From: Sattelberg, Mark
To: Mary Flanderka
Cc: Mark Konishi; Tom Christiansen
Subject: Re: Molvar comments
Date: Friday, May 23, 2014 10:07:13 AM

Tom,

Just saw that Pat called you with the same question. I have everything I need, so I won't be calling.

You all have a great weekend.

Mark, good to have Kathy up here, as I image you feel as well.

Mary, thanks for the help, as usual.

Mark

R. Mark Sattelberg
Field Supervisor
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Wyoming Ecological Services Field Office
5353 Yellowstone Boulevard, Suite 308A
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82009

Phone: 307.772.2374 ext.234
Cell Phone: 307.631.8186
Fax: 307.772.2358
mark_sattelberg@fws.gov

On Fri, May 23, 2014 at 10:01 AM, Mary Flanderka <mary.flanderka@wyo.gov> wrote:

> Tom, Mark might be trying to call you. He is answering the same questions and just wants to be on the same page. Mark one of these is Tom's cell. Sorry.
>
> 870-5001, 870-6847
>
> ---------- Forwarded message ----------
> From: **Tom Christiansen** <tom.christiansen@wyo.gov>
> Date: Fri, May 23, 2014 at 9:46 AM
> Subject: Fwd: Molvar comments
> To: Mary Flanderka <mary.flanderka@wyo.gov>, Bob Lanka <bob.lanka@wyo.gov>
>
> fyi...
>
> ---------- Forwarded message ----------

From: **Tom Christiansen** <tom.christiansen@wyo.gov>
Date: Fri, May 23, 2014 at 9:45 AM
Subject: Re: Molvar comments
To: Bob Budd <bob.budd@wyo.gov>

He is just looking at the downside of one cycle, rather that the longer view. Certainly grouse numbers are down historically (as we all know) but they are still above the 1995 low (except in NE WY). 60% decrease since 2006 is accurate based on ave. lek size, but in the gamebird world that is "so what?". Such fluctuations are normal. In the mid-2000s grouse lek attendance soared to levels not seen since the mid-70s. All we had to do was sit around tables making (not necessarily implementing) conservation plans for that to happen! The point being, mgt was not driving either of those broad scale trends. Long term is what is important. Remember, this is at the broad scale. Local/regional impacts (specific developments, NE Wyo, differ).

On the other side of the coin, Anadarko (Owens & Applegate) are equally misrepresenting grouse data for NE Wyoming. They have not been quoted in the press however. We might need to talk about that after dealing with Molvar.

Tom Christiansen
Sage-Grouse Program Coordinator
Wyoming Game & Fish Department
351 Astle Ave
Green River, WY 82935
307.875.3225 ext. 18610
tom.christiansen@wyo.gov

On Fri, May 23, 2014 at 9:30 AM, Bob Budd <bob.budd@wyo.gov> wrote:

Thanks. Is he taking peak cycle minus bottom? Where does he get his percentages?

Sent from my iPhone

On May 23, 2014, at 9:28 AM, Tom Christiansen <tom.christiansen@wyo.gov> wrote:

Bob,

I'm off today but will get something to you over the weekend. FYI, Pat Deibert just called and she is answering an inquiry from Michael Bean on the same subject. Pat and I are on the same page about Molvar mischaracterizing the 2006 to present decline. In the end, I think the State and Feds will be delivering/understanding the same message. (I'm not addressing the DDCT issue, that is more on the policy side.)

Have a great holiday weekend.

Tom Christiansen
Sage-Grouse Program Coordinator
Wyoming Game & Fish Department
351 Astle Ave
Green River, WY 82935
307.875.3225 ext. 18610
tom.christiansen@wyo.gov

On Thu, May 22, 2014 at 7:17 PM, Bob Budd <bob.budd@wyo.gov> wrote:

FYI.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Donald Simpson <dsimpson@blm.gov>
To: bob budd <bob.budd@wyo.gov>, Jerimiah Rieman <jerimiah.rieman@wyo.gov>
Subject: Molvar comments

Dear Director Kornze,

Thanks for meeting with us last week to discuss opportunities to achieve

adequate regulatory mechanisms through the land-use planning process, which

would satisfy ESA requirements.

The meeting left us a little concerned that BLM in Wyoming might not be on

track to emplace legally sufficient protections. Given that more than half

the remaining range wide populations inhabits Wyoming, and that state has

experienced a 60% population decline since 2007 (while the state Core Area

strategy was in place), the fact set is lining up to be a major point of

vulnerability should the Wyoming RMPs not be able to meet the bar on

certainty of implementation or science-backed effectiveness.

The Wyoming nine-plan EIS is particularly problematic, due to issues of

certainty (there are blanket authorizations for discretionary exceptions

that undermine this) and science-based effectiveness (there are zero

scientific studies that support a 0.6-mile NSO lek buffer or a 5%

disturbance cap, for example, and numerous studies that debunk these as

appropriate thresholds). From our perspective, there could be a political

donnybrook over any listing, regardless how toothless, and thus it makes

more sense to give it to Wyoming straight about the inadequacies of the

current Core Area strategy rather than have that become the Achilles heel

that brings about a listing.

I also wanted to point out a problem with Wyoming's DDCT (apparently

reprised in UT and CO) — this process artificially inflates the denominator

in the wells and disturbance per square mile ratio, allowing densities of

development and sites that result in significant impacts to sage grouse

inside Priority Habitats. Importantly, if one re-ran the scientific

analyses using measurements in accordance with the DDCT protocol, then

certainly thresholds much less than 3% and 1 pad per square mile would

result. The fact that all studies have measured per square mile section,

and the BLM's own NTT panel has correctly adopted this approach, makes the

use of a DDCT legally and biologically untenable. I have attached a graphic

that illustrates how the use of a DDCT allowed excessive levels of

development inside a Core Area in a real-world example from 2012.

Thanks for joining us at the end of the meeting, and I'd be happy to fill

you in on any points you might have missed that were made earlier in the

meeting.

Respectfully yours,

E-Mail to and from me, in connection with the transaction of public business, is subject to the Wyoming Public Records Act and may be disclosed to third parties.

E-Mail to and from me, in connection with the transaction of public business, is subject to the Wyoming Public Records Act and may be disclosed to third parties.

E-Mail to and from me, in connection with the transaction of public business, is subject to the Wyoming Public Records Act and may be disclosed to third parties.

E-Mail to and from me, in connection with the transaction
of public business, is subject to the Wyoming Public Records
Act and may be disclosed to third parties.

--

Mary Flanderka
WGFD
Habitat Protection Supervisor
5400 Bishop Blvd.
307-777-4587
307-290-0069
mary.flanderka@wyo.gov

E-Mail to and from me, in connection with the transaction
of public business, is subject to the Wyoming Public Records
Act and may be disclosed to third parties.