From: Delavan, Jodie
To: David Budeau
Cc: Jeffrey Dillon
Subject: Re: FW: Threat table
Date: Wednesday, April 03, 2013 3:40:02 PM

I can see the concern. The Y vs. L rank only gets at the scope of the threat and not how severe it is. They should keep that in mind. OKAY I'm done... :)

Jodie Delavan
USFWS - Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office
2600 SE 98th Ave., Ste. 100
Portland, Oregon 97266
Phone: (503) 231-6179
http://www.fws.gov/oregonfwo/

On Wed, Apr 3, 2013 at 3:28 PM, David Budeau <david.a.budeau@state.or.us> wrote:

> Adding to my e-mail below… what may have got lost in the process, is that "E" in the draft report which turned to "L" in revised report was supposed represent a substantial threat, but localized. In final report the substantial portion was lost and it is simply a local threat. Which as Jeff and I heard in today's BLM IDT call, L is interpreted as being less of a threat than Y. OKAY I'm done!
>
> Dave Budeau
>
> Upland Game Bird Coordinator
>
> Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
>
> 3406 Cherry Avenue NE
>
> Salem, OR 97303
>
> Ph: 503-947-6323
>
> email: david.a.budeau@state.or.us
>
> ---
>
> **From:** David Budeau
> **Sent:** Wednesday, April 03, 2013 3:08 PM
> **To:** 'Delavan, Jodie'
> **Cc:** Jeffrey Dillon
> **Subject:** RE: Threat table
>
> Jodie,
>
> Thanks for forwarding Pat's January e-mail which loosened up the memory. I do think that is what we agreed to in the end - any level threat got the "Y" ranking. Somehow I got swept into thinking

"Y" was more of a threat than "L" but that was not the intent of the rankings.

Dave Budeau

Upland Game Bird Coordinator

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

3406 Cherry Avenue NE

Salem, OR 97303

Ph: 503-947-6323

email: david.a.budeau@state.or.us

From: Delavan, Jodie [mailto:jodie_delavan@fws.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 03, 2013 3:00 PM
To: David Budeau
Cc: Jeffrey Dillon
Subject: Fwd: Threat table

Hi Dave,

I am forwarding the email that Pat sent about converting the rankings in table 2 in response to peer review comments. The third paragraph says that threats ranked G were going to be Y. This is the version of the table we ended up going with I thought. I can't remember if we talked about making Gs something different after this email. Hope this helps clarify why it is a Y or at least how it got there.

Jodie

Jodie Delavan

USFWS - Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office

2600 SE 98th Ave., Ste. 100

Portland, Oregon 97266

Phone: (503) 231-6179

http://www.fws.gov/oregonfwo/

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Deibert, Pat** <pat_deibert@fws.gov>
Date: Sat, Jan 12, 2013 at 4:13 PM
Subject: Threat table
To: Aaron Robinson <acrobinson@nd.gov>, Bob Budd <bbudd@wyo.gov>, Dave Budeau <david.a.budeau@state.or.us>, Jack Connelly <jcsagegrouse@aol.com>, James Lindstrom <james_lindstrom@fws.gov>, Jesse DElia <jesse_delia@fws.gov>, Jodie Delavan <jodie_delavan@fws.gov>, John Harja <johnharja@utah.gov>, Kathy Griffin <kathy.griffin@state.co.us>, Mike Schroeder <grouse@homenetnw.net>, "Northrup, Rick" <rnorthrup@mt.gov>, Paul Souza <paul_souza@fws.gov>, Scott Gardner <sgardner@dfg.ca.gov>, Shawn Espinosa <sespinosa@ndow.org>, Steve Abele <steve_abele@fws.gov>

Hi everyone -

I've been working with the threats table today - in the context of our recent phone exercise and the notes from our conference call on Nov. 29. In that call we ditched the C1-C4 designations for populations, and discussed moving the threats table to an appendix. We also talked about changing the threat designations as outside readers were reading too much into our qualitative designation. So I played with the table a bit to see what things looked like.

There are three versions of Table 2 attached. One is the original and is dated 8/01 in the file name. The first revision (Table 2, version 1)still tries to qualify the level of threat - I lumped imminent threats (substantial, moderate and localized - A, B, and E) into a new designation of "1"; non-imminent substantial or moderate threats (C and D) into a new designation of "2", low, slight threats (F and G) into a new designation of "3", left unknown alone, and put in a "-" for unthreatened (H). It still provides some pseudo-qualitative threat ranking, but not in the level of detail that seem to cause angst for some of our reviewers - both peer and otherwise. By retaining some ranking this table may help in priortizing threat amelioration in their affected populations.

The second revision (Table 2, version 2) takes out all qualitative ranking save one - localized. In this table any level of threat (A-D and F-G) were simply acknowledged as Y in the table. H - unthreatened was designated as N, U was unchanged. E - localized, substantial threats was changed to L to designate the localized nature of the threat. However, it could just as easily be designated as a Y. This table is a bit simpler, and if used will direct the user to local conditions to determine what threats to ameliorate - which is the tact we have taken in the description of the PAC.

A few common edits to both revisions: The column labeled "threat" used to designate the C1 - C4 categories. Its there just as a marker, and can be tweaked (e.g. moved to a horizontal bar over the threats). Footnote 1 is gone, as the need for it is also gone (the C1-C4 designation). I removed the disease and predation categories as they were not the categories that resulted in a warranted designation for grouse (and as discussed last week); I removed climate change and drought as we will deal with them in the text; I changed "livestock" to grazing as a threat since we are talking all ungulates, and I changed feral horses to wild horses simply for accuracy. A suggested addition that I didn't make is a column designating MZ for each population, since our PAC discussion refers to MZ in an overall objective.

The first and last page of each attached file is there for formatting purposes only. Gotta love Bill Gates. Will fix that as we move a preferred version forward.

Please review these tables and see which one you think makes the most sense. Once a table is selected we will get it cleaned up, and ask for your review of the designations for "your" populations. I'm also leaning to keeping this table in the main text of the report as opposed to moving it to an appendix. Thoughts?

Lastly - our conference call notes of 11/29 suggested a map that demonstrated threat amelioration ranking. Let me know what you think about that, and if you want the map, how to portray it so I can get Jim working on it ASAP.

Thats all for today. I likely won't get the threats discussion written up until Monday or Tuesday and will share it as soon as I get it done.

p
--
Pat Deibert

National Sage-grouse Conservation Coordinator

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

5353 Yellowstone Road, Suite 308A

Cheyenne, WY 82009

307-772-2374, ext. 226

> got leks?