From: Ren Lohoefener
To: Noreen Walsh
Subject: Re: good working session with Amy today
Date: Wednesday, December 17, 2014 7:04:43 PM

---

with appropriate conditions through BLM (they have final say, governed by a panel of FWS/BLM/NDOW biologists, good backup adaptive management) the NV credit system could be used where ever mitigation was appropriate, if the wrinkles can be ironed out.

Sent from my iPad

> On Dec 17, 2014, at 5:59 PM, Noreen Walsh <noreen_walsh@fws.gov> wrote:
>
> Thanks!
>
> I think what you are saying for sand and gravel is exactly what the NPT
> guidance said?? - so that would be good. (closed except for free use
> permits which means gravel for municipal purposes like roads)
>
> If the wrinkles are worked out would the crediting system be used everywhere
> or just in general?
>
> 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.
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Ren Lohoefener [mailto:ren_lohoefener@fws.gov]
> Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2014 6:56 PM
> To: Noreen Walsh
> Subject: good working session with Amy today
>
> I think we are at a place where FWS and BLM can agree to the provisions in
> the BLM plan. Whether the state will is unknown.
>
> High altitude summary:
>
> all habitat = avoid, minimize, mitigate
>
> On the superpac habitat - all BLM protections in place with 3% cap (but I
> think we have a better strategy than a hard 3% cap so if you agree we could
> go with that strategy on the superpac habitat.
>
> On other PAC habitat (about 6M acres) - A triggered cap that at the onset
> can be no greater than 3%. However, as time progresses, if the science

> changes showing 3% is too conservative or (and this is the important point
> that I like) if conservation is working and occupied sage grouse habitat has
> increased by X%, the the disturbance cap could also increase by some percent
> but the increase would be less than proportional to the habitat increase to
> insure net conservation gain.
>
> on all PAC habitat the BLM land use provisions stay in place. A big one for
> the state is evidently sand and gravel. We worked on language that would
> allow disturbance for sand and gravel mining so long as the purpose was
> urban development and so long as the disturbance was accounted for within
> the disturbance cap.
>
> If the wrinkles can be worked out of the NV crediting system the system
> could be used with strong adaptive management triggers where the fall back
> would be an enhanced BLM mitigation plan.
>
> I will share in more detail when Mary has it written up as draft for
> consideration.
>
> Ren
> Sent from my iPad