From:	DElia, Jesse
To:	Deibert, Pat
Cc:	Mary Grim; Susan Linner; Nicole Alt
Subject:	Re: HQ consultation on herbicides for invasives
Date:	Wednesday, November 05, 2014 3:09:33 PM

Makes sense to me.

Jesse
---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Deibert, Pat** <pat_deibert@fws.gov>
Date: Tue, Nov 4, 2014 at 3:51 PM
Subject: HQ consultation on herbicides for invasives
To: Mary Grim <Mary_Grim@fws.gov>, Jesse DElia <jesse_delia@fws.gov>
Cc: Susan Linner <susan_linner@fws.gov>, Nicole Alt <nicole_alt@fws.gov>

Hi Mary, Jesse and Susan -

As you know HQ is preparing a programmatic consultation for EPA re: 3 herbicides being licensed to control invasive vegetative species. The recommendation they have made for Bi-State and Gunnison sage-grouse is a 4 mile protective buffer around leks (i.e. no application within that buffer). I have suggested a modification of that recommendation of limiting the restriction to the breeding and nesting season (end of Feb. - end of June), as it may be advantageous to control invasives within the buffer while the birds are not present.

Individual project NEPA and consultations will be necessary for actual herbicide application. So working with HQ we thought we would add an additional caveat that if local data were available regarding either timing or location of nesting habitat relative to the lek the national recommendation could be modified to incorporate the local data. If local data were not available the default would be the national consultation recommendation.

We do not have buffer recommendations for herbicide application for controlling invasives in the BLM planning process, so there should not be any conflicts with that effort.

George asked me to draft some language for their discussions with BLM (see italics below) about the local exceptions. Please review and get to back to me NLT COB tomorrow (11/5) as George needs the language Thursday a.m. in HQ. Thanks!

pat

Where local data on actual distribution of nesting habitats are available the four-mile buffer may be modified as appropriate if the project impacts will still not contribute to a negative effect on the species. Additionally, temporal restrictions may also be modified if local data indicate a different window of occupancy by breeding birds and chicks. Where such data are lacking, strict adherence to the programmatic standards should be enforced.

--
Pat Deibert, PhD
Certified Wildlife Biologist®

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
5353 Yellowstone Road, Suite 308A
Cheyenne, WY 82009
307-772-2374, ext. 226

got leks?

--

Jesse D'Elia
Candidate Species Conservation Coordinator
Endangered Species Division, Pacific Regional Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
911 NE 11th Avenue, 4th Floor, Portland, OR 97232
503.231.2349 phone; 503.231.6243 fax
jesse_delia@fws.gov