September 17, 2020

Via Certified and Electronic Mail

David Bernhardt, Secretary  Marc Jackson, Field Supervisor  
1840 C Street, N.W.  1340 Financial Blvd, Suite 234  
Washington, D.C. 20240  Reno, NV 89502  
secretary_of_the_interior@ios.doi.gov  marc_jackson@fws.gov  

Aurelia Skipworth, Director  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
1849 C Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20240  
aurelia_skipworth@fws.gov  

Re:  Petition Pursuant to Administrative Procedure Act to Issue a Rule Immediately Protecting the Tiehm’s Buckwheat under the Endangered Species Act due to a Significant Risk to the Species’ Well-Being; Requesting Conclusion by September 24, 2020  

Dear Secretary Bernhardt, Director Skipworth, and Field Supervisor Jackson:

The Center for Biological Diversity (“the Center”) hereby provides new and alarming information regarding a recent incident, or more than one incident, of collection and/or destruction of Tiehm’s buckwheat (*Eriogonum tiehmii* Reveal, Polygonaceae) plants at all six subpopulations on public land in Nevada where the species can still be found. In addition, pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 553(e), we hereby renew our October 2019 petition asking the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (“Service”) to immediately list Tiehm’s buckwheat as an endangered or threatened species on an emergency basis, as authorized by the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1533(b)(7); 5 U.S.C. §§ 553(e), 555(b).

In recent weeks and months, an unknown number of Tiehm’s buckwheat plants have been destroyed and removed at all six subpopulations, apparently having been dug up with spades or small shovels. See Attachment A (Letter from P. Donnelly, Center for Biological Diversity to D. Furtado, Bureau of Land Management et al, Re: *Tiehm’s buckwheat large-scale destruction incident* (Sept. 15, 2020)). About 40 percent of the total population may have been destroyed and removed so far, with individual plants nearly extirpated from two of these locations and substantially reduced or affected in four. The causes or reasons for this unprecedented incident(s) are yet to be known but indisputably pose an immediate, direct threat to the species’ very existence. Until this emerging threat can be sufficiently addressed and a final rule listing the Tiehm’s buckwheat can be published, it is absolutely critical—indeed, existential—that the
Service exercise its authority and issue an emergency rule immediately protecting the buckwheat as endangered or threatened under the ESA. *Id.* § 1533(b)(7) (authorizing the Service to issue a rule immediately protecting a species under the ESA in the event of an “emergency posing a significant risk to the well-being of any species of fish or wildlife or plants”).


But emergency protection is needed right away to protect the species for the duration of the listing process from these recent incidents, which present an emerging and ongoing threat to the buckwheat’s well-being that has come to light since the Service determined listing may already be warranted. 90-Day Finding; Attachment A (Donnelly Letter).

Indeed, in the Petition, the Center also petitioned for issuance of an emergency rule to protect the Tiehm’s buckwheat immediately, due to significant risks to the species’ well-being known at that time. Petition at 2-3; 5 U.S.C. § 553(e) (“Each agency shall give an interested person the right to petition for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of a rule.”). In the 90-Day Finding, in July 2020, the Service did not formally conclude whether it would do so, merely stating that the ESA does not require the agency to respond to this request. 90-Day Finding, 85 Fed. Reg. 84, 267 (“The Act does not provide for a process to petition emergency listing; therefore, we are evaluating this petition under the normal process ...”). While we do not agree with this interpretation of the ESA, the APA does nevertheless require you to conclude the matter either way, i.e., to determine whether to publish an emergency listing rule, and to do so within a reasonable time. 16 U.S.C. § 1533(7); *id.* § 555(b) (“With due regard for the convenience and necessity of the parties or their representatives and within a reasonable time, each shall proceed to conclude a matter presented to it.”). While emergency listing has been clearly warranted since our October 2019 petition was submitted, in light of the additional, existential threat presented by the recent incident(s), the risk to the species’ well-being, and indeed its very existence, is even more dire.

Therefore, and particularly considering this additional, existential threat to the species, we renew our petition to the Service under the APA to issue a rule immediately listing Tiehm’s buckwheat

1 The Center hereby incorporates by reference the information in our Petition and the scientific information included therein.

