonstrate that within the modeling framework, we can detect whether barred owl removal is affecting the spotted owl population trend even with the loss of some habitat during the study. This is particularly true given the small amount of habitat that may be removed under the conditions of the Safe Harbor Agreement.

**Comment 17:** Cascadia Wildlands stated that the USFWS assumes minor impact from the loss of habitat because of remaining habitat on other private and surrounding Federal lands to support the site. They are concerned that these lands may also be harvested. They believe that landowners may log areas down to the "thresholds" and then Weyerhaeuser would be able to log further below this. They believe that the Service erroneously relies on neighboring lands to provide the net conservation benefit. Cascadia Wildlands stated that the USFWS should consider the cumulative impacts of likely surrounding logging over time. They recommended that the USFWS should not allow any habitat loss that puts the site center below take thresholds. Finally, they recommended any take authorization be delayed until the final year of the Permit.

**Response:** Contrary to Cascadia Wildlands impression, the USFWS has not set specific habitat thresholds for below which any habitat removal is considered take. All evaluation of take is conducted case by case, taking into account the specific situation, location, amount, and effect of habitat removal.

The USFWS did not base its analysis of net conservation benefit on the condition of the lands outside of Weyerhaeuser's land base, nor did we assume that the neighboring landowners would not harvest some habitat. Under current land use plans, very little Federal high-quality habitat will be harvested. In fact, since 2010, the USFWS has consulted on the removal of only 1,115 acres of spotted owl habitat on Federal lands in the entire Oregon Coast Ranges, of which this treatment area is a small part. In the EA, we did note that in many cases, Weyerhaeuser has very small amounts of the habitat within the historic use area of specific spotted owl sites. However, in all cases we assume that the harvest of these acres could result in incidental take and would affect, to some degree, these 16 sites if they become reoccupied by spotted owls.

The USFWS analyzed cumulative effects in the draft EA, as described in the NEPA regulations "the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or nonfederal) or person undertakes such other actions" (40 CFR § 1508.7). Cascadia Wildlands' recommendation to not allow any harvest that drops any site center below threshold levels of habitat amounts to the USFWS not authorizing any take. The same applies to only allowing take in the final year of the Permit. Without the incidental take authorization, the Company has little incentive to enter into the Safe Harbor Agreement.

**Comment 18:** Cascadia Wildlands stated that the removal of barred owls will serve to attract viable spotted owls to the area from surrounding areas, and the approved harvest of habitat will then harm these individuals, creating a sink population.

**Response:** The most likely source of spotted owls that may reoccupy sites once barred owls are removed are the spotted owls that were displaced from these sites and remain in the area as floaters (non-territorial, non-breeding) birds. A few replacement birds may be younger spotted owls produced on one of the few remaining spotted owl sites and still looking for a territory, therefore joining the floater population. We are unlikely to entice the remaining territorial spotted owls to abandon their current sites and move onto the non-baseline sites from which we are removing barred owls. Experience shows that once spotted owls establish a territory, spotted owls have a high inclination to remain on that familiar territory (Forsman et al. 2002, p 29). Therefore, we do not anticipate that any of the spotted owls currently occupying baseline sites would move onto non-baseline sites and therefore be incidentally taken under this Permit.

We have no evidence that floaters (young and displaced territorial spotted owls) successfully breed unless they first establish a territory. These individuals are unlikely to find and defend territory as long as barred owls remain in the area in the current densities. Thus, these non-territorial owls are not contributing to future generations and, in the absence of barred owl removal, will likely die without reproducing. If we remove barred owls, these spotted owls may be able to establish territories and reproduce, thus contributing to future generations during the removal period.

### **Recommendation for Changes to the Safe Harbor Agreement**

**Comment 19:** Cascadia Wildlands recommended that the USFWS simply carry out the Experiment without Weyerhaeuser's cooperation, stating that since most territories are on Federal land and the EA analysis notes that the Experiment could be done without access to Weyerhaeuser lands, this is a reasonable approach. Later in their comments, they stated that they did not believe that providing for a "slightly more convenient and thorough experiment" provides a net conservation benefit.

**Response:** Cascadia Wildlands failed to acknowledge that, while the EA states that the Experiment could be done without access to Weyerhaeuser lands, we also noted that the quality of the experimental results would be negatively affected by the lack of access. While some portion of the Experiment is possible without access to Weyerhaeuser non-federal lands and the use of Weyerhaeuser roads, failure to remove barred owls from portions of the treatment area could reduce the power of the Experiment to detect any changes in spotted owl population dynamics resulting from the removal of barred owls and potentially extend the duration of the Experiment. The USFWS has repeatedly indicated the need to gather this information in a timely manner. Failure to access non-federal lands could delay the results.

