From: Norman, Kate
To: Noreen Walsh; Michael Thabault
Subject: Re: GSG: moving forward on 5/22
Date: Monday, May 12, 2014 8:58:28 AM

I really appreciate your willingness to have this meeting (and so quickly).

I will coordinate with Mike to get an agenda fleshed out as soon as possible.

Thank you,
Kate

On Fri, May 9, 2014 at 2:29 PM, Noreen Walsh <noreen_walsh@fws.gov> wrote:

> Dear all,
>
> Thanks again for the briefing on Wednesday. We closed with the understanding that we needed a little more dialogue between RD offices and ARDs to ensure we are starting the decision analysis process with a common understanding of the objectives and the general framework that we will employ moving forward. We greatly appreciate how cognizant you all are of managing to the available time, and we want to support that.
>
> Subsequent to the briefing, the RDs had a chance to talk about next steps. We all think it is incumbent upon us to make sure we give your team the benefit of our thinking now, so that we establish common expectations, and that you have the opportunity to run with the process knowing that we support the approach. We also discussed the need for the bi-state decision and the GSG decision to have a foundational approach in common. If we set the foundational approach, the bi-state process can be a test version of the approach for GSG. Based on that discussion, and individual discussions with you, we've gone ahead to set aside 5/22 for an in-person meeting of D/RDs and ES ARDs and Kate in Denver. We'll get a room out at the airport for easy fly in and fly out access. Debbie is working on logistics. Our objective is to create the time to have the dialogue with you as the senior leaders of the three ES programs that will lead to the common expectations and approach for the decision process.

As you heard during the briefing, Ren mentioned beginning with an approach that would compare current situation to 2010, and we think that makes sense. Roughly speaking, we discussed a potential construct like:

What were the **major threat factors in 2010?**

What has changed (+ or -) since 2010 in regard to each of those threat factors? How has the baseline for the species changed?

Which of those factors should be modeled to project likely outcomes for the species into the future?

How can we predict (model) into the future the likely trajectory of those threat factors?

Have **new major threat factors** emerged since 2010?

Which of those factors should be modeled to project likely outcomes for the species into the future?

How can we predict (model) into the future the likely trajectory of those new threats? What information do we need to model this?

Has **new scientific information** emerged since the 2010 finding? How does that new information impact the current assessment of species status?

We wanted to share this for your reflection now to inform our dialogue. Kate, could you help us rough out a draft agenda for 5/22?

Thank you all, we are looking forward to the discussion,

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.*

--
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