From:	Eric Rickerson
To:	btaylor@defenders.org; "Cathy Macdonald"; "Holly Michael"; jamie.damon@state.or.us; "Sara O"Brien"; "Shauna Ginger"; Theresa Burcsu; theresa.burcsu@pdx.edu
Cc:	BROWNSCOMBE Brett * GOV; "Jeff Everett"
Subject:	RE: Governance and Disturbance Cap presentation
Date:	Wednesday, April 30, 2014 10:02:03 AM

Good catch Theresa!

From: Theresa Burcsu [mailto:tburcsu@pdx.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2014 9:40 AM
To: 'Shauna Ginger'; 'Cathy Macdonald'; 'Eric Rickerson'; btaylor@defenders.org; 'Holly Michael'; jamie.damon@state.or.us; 'Sara O'Brien'; theresa.burcsu@pdx.edu
Cc: BROWNSCOMBE Brett * GOV; 'Jeff Everett'
Subject: RE: Governance and Disturbance Cap presentation

Good work, Eric! I believe that there is an error in the Disturbance Cap Matrix in the last three rows: the numbers seem to have been in reverse order. Late last night I also saw this discrepancy in the Working Draft Proposal that Sara distributed as well.

See you all soon.
Theresa

From: Shauna Ginger [mailto:shauna_ginger@fws.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 6:12 PM
To: Cathy Macdonald; Eric Rickerson; btaylor@defenders.org; Holly Michael; jamie.damon@state.or.us; Sara O'Brien; theresa.burcsu@pdx.edu
Cc: BROWNSCOMBE Brett * GOV; Jeff Everett
Subject: RE: Governance and Disturbance Cap presentation

Eric,
Looking good. A suggestion - You might want to add a bit (maybe just verbally) on why we're trying to keep the areas with low% existing disturbance even lower overall than areas with higher existing disturbance (Slide 10 – the disturbance cap chart) as related to keeping strongholds as identified in ODFW plan but also the COT report, which recommends keeping PACs(core) intact, etc. You do mention how the cap is not a goal to attain (slide 6), but tying that back to why, in terms of existing plans and recommendations from the COT, might be a useful message.

--
Shauna Ginger
Ecosystem Services Biologist
USFWS Oregon Field Office
Portland, OR | 503-231-6949
Learn more about USFWS & Ecosystem Services here

From: Cathy Macdonald [mailto:cmacdonald@TNC.ORG]
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 5:15 PM
To: Eric Rickerson; Bruce Taylor (btaylor@defenders.org) (btaylor@defenders.org); Holly Michael; jamie.damon@state.or.us; Sara O'Brien (obrien@willamettepartnership.org); Shauna Ginger (shauna_ginger@fws.gov); theresa.burcsu@pdx.edu

Cc: BROWNSCOMBE Brett * GOV
Subject: RE: Governance and Disturbance Cap presentation

Eric – I think what you have looks really good. I pasted in the Knick graph in case you want to use it. It may not be needed but perhaps you could put it at the back of the deck in case we need to emphasize the point. I edited two of the slides [see yellow text] to simplify them a bit. It did expose that I'm not sure I know how we proposed to consider the habitat side of the equation – is it just yes or no – its above 70 or the baseline or were we going to look at trend if it's below the 70?

From: Eric Rickerson [mailto:eric.v.rickerson@state.or.us]
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2014 4:45 PM
To: Bruce Taylor (btaylor@defenders.org) (btaylor@defenders.org); Cathy Macdonald; Holly Michael; jamie.damon@state.or.us; Sara O'Brien (obrien@willamettepartnership.org); Shauna Ginger (shauna_ginger@fws.gov); theresa.burcsu@pdx.edu
Cc: BROWNSCOMBE Brett * GOV
Subject: Governance and Disturbance Cap presentation

Good afternoon SageConners!

Attached is my first cut at a powerpoint for Thursday. The first slide is for the joint talk with Jamie and just shows the Governance model. Jamie – the roles for each group are identified in the notes section at the bottom of the slide.

The remainder of the slides outlines the cap and other recommendations. I would really appreciate feedback if you think I missed any critical pieces.

Thanks and I look forward to discussing this tomorrow at 1pm.

EVR