In areas of checkerboard ownership, such as the treatment area, not all forest roads are open for public use and access to Federal lands requires using roads that cross private lands. Under some historic right-of-way agreements, even Federal use of the roads may be limited to specific uses, or not allowed at all. Thus, the lack of access to Weyerhaeuser controlled roads could have a

greater effect than simply failing to access their lands. The mere presence of Federal lands does not ensure we have access to that land for the Experiment. The need for this access is more than a matter of convenience or slight difference in the thoroughness of the Experiment.

**Comment 20:** Cascadia Wildlands stated that there is significant uncertainty as to whether spotted owls may recolonize the area or whether and when barred owls may return. They suggest that USFWS prohibit logging of nest stands during the Experiment, so that if spotted owls remain after the Experiment terminates, the new spotted owl reproductive opportunities will occur. They note that if USFWS predictions are true, spotted owls will not be present and harvest can proceed.

**Response:** The primary purpose of the Experiment is to discover whether spotted owls will reoccupy sites if barred owls are removed. Based on results from the Green Diamond barred owl removal study in California, the USFWS believes that reoccupancy of at least some of the sites is likely, and that the rapidly declining population trend for spotted owls in this area may improve; however, uncertainty does remain as to whether this will also work in Oregon. If there were no uncertainty, there would be no reason for the Experiment.

We assume that by site centers, Cascadia Wildlands is referring to the nest stand. As noted before, there are no historic nest stands on Weyerhaeuser lands in the treatment area, and based on previous experiments, historic site centers are the most likely to be reoccupied. Thus, we believe the risk of losing a site center during the Experiment is very low.

Safe Harbor Agreements are voluntary agreements. In this case, Weyerhaeuser will allow us to remove barred owls from their lands in return for not encumbering lands that are currently not encumbered, including potential nest stands or site centers that may develop with the removal of the barred owls. If we do not complete the Safe Harbor Agreement and therefore do not remove barred owls from Weyerhaeuser lands, it is highly unlikely that spotted owl site centers will be established on Weyerhaeuser lands.

**Comment 21:** Cascadia Wildlands stated that retaining all unoccupied habitat reduces fragmentation and the risk of barred owl invasion, provides foraging and dispersal, and increased the chance that will reproduce and succeed in an area. They note that the recovery plan recommended managing to conserve high value spotted owl habitat.

**Response:** Whether the removal of suitable spotted owl habitat under this SHA would lead to any of the results described by Cascadia Wildlands depends, in great part, on the specific situation. For example, the removal of isolated small patches would not increase fragmentation. Habitat patches provide for foraging opportunities only if spotted owls can access it safely (no barred owls using the area), and dispersal ability only if there are young spotted owls available to use it. There is no evidence that fragmentation increases the risk that barred owls will invade, or use, an area and Cascadia Wildlands did not provide any information to support this contention. Since these areas are unoccupied, they are less likely to be supporting any reproducing spotted owls.

Recovery Action 10, the discussion cited by Cascadia Wildlands in their comment, is focused on Federal lands. Under Recovery Action 13, the Recovery Plan does make the following statement: "Given the continued decline of the species, the apparent increase in severity of the threat from barred owls, and information indicating a recent loss of genetic diversity for the species, we recommend conserving occupied sites and unoccupied, high-value spotted owl habitat on State and private lands wherever possible. This recommendation is primarily driven by the concern associated with displacement of spotted owls by barred owls, the need to retain good quality habitat to allow for displaced or recruited spotted owls to reoccupy such habitat, and the need to retain a spotted owl distribution across the range where Federal lands are lacking. . . . Because spotted owls on established territories are likely to be more successful if they remain in those locations (Franklin et al. 2000), managing to retain spotted owls at existing sites should be the most effective approach to conserving spotted owls. Retention of long-term occupancy and reproduction at established spotted owl sites will require a coordinated and cooperative effort to craft management approaches tailored to regional, provincial or local conditions." Note that while the Recovery Plan recommends retaining unoccupied, high-value spotted owl habitat wherever possible, the Recovery Plan goes on to stress the concern over the increasing barred owl threat and the importance of maintaining spotted owls at existing sites. The Experiment will, at least for a short time, contribute to maintaining currently occupied spotted owl sites, delay the invasion of barred owls, and otherwise contribute to the conservation of the spotted owl through the experimental results, as described in the EIS for the Experiment. Also, because these sites are currently unoccupied by resident spotted owls, this habitat is, or will very soon be, unprotected from harvest by State or Federal law. Thus, the USFWS has determined that the value of the SHA and its contribution to the Experiment outweighs the value of the scattered nesting-roosting habitat in the non-baseline sites and areas.