2 While the Center believes that the evidence clearly demonstrates that the recent devastation is caused by human activity, emergency listing is warranted regardless of the cause. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 1533(a)(1)(E) (requiring listing based on “any other natural or manmade factors affecting [the species’] continued existence”).
on an emergency basis as authorized by the ESA and necessitated by the present circumstances. Either way, given the exigent circumstances, please provide the Center with your conclusion of the matter no later than the close of business on September 24, 2020. Please contact the undersigned with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Amy R. Atwood
Center for Biological Diversity
P.O. Box 11374
Portland, OR 97211-0374
971-717-6401
atwood@biologicaldiversity.org

cc: Douglas Furtado, Battle Mountain District Manager
Bureau of Land Management
50 Bastian Road
Battle Mountain, NV 89820
dfurtado@blm.gov
ATTACHMENT A

Letter from P. Donnelly, Center for Biological Diversity to D. Furtado, Bureau of Land Management et al, Re: *Tiehm’s buckwheat large-scale destruction incident* (Sept. 15, 2020)
September 15, 2020

Douglas Furtado, District Manager
Bureau of Land Management, Battle Mountain District
50 Bastian Road
Battle Mountain, NV 89820
dfurtado@blm.gov

Marc Jackson, Field Supervisor
US Fish and Wildlife Service, Reno Office
1340 Financial Blvd, Suite 234
Reno, NV 89502
marc_jackson@fws.gov

Kacey KC, State Firewarden/Forester
Nevada Division of Forestry
2478 Fairview Dr.
Carson City, NV 89701
kaceykc@forestry.nv.gov

Ioneer Corp, USA Office
9460 Double R Blvd, Suite 200
Reno, NV 89521
info@ioneer.com

Kris Kuyper, Biology Program Manager
EM Strategies
1650 Meadow Wood Lane
Reno, NV 89502
kris@emstrats.com

Re: Tiehm’s buckwheat large-scale destruction incident

With great sadness we report that on September 13, 2020 a large-scale destruction/collection incident destroyed an estimated 40% of the global population of the imperiled Tiehm’s buckwheat (*Eriogonum tiehmii* Reveal, Polygonaceae). This significant and possibly irreparable loss is likely a consequence of inaction to protect the species by the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the State of Nevada, and the Ioneer Corporation. We request that all parties to which this letter is addressed take immediate corrective,
protective, and restorative actions to ensure the long-term viability of Tiehm’s buckwheat and to protect it from further loss.

On September 12, 2020 at approximately 4:00 p.m., Dr. Naomi Fraga of California Botanic Garden and Patrick Donnelly of the Center for Biological Diversity visited subpopulation 1 of Tiehm’s buckwheat (*Eriogonum tiehmii*) at Rhyolite Ridge. We discovered that there was significant disturbance at subpopulation 1 adjacent to the road, and many plants were missing. It appeared to be a poaching incident.

We returned on September 13, 2020 to conduct a more thorough survey of the damage. It appears that **there has been a significant incident of collection and/or wanton destruction of Tiehm’s buckwheat across the entirety of its range.** The buckwheats appear to have been dug up by small shovels or spades. There were three predominant ways the damage presented: the entire plant was dug up and all that was left was a hole in the ground (Figs. 6-7); a portion of a buckwheat mat was dug up or removed from the ground, leaving a badly damaged remaining plant/mat (Figs. 8-9); or holes were dug to extract plants and extant plants are remaining with taproots exposed and a large hole surrounding them (Fig. 10). We observed significant footprints and disturbance in all subpopulations, including what appeared to be newly created social trails, which we surmise were used to haul out buckwheats (Fig. 3). While there were remains of buckwheat plants around the site within the subpopulations, including whole plants and pieces of plants, the lack of a large amount of uprooted biomass makes very clear that the perpetrators took the majority of the uprooted plants offsite. Please see the end of this letter for photographs of the incident (Figs. 4-10).

