From: Dan Ashe
To: Noreen Walsh
Cc: Ren Lohoefener; Mary Grim
Subject: Re: Nevada responds to sage grouse discussion
Date: Saturday, January 17, 2015 5:42:14 AM

Noreen, could you please discuss with Ren, and then let me know what you both recommend. Ren, I thought we were discussing a 3% cap overall (considering all anthropogenic losses), but with opportunity to "except" certain things, based on net gain and consensus. Your description below sounds different, with only certain losses counting toward a cap (i.e., not mining for example).

Dan.

Dan Ashe
Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

On Jan 16, 2015, at 1:52 PM, Noreen Walsh <noreen_walsh@fws.gov> wrote:

> I can discuss at your convenience, just let me know what time.
>
> **From:** Lohoefener, Ren [mailto:ren_lohoefener@fws.gov]
> **Sent:** Friday, January 16, 2015 11:50 AM
> **To:** Dan Ashe; Noreen Walsh
> **Cc:** Mary Grim
> **Subject:** Nevada responds to sage grouse discussion
>
> Nevada takes wind off the table, no wind in priority habitat
>
> Nevada willing to accept the cap discussion. To reiterate, that is for ROWs, road, transmission lines, geothermal (I think), the 3% cap is in place. If there was a project that would exceed the 3% it would have to be at the consensus of a panel composed of FWS, NDOW, and BLM that the project could go forward while maintaining or improving the net conservation gain status of the species.
>
> They are raising a "want" regarding buffers where it sounds like there could be a lesser buffer if the lek was not viable, but I don't fully understand that "ask" and I don't have language in front of me.
>
> So we need to come to a conclusion on whether the Service could accept the "cap" language. I said I would try to have a Service position by next week.
>
> Do we want to discuss this afternoon?
>
> Ren