**Comment 22:** Cascadia Wildlands recommended that the "protected core" be expanded to encompass all nesting and roosting habitat in the site and not allow for timber harvest in the non-nesting season. They state that removing this habitat may preclude future use and may harm fledglings that rely on the area prior to dispersing and juvenile owls that often periodically linger on their site beyond dispersal.

**Response:** There are no known historic site centers on Weyerhaeuser lands in over 20 years of spotted owl surveys. Based on experience on the Green Diamond barred owl removal experiment, spotted owls are more likely to reoccupy past site centers than initiate new ones (Diller et al, 2014). Thus, the potential for spotted owls that may reoccupy the area as barred owls are removed will set up a nest stand or site center on Weyerhaeuser land is low and other nest stands exist for spotted owls on these sites.

The purpose of the seasonal restriction is to allow fledglings to stay on the natal core prior to dispersal. Data shows that spotted owls generally fledge in this area in September. Fledging spotted owls typically disperse out of the area, even if they eventually return to the vicinity. Cascadia provided no specific information supporting the claim that juvenile spotted owls "often periodically linger on their natal territories as they mature".

**Comment 23:** Cascadia Wildlands claimed that the USFWS's analysis assumes that Weyerhaeuser will wait until late in the Permit term to log habitat.

**Response:** The USFWS made no such assumption and did not assume that any of the habitat on the covered lands within the non-baseline sites and areas would remain in place for any specific time. The contribution to the recovery of the spotted owl from this Safe Harbor Agreement is access to allow for a more complete and efficient removal of barred owls resulting in strong information on the effect of barred owl removal on spotted owl populations, not retention of habitat in the non-baseline sites and areas.

### **Endangered Species Act**

**Comment 24:** Friends of Animals and Cascadia Wildlands stated that the Weyerhaeuser's proposed Permit and Safe Harbor Agreement are not in compliance with the Endangered Species Act because they would not provide a net conservation benefit to northern spotted owls. They stated that the loss of habitat is long term and would negate the contributions to the survival of the species. Friends of Animals suggested that this is grounds for denying the Permit and noted that the Permit exceeds the length of the actual Experiment. They contend that "If northern spotted owl habitat is destroyed as part of the Experiment, as proposed in the Safe Harbor Agreement, then no benefit can come from conducting the Barred Owl Removal Experiment, and it could actually reduce the likelihood of spotted owl survival and recovery."

**Response:** In the draft Safe Harbor Agreement, Section 4.3 b-- Net Conservation Benefit, we describe the value of the Barred Owl Removal Experiment, and the value of access to the Weyerhaeuser lands to the efficient operation of the Experiment. We note that lack of access will likely reduce the detection power of the Experiment which, in turn, would lead to extending the term of the Experiment and delay results. As Friends of Animals notes, spotted owl populations are in decline. Any delay in acquiring information important to potentially addressing the threat from barred owl competition will only exacerbate the decline. See our response to Comment 1 for a discussion of habitat loss.

Both commenters fail to acknowledge that the habitat in question is either in areas where no spotted owls have been found in over 20 years of surveys (areas outside Thiessen polygons) or on sites where spotted owls have not been detected in over three years. These sites are currently unoccupied by resident (territorial) spotted owls, are based on the recent data on the effect of barred owls on site occupancy (Dugger et al. 2016), and are not likely to become reoccupied under the status quo (no barred owl removal). As such, this habitat is, or will very soon be, unprotected from harvest by State or Federal law.

The length of the Permit is based on the length of time before the USFWS anticipates conditions in terms of spotted and barred owl populations on the Study Area will return to baseline condition. The effects of the Barred Owl Removal Experiment do not vanish immediately following the last removal period. The USFWS anticipates that the barred owl population will take three to five years to recover following the removal. The Permit length was established to coincide with the return to baseline conditions as far as potential spotted owl occupancy.

