From:	BRETT E BROWNSCOMBE
To:	Richard Hannan
Cc:	jamie.damon@oregonstate.edu; Jerome Perez; Michael Haske; Noreen Walsh; Paul Henson; WHITMAN Richard M * GOV; Shirley Gillum; Terry Rabot; Vicki Finn
Subject:	Re: Meeting follow-up
Date:	Wednesday, April 01, 2015 8:43:40 AM

Thanks much Rich, and again, thanks to you and Mike for making the time on Sunday. On the third issue, yes, we plan on submitting that in writing and am working w Richard W on that. On the last one re factoring the 3% backstop and threshold approach into the fws's modeling assumptions for Oregon, that is our desire and the draft LCDC rule we supplied captures it. On the first two issues, yes info and more conversation on that would be helpful. Agree re need to be having these convos w blm too.

Thanks for the follow up. In continuing forward from here, it's Richard, Jamie and myself that should be on point from the state's end. I could do a Friday afternoon convo / meeting if that works for others?

Sent from my iPhone

> On Mar 31, 2015, at 3:14 PM, Richard Hannan <richard_hannan@fws.gov> wrote:
>
> Brett and Richard, in our meeting there were 4 issues that were
> identified that warranted additional conversation. I have talked with
> Terry Rabot and Paul Henson and relayed our Sunday discussion. The
> areas include: a conversation on mitigation standards relative to the
> B-H transmission line; you wanted information the current status of
> PACs relative to population and habitat triggers; and you indicated
> that OR was considering approaching BLM and FWS with your logic for
> wanting an allocation change for the 4 northern counties where sage
> grouse occur. Finally, you suggested that when FWS modeling is done
> that it should factor in the 3% cap and 1%/decade in OR. We have
> asked Paul to reach out to you to discuss these issues. Some of these
> discussions should also include BLM not just FWS. Please let Paul
> know who he needs to contact to advance these discussions. Rich
>
> Richard Hannan
>
> Sent from my iPad