From:	Drizd, Lara
To:	Berglund, Jeff
Cc:	Skora, Genevieve; Martini, Jay; Jeff Everett; Terry Ireland; Kathleen Hendricks
Subject:	Re: GRSG CED Evals - Infrastructure
Date:	Tuesday, March 17, 2015 1:49:49 PM
Attachments:	201250316_CED_Threats_Compiled-Infrastructure-Duplicates Discussed.xlsx

---

Thanks for discussing these issues. Just waiting on a couple more responses. Attached you can see an updated version of my spreadsheet with a column for this discussion.

On Tue, Mar 17, 2015 at 10:54 AM, Berglund, Jeff <jeff_berglund@fws.gov> wrote:

> I'm fine with that too - our assessments were very similar - but am open to discussing it further if anyone sees benefit to that.
>
> Jeff
>
> On Tue, Mar 17, 2015 at 10:43 AM, Skora, Genevieve <genevieve_skora@fws.gov> wrote:
>
> > I agree with going with Kathleen's evaluation.
> >
> > - Gen
> >
> > On Tue, Mar 17, 2015 at 9:23 AM, Martini, Jay <jay_martini@fws.gov> wrote:
> >
> > > All of my projects that were marked no was because they were outside of the state of Utah. As for 500, I am open to giving it a "no" based on Kathleen's response/reasoning "*did not describe what type of retrofit and probably addresses predation rather than infrastructure. Regardless of what they did the infrastructure still remains, the threat has not been addressed*. Like Jeff and the others have said--it may be worth having a discussion about.
> > >
> > > On Tue, Mar 17, 2015 at 9:22 AM, Berglund, Jeff <jeff_berglund@fws.gov> wrote:
> > >
> > > > Hi all. I agree. With the exception of project 500, all of my "no" responses on this list involved projects that occurred either outside MT or outside the MZ being assessed. Project 500 was possibly in that boat too (but couldn't tell for sure) - although it had additional effectiveness documentation issues. I think it would be worth chatting about that one anyway. Thanks,
> > > >
> > > > Jeff
> > > >
> > > > On Tue, Mar 17, 2015 at 8:59 AM, Skora, Genevieve <genevieve_skora@fws.gov> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Hi everyone,
> > > > >
> > > > > Project 5453 doesn't appear to be in conflict to me. Two of us stated the project was in Idaho and therefore we didn't evaluate it. The third response is the one that evaluated it and stated it was effective.
> > > > >
> > > > > This is the same situation for the 5456, 5425, 5457, 5759, 5452, 5757,5461, 5758, 5451, 5431, 5432, 5444, . They were evaluated in one area and not in the others as it was not appropriate.
> > > > >
> > > > > #5436 - Fence is not in CA. Unsure which of two MZs in NV the project occurs in. 1 mi fence however spatial data shows large polygon. Could be deemed effective if we receieved more information.
> > > > > #5458 - same as above - fence was in NV, therefore Jay did not evaluate. Effective,

but we really need more info. Spatial data did not match description.
#5447 - effective, but should probably only be counted under one of the MZs - would need to verify with spatial data
#5439 - Fence was in OR, evaluated there. Yes, effective, but would like additional information.
#5438 - Proj was in OR, evaluated there - spatial data needs to be checked to see if this project occurred in three MZs/States or not. Other reviewers stated proj was effective.
#5761 - Spatial data is unclear whether this project should be evaluated under MZ III or MZ IV. Yes, effective in one of the MZs - however, would be nice to have additional information and spatial data that matches the described project.

#5424 - Project occurred in CA; should not have been evaluated in OR. Was not evaluated in NV.
#5435 - Project occurred in NV, should not have been evaluated in ID or OR or UT. Should only be evaluated under MZ IV. Need more information to determine if effective. Spatial data does not match description.
#5427 - Project should only be evaluated in ID.
#5459 - Project should only be evaluated in NV Zone IV. Yes effective.

#5764 - Perch deterrents - probably should discuss this one; however, most reviewers stated not effective or didn't address the threat. One stated yes, but cites fence marking, so may have skipped up or down a line on Excel spreadsheet.
#500 - Project possibly should be discussed - APP Utility line retrofits.

Does everyone else agree? Any comments?

