From: Noreen Walsh
To: Theresa Rabot
Subject: RE: ES&BAR funding proposal
Date: Friday, September 04, 2015 2:31:00 PM

Thank heavens. I thought I had not seen this before.

Noreen Walsh
Regional Director
Mountain-Prairie Region
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
303 236 7920

From: Theresa Rabot [mailto:theresa_rabot@fws.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 04, 2015 2:01 PM
To: Noreen Walsh
Subject: Re: ES&BAR funding proposal

No. You sent it to me before. It just reaffirms what we've been saying.

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 4, 2015, at 11:55 AM, Noreen Walsh <noreen_walsh@fws.gov> wrote:

> Sorry, I just realized I had this.
>
> Does it change anything for you?
>
> *Noreen Walsh*
> *Regional Director*
> *Mountain-Prairie Region*
> *U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service*
> *303 236 7920*
>
> **From:** Lyons, James [mailto:james_lyons@ios.doi.gov]
> **Sent:** Friday, August 21, 2015 12:48 PM
> **To:** Noreen Walsh
> **Cc:** Dan Ashe; Karen Kelleher
> **Subject:** ES&BAR funding proposal
>
> Noreen -
>
> To follow-up on our discussion regarding the policy direction for future ES&BAR funding, I have attached a series of charts that compares funding levels under alternative allocation scenarios.
>
> I believe we agree that funding should be "risk-based" to ensure that resources are

allocated to provide maximum benefit in restoring sage-grouse habitat post-fire.

The best surrogate for determining risk is acres burned over a period of time. These data are represented by the blue bar in the first chart. As you can see on page 2, under this scenario, BLM receives the greatest amount of funding -- an estimated 72% of the allocation. FWS receives 6.5%.

Page 3 indicates how funding allocations would change if based on the 10-year historic average for expenditures by bureau. Under this scencario, BLM would receive approx. 58% and FWS would receive 19.5%.

Page 4 simply reflects the allocation using a 5-year average for expenditures. Page 5 reflects how the calculations based on historic allocations were made.

I would note that the summary of bureau comments on the OWF proposal would indicate that FWS accepted the "70-30" split originally proposed for allocating resources -- i.e., 70% to be allocated upfront and 30% withheld. However, where the FWS comes down on the risk-based vs. historic fire funding allocation proposal is not clear. And, the proposal to allocate some funds up front and hold 30% in reserve is no longer under consideration.

The most straightforward way to allocate resources under a risk-based strategy would be to use historic estimates of acres burned. And this is consistent with the guidance included in the NTT report, page 27 -- "

Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ES&R)

> Prioritize native seed allocation for use in sage-grouse habitat in years when preferred native seed is in short supply. This may require reallocation of native seed from ES&R projects outside of priority sage-grouse habitat to those inside it. Use of native plant seeds for ES&R seedings is required based on availability, adaptation (site potential), and probability of success Richards et al. 1998). Where probability of success or native seed availability is low, non-native seeds may be used as long as they meet sage-grouse habitat conservation objectives (Pyke 2011). Re- establishment of appropriate sagebrush species/subspecies and important understory plants, relative to site potential, shall be the highest priority for rehabilitation efforts.

I trust this is helpful. Let me know if you need any additional information.

Jim Lyons
Deputy Assistant Secretary

Land and Minerals Management
Jim_Lyons@ios.doi.gov
202-208-4318 (direct)
202-815-4412 (mobile)

<Agency_FY16_BAR Funding Level Comparison 2015_05_29 v3 (1).xlsx>
<Summary of Bureau Comments on ESR Policy Issues 20150820.docx>