From: Noreen Walsh
To: Matt Kales
Subject: Re: going final with the BP today
Date: Monday, May 06, 2013 12:47:14 PM

I can figure it out - IPAD better than IPHONE!! ◆ ◆:)

Noreen Walsh
Regional Director
Mountain-Prairie Region
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

On May 6, 2013, at 2:45 PM, Matt Kales <matt_kales@fws.gov> wrote:

> Shouldn't be a problem.
>
> On May 6, 2013, at 12:42 PM, Noreen Walsh <noreen_walsh@fws.gov> wrote:
>
>> I didnt realize you weren't coming back to the office
>>
>> Noreen Walsh
>> Regional Director
>> Mountain-Prairie Region
>> U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
>>
>> On May 6, 2013, at 2:40 PM, Matt Kales <matt_kales@fws.gov> wrote:
>>
>>> Got it. Think I can manage the below via iPhone.
>>>
>>> On May 6, 2013, at 12:33 PM, Noreen Walsh <noreen_walsh@fws.gov> wrote:
>>>
>>>> I just sent Mike T the revision. ◆When I go final later today I need your help....IPAD challenged.
>>>>
>>>> Transmit to me the final BP clean with no commentary, with the first 4 attached files below also attached to the email. ◆Only the first 4, I don't want to send the last 2 now.
>>>>
>>>> that will be what I send to Dan and Gary. ◆I know you are at the dentist, and I don't think we need to call unless this doesn't make sense.

Muchos gracias

NW

Noreen Walsh
Regional Director
Mountain-Prairie Region
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

On May 2, 2013, at 4:30 PM, Matt Kales <matt_kales@fws.gov> wrote:

> Hi, Noreen.
>
> Per your below, we have identified and packaged (attached) pertinent correspondence re: FWS approval of state plans. Please find attached the following items:
>
> 1. Sec. Salazar's 12/11 letter to Governors re:
> 2. FWS 05/07/08 letter to WY re: that state's core area strategy
> 3. FWS 4/10/13 letter to ID re: that state's plan
> 4. FWS formal comments to ODFW Commission on that state's planning efforts (see section re: FWS perspective on OR's plan)
> 5. An updated status report for state planning efforts (note we are still waiting on updates from WA, ND, CA and NV).
> 6. A draft BP re:

the approval issue

We believe this captures our formal communications to states on this issue to date, but will advise you if we identify additional items. As you review item 6, the internal BP on this issue, we recommend including some additional language that points up what we believe to be at the core of this issue, namely that **states, in seeking regulatory certainty, are looking to us to approve plans in the same context we approve state plans for species currently listed under the Act, e.g., to support a delisting effort, when in fact sage-grouse are currently a state trust resource and therefore we don't have the authority at this time to approve a plan in such a way it would provide regulatory certainty for the states. It follows it is essential we clarify this issue as soon as possible with state leadership so they have a full and accurate understanding of the purpose of our review, which is not to approve but to review and determine if we can support a state plan in the context of our analysis. Further, we think that we can and should go one step past that clarification and identify for the state a vehicle by which they can demonstrate, in a qualitative way(s), how the measures in their plans will inform our analysis, specifically our PECE process.**

If the above language ⬩ or at

least the concept - ◆works, we◆ll incorporate it into the next iteration of the BP.

◆

Beyond that, please let me know if you need additional materials to inform the conversation with the Director on this issue in advance of the 5/17 telecon w/the SGTF.◆ Thanks.

◆

Matt

◆

From: Noreen Walsh [mailto:noreen_walsh@fws.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2013 7:52 AM
To: Matt Kales
Cc: Michael Thabault; nicole_alt@fws.gov; pat deibert
Subject: reviewing GSG correspondence to states before we finalize recommendation to Dir

◆

Matt,

◆

Can you assist the ES program in the following:

◆

Gather any pertinent correspondence (beginning with any official notes from the December 2011 Secy Salazar meeting in Cheyenne and any letters the Secy sent right after that meeting), that speak to or allude to the degree to which the Service would ◆approve◆ state plans.◆

◆

We need to review what we have put in writing on this topic over that last two years and what we have already sent to states.◆◆ I would like that review to inform our recommendation to the Director, so please also include in

the packet you prepare for me the letters we have sent to WY and the letters we have sent to ID.□ I am attaching here the ones I already am aware of.□ I didn□t find these on the sharepoint, but maybe I am just not looking in the right place.□ If they are not there, will you please make sure a folder is established for state plan correspondence?

□

I need this by next Friday 5/3 at the latest, but would value it sooner if you all can make that happen, so that we can have a good dialogue with the Director before the 5/17 SGTF teleconf on this topic.□ All, please holler if you have questions.

□

Thanks,
Noreen

□

Noreen Walsh
Regional Director
Mountain-Prairie Region
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

□

303 236 7920

□

The Mountain-Prairie Region of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service: *□We provide conservation stewardship of some of America□s most scenic lands, to ensure healthy fish and wildlife for the enjoyment and benefit of all people.*

□

<Ltr from Salazar to Governors (December 2011) Greater Sage Grouse.pdf>

<05-07-08_Letter to Ryan Lance.pdf>

<CLBO GRSG FWS response letter 4_10_13.pdf>

<FWSsage-grouse-position ODFW Commission testimony 1.doc>

<Status of Sage-grouse Planning Efforts (May 2013) (2).docx>

<State plans bp 4-24-13 rev.doc>