From: Henson, Paul
To: Thabault, Michael
Cc: Theresa Rabot
Subject: Re: NPT call update
Date: Wednesday, November 06, 2013 11:02:44 AM

---

yes.

On Wed, Nov 6, 2013 at 9:56 AM, Thabault, Michael <michael_thabault@fws.gov> wrote:

?? can you answer that one.

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

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Noreen Walsh** <noreen_walsh@fws.gov>
Date: Wed, Nov 6, 2013 at 10:50 AM
Subject: Re: NPT call update
To: "Thabault, Michael" <michael_thabault@fws.gov>
Cc: Theresa Rabot <Theresa_Rabot@fws.gov>, Paul Henson <paul_henson@fws.gov>, Tyler Abbott <Tyler_Abbott@fws.gov>, Pat Deibert <pat_deibert@fws.gov>, Matt Kales <matt_kales@fws.gov>, Nicole Alt <Nicole_Alt@fws.gov>

Thank you so much. I really appreciate the effort in the short turnaround time.

for my clarity - these comments about the "plan" or the "DEIS" refer specifically to the preferred alternative?

Noreen Walsh
Regional Director
Mountain-Prairie Region
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

On Nov 6, 2013, at 12:46 PM, "Thabault, Michael" <michael_thabault@fws.gov> wrote:

Noreen, this was a bit of a challenge but this is the best we can provide in the time allotted. The WY9 plan is not as far along in the application of the matrix with the colors as Oregon is. Their basic assessment is that the WY9 plan could meet COT objectives but there is some uncertainty and the AM plan is a key component that will help determine that. Here are the bullets from WYES:

One major priority and exercise that BLM can be undertaking to ensure that the 9-plan amendment will meet the COT report objectives is the following: BLM should articulate the details of their **Adaptive Management Strategy** to be included in their RMPs. For example:

- details of monitoring protocol;
- details regarding how they will evaluate effectiveness;
- details concerning methods for modifying conservation measures in the RMPs if conservation measures are not meeting the COT objectives. So, for instance,

  - will new plan amendments be necessary if COT objectives are not met?

  - will the adaptive management strategy that is being developed at the national level for inclusion in the plans allow for conservation measures, such as lek buffers, etc, to be modified with simply RMP maintenance actions, if (after years of conservation measure implementation and evaluation), it is found that the new expanded lek buffers, for example, are not adequate to meet the COT objectives?

  - will the adaptive strategy, instead, be so vague that new plan amendments are necessary requiring further NEPA at the plan level?

For Oregon they have gone through the BLM plan with the and have concluded the following:

Using the matrix table developed by the Montana FWS office to crosswalk the DEIS to the COT report, the Oregon DEIS does **not** fully meet the objectives of the COT report. The BLM grouse biologist and ORES sat down and
filled out the matrix table.

Using the old color scheme green-yellow-orange-red, the majority of the COT threat objectives
analysis falls into the yellow and orange categories (upwards of 70%).

About 20% of the COT threat objectives were "fully" addressed by the alternatives (green).

The remaining 10% fell into the red category.

The Oregon BLM team lead is aware of this and they are working to address
these issues. However, there is an issue that, many in BLM are concerned about putting some of the specifics from the COT report into their plan. They believe it could be too restrictive in managing their programs. They also feel that if new science came out after the plan that it would require amending the plans (ex. keep juniper canopy levels to less than 5%

near leks).

I am asking Oregon for more intel on what is in the red.

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

--
Paul Henson, Ph.D.
State Supervisor
Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
(503)231-6179