From: Kulpa, Sarah
To: Davis, Dawn
Cc: Ted Koch
Subject: Re: Paragraph and Line Item Descriptions for FIAT Assessments
Date: Monday, March 23, 2015 2:38:15 PM

Ted & Dawn,

I think Amy's changed paragraph is fine, but that paragraph is in section 2. My question is what happened to the paragraph under 4.1.4 that started this entire email string? That paragraph has been included in the SGB assessment from the beginning. Is that paragraph now removed with the projects SGB included in each PPA for invasives?

Thanks,

Sarah

On Thu, Mar 19, 2015 at 4:47 PM, Davis, Dawn <dawn_davis@fws.gov> wrote:

> Ted and Sarah,
>
> I did advocate the following language be incorporated into the SO Final Report:
>
> ***Inventory, treat, and monitor nonnative, invasive species* – Currently, spatial data are not available that portray the distribution of non-native, invasive, and/or noxious plant species across the range of greater sage-grouse. Policies and funding are needed to ensure that non-native, invasive, and/or noxious plant species are inventoried and monitored in in order to prioritize treatments of these species within the Great Basin. Management actions needed include: locating infestations, decreasing propagule pressure (especially along roadside areas), treating satellite infestations, and preventing future infestations.**
>
> Originally, it was proposed to go in 7(b)viii - science but was suggested to be a more appropriate section in 7(b)vii which deals specifically with invasives.
>
> On Thu, Mar 19, 2015 at 4:10 PM, Ted Koch <ted_koch@fws.gov> wrote:
>
>> Dawn and Sarah-
>>
>> FYI. I hope this works for us?
>>
>> Ted
>>
>> Ted Koch
>> Field Supervisor
>> Reno Fish & Wildlife Office
>> 1340 Financial Boulevard
>> Reno, NV. 89521
>> 775-861-6300
>>
>> Begin forwarded message:

From: Amy Lueders <alueders@blm.gov>
Date: March 19, 2015 at 11:22:23 AM PDT
To: Ted Koch <ted_koch@fws.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Paragraph and Line Item Descriptions for FIAT Assessments

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** "Havlina, Douglas" <dhavlina@blm.gov>
> **Date:** March 19, 2015 at 11:21:41 AM PDT
> **To:** "Lueders, Amy" <alueders@blm.gov>
> **Subject: Re: Paragraph and Line Item Descriptions for FIAT Assessments**
>
> Hi Amy:
>
> Thanks for taking the time to craft this language. Our writer-editors at EMPSi said they would get this inserted into the SGB document first thing monday am (the document is undergoing tech editing right now so it's locked for the time being).
>
> Much appreciated, Doug
>
> On Thu, Mar 19, 2015 at 8:56 AM, Lueders, Amy <alueders@blm.gov> wrote:
>
> > Doug et al-
> > i agree that the language that Dawn includes in the email at the bottom of the string is outside the scope of the FIAT assessments and is already addressed in the LUPs (we could probably even share some of those excerpts with her).
> > The issue of concern to Ted for Southern GB was not that issue but the issue of cheatgrass understory in sagebrush, which is a R&R issue. The language we had originally proposed to address that is below:
> >
> > > The lack of an accurate invasive annual grasses map made it difficult to determine the expanse of cheatgrass, medusahead, and other invasive species in the MZ III, SGB FIAT area. A broad brush determination was made based on the USFWS's suggestion that greater than 20 percent

cheatgrass understory would need to be identified in the PPAs. Passive treatments inside and outside of the focal habitats would be incorporated, while the greater than 20 percent cheatgrass understory would be monitored. The invasive annual grasses in the SGB FIAT area are ephemeral. Because of this, future research should be supported to determine when active cheatgrass chemical treatments are needed to treat cheatgrass understory.

At the time of this assessment, the conifer expansion model was not available from Coates *et al*., therefore, SynthMap and the conifer expansion layer were used to determine where pinyon-juniper (PJ) would need to be removed. The SGB team also used ERSI imagery, elevation, and aspect information to help determine Phase 1 and 2 PJ sites.

I understand that there is a concern that the 20% understory does not have a scientific reference and believe that the first sentence is too broad re: cheatgrass, medusahead and other invasive species. I do think in both the assessments (someone smarter than me would know where) particularly where we talk about next steps, we could and should highlight that we don't have a good data layer at this scale to identify understory of sagebrush and as we proceed to the next stage (phase 3?) of project design, we need to use local knowledge to identify sagebrush areas that are vulnerable to fire disturbance b/c of their understory component and prioritize treatments in that area. Rex and I have also discussed including something in an implementation type guide (the what do I do next with this giant binder summary) that would say--keep an eye to this specific situation as you are developing site-specific treatments. Smarter people than me could figure out how and where to say that. Here's a first start at the concept...

The lack of an accurate invasive annual grasses map made it difficult to determine the expanse of cheatgrass,understory in sagebrush habitat in the MZ III, SGB FIAT area. During the project planning process, local site specific knowledge would be sued to identify areas appropriate for specific treatment to enhance the resiliency of intact sagebrush habitat. The invasive annual grasses in the SGB FIAT area are ephemeral. Because of this, future research should be supported to determine when active cheatgrass chemical treatments are needed to treat cheatgrass

understory.

At the time of this assessment, the conifer expansion model was not available from Coates *et al*., therefore, SynthMap and the conifer expansion layer were used to determine where pinyon-juniper (PJ) would need to be removed. The SGB team also used ERSI imagery, elevation, and aspect information to help determine Phase 1 and 2 PJ sites.

