From: Evans, Heather
To: Herren, Vicki; sherry.ligouri@pacificorp.com; Drue DeBerry
Subject: RE: Sage-grouse BMPs follow up
Date: Monday, September 16, 2013 3:17:49 PM

Hi Vicki,

It was very nice meeting you in Colorado, and thank you again for attending the meetings! I apologize for not responding sooner, I have just been back in the office today, and been playing catch up. Also, thank you for your comments and attached documents. I went through them briefly and wanted to thank you for your input, as it looks very thorough and is much appreciated. I will go through them more this week, and contact you if I have any questions, and will also keep an eye out for future emails after you have a chance to talk with Washington folks. Please let me know if I can provide anything to you, or if you have any questions me.

Thank you,
Heather

From: Herren, Vicki [mailto:vherren@blm.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2013 2:06 PM
To: Evans, Heather; sherry.ligouri@pacificorp.com; Drue DeBerry
Subject: Sage-grouse BMPs follow up

Sherry and Heather
Thank you for organizing the face-to-face meeting earlier this week and thanks too for providing lunches. I think we made alot of progress.
Attached and included in this email are several suggestions from BLM reviewers of the September version that I didn't provide during the face-to-face meeting as well as my assignment to provide NEPA language for section 4.4. I plan to follow up with you later to provide a BLM POC after I have discussions with the Washington office Wildlife Program folks.

The Background section is about the background of developing this document, not the background of research related to impacts to sage-grouse from which the BMPs are based.. Suggestion to name this section something like "Background to development of this BMP document". Then, in Section 7.0 (or Section 12.0 Research), there could be a background/summary of literature from which the BMPs are derived,

In Background - suggested rewording of this sentence: "In 2010, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) found the Greater Sage-grouse as warranted for listing as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), but precluded by other listing priorities (FWS 2010)." This is cited but the document does not contain a Lit Cited section.

In Section 7.0, there is a section on "Determining the Suitability of Habitat" that we did not discuss and a section titled Mitigation that was also not discussed. Is the intent to retain those sections? If so, I could provide some language from BLM.

For the Brain Dump section we created on 9/11:
(This may already occur) Consider including documentation of raptor/raven nests during aerial inspection of lines and poles to detect problems (from the routine maintenance table).

These 2 were discussed but I can't recall whether they were captured:
If a project has to be routed through priority habitat and there is no poor quality or non-habitat to use within the priority habitat, site the line at the distal side or edge of the habitat.
Use of mats to conserve the sagebrush, the herbaceous understory and the biological soil crusts.

As far as I can tell, this completes my assignment and provides the additional comments I referred to during the meeting. Let me know if I missed something or you have questions/comments.

--
Vicki Herren
Natural Resource Assessment Project Manager
BLM National Operations Center
Denver Federal Center
303.236.6337