We visited all six subpopulations as established by Morefield (1995) and found varying levels of destruction throughout the entirety of occupied habitat and across all subpopulations. As a whole the data presented in this letter are largely preliminary based on observations, though we did count specific holes in the ground at subpopulations 1 and 2. It is unclear how many plants are lost for each hole in the ground – at a minimum one, but it may be more. In subpopulations 3, 4, 5, and 6 we present here estimates of percentage of plants loss, since the holes became too numerous to count. This data may be better obtained during the vegetative growth period in the spring, when plants are green and photosynthetic and more apparent in the landscape. These are presented as provisional and observational data to understand the scope of the destruction.

Subpopulations 3, 4, and 5 were the most severely affected, experiencing severe loss and apparent near total extirpation. Subpopulation 6, far and away the largest of the subpopulations, experienced an estimated 35% loss of individuals, including much higher levels of loss in subpopulation 6b. Subpopulations 1 and 2 were also significantly affected, experiencing an estimated loss of 25%. Within subpopulations, some populations were targeted for more intensive removal/destruction creating areas of wholesale extirpation (Figs. 4-5).

In total, a preliminary field survey revealed an estimated loss of over 17,000 plants. The total global population per EM Strategies 2019 survey was 43,921. **Thus we estimate that approximately 40% of Tiehm’s buckwheat’s global population was lost to this wanton act of destruction.** Please see provisional field survey data in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subpopulation</th>
<th>Estimated number of plants per 2019 survey (Percent of population)</th>
<th>(Count of holes 2020)</th>
<th>(Visual assessment 2020)</th>
<th>(Count of plants destroyed based on visual assessment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9,240 (21%)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>25% extirpation</td>
<td>2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,541 (10%)</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>25% extirpation</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,860 (4%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>90% extirpation</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,159 (19%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>80% extirpation</td>
<td>6,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>199 (1%)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100% extirpation</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (a, b)</td>
<td>19,871 (45%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35% extirpation</td>
<td>6,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43,921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are unclear on the timing of this incident. Our last visit was July 5, 2020, and we did not notice any of this destruction at that time.

We also want to note that for some number of months, Ioneer Corp. has had a “missing” poster for Tiehm’s buckwheat posted in the general store in nearby Dyer, NV. The poster offers a $5,000 reward for confirming a new population of Tiehm’s buckwheat. The poster can be seen below in Figure 1. The poster was also distributed as a two-page stapled document, which is scanned below as Figures 2. We are aware that the poster was up in the Dyer store at least as far back as June 3, 2020 when the picture in Figure 1 was taken. We have been told anecdotally that the poster was up as early as April of 2020 which is supported by a posting on Ioneer’s website.1 The handout scanned below in Figure 2 was obtained at the general store on July 5, 2020.

---

1 https://rhyolite-ridge.ioneer.com/ioneer-is-offering-a-5000-reward-for-the-discovery-of-tiehms-buckwheat/
Figure 1: “missing” poster as posted in the Dyer general store on June 3, 2020.

Figure 2: the Ioneer “missing” handout, which is identical to the poster in the store, obtained July 5, 2020.
Although it would be fruitless to speculate on the motives of the perpetrators of this incident, we will make a few observations. The plants were largely broken off from their taproots, and thus it was primarily the above-ground vegetative material that was taken. Such parts of a plant are highly unlikely to be viable in a transplanting situation. They are effectively dead. However, some great care was taken to haul out the dead pieces of buckwheat once they were unearthed, as was evidenced by recently trampled “social trails,” which had been barely discernable in past visits to the site. It seems unusual to go to such effort to remove the plants when they would be so certain not to survive.

The emerging social trail pictured below in Figure 3 was on the east side of subpopulation 2. This area of subpopulation 2 experienced almost 100% extirpation. This trail was not observed in previous visits to be of the same level of use and definition. One might surmise this trail was further developed by repeated trips to haul out the buckwheat plants. We saw similar trails in all populations.

