From: "John Emmerich" <John.Emmerich@wgf.state.wy.us>
To: rodney.f.krischke@aphis.usda.gov; Jack_Hanson@blm.gov; Rusty_Kaiser@blm.gov; Alex_Schubert@fws.gov; pat_deibert@fws.gov; Chris Wichmann; Jessica Crowder; Mary Flanderka; ddw@wyoming.com
Cc: Steve Ferrell; Wanda Pomeroy
Subject: Re: predators in RMP amendment
Date: Friday, November 05, 2010 7:54:12 AM

Thanks for the excellent clarification Rusty. I will be on the call Nov 9.

>>> <Rusty_Kaiser@blm.gov> 11/4/2010 10:10 AM >>>

I appreciate all the e-mails and comments I've received so far concerning this issue. However, before everyone gets too worked up, lets have our first phone call and see what comes of it. I'm sensing that folks feel like they are "going to battle" on this issue and are becoming very defensive. I want to make it very clear of the objective of this team: Address predator control in the management alternatives.
We need to be clear what the BLM has authority to do as it pertains to predator control. BLM isn't going to go out and poison ravens or coyotes...however, they can indirectly "control" predators through land management decisions (ie. how we address tanks and other nesting structures, trash facilities and cleanup, trying not to disturb the ground in a way that creates lanes for predators to use, etc....). We can also support other agencies in their authority to control predators where a problem is identified. For example, each year BLM signs off on a yearly plan from APHIS that says we are OK with their plans for the year and how they will be conducted on public land. When we a have a road closure (like the winter road closure in Pinedale) the Federal Register is written so that "Personnel of the BLM, Wyoming Game and Fish Department, U.S. Department of Agriculture- APHIS and Forest Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and law enforcement personnel are exempt from this closure only when performing official duties."

I understand that many of you have been round and round on this topic for years and are at the end of your rope. Please, lets keep things professional here and not let our personal feelings and values as they pertain to predators get in the way of us coming up with some ideas and language for the RMP amendment. I don't see this first conference call as being the "Great Predator War of 2010" so let's not make it that. I have thought about what kind of statement we could put into the alternatives section and have come up with this so far:

"BLM will implement strategies and techniques in land management decisions that would address predators shown to pose a threat to sage grouse (we could then list some examples such as trash clean up, nesting structures, etc....). BLM will also support and encourage other agencies in their efforts to address predators."

This probably needs some more detail to properly analyze, but it is a rough example of what we could put into one of the alternatives, and then adjust it for the other alternatives. This is by no means what we have to go with, but is an example of what I envision.

We need to remember that in our purpose and need statement we identified predators as being a potential threat to sage grouse so it needs to be addressed in the EIS analysis. We just need to come up with something

reasonable that will address the issue properly.

Thanks for all of your concern and Have a Good Weekend.....RELAX! (I'm going hunting!)

Talk to you next week.

Rusty Kaiser
Wildlife Biologist
Pinedale Field Office
(307) 367-5317
(307) 749-0642 cell