**Comment 25:** Cascadia Wildlands requested that the USFWS document and quantify the amount of all past and ongoing incidental take of northern spotted owls. They are concerned that USFWS is routinely issuing incidental take statements and permits with little cumulative effects analysis, pointing to the recent Safe Harbor Agreement signed with Roseburg Resources Company and Oxbow I, LLC where incidental take of spotted owls associated with 19 non-baseline spotted owl sites was authorized.

**Response:** The USFWS tracks all authorized incidental take of spotted owls, and considers this information in the environmental baseline section of Section 7 consultation on all actions, including this proposed issuance of a permit. Past levels of take are considered in the analysis of the project, including the incidental take of up to an estimated 46 spotted owls under the Programmatic Safe Harbor Agreement for the Northern Spotted Owl between U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Oregon Department of Forestry and USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. We included explicit consideration of the take authorized for Roseburg Resources Company and Oxbow I, LLC in the draft EA for this Safe Harbor Agreement, as well as the potential for additional take with the now-draft Oregon Department of Forestry Safe Harbor Agreement.

In the period starting October 2010, the USFWS has authorized the incidental take of spotted owls at 32 sites on Federal lands throughout the entire North Coast Planning Province (similar to the Oregon Coast Ranges Physiographic Province) where the lands that would be covered by the Permit occur, though not all of this incidental take authorization was used. Most of this take has been in the form of harassment from noise and/or smoke during one breeding season. This may affect breeding for that year, but is not likely to affect the survival of the territorial spotted owls. No incidental take has been authorized in any area on Federal lands in the North Coast Planning Province since October 2014.

## Literature Cited

- Diller, L. V., Dumbacher, J. P., Bosch, R. P., Bown, R. R. and Gutiérrez, R. J. 2014 , Removing barred owls from local areas: Techniques and feasibility. *Wildl. Soc. Bull.*, 38: 211–216. doi:10.1002/wsb.381
- Dugger, K.M., R. G. Anthony, and E.D. Forsman. 2009. Final Report Estimating Northern Spotted Owl Detection Probabilities: Updating the USFWS Northern Spotted Owl Survey Protocol Principal Investigators. Report for the US Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, OR. 55 pp.
- Dugger, K.M., E.D. Forsman, A.B. Franklin, R.J. Davis, G.C. White, C.J. Schwarz, K.P. Burnham, J.D. Nichols, J.E. Hines, C.B. Yackulic, P.F. Doherty., L. Bailey, D.A. Clark, S.H. Ackers, L.S. Andrews, B. Augustine, B.L. Biswell, J.Blakesley, P.C. Carlson, M.J. Clement, L.V. Diller, E.M. Glenn, A.Green, S.A. Gremel, D.R. Herter, J. M. Higley, J. Hobson, R.B. Horn, K.P. Huyvaert, C. McCafferty, T. McDonald, K. McDonnell, G.S. Olson, J.A. Reid, J. Rockweit, V. Ruiz, J.Saenz, and S.G. Sovern.2016. The effects of habitat, climate, and Barred Owls on long-term demography of Northern Spotted Owls. *The Condor*: February 2016, Vol. 118, No. 1, pp. 57-116.
- Forsman, E. D., R. G. Anthony, J. A. Reid, P. J. Loschl, S. G. Sovern, M. Taylor, B. L. Biswell, A. Ellingson, E. C. Meslow, G. S. Miller, K. A. Swindle. 2002. Natal and breeding dispersal of Northern Spotted Owls. *Wildlife Monographs* 149.
- Franklin, A.B., D.R. Anderson, R.J. Gutiérrez, and K.P. Burnham. 2000. Climate, habitat quality, and fitness in northern spotted owl populations in northwestern California. *Ecological Monographs* 70:539–590.
- J. D. Wiens. 2016. Pers. Comm. Email summarizing response to question on barred and spotted owl interactions at sites.
- J. D. Wiens, K.M. Dugger, K.E. Lewicki, D.C. Simon, B. Glenn, R. Bown. February 2016. Experimental Removal of Barred Owls to Benefit Northern Spotted Owls: Status in Oregon and Washington. Presentation at the 2016 Oregon Chapter of The Wildlife Society Annual Meeting. Seaside, Oregon.
- USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2011. Revised Recovery Plan for the Spotted Owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon.
- USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2013. Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Experimental Removal of Barred Owls to Benefit Threatened Spotted Owls. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Portland, Oregon.