Thanks,

- Gen

On Mon, Mar 16, 2015 at 5:33 PM, Drizd, Lara <lara_drizd@fws.gov> wrote:

> Hi everyone,
>
> There are 25 infrastructure projects with conflicting responses. I've uploaded the spreadsheet of "problem projects" to SharePoint but it's also attached. Can you discuss these projects and let me know what your final response on each one is? Thanks!
>
> --
> Lara Drizd
> Biologist
> Endangered Species Division, Pacific Regional Office
> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
> 911 NE 11th Avenue, 4th Floor, Portland, OR 97232
> Phone: (503) 872-2824 Email: lara_drizd@fws.gov

--

Genevieve A. Skora
Biologist (Endangered Species)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Reno Fish & Wildlife Office
1340 Financial Blvd., Suite 234 | Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 861-6395 | *Genevieve_Skora@fws.gov*

--
Jeff Berglund
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Montana Field Office
585 Shepard Way, Suite 1
Helena, MT 59601
(406) 449-5225, ext. 206

--
Jay Martini
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Utah Ecological Services Field Office
2369 W. Orton Circle
West Valley City, Utah 84119
ph: 801-975-3330, ext. 144

--
Genevieve A. Skora
Biologist (Endangered Species)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Reno Fish & Wildlife Office
1340 Financial Blvd., Suite 234 | Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 861-6395 | *Genevieve_Skora@fws.gov*

--
Jeff Berglund
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Montana Field Office

585 Shepard Way, Suite 1
Helena, MT 59601
(406) 449-5225, ext. 206

--
Lara Drizd
Biologist
Endangered Species Division, Pacific Regional Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
911 NE 11th Avenue, 4th Floor, Portland, OR 97232
Phone: (503) 872-2824 Email: lara_drizd@fws.gov

Effort ID	Effort Name
5453	Fence Removed: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (ID)
5453	Fence Removed: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (ID)
5453	Fence Removed: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (ID)
5456	Fence Removed: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (MT)
5456	Fence Removed: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (MT)
5425	Fence Marked: Population 9e - NW Colorado
5425	Fence Marked: Population 9e - NW Colorado
5425	Fence Marked: Population 9e - NW Colorado
5436	Fence Marked: Population 30 - Warm Springs Valley (NV)
5436	Fence Marked: Population 30 - Warm Springs Valley (NV)

5436	Fence Marked: Population 30 - Warm Springs Valley (NV)
5457	Fence Removed: Population 4 - Yellowstone Watershed
5457	Fence Removed: Population 4 - Yellowstone Watershed
5457	Fence Removed: Population 4 - Yellowstone Watershed
5458	Fence Removed: Population 15c - Southern Great Basin
5458	Fence Removed: Population 15c - Southern Great Basin
5458	Fence Removed: Population 15c - Southern Great Basin
5447	Fence Marked: Population 26b - Box Elder

5447	Fence Marked: Population 26b - Box Elder
5447	Fence Marked: Population 26b - Box Elder
5759	Structures Removed: Population 26b - Box Elder
5759	Structures Removed: Population 26b - Box Elder
5452	Fence Removed: Population 9e - NW Colorado
5452	Fence Removed: Population 9e - NW Colorado
5452	Fence Removed: Population 9e - NW Colorado
5439	Fence Marked: Population 31 - Western Great Basin (OR)
5439	Fence Marked: Population 31 - Western Great Basin (OR)

5439	Fence Marked: Population 31 - Western Great Basin (OR)
5439	Fence Marked: Population 31 - Western Great Basin (OR)
5757	Structures Removed: Population 15c - Southern Great Basin
5757	Structures Removed: Population 15c - Southern Great Basin
5757	Structures Removed: Population 15c - Southern Great Basin
5438	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (OR)
5438	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (OR)

5438	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (OR)
5438	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (OR)
5438	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (OR)
5461	Fence Removed: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)
5461	Fence Removed: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)
5461	Fence Removed: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)
5461	Fence Removed: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)
5461	Fence Removed: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)
5461	Fence Removed: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)
5461	Fence Removed: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)

5764	Transmission Line Deterrents: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)
5764	Transmission Line Deterrents: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)
5764	Transmission Line Deterrents: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)
5764	Transmission Line Deterrents: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)
5764	Transmission Line Deterrents: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)
5758	Structures Removed: Population 30 - Warm Springs Valley (NV)
5758	Structures Removed: Population 30 - Warm Springs Valley (NV)
5758	Structures Removed: Population 30 - Warm Springs Valley (NV)
5451	Fence Marked: WAFWA Management Zone V

