From:	Deibert, Pat
To:	Matt Kales
Cc:	Nicole Alt
Subject:	Re: GRSG: summary of recent correspondence challenging GrSG science and conservation measures
Date:	Thursday, March 26, 2015 11:17:39 AM
Attachments:	FWS.GrSG.summary of recent correspondence challenging science and conservation measures.draft 032515 _pd.docx

---

Matt -

a few very minor comments attached. I am assuming Noreen will have the necessary resources (probably already in her head) to respond to questions about the summary arguments. If more assistance is needed please advise.

p

On Wed, Mar 25, 2015 at 3:46 PM, Matt Kales <matt_kales@fws.gov> wrote:

> Hi, Pat. As mentioned, please see attached the subject doc, which I developed per Noreen's request. She'd like this handy for SGTF, so I'd be grateful for your review/feedback by COB tomorrow. Thanks. MK
>
> Matt Kales, Senior Advisor for Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation
>
> Office of the Regional Director
>
> US Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region
>
> Office: (303) 236-4576
>
> Mobile: (720) 234-0257

--
Pat Deibert, PhD
Certified Wildlife Biologist®
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
5353 Yellowstone Road, Suite 308A
Cheyenne, WY 82009
307-772-2374, ext. 226

got leks?

Selected Recent Correspondence to Federal Agencies re: Sage-Grouse Science as of March 25, 2015

Product and Author/Date	Receiving Agency	Summary Argument
Letter from Sage-grouse scientists, 3/12/15	DOI/USDA leadership	Federal plans should contain "…objective, measurable and robust conservation measures based on best available science..." Federal agencies appear to be abandoning NTT in favor of more "elastic, subjective" measures in COT (which authors claim is a summary of existing information, doesn't contain adequate conservation measures, and introduced ambiguity to conservation actions).
Report from American Exploration & Mining Association, 3/17/2015	Public	BLM's ES&R Program imposes arbitrary deadlines and technical constraints that impede successful rehabilitation of fire-impacted low-elevation subspecies of sagebrush. Recommended policy changes include more realistic timelines for measuring success and providing funding for low-elevation restoration efforts.
DQA from Western Energy Alliance and "Western Coalition" (counties and other industry groups), 3/18/15	BLM (NTT); FWS (COT; USGS (Monograph)	Federal agencies are imposing "one size fits all" measures on Western states and are "justifying a top-down approach with selective and faulty information that ignores a large body of scientific literature on the species." "Prescriptions from the three reports are heavily influencing policies not just for federal lands but the full 186 million acres of GRSG habitat, yet the reports fail to meet basic standards of science…"
Letter from NCBA, 3/20/15	Secretary Jewell	"…inclusion of Sagebrush Focal Areas (SFAs), as noted in Director Ashe's October 27, 2014 memorandum, in federal resource management plans is very concerning and may undermine this entire [sage-grouse conservation planning] process." Authors note concerns about last-minute nature of SFAs; lack of understanding of proposed SFA locations and management implications; targeting of landowners; lack of benefit to species; confusion and mistrust surrounding SFAs.
Letter from CBD and other NGOs, 2/20/2015	DOI leadership	"SuperPACs" (strongholds) should not diminish importance of PACs…" Existing SuperPACs are inadequate and should include key areas SuperPACs should include a suite of robust conservation measures (e.g., lek buffers, fire management, restrictions on grazing, O&G development, etc. SuperPACs should be codified in specific, restrictive management designations for these landscapes, e.g., National Wildlife Refuges, National Monuments SuperPACs should be venues for LTER

Comment [DP1]: I would spell out – have no idea what this acronym is.

Comment [DP2]: are these defined by CBD?

Selected Recent Correspondence to Federal Agencies re: Sage-Grouse Science as of March 25, 2015

Product and Author/Date	Receiving Agency	Summary Argument
Letter from Sage-grouse scientists, 3/12/15	DOI/USDA leadership	Federal plans should contain "…objective, measurable and robust conservation measures based on best available science..." Federal agencies appear to be abandoning NTT in favor of more "elastic, subjective" measures in COT (which authors claim is a summary of existing information, doesn't contain adequate conservation measures, and introduced ambiguity to conservation actions).
Report from American Exploration & Mining Association, 3/17/2015	Public	BLM's ES&R Program imposes arbitrary deadlines and technical constraints that impede successful rehabilitation of fire-impacted low-elevation subspecies of sagebrush. Recommended policy changes include more realistic timelines for measuring success and providing funding for low-elevation restoration efforts.
DQA from Western Energy Alliance and "Western Coalition" (counties and other industry groups), 3/18/15	BLM (NTT); FWS (COT; USGS (Monograph)	Federal agencies are imposing "one size fits all" measures on Western states and are "justifying a top-down approach with selective and faulty information that ignores a large body of scientific literature on the species." "Prescriptions from the three reports are heavily influencing policies not just for federal lands but the full 186 million acres of GRSG habitat, yet the reports fail to meet basic standards of science…"
Letter from NCBA, 3/20/15	Secretary Jewell	"…inclusion of Sagebrush Focal Areas (SFAs), as noted in Director Ashe's October 27, 2014 memorandum, in federal resource management plans is very concerning and may undermine this entire [sage-grouse conservation planning] process." Authors note concerns about last-minute nature of SFAs; lack of understanding of proposed SFA locations and management implications; targeting of landowners; lack of benefit to species; confusion and mistrust surrounding SFAs.
Letter from CBD and other NGOs, 2/20/2015	DOI leadership	"SuperPACs" (strongholds) should not diminish importance of PACs…" Existing SuperPACs are inadequate and should include key areas SuperPACs should include a suite of robust conservation measures (e.g., lek buffers, fire management, restrictions on grazing, O&G development, etc. SuperPACs should be codified in specific, restrictive management designations for these landscapes, e.g., National Wildlife Refuges, National Monuments SuperPACs should be venues for LTER

Comment [DP1]: I would spell out – have no idea what this acronym is.

Comment [DP2]: are these defined by CBD?