From: Drizd, Lara
To: Jeff Everett
Subject: Re: GRSG CED Evals - Infrastructure
Date: Monday, March 23, 2015 11:36:23 AM

Nope, it's all covered except for one project which I think Kevin Shelley is planning on contacting you about to discuss. I'll forward the email to you.

On Mon, Mar 23, 2015 at 11:33 AM, Jeff Everett <jeff_everett@fws.gov> wrote:

> Hey Lara –
>
> I'll defer to Jay and Gen on #5764 – they both said no, and upon further review I agree with their reasoning; especially with the reference to the COT report. Also – since it is a NV project, I think it is most appropriate to go with the NV opinion.
>
> I also agree that at some point in the future we should discuss the fence marking, predator deterrents, etc. as several folks on this email string have suggested. Good subject for the next sage grouse biologist call that Pat hosts?
>
> Do you still need me to go through the updated spreadsheet you sent Tuesday?
>
> Cheers
>
> J-
>
> **From:** Drizd, Lara [mailto:lara_drizd@fws.gov]
> **Sent:** Tuesday, March 17, 2015 2:05 PM
> **To:** Jeff Everett
> **Subject:** Re: GRSG CED Evals - Infrastructure
>
> Oops, I meant project #5764. I sent the wrong emails to you and Terry.
>
> On Tue, Mar 17, 2015 at 1:43 PM, Drizd, Lara <lara_drizd@fws.gov> wrote:
>
> Hey Jeff,

Can you weigh in on project #500?

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

--

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

--

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