5451	Fence Marked: WAFWA Management Zone V
5451	Fence Marked: WAFWA Management Zone V
5451	Fence Marked: WAFWA Management Zone V
5451	Fence Marked: WAFWA Management Zone V
5451	Fence Marked: WAFWA Management Zone V
5761	Structures Removed: Population 15c - Southern Great Basin_1
5761	Structures Removed: Population 15c - Southern Great Basin_1
5761	Structures Removed: Population 15c - Southern Great Basin_1
5431	Fence Marked: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (MT)
5431	Fence Marked: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (MT)

5432	Fence Marked: Population 4 - Yellowstone Watershed
5432	Fence Marked: Population 4 - Yellowstone Watershed
5432	Fence Marked: Population 4 - Yellowstone Watershed
5444	Fence Marked: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)
5444	Fence Marked: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)
5444	Fence Marked: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)
5444	Fence Marked: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)
5444	Fence Marked: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)
5444	Fence Marked: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)
5444	Fence Marked: Population 9a - Wyoming Basin (WY)

5424	Fence Marked: Population 31 - Western Great Basin (CA)
5424	Fence Marked: Population 31 - Western Great Basin (CA)
5424	Fence Marked: Population 31 - Western Great Basin (CA)
5435	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)
5435	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)
5435	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)
5435	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)

5435	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)
5427	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (ID)
5427	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (ID)
5427	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (ID)
5427	Fence Marked: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (ID)
5459	Fence Removed: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)
5459	Fence Removed: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)
5459	Fence Removed: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)

5459	Fence Removed: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)
5459	Fence Removed: Population 26a - Northern Great Basin (NV)
500	APP Utility Line Retrofits within Sage-grouse Core/4 mile Buffer Areas
500	APP Utility Line Retrofits within Sage-grouse Core/4 mile Buffer Areas
500	APP Utility Line Retrofits within Sage-grouse Core/4 mile Buffer Areas
500	APP Utility Line Retrofits within Sage-grouse Core/4 mile Buffer Areas
500	APP Utility Line Retrofits within Sage-grouse Core/4 mile Buffer Areas
500	APP Utility Line Retrofits within Sage-grouse Core/4 mile Buffer Areas

500	APP Utility Line Retrofits within Sage-grouse Core/4 mile Buffer Areas

Does the Service agree with the self-reported effectiveness assessm
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - supported by documentation provided by partner/proponent (Cite document and relevant section/pages)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - effectiveness info provided is absent or inadequate
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - effectiveness info provided is absent or inadequate

1. Yes - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)

1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - effectiveness info provided is absent or inadequate
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)

1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)

1. Yes - well supported in personal communications with expert(s) (Cite person, date [documentation must be in the record])
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)

2. No - threat not present for MZ specified
2. No - threat not present for MZ specified
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - well supported in personal communications with expert(s) (Cite person, date [documentation must be in the record])
2. No - effectiveness info provided is absent or inadequate
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)

2. No - effectiveness info provided is absent or inadequate
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - effectiveness info provided is absent or inadequate
1. Yes - well supported in personal communications with expert(s) (Cite person, date [documentation must be in the record])
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - effectiveness info provided is absent or inadequate
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)

1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)

2. No - effectiveness info provided is absent or inadequate
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - effectiveness info provided is absent or inadequate
2. No - effectiveness info provided is absent or inadequate
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - well supported in personal communications with expert(s) (Cite person, date [documentation must be in the record])

1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
2. No - effectiveness info provided is absent or inadequate
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)

1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
1. Yes - well supported in the peer-reviewed literature and/or in reports/gray literature(Cite one or two references supporting conclusion)
1. Yes - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
1. Yes - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - other (Narrative explanation in text box)
2. No - effectiveness info provided is absent or inadequate

2. No - effectiveness info provided is absent or inadequate

Explain Service Assessment (Required Based on Effectiveness Assessment)
FLAG - Project appears to be in ID. ScienceBase was unable to display the spatial data.
Project completed in Idaho
Fence removal is complete and more effective than fence marking; dates appear arbitrary and the same as other projects
WY Basin not in MZ 1.
Supported in COT Report, Fences.
Project occurred in CO
Fences have been known to cause direct mortality through collision. Stevens et al. 2012, Braun 1998, Christiansen 2009
Should location be in CO would consider it effective, but location could not be confirmed by BLM contact.
Project occurred in NV.
FLAG - Could be deemed effective if we receive documentation to support effectiveness. Spatial data shows a very large polygon, not 1.0 mi of fenceline. Where are these fences in relation to leks or other important GrSG habitat? Were there documented mortalities prior to the fence marking?

