From: Matt Kales
To: Moore,Virgil
Subject: RE: Sage-grouse Task Force assessment template
Date: Friday, October 25, 2013 11:51:09 AM

Great. Thanks, Virgil.

From: Moore,Virgil [mailto:virgil.moore@idfg.idaho.gov]
Sent: Friday, October 25, 2013 11:45 AM
To: Matt Kales (matt_kales@fws.gov)
Subject: FW: Sage-grouse Task Force assessment template

Matt,
I found it. I forwarded this to my staff on October 21 and they are reviewing. I will follow up and provide this information

Virgil

From: Noreen Walsh [mailto:noreen_walsh@fws.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 5:44 PM
To: betwarren@mt.gov; bonnie.butler@gov.idaho.gov; Brett.Brownscombe@das.state.or.us; Carlee Brown; Claudia Walker; chuck.bonham@wildlife.ca.gov; civerson@fs.fed.us; cynthia_moses-nedd@blm.gov; Dan Ashe; david.naugle@umontana.edu; Drue DeBerry; Doug Young; Edwin_Roberson@blm.gov; eloft@dfg.ca.gov; eric.v.rickerson@state.or.us; Aristotle Evia; Gisella Ojeda-dodds; greg.schirato@dfw.wa.gov; gstein@fs.fed.us; Jessica Rubado; Jamie Connell; Jeff.Ver_Steeg@state.co.us; JHagener@mt.gov; John Harja; jpena@fs.fed.us; kathleenclarke@utah.gov; kmcdonald@mt.gov; ldrozdoff@dcnr.nv.gov; lweldon@fs.fed.us; Matt Kales; mfinley01@fs.fed.us; Michael Bean; Michael Thabault; Moore,Virgil; Maritiza Harris; nancy.salber@state.or.us; Nicole Alt; Neil Kornze; Noreen Walsh; Pat Deibert; Roslyn Sellars; Steven Ellis; Shawn Reese; Stephen Small; Tim Macklin; Tim.griffiths@mt.usda.gov; Tamara Williams; Tom.Kirschenmann@state.sd.us; tsteinwa@nd.gov; ttidwell@fs.fed.us
Cc: Ren Lohoefener; Alexandra Pitts (CN=Alexandra Pitts/OU=SAC/OU=R1/OU=FWS/O=DOI); Robyn Thorson; Richard Hannan
Subject: Sage-grouse Task Force assessment template

Dear Task Force members,

Last week, at the Greater Sage-grouse Task Force meeting in Denver, Task Force members agreed that it would be helpful for each member agency to conduct a self-assessment of their own ongoing activities and measures to reduce threats to greater sage-grouse. These would contribute to an assessment of collective progress towards the objectives identified in the Conservation Objectives Team (COT) report at this point in time. This would provide all of us a "snapshot in time", while recognizing that many conservation efforts continue and others may have not yet even begun. As discussed at the meeting, this type of assessment will help us focus on the progress we are all committed to make.

The Fish and Wildlife Service agreed to prepare a template to guide those "self-assessments." We have been working since the meeting adjourned last week to prepare that template. We would have benefitted from additional time to refine and polish our approach, but deliberations were cut short by today's government shutdown. In the interest of promptly providing Task Force members

with a document to work from (and not hold up this process during the federal government shutdown) I am forwarding this draft to you today.

Attached are three files:

1. **Assessment Review Matrix:** States should fill out this matrix for each population that exists in that state (populations as identified in the COT Final Report Table 2).

   If a given state contains 4 populations, you would fill out this report 4 times (one report for each population). The fourth column in this spreadsheet is labeled "State Self-Assessment Ranking" and consists of a scale from 0-6 plus U for unknown. This column is meant to capture your summary of the overall degree to which the issue or threat has been addressed. The definitions of the categories in this scale are found in the second attached file (draft, deliberative description of ranking). The fifth and sixth columns are asking for your narrative description of actions that would support the summary rank you assigned in column 4.

2. **Draft, deliberative descriptions of ranking…:** This file is simply a reference and provides standard definitions of summary ratings 0-6 used in column 4 of the Assessment review matrix.

3. **GSG assessment overview:** This file is an example of an overview "at a glance" of the summary status of all populations in your state. For example, if you filled out the "Assessment review matrix" four times to correspond to the four populations in your state, this table just collates the summary of that information into one table with four rows. It shows each population (rows) by threat category (columns) and the cells are color-coded to show your summary assessment of whether that threat is addressed in that population (green), or partially addressed (yellow), or not yet addressed (red). For threats in the Assessment Review Matrix that contain only one "measure," the rank you use in this summary table will be a one to one correspondence with the Assessment Review Matrix. However, for threats in the Assessment Review Matrix that contain several measures, consider averaging the rankings for each measure for a given threat.

Ideally, we would have a webinar to walk you through this template. Unfortunately that won't be possible until the federal government re-opens, and we will be happy to do that then. In the meantime, please take a look. In addition to any clarification or assistance we at FWS can provide, it may be helpful for state members to work closely with their BLM/FS counterparts, when the government reopens, in filling out the template relative to impact of the federal planning process in your state. I hope this provides sufficient information for you to begin using the template and I look forward to talking with you as soon as we can.

Best regards,
Noreen

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

303 236 7920

The Mountain-Prairie Region of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service: *We provide conservation stewardship of some of America's most scenic lands, to ensure healthy fish and wildlife for the enjoyment and benefit of all people.*