1. MZ: VII - CO portion of Colorado Plateau

2. Populations included:

   Piceance Basin (Parachute-Piceance-Roan)
   White River (Meeker/White River)

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.

   Piceance Basin (Parachute-Piceance-Roan [PPR]): - Within the PPR population, representation appears to be captured adequately. Priority habitats capture 60% of the occupied range in this population and also includes 100% of all known active leks and all habitat that was modeled "high probability of use" within 4 miles of a lek 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 93) and somewhat isolated population. This population is on the very southern edge of the species range. There is some potential for connectivity to the north to the NW CO and MWR populations. Linkage habitats have been included in our mapping efforts. Representation and redundancy are at risk within this population due to its small size, energy development and the associated infrastructure, especially road development. Piñon-juniper encroachment is also an issue.

   White River (Meeker-White River [MWR])- There is no redundancy and little representation in the MWR population (3-year running average high male count is 6 birds). Priority habitats capture 27% of the occupied range in this population and includes the only known active lek. All habitat modeled "high probability of use" and within 4 miles of any lek (active in the last 10 years) is within priority habitat. Representation and redundancy are at risk within this population due to its small size, proximity to an urbanized setting and, thus, housing development and associated infrastructure and agriculture conversion. This is a very small population located near the town of Meeker and consists of only 1 active lek that was discovered in 2004, and strutting male counts have been on a steady decline since (e.g., from a high of 30 males in 2004 to 6 males in 2012). Most of the occupied habitat is privately owned (90%) and is in 2 disconnected patches of habitat, separated by the White River. One of the patches remains unfragmented. The other patch is located where housing development will primarily occur.

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 priority areas in the MWR and PPR populations (the only 2 populations in this MZ) capture redundancy and representation as best as can be accomplished. Priority habitats are well mapped and include all high probability of use habitat (which includes breeding, summer, and

DRAFT

winter habitat within 4 iles of all known leks) and linkage zones to closest MZ 2 to the north. There is no known connectivity with UT (MZ3 to the west) due to natural habitat fragmentation and large areas of non-habitat.

5. Identify populations for which resistance has been lost:

   Piceance Basin (Parachute-Piceance-Roan)
   White River (Meeker/White River)

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

      The **Parachute-Piceance-Roan** population appears to have some resiliency. The population has been monitored since 2005 and appears to be fluctuating similar to other larger populations in the state.

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

      Meeker White River has lost resiliency. The population has been monitored since 2004 and the population has been in a steady decline from 30 males to the current 6 males.

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

      Piceance Basin (Parachute-Piceance-Roan) -. A large majority of priority habitat is privately owned mostly by energy companies. Energy and Mineral Development is the highest ranked threat to GrSG in PPR. Advances in drilling technology and rapid natural gas demand and subsequent rising prices have led to a significant increase in natural gas drilling activity in the PPR. Road and Infrastructure are also ranked high as they are related/interrelated with energy production. Historic habitat has been lost and fragmented also by PJ encroachment.

      White River (Meeker/White River) - Housing development is increasing mainly due to energy development in nearby counties. A large part of the habitat was converted to agriculture in the 1960's, which was a primary reason why the population went into decline. Current issue is that some of the lands in pasture and CRP land may now be converted back to crop lands.

DRAFT