FLAG - Could be deemed effective if we obtain documentation from project proponent to support claim. Only generic information given. GIS information does not show fence locations. No information on fence distance to leks or other important GrSG habitats.
Supported in COT Report, Fences.
Yellowstone Watershed not in MZ 2.
Project did not occur in MZ 4.
COT Infrastructure objectives #1 & #5, p. 51. NOTE - project is also on the NV Zone IV Infrastructure Excel Sheet. Would like more information on where these fences are in relation to leks or other important GrSG habitat. Spatial data shows an extremely large polygon, not 1.5 mi of fences.
FLAG - COT Infrastructure Objective #5, p. 51. Would like documentation to support the claim. How far was the removed fence from a lek or other important habitat? What were the documented mortalities prior to the fence being removed? Was a fence installed elsewhere to replace this removed structure?
Project completed in Nevada
FLAG - Project appears to be in UT. ScienceBase was unable to display spatial data.

By marking a fence line, the potential for collision mortalities have been greatly reduced (Stevens et al. 2012)
COT, page 52 Fences, Conservation Objective-Options
FLAG - Project appears to be in UT. ScienceBase was unable to display spatial data.
Two MET tower were removed by BLM Utah Salt Lake Field Office. Collision risk removed
Project occurred in CO
Fences have been known to cause direct mortality through collision. Stevens et al. 2012, Braun 1998, Christiansen 2009
Should location be in CO would consider it effective, but location could not be confirmed by BLM contact.
FLAG - Project appears to be in OR. ScienceBase was unable to display spatial data.
Project is in OR.

Fence marking is complete but it would be nice to know how and with what materials as well as what maintenance/follow up will take place; dates appear arbitrary and the same as other projects
fence marking was completed
FLAG - NOTE - Project #5757 is also on the Spreadsheet for NV Zone IV Infrastructure. Would like more information regarding the location of the structures removed in relation to important GrSG habitat. COT Objective Infrastructure #5, p. 51.
FLAG - Would like more information regarding the location of these structures in relation to important GrSG habitats. COT Objective under Infrastructure #5, p. 51. (
Project completed in Nevada
FLAG - Project should be evaluated by OR.
Project is in OR.

Fence marking is complete but it would be nice to know how and with what materials as well as what maintenance/follow up will take place; dates appear arbitrary and the same as other projects
fence marking was completed
COT, page 52 Fences, Conservation Objective-Options
Project completed in Wyoming
Project did not occur in MT. Effort 5456 is for MT portion of WY Basin fence removal project.
Project did not occur in MT. Effort 5456 is for MT portion of WY Basin fence removal project.
Project did not occur in MT. Effort 5456 is for MT portion of WY Basin fence removal project.
COT, page 52 Fences, Conservation Objective-Options
In Wyoming

FLAG - COT Objective #6, p. 52 does recommend reducing or eliminating perch sites; however, predation is not identified as a primary threat. Also, this project does not alliviate the threat of infrastructure. NOTE - project #5764 is also listed on the spreadsheet for NV Zone IV Infrastructure.
FLAG - COT Objective #6, p. 52 does recommend reducing or eliminating perch sites; however, predation is not identified as a primary threat. Also, this project does not alliviate the threat of infrastructure.
Project completed in Nevada
Fence marking is complete but it would be nice to know how and with what materials as well as what maintenance/follow up will take place; dates appear arbitrary and the same as other projects
Location is NV. Deterrents were applied to reduce predation. Infrastructure still remains, therefore negative effect still remains.
Project occurred in NV.
COT infrastructure objective #6 - remove infrastructure, p. 52. NOTE - this project was also listed on the NV Zone V Infrastructure Spreadsheet.l
COT infrastructure objective 6 - remove infrastructure, p. 52. Project removed 17 MET towers. Unsure if removal of 11 SODARs would benefit GrSG.
Project occurred in OR

FLAG - Project appears to be in OR. ScienceBase was unable to display spatial data.
FLAG - Project should be evaluated by OR.
FLAG - Could be deemed effective if we obtain documentation from project proponent to support the claim. Only generic information given. GIS information does not show fence locations. No information on fence distance to leks or other important GrSG habitats.
Fence marking is complete but it would be nice to know how and with what materials as well as what maintenance/follow up will take place; dates appear arbitrary and the same as other projects
fence marking was completed
COT infrastructure objective #6 - remove infrastructure, p. 52.
FLAG - Could be deemed effective if support documentation is received. Why were these telephone poles chosen to be removed? How close were they located to active leks or other importanat GrSG habitat? Mortalities reported prior to telephone pole removal? NOTE - was unable to view spatial data due to ScienceBase issues.
Project completed in Nevada
WY Basin not in MZ 1.
Supported in COT Report, Fences.

