1. MZ: II - CO portion of WY Basin

2. Populations included:

   Eagle -South Routt
   Middle Park
   North Park (as part of WY Basin)
   NW Colorado (as part of WY Basin)

3. For each **population** do the identified priority/core areas capture redundancy and representation? If not please clarify why and what needs to be changed. If so, please provide a brief description of your rationale.

   Eagle -South Routt: - Within the North Eagle-South Routt population, representation appears to be captured adequately. Priority habitats capture 68% of the occupied range in this population it also includes 100% of all known active leks and all habitat that was modeled "high probability of use" within 4 miles of leks that has been active in the last 10 year. Redundancy is not captured within this population because it is a fairly small (3 year running average number of males is 108) and fairly isolated population. The greatest threat to this population is loss of habitat from subdivision and housing development as well as the associated infrastructure and roads. PJ encroachment has been, and continues to be, a significant threat to the population as well.

   Middle Park: - Within the Middle Park population, representation and redundancy appear to be captured adequately. Priority habitats capture 79% of the occupied range in this population and also includes 95% of all known active leks and 95% of habitat that was modeled "high probability of use". Redundancy is captured reasonably well within this population because although it currently has a 3 year running average of males of 210 the priority habitats include most of the known distribution of birds and connectivity to the North Park population has been known to occur. Housing development has the most current and foreseeable threat. Grand County has experienced a high rate of human population growth in recent years. This high growth rate is projected to continue primarily due to its' proximity to major ski resorts and summer recreational activities.

   North Park (as part of the WY Basin Population) Within the North Park population, representation and redundancy appear to be captured well. Priority habitats capture 91% of the occupied range in this population and includes 100% of all known active leks and 100% of habitat that was modeled "high probability of use" within 4 miles of a lek that has been active within the last 10 years. Historically no significant threats were apparent to this population. However, there is renewed interest in oil development in NP. In addition, a large portion (29%) of public land in priority habitat has been leased for energy development. NP has overlapping energy and mineral resources and thus could experience natural gas, coalbed methane, and oil extraction. Although present, the other identified threats are less in NP than in other populations. Priority habitat is in fairly good condition, and a large portion of it is on public lands.

   NW Colorado (as part of WY Basin) Within the North Park population, representation and redundancy appear to be captured adequately. Priority habitats capture 56% of the occupied

DRAFT

range in this population and also includes 95% of all known active leks and 95% of habitat that was modeled "high probability of use" within 4 miles of a lek that has been active within the last 10 years.. Most of the sub-management zones within this population have some connectivity with other sub-management zones in this population.

4. At the **MZ scale** is redundancy and representation accurately captured by the priority/core areas? If not please identify why and what needs to be changed. If so, please provide a brief description of your rationale.

   The Colorado portion of this MZ appears to adequately capture redundancy and representation in the priority/core areas. Priority habitats represent 61% of the occupied range in Colorado and 84 % of the breeding birds in the state occur within the priority habitat. Being on the edge of the species range the populations within this MZ are somewhat isolated. Linkage zones have been mapped between the Colorado populations. It is assumed the habitat linkages will allow for movement between populations and will decrease the probability of extinction of the subpopulations by stabilizing population dynamics. Connectivity with the WY portion of the MZ (Colorado's priority habitats with Wyoming's Core habitats) maybe adequate in most areas but there may be some areas that need to be addressed specifically in the NW CO area.

5. Identify populations for which resistance has been lost:

   a. For those populations listed above, which populations **are still resilient** to further disturbances, assuming that no further threats occur.

      Middle Park - Although this is a relatively small population (current 3-year average is 210 males) we do not believe the population has ever been very large. Since the 1970's, the population counts have been roughly between 200 and 325 males. Connectivity to the North Park population has always been somewhat naturally limited over Muddy Pass although we have documented birds moving over the pass.

      North Park (as part of WY Basin) - This is likely Colorado's most resilient population. Long - term data trends (since the early 1970's) indicate this population has fluctuated roughly between 500 and 1,500 males. Priority habitat is in fairly good condition, and a large portion of it is on public lands.

      NW Colorado (as part of WY Basin) - This is Colorado's largest population. The northern portion is likely to be more resilient than the south eastern portions of this population because of habitat condition and connectivity. There is more habitat fragmentation in the south eastern portion of this population. According to lek count data, the long-term trend appears to be stable, but substantial population fluctuations have occurred regularly. Population peaks have occurred in 1960-70, 1978-80, and in the mid-2000s.

   b. For those populations listed above, which **populations have lost their resiliency** (assuming no further threats occur).

DRAFT

Eagle -South Routt - This population is mostly resilient but due to its fairly small population size (3 year running average number of males is 108) and fairly isolated population it has little lost resiliency. Populations (males only) in the late 1960s were likely in the high 200s.

c. For those populations listed above, which **populations are at most risk for further threats**?

Eagle -South Routt - This population is most at risk due to its fairly small population size and fairly isolated population. A stochastic event could greatly affect this population. The greatest threat to this population is loss of habitat from subdivision and housing development as well as the associated infrastructure and roads. PJ encroachment has been, and continues to be, a significant threat to the population as well.

DRAFT