On Wed, Mar 18, 2015 at 10:38 AM, Havlina, Douglas <dhavlina@blm.gov> wrote:

Hello Raul and Amy:

Please see the email string below. We need to arrive at a final decision on how we commit to invasive plant monitoring/inventory. Pellant and I have asserted that the inventory and monitoring of invasive plant species falls under RMP guidance, and should not be specific to FIAT landscapes. Conversely, Ted has strongly lobbied for these kinds of commitments as potential management actions in the FIAT assessments. Mike and I feel that this sets a dangerous precedent which would commit FIAT districts to onerous requirements in the years ahead. Again, we feel it is part of the broader RMP-based inventory protocols and outside of FIAT.

For background, please read my response to FWS below, and the associated request they sent to us late monday. If you could advise, Mike and I would really appreciate it.

best, doug

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Havlina, Douglas** <dhavlina@blm.gov>
Date: Wed, Mar 18, 2015 at 6:55 AM
Subject: Re: Paragraph and Line Item Descriptions for FIAT Assessments
To: "Davis, Dawn" <dawn_davis@fws.gov>, Michael Pellant <mpellant@blm.gov>, Jolie Pollet <jpollet@blm.gov>, Ted Koch <ted_koch@fws.gov>

Hi Dawn:

As you're aware it is pretty late in the game for additions to our reports, particularly for broader buy-in from team members which have contributed to their development. I've spoken with the FIAT tech team about your proposed addition, and have these thoughts.

1. The management actions proposed are covered in land use plans, falling under the management of invasive species and weeds.
2. The suggested verbiage dealing with nonnative, invasive species falls beyond the scope of FIAT. The sideboards of FIAT are in part defined by invasive annual grasses which contribute to the fire/invasive annual grass feedback cycle.
3. I think our teams have done a great job in identifying invasive annual grass polygons in and around our PPAs where potential treatments may be applied. This work has been commensurate in scale with the identification of potential treatments for the other resource issues, such as conifer removal.

I fully appreciate the passion which Ted and the Service brings to the FIAT process in terms of management of invasive species. At the same time, I have been continually reminded by BLM leadership that FIAT cannot make broad commitments which are most appropriately captured in land use plans. This is the fine line that i've been trying to walk throughout the process.

On another note, I am finalizing our response to the Service on how we handled the Category 1 and 2 comments you provided in early February, and want to get those to you by the end of this week.

I'm in the remainder of this week so please call with questions.

Thanks, Doug

On Tue, Mar 17, 2015 at 1:05 PM, Davis, Dawn <dawn_davis@fws.gov> wrote:

> Hi Doug,
>
> I made a request to our FWS FIAT team leads yesterday to have language that was being incorporated into the Southern Great Basin report added to the other 4 FIAT

assessments (see my original email below) not realizing that the reports had been sent off to EMPSi for final editing. My understanding is that Amy Lueders wanted this paragraph inserted and table line item in at least the Southern Great Basin FIAT plan but do you know if it was incorporated into the other step-down assessments or if there is an opportunity to do so?

Thanks,

Dawn

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Davis, Dawn** <dawn_davis@fws.gov>
Date: Mon, Mar 16, 2015 at 6:02 PM
Subject: Paragraph and Line Item Descriptions for FIAT Assessments
To: Angela Sitz <angela_sitz@fws.gov>, Jason Pyron <jason_pyron@fws.gov>, Katie Powell <katie_powell@fws.gov>, Brandon Miller <brandon_miller@fws.gov>, Jay Martini <jay_martini@fws.gov>, Sarah Kulpa <sarah_kulpa@fws.gov>

Hi all,

To the extent possible can you ensure that the following language taken from the SGB step-down assessment is incorporated into each of the other 4 FIAT assessments?

Paragraph under 4.1.4 Proactive Strategies:

At the time of document preparation, spatial data were not available which portrayed the distribution of non-native, invasive, and/or noxious plant species across the range of GRSG. Therefore, non-native, invasive, and/or noxious plant species need to be inventoried and monitored in each PPA in order to prioritize treatments of these species. Management actions needed in PPAs include: locating infestations, decreasing propagule pressure (especially along roadside areas), treating satellite infestations, and preventing future infestations.

Language to be inserted in every PPA as a project line item:

Under 1st order priority

(Insert PPA Name) Non-Native Treatment: Inventory, treat, and monitor nonnative, invasive species in the PPA.

Thanks - let me know if you have any questions,
--

Dawn Davis, Ph.D.
Certified Wildlife Biologist ®
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Regional Office
911 NE 11th Avenue, 4th Floor, Portland, OR 97232
Office: 503.231.6194; Cell: 503.784.7429; FAX: 503.231.6243
dawn_davis@fws.gov

--

Dawn Davis, Ph.D.
Certified Wildlife Biologist ®
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Regional Office
911 NE 11th Avenue, 4th Floor, Portland, OR 97232
Office: 503.231.6194; Cell: 503.784.7429; FAX: 503.231.6243
dawn_davis@fws.gov

--

Dawn Davis, Ph.D.
Certified Wildlife Biologist ®
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Regional Office
911 NE 11th Avenue, 4th Floor, Portland, OR 97232
Office: 503.231.6194; Cell: 503.784.7429; FAX: 503.231.6243
dawn_davis@fws.gov

--
****
Sarah Kulpa
Botanist
Reno Fish and Wildlife Office
1340 Financial Boulevard, Suite 234
Reno, Nevada 89502
Tel: (775) 861-6340