From: James Lyons
To: Noreen Walsh
Cc: Pat Deibert
Subject: Re: Mitigation discussions
Date: Tuesday, February 25, 2014 6:30:40 AM

Thanks for the response. We can discuss more later.

States and BLM would rather work at the state level. Of course, as Pat and your colleagues witnessed in Portland that can lead to all kinds if inconsistencies in interpretation and approach.

It would be better to agree on mitigation principles and methods on a WAFWA zone basis to overcome this. If this were possible, then implementation could be disaggregated to the state level and states could use whatever tools/approach they like provided consistent with regional principles. So if a state wanted to contract work out to NFWF for example or set up their on mitigation bank they could.

My concern is that if we don't try to create regional mitigation frameworks or guidelines then we will never get to a landscape approach to managing the species -- which is what is needed to conserve it.

The lesser prairie chicken approach broke new ground in doing this on a 5 state basis and that was initiated by the states through WAFWA.

Shouldn't we try to build on that precedent here?

BTW, BLM told me in our meeting yesterday that they want to work on a regional basis but FWS insisted Ina state by state approach. True?

Jim

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 24, 2014, at 9:24 PM, Noreen Walsh <noreen_walsh@fws.gov> wrote:

> Sorry to not make your 1pm meeting Jim. I hope we can talk more about this at the FF meeting. I don't recall the question being posed to me as you describe below, but others may have opined on this.
>
> I think that ecologically, an ecological zone (like the WAFWA zones, or perhaps by population) is more appropriate. That being said, I suspect that some are worried states won't buy in to a regional approach. I am not sure if we have put the question to any of them that plainly? I think we have to work to get all players behind the concept of mitigating where it matters most, not just next door.
>
> I encourage Pat to jump in – especially if she sees it differently.
>
> Noreen

Noreen Walsh
Regional Director
Mountain-Prairie Region
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

303 236 7920

The Mountain-Prairie Region of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service: *We provide conservation stewardship of some of America's most scenic lands, to ensure healthy fish and wildlife for the enjoyment and benefit of all people.*

From: Lyons, James [mailto:james_lyons@ios.doi.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 24, 2014 9:08 AM
To: Pat Deibert; Noreen Walsh
Subject: Mitigation discussions

Quick question re: mitigation for SG

BLM is proposing this be done/developed on a state by state basis. It would seem to me that a more appropriate frame would be WAFWA zones -- from the WAFWA report:

"The overall objective of the range-Wide Strategy is to produce and maintain neutral or positive trends in populations and to maintain or increase the distribution of sage-grouse in each Management Zone."

BLM says FWS agrees that this must be done on a state by state basis. Is that what you understand? It seems counter to a landscape/WAFWA zone approach.

I'm meeting with the BLM team at 1pm if you have any thoughts.

Jim

--
Jim Lyons
Counselor to the Assistant Secretary
for Lands and Minerals Management
Jim_Lyons@ios.doi.gov
202-208-4318 (direct)
202-815-4412 (mobile)