Supported in COT Report, Fences.
Yellowstone Watershed not in MZ 2.
Project did not occur in MZ 4.
Project completed in Wyoming
Project did not occur in MT. Effort 5431 is for MT portion of WY Basin fence marking project.
Project did not occur in MT. Effort 5431 is for MT portion of WY Basin fence marking project.
Project did not occur in MT. Effort 5431 is for MT portion of WY Basin fence marking project.
COT, page 52 Fences, Conservation Objective-Options
In Wyoming

FLAG - need more information. 18 miles by Altura FO, 57.65 mi by Surprise FO, 1 mi by Eagle Lake FO. No info on where these fences are located. Are there any leks or other important SG habitat located near these fences?
CA Project, evaluated under CA
fence marking was completed
FLAG - Could be deemed effective if we receive documentation to support effectiveness. ScienceBase was unable to display spatial data. Where are these fences in relation to leks or other important GrSG habitat? Were there documented mortalities prior to the fence marking?
FLAG - Could be deemed effective if support documentation is received. Why were these fences chosen to be marked? How close were they located to active leks or other importanat GrSG habitat? Mortalities reported prior to fence marking? NOTE - was unable to view spatial data due to ScienceBase issues.
Project completed in Nevada
Fence marking is complete but it would be nice to know how and with what materials as well as what maintenance/follow up will take place; dates appear arbitrary and the same as other projects

COT, page 52 Fences, Conservation Objective-Options
FLAG - Project should be evaluated by ID.
Project completed in Idaho
Fence marking is complete but it would be nice to know how and with what materials as well as what maintenance/follow up will take place; dates appear arbitrary and the same as other projects
COT, page 52 Fences, Conservation Objective-Options
COT Infrastructure objectives #1 & #5, p. 51. Would like more information on where these fences are in relation to leks or other important GrSG habitat. ScienceBase was unable to display spatial data.
FLAG - Could be deemed effective if support documentation is received. Why were these fences chosen to be removed? How close were they located to active leks or other importanat GrSG habitat? Mortalities reported prior to fence removal? NOTE - was unable to view spatial data due to ScienceBase issues.
Project completed in Nevada

Fence removal is complete and more effective than fence marking; dates appear arbitrary and the same as other projects
COT, page 52 Fences, Conservation Objective-Options
As described by Pacific corp: APP retrofit projects are deemed effective against sage-grouse collision and/or electrocutions for both distribution and transmission lines within core/4 mile buffer areas.
As described by Pacific corp: APP retrofit projects are deemed effective against sage-grouse collision and/or electrocutions for both distribution and transmission lines within core/4 mile buffer areas.
Project **does not appear to occur in MT in MZ 1** based on CED information. May be a data entry error.
Vast majority occurs outside of MT - unclear whether even a very small portion of the project may occur in MT in MZ 2 based on CED information. May be a data entry error. In any event, "retrofits" were not described, conservation effectiveness for GRSG was not documented, and infrastructure remains on the landscape.
Vast majority occurs outside of MT - does not appear that any portion occurs in MT in MZ 4 based on CED information. May be a data entry error. In any event, "retrofits" were not described, conservation effectiveness for GRSG was not documented, and infrastructure remains on the landscape.
Type of retrofit was not described, unclear of effectiveness. Structures still remain, therefore negative effect still remains.

Type of retrofit was not described, unclear of effectiveness.
Structures still remain, therefore negative effect still remains.

Name of Certifier
Genevieve Skora
Jay Martini
Jeff Everett
Jeff Berglund
Jeff Berglund
Jay Martini
Terry Ireland
Terry Ireland
Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora

Genevieve Skora
Jeff Berglund
Jeff Berglund
Jeff Berglund
Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora
Jay Martini
Genevieve Skora

Jay Martini
Kathleen Hendricks
Genevieve Skora
Jay Martini
Jay Martini
Terry Ireland
Terry Ireland
Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora

Jeff Everett
Jeff Everett
Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora
Jay Martini
Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora

Jeff Everett
Jeff Everett
Kathleen Hendricks
Jay Martini
Jeff Berglund
Jeff Berglund
Jeff Berglund
Kathleen Hendricks
Kathleen Hendricks
Flag. Terry Ireland

Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora
Jay Martini
Jeff Everett
Kathleen Hendricks
Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora

Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora
Jeff Everett
Jeff Everett
Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora
Jay Martini
Jeff Berglund
Jeff Berglund

Jeff Berglund
Jeff Berglund
Jeff Berglund
Jay Martini
Jeff Berglund
Jeff Berglund
Jeff Berglund
Kathleen Hendricks
Kathleen Hendricks
Flag. Terry Ireland

Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora
Jeff Everett
Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora
Jay Martini
Jeff Everett

Kathleen Hendricks
Genevieve Skora
Jay Martini
Jeff Everett
Kathleen Hendricks
Genevieve Skora
Genevieve Skora
Jay Martini

Jeff Everett
Kathleen Hendricks
Jay Martini
Terry Ireland
Jeff Berglund
Jeff Berglund
Jeff Berglund
Kathleen Hendricks

Kathleen Hendricks

Discussion	MZs to remove
Two of us stated the project was in Idaho and therefore we didn't evaluate it. The third response is the one t	
Was not evaluated in states where project did not take place. The "Yes" response is the one that evaluated it	
Was not evaluated in states where project did not take place. The "Yes" response is the one that evaluated it	
Fence is not in CA. Unsure which of two MZs in NV the project occurs in. 1 mi fence however spatial data sh	

Was not evaluated in states where project did not take place. The "Yes" response is the one that evaluated it

Fence was in NV, therefore Jay did not evaluate. Effective, but we really need more info. Spatial data did not

Effective, but should probably only be counted under one of the MZs - would need to verify with spatial data

Was not evaluated in states where project did not take place. The "Yes" response is the one that evaluated it

Was not evaluated in states where project did not take place. The "Yes" response is the one that evaluated it

Fence was in OR, evaluated there. Yes, effective, but would like additional information.

Was not evaluated in states where project did not take place. The "Yes" response is the one that evaluated it

Proj was in OR, evaluated there - spatial data needs to be checked to see if this project occurred in three MZs

Was not evaluated in states where project did not take place. The "Yes" response is the one that evaluated it

Perch deterrents - probably should discuss this one; however, most reviewers stated not effective or didn't a

Did not address the threat of infrastructure but rather predation (which is not a primary threat) so I don't sup

Was not evaluated in states where project did not take place. The "Yes" response is the one that evaluated it

Was not evaluated in states where project did not take place. The "Yes" response is the one that evaluated it

Spatial data is unclear whether this project should be evaluated under MZ

Was not evaluated in states where project did not take place. The "Yes" response is the one that evaluated it

Was not evaluated in states where project did not take place. The "Yes" response is the one that evaluated it

Was not evaluated in states where project did not take place. The "Yes" response is the one that evaluated it

Project occurred in CA; should not have been evaluated in OR. Was not evaluated in NV.

Project occurred in NV, should not have been evaluated in ID or OR or UT. Should only be evaluated under M

Project should only be evaluated in ID.

Project should only be evaluated in NV Zone IV. Yes effective.

Project possibly should be discussed - APP Utility line retrofits. (-GS) Did not describe what type of retrofit an

All of my "no" responses on this list involved projects that occurred either outside MT or outside the MZ bein

Did not describe what type of retrofit and probably addresses predation rather than infrastructure. Regardle

Did not describe what type of retrofit and probably addresses predation rather than infrastructure. Regardle

:hat evaluated it and stated it was effective.

t and stated it was effective.

t and stated it was effective.

ows large polygon. Could be deemed effective if we receieved more information.

t and stated it was effective.

t match description.

t and stated it was effective.

t and stated it was effective.

t and stated it was effective.

s/States or not. Other reviewers stated proj was effective.

t and stated it was effective.

ddress the threat. One stated yes, but cites fence marking, so may have skipped up or down a line on E

port counting it under infrastructure.

t and stated it was effective.

t and stated it was effective.

t and stated it was effective.

t and stated it was effective.

t and stated it was effective.

1Z IV. Need more information to determine if effective. Spatial data does not match description.

d probably addresses predation rather than infrastructure. Regardless of what they did the infrastructu

ıg assessed. Project 500 was possibly in that boat too (but couldn't tell for sure) - although it had additic

ss of what they did the infrastructure still remains, the threat has not been addressed.

ss of what they did the infrastructure still remains, the threat has not been addressed.

xcel spreadsheet.

re still remains, the threat has not been addressed. (-JM)

onal effectiveness documentation issues. I think it would be worth chatting about that one anyway.