From:	Lyons, James
To:	Quamen, Frank
Bcc:	noreen_walsh@fws.gov
Subject:	Re: GRSG stronghold mapping
Date:	Wednesday, January 07, 2015 2:33:11 PM

OK, but I read differently on 1 count:

There are areas of non-habitat in the strongholds. We did not exclude those areas as their contribution (or not) to sage-grouse conservation depends on their juxtaposition to habitat and their extent (which defines the potential for indirect impacts). -- So would include non-habitat in mapping.... and

I would question, if you do the above, why you wouldn't include GHMA, since how it is managed would have ramifications for the integrity of the stronghold area. I suggest that this ... and the subsurface issue which Pat says SHOULD be in, should be revisited.

Jim

On Wed, Jan 7, 2015 at 3:46 PM, Quamen, Frank <fquamen@blm.gov> wrote:

> Hi Jim,
>
> See Pat's words below for details, but Areas of Significance/Sagebrush Focal Areas were intended to:
>
> - Only include Federal Surface AND Subsurface
> - Only include PHMA (not GHMA or non-habitat unless on a FWS refuge)
>
> ---------- Forwarded message ----------
> From: **Deibert, Pat** <pat_deibert@fws.gov>
> Date: Wed, Dec 3, 2014 at 11:25 AM
> Subject: GRSG stronghold mapping
> To: Stephanie Carman <scarman@blm.gov>
> Cc: Lauren Mermejo <lmermejo@blm.gov>, Frank Quamen <fquamen@blm.gov>, Nicole Alt <nicole_alt@fws.gov>, Michael Thabault <michael_thabault@fws.gov>
>
> Hi Stephanie -
>
> I finally got the opportunity to take a look at the tables you sent that Frank pulled together. Hopefully the following clarifications will put everyone's minds at ease.
>
> The strongholds were intended to cover only federal surfaces, and subsurface. There was no intent to include non-federal surfaces with no federal subsurface - and any that were included were in error. Some non-federal surfaces may have been included if they were underlaid by federal subsurface.
>
> The strongholds were clipped to PHMA. Again, there may have been mapping errors but it was not the intent to include GHMA. The tables indicated the largest GHMA "errors" were due to including FWS refuges as GHMA - which is not a designation we share. Our refuges

all include sage-grouse as a priority species.

There are areas of non-habitat in the strongholds. We did not exclude those areas as their contribution (or not) to sage-grouse conservation depends on their juxtaposition to habitat and their extent (which defines the potential for indirect impacts). That site specific information was not available to us in creating the maps.

I hope this helps and hopefully will preclude the need for a call. Please don't hesitate to contact me if folks have further questions.

pat

--
Pat Deibert, PhD
Certified Wildlife Biologist®
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
5353 Yellowstone Road, Suite 308A
Cheyenne, WY 82009
307-772-2374, ext. 226

got leks?

--
Frank Quamen, Wildlife Biologist
BLM National Operations Center
Denver Federal Center Building 40
303-236-6310

--
Jim Lyons
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Land and Minerals Management
Jim_Lyons@ios.doi.gov
202-208-4318 (direct)
202-815-4412 (mobile)