From:	Thabault, Michael
To:	Norman, Kate
Subject:	Re: GSG 2015, 5/22 Materials - revised from 5/16 call
Date:	Friday, May 16, 2014 2:41:53 PM
Attachments:	20140522_RDmtg_TalkPts (1).docx

Kate, A sharepoint neophyte so not sure how to edit there. Here are just a couple of specific bullets that I added up front.

Michael Thabault
Assistant Regional Director
Ecological Services
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mountain Prairie Region
303-236-4210
michael_thabault@fws.gov

On Fri, May 16, 2014 at 2:27 PM, Norman, Kate <kate_norman@fws.gov> wrote:

> Here are the revised materials.
>
> I've highlighted my changes just to make it a bit clearer. I'll check messages again tonight, so if I need to make edits before Monday, just let me know.
>
> All materials are visible here:
>
> https://portal.doi.net/usfws/SG/docs/Forms/522.aspx
>
> *I moved the Talking Points, but changed the permissions. That document will only be visible to the individuals on today's call.*
>
> ## Changes Kate Made:
>
> **Agenda**
> Added "Vision" to morning to give ARDs a chance to explain the current direction *(may want to move some of the talking points from "Welcome" to "Vision intro")*
>
> **Talking Points**
> Added recognition of "concerns about this process; sensitivity"
>
> **Briefing Paper**
> Added litigation history to each "lesson learned"
> Added history of objectives prior to process bullet points
> Added closing thought on 2010 at the end of process (Just to reiterate)

--
Kate Norman
Sage-Grouse Project Manager
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Headquarters
4401 N. Fairfax Dr., Rm 420
Arlington, VA 22203
Work: 703-358-1871
Mobile: 703-927-2445
kate_norman@fws.gov

Welcome (introduction for morning)

Thank yous

- Travel, Time, Input

Why are we here today?

We want to explain our thoughts, hear from you, and then find the best path forward.

- Briefing on May 18, 2014 was a check in – need for additional discourse
- We've heard concerns about this process.
- We understand decision space
- We understand over analysis and metrics
- We understand as simple as possible
- We understand consistency with prior decision making
- We are sensitive to these concerns.
- This is our first opportunity to hear from RDs face-to-face
- Want to clarify expectations
    - What do RDs need from us?
    - How do RDs want to be engaged?

What have we done so far?

- We've spent a lot of time thinking about this process
    - **Huge amounts of data:** There's a huge amount of available data. We need a way to manage this information efficiently and effectively.
    - **Focus on what really matters:** We want to look at the most important things for conservation be they threats or positive actions.
    - **Independent Analysis and Modeling:** We believe that some independent analysis of certain issues will be necessary; we believe this will require some modelling.
    - **Experts:** We believe that expertise from various sectors (states etc) will be essential to our success.
    - **Pull It All Together:** We will need a way to bring disparate pieces of information together into a coherent story. We will need some tools to help us do that.
        - **Help Finding Tools to Pull it Together:** Some of these are still undefined and we anticipate enlisting others to help us define
    - **Uncertainty:** We need to be able to determine the scope of uncertainty and put some boundaries on that

Comment [KNorman1]: Mike's notes with Kate headers

We want to provide the best resources to the RDs

- We've tried to anticipate some of your concerns and suggestions.
    - **Range of Scenarios:** We want to, at the end of the day, provide the decision makers with a reasonable range of scenarios that will provide information on potential

abundance and distributions of sage grouse that can then inform the policy decision as to status
    - **Provide RDs what they need as we go:** We want to and anticipate that we will bring key decision points to the RDs for input and direction along the way.

Comment [KNorman2]: Mike Notes w/ Kate Headers

Kick off the Discussion of Expectations

- This is the opportunity to hear directly from you.
- We've tried to consider some guiding principles (echoes the "Questions" document):
    - Transparency
    - Maximize legal defensibility
    - Maximize scientific soundness
    - Maintain relationships with Federal, State, and Tribal partners
    - Provide a clear rationale for decision making
    - *Be completed efficiently using FWS capacity most effectively*
- In discussions with USGS we've recognized these objectives and also the balance between the scientific process and the policy decision.
    - Role of experts will be to provide input on specific issues/items
    - FWS will retain authorship of all materials
    - Determination will not be defined by metrics, but will rely upon decision maker interpretation of data
- We provided some questions to seed today's discussion.
- To start, we want to hear each RDs thoughts on:
    - What you want from this process?
    - What you're worried about (afraid of)?

Comment [KNorman3]: Moved some of the "what have we done" down here as a start to the discussion. Just a thought- can totally be scrapped!

Comment [KNorman4]: Don't know if we want to start with a round robin just to make sure that everyone is invested right up front.

Tools (introduction for afternoon)

Why we're here (revisited)

- May 18, 2014 showed that the approach as we described it needed work
- We want to take this opportunity to approach the issue from a different perspective
- We want to determine if it's the approach or merely the way we communicated that approach that's at issue

Big Question

- We want to provide you with information to help you determine the status of the species
- We believe that abundance and distribution are the metrics that will help you make a well-supported decision
- If this is not the case, we want to determine what will be the appropriate measure

Today's presentation

- Kevin and Pat will describe how we've come to this place
- Touching on 2005, 2010, and Bi-state
- And relating these previous works to the current status review

Take it away Pat!