![Figure 3: emerging social trail within subpopulation 2.](image-url)
Urgent Recommendations:

Tiehm’s buckwheat faces a dire situation due to this new and active threat. Losing 40% of the global population in a single incident is catastrophic. Without immediate corrective, protective, and restorative action, we fear that other, similar incidents could occur and further jeopardize the long-term viability of the species, ultimately driving the species to extinction. But if your agencies take appropriate measures to protect the plant and restore the damage done to individual plants and habitat by this latest incident, we believe Tiehm’s buckwheat can recover from this catastrophic event. Our recommendations are as follows:

Bureau of Land Management:
- Flag visible holes to enable assessment next spring during vegetative growth period;
- Backfill holes to prevent erosion, including focused effort on potentially viable plants that have had their roots exposed and are surrounded by holes;
- Repair damage to plants that is reparable and provide plant care to plants, including potentially supplemental water and/or other aids;
- Fence the entire habitat of Tiehm’s buckwheat with secure fencing;
- Install security/game cameras;
- Install proper signage to inform the public of the sensitive resources present;
- Commence an investigation into this crime;
- Prosecute any violations of applicable federal law.

US Fish and Wildlife Service:
- Conduct a comprehensive re-survey of the population to confirm extent of damage;
- Immediately issue a 12-month finding to list Tiehm’s buckwheat as endangered under the Endangered Species Act;
- Designate critical habitat for the entirety of the buckwheat’s occupied range;
- Develop a recovery plan to ensure Tiehm’s buckwheat does not go extinct.

Nevada Division of Forestry:
- Immediately adopt a rule to protect Tiehm’s buckwheat under NRS 527.
- Create a plan for seed collection in 2021 and propagation.

Ioneer Corp. & EM Strategies:
- Immediately remove “missing” posters from Dyer store;
- Immediately cease offering a reward for new discoveries of Tiehm’s buckwheat;
- Post a 24-hour security guard on-site until more appropriate security measures can be implemented by BLM.
- Cease any further disturbance of Tiehm’s buckwheat individuals or native habitat for mining mitigation research until further information about the status and viability of the species in the aftermath of this destruction can be determined.
All Parties:

- Only a comprehensive seed banking, propagation, and outplanting effort can restore Tiehm’s buckwheat to its former state in its native habitat. Conservation efforts must prioritize restoring Tiehm’s buckwheat within formerly occupied habitat, not on mining mitigation.
- Permitting for mining activities within the native range of Tiehm’s buckwheat should cease until the population can be stabilized.

The agencies and other parties addressed by this letter can take protective, corrective, and restorative actions that are critical for the species’ continued persistence. This species has faced threats from mining for decades, but USFWS and NDF have failed to take action to provide adequate protection for this species, despite repeated warnings of its precarity and limited range; by BLM’s lack of management for the buckwheat and its habitat; and by Ioneer’s disregard for the need to protect the species in its native environment. Considering the catastrophic damage that the species has already experienced, only direct and immediate action from all interested parties will restore Tiehm’s buckwheat and prevent further decline and ultimate extinction.

We await your prompt action,

Patrick Donnelly  
Nevada State Director  
Center for Biological Diversity  
pdonnelly@biologicaldiversity.org

Naomi Fraga, Ph.D.  
Director of Conservation  
California Botanic Garden  
nfraga@calbg.org

CC: Bradley Crowell, Catherine Erskine, Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources; Perry Wickham, BLM Tonopah; Justin Barrett, USFWS Reno; John Christopherson, Nevada Division of Forestry; Kirstin Szabo, James Morefield, Nevada Division of Natural Heritage; Zach Zaragoza, Kyle Chapman, office of Senator Cortez Masto; Kelly Riddle, office of Senator Jacky Rosen; Kevin Herzik, office of Representative Steven Horsford; Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair, Senate Natural Resources Committee.
Figure 4: destruction at a single site near the access road at subpopulation 1.
Figure 5: destruction in subpopulation 6b.

Figure 6: Dug up plants with detritus, subpopulation 2.
Figure 7: completely dug up plants, subpopulation 1.

Figure 8: Destroyed buckwheat with loose pieces, exposed taproot, and small remaining rooted plants in subpopulation 1.
Figure 9: Exposed taproot, subpopulation 1

Figure 10: extant plants are remaining with taproots exposed and a large hole surrounding them.