From: Brown, Nathanael
To: Keith Day; Rebecca Bonebrake
Subject: Re: GSG & UPD
Date: Tuesday, March 05, 2013 10:27:22 AM

Keith and Becky- this email is just meant for you two!

Trust me, I know how you are feeling. You have both served as my mentors and helped shape the biologist I am now. So....

I had to fight to bring this to the attention of my leadership, at some point after I was loud enough long enough, they decided it would be a good idea for me to write a co-management strategy/briefing document. As I pointed out in my email to Jason and Renee after we write it, it would be reviewed (certainly by you two and many others).

The document I will write with Nicki, Jason, and Renee- will just be a science based document. It will probably not inform the overarching process that is happening at the highest levels one bit. The idea is to draft a document that is already mostly within the sideboards of the the four alternatives of the State/BLM/Forest EIS process. As near as I can tell there is no clear advocacy for UPD's in the higher meetings. I know Larry and Laura are involved and they are aware of the potential conflict. Ron Rodriguez also sits on some of the higher committees. We (the RT or RIT) ARE NOT directly represented in the higher up process. This is not something I can fix, I was just hoping to make a document that people could point to after the fact for a reference on how to manage for both effectively.

Sincerely,
Nathan Brown

On Tue, Mar 5, 2013 at 10:01 AM, Keith Day <keithday@utah.gov> wrote:

> Becky, Ron and Nathan:
>
> In spite of assurances that UPD management is being considered, I am still uncomfortable with what I am hearing. As long as the RT/RIT are excluded . . .
>
> Keith
>
>
> On Thu, Feb 28, 2013 at 8:22 AM, Bonebrake, Rebecca <bbonebra@blm.gov> wrote:
>
>> Hi all,
>>
>> I came by this copy, below, of notes from the meeting that Nathan had with Jason Robinson & Renee Chi on UPD/GSG management.
>> I have a few concerns, in highlight, within the notes.
>>
>> ***Main Points-***
>>
>> *1) There is definitely LOTS of habitat overlap between the two species in Southern Utah.*
>>
>> *2) There is a potential for co-management- GSG have a minimum canopy cover threshold (sagebrush) of 10% (line-intercept) where UPD's have a maximum canopy cover threshold (sagebrush or any shrubs) of %20 (line-intercept)- so there is a sweet spot for habitat projects*

(managing for 10-20%). GSG do need openings for brood rearing- which UPD's can occupy- its just a question of how big are the openings, how many are there, and where are they on the landscape relative to leks , other open patches, etc.....
I do not agree that UPD have a maximum shrub canopy cover threshold of 20%

3) There is still discussion within the GSG working group as to what the 5% allowed disturbance means- i.e.- do beneficial wildlife habitat projects that all of the partners agree on count towards that %5 OR do only anthropogenic disturbances count (e.g.- roads, ATV's energy development) etc...

4) If there a 4 mile buffer around active leks where NO disturbance (inlcuding habitat projects) is to take place - WE will have ***substantial*** *difficulties in recovering and delisting UPD's*

Action Items-

1) Providing (me) with the GSG "management" areas shp file- jason/renee
2) Providing (me) with the USU model for crucial GSG winter range (shp file.)- jason/renee
3) Providing (me) with a bulleted brief- hi-lighting the main points of the currents GSG state plan- main biological and policy constraints (see above)- jason/ renee
4) I will prepare a small brief showcasing three co-management treatment strategies/designs/examples- one from the awapa, pausaugunt, and the bald hills/black mountain- Me with help from Dr. Frey (Nicki), Rhett Boswell (UDWR) and others where needed.
5) We all review/edit..... brief then circulate to management
Shouldn't the RT or RIT be involved in a review before management buys off on something?

Goals-

1) demonstrate that mutually beneficial projects can be accomplished across the range of the UPD/GSG overlap zone- so that the Final State GSG plan will allow for "mutually beneficial multi-species (UPD+GSG) habitat improvement projects" that should not and hopefully WILL not count towards the %5 disturbance threshold

2) Outline sound, science based co-management strategies

3) Adjust current UPD "management areas" to avoid GSG "crucial" winter range identified by the USU model where possible (or projects within the UPD management areas to avoid the GSG crucial winter range)
I'm not positive, but I think that avoiding GSG winter range will make UPD recovery extremely difficult

4) Recover UPD's- delist and prevent listing of GSG

Nathan: I think that your team is waiting on you to proceed with the effort. I know that some folks do not think that it is needed. I guess if you need help from the RT/RIT, we are available.

Becky Bonebrake, Certified Wildlife Biologist
BLM Wildlife Biologist
Cedar City Field Office
176 East DL Sargent Drive
Cedar City, UT 84721
(435) 865-3087
bbonebra@blm.gov

--
Keith Day
Wildlife Biologist
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
1470 N. Airport Rd.
Cedar City, Utah 84721
435-865-6100 (o)
435-691-3113 (c)
435-586-2457 (fx)
keithday@utah.gov

--
Nathanael L. Brown M.S.
Ecologist
United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Utah Field Office- Cedar City
1789 N. Wedgewood Road
Cedar City, UT 84721
435-865-3763-phone
801-946-2600- cell