From: Sarah Greenberger
To: Noreen Walsh
Cc: Dan Ashe; Robert Dreher; Gary Frazer
Subject: Re: GRSG: re: request
Date: Tuesday, May 19, 2015 7:15:40 PM

Great. Thanks Noreen for the quick turnaround. We'll either (1) use this or (2) strike entirely if it's too late vet the change and work toward an agreed version for the ROD.

Sent from my iPhone

On May 19, 2015, at 7:38 PM, Noreen Walsh <noreen_walsh@fws.gov> wrote:

> Sarah,
>
> First, thanks much for asking for our thoughts. We have anticipated that over time, as habitat conditions change, maps would periodically need updating to reflect that. I am not intending to wordsmith here, but I would suggest it is more appropriate to reference all future mapping changes as being driven by best available science. I think that is sound, protective of the plans, and consistent with the approach we will continue to use to evaluate the status of the species. You could use this construct:
>
> Adjustments to PHMA/GHMA boundaries may be made if BLM biologists, in coordination with state of Colorado biologists, determine, BASED ON BEST AVAILABLE SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION, ~~site-specific conditions warrant~~ THAT such changes WOULD more accurately depict existing or potential GRSG habitat. The appropriate planning process (i.e., plan maintenance or plan amendment) would be used, as determined on a case-by-case basis considering site-specific issues.
>
> Thanks for the chance to provide comment.
>
> Noreen
>
> *Noreen Walsh*
> *Regional Director*
> *Mountain-Prairie Region*
> *U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service*
> *303 236 7920*
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Sarah Greenberger [mailto:sarah_greenberger@ios.doi.gov]
> **Sent:** Tuesday, May 19, 2015 3:07 PM
> **To:** Noreen Walsh
> **Subject:** Fwd: Request
>
> Here is the proposed language.
>
> Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Amy Lueders <alueders@blm.gov>
> **Date:** May 19, 2015 at 3:33:27 PM EDT
> **To:** Sarah Greenberger <sarah_greenberger@ios.doi.gov>
> **Subject: Fwd: Request**
>
> Here's what we are proposing to jam in. R u ok with it?
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
>> **From:** "Carman, Stephanie" <scarman@blm.gov>
>> **Date:** May 19, 2015 at 3:28:53 PM EDT
>> **To:** Amy Lueders <alueders@blm.gov>
>> **Subject: Re: Request**
>>
>> Based off of Utah, per Sarah's recommendation:
>>
>> Adjustments to PHMA/GHMA boundaries should be made if BLM biologists, in coordination with state of Colorado biologists, determine site-specific conditions warrant such changes to more accurately depict existing or potential GRSG habitat. The appropriate planning process (i.e., plan maintenance or plan amendment) would be used, as determined on a case-by-case basis considering site-specific issues.
>>
>> **Stephanie Carman**
>> Bureau of Land Management
>> Sage-Grouse Project Coordinator
>> office 202-208-3408
>> mobile 202-380-7421
>> scarman@blm.gov
>>
>> On Tue, May 19, 2015 at 3:24 PM, Amy Lueders <alueders@blm.gov> wrote:
>> I told Sarah it would likely not be this language, although I suppose we could generalize this language and strip the specific geo reference
>>
>> Sent from my iPhone
>>
>> Begin forwarded message:
>>
>>> **From:** Sarah Greenberger <sarah_greenberger@ios.doi.gov>
>>> **Date:** May 19, 2015 at 3:19:14 PM EDT
>>> **To:** Amy Lueders <alueders@blm.gov>
>>> **Subject: Request**

"Colorado would like the LUPA to contain
assurances that sage-grouse
habitat maps used by the federal agencies
for land use decisions will
be based on the best available information
and periodically updated as
necessary. For example, the state
anticipates developing finer-scale
habitat maps for the Piceance Basin and
Jackson County and
incorporating new lek locations"

Sent from my iPhone