From: Bean, Michael
To: James Lyons
Cc: Sarah Greenberger; D. M. Ashe; Noreen Walsh; gary frazer
Subject: Re: Follow up
Date: Monday, April 06, 2015 12:54:37 PM

Jim: I agree that the restriction should only apply to future fences and should not be overbroad. However, I think your language is overbroad as well, at least as measured by the USGS report (whose guidance we are endeavoring to follow).

The USGS report identifies only certain types of fences as presenting a collision hazard (i.e.,those with wide spacing of poles or less visible t-posts, as opposed to wooden posts) and then only in "rough" terrrain (as opposed to flat and rolling terrain). If we want to anchor our plans in the USGS report, then the way to do that is to require that new fences (of the types described in the report) be placed at least 1.2 miles from leks in flat or rolling terrain. I realize that this will present some definitional challenges, but given the low significance generally given to the threat of fence collisions, that is probably better than the alternative of lumping all fences together, regardless of type and location. .

On Mon, Apr 6, 2015 at 1:09 PM, James Lyons <james_lyons@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

> I think this exception is Too broad and BLM range cons would have authority to determine " benefit" without any input from biologists - BLM, state or FWS. Granting an exemption here is not the way I would go.
>
> I would make this an exception for all future fences and structures and limit the potential for overly broad interpretation:
>
> "Buffer distances for fences and other structures should be consistent with the requirements for low structures in the USGS report -- interpreted literature minimum unless they can provide a conservation benefit to the GRSG such as protecting important seasonal habitats or riparian areas. Existing structures are exempt from this requirement but permittees should be encouraged to flag fences and implement other actions to limit any adverse pacts that may be associated with existing structures."
>
> Jim
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> On Apr 6, 2015, at 12:24 PM, Sarah Greenberger <sarah_greenberger@ios.doi.gov> wrote:
>
>> This is the proposed language:
>>
>> - Range improvements which provide a conservation benefit to sage-grouse, such as fences for protecting important seasonal habitats, are not subject to the lek buffer-distances in either PHMA or GHMA.

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 6, 2015, at 9:48 AM, "Bean, Michael" <michael_bean@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

> Sarah: Did BLM circulate new buffer language Friday? If so, I never got it. I'm off this week, but checking email.
>
> On Sun, Apr 5, 2015 at 12:21 PM, Sarah Greenberger <sarah_greenberger@ios.doi.gov> wrote:
>
> > Happy holiday to you all. Based on our conversation Thursday evening
> > and Friday looking to do the following this week. Let me know if I am
> > off on something:
> >
> > 1. Have one more conversation about wind in OR contingent on their
> > having heir plan operational.
> >
> > Who should be part if that from FWS and BLM?
> >
> > 2. MT- measuring whether the 50 percent threshold for the NSO
> > exception can be measured at the project scale. We are waiting for
> > some info from BLM but again, helpful to know who needs to be part of
> > this convo and whether it can be limited to the same group as OR or
> > needs to include different state and regional folks.
> >
> > 3. Buffers and fences. Have some draft language from BLM to circulate
> > later today.
> >
> > 4. Plan for secretarial mineral wdrawal process. Talked to tommy
> > about setting up a follow up meeting on this one so look for an invite
> > from Katie.
> >
> > Am I off or forgetting anything?
> >
> > Sent from my iPhone
>
> --

Michael J. Bean

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks

Room 7257, Department of the Interior

Washington, DC 20240

202-208-4416

202-208-4684 (fax)

michael_bean@ios.doi.gov

--

Michael J. Bean

Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks

Room 7257, Department of the Interior

Washington, DC 20240

202-208-4416

202-208-4684 (fax)

michael_bean@ios.doi.gov