**From:** Birdsong, Bret
**To:** Dreher, Robert
**Cc:** Greenberger, Sarah; Dan Ashe; Lyons, James; Karen Kelleher; Amy Lueders; Gary D Frazer; Kate P Kelly; Ted Boling; Neil G Kornze; Steven Ellis; Tommy Beaudreau; Michael Connor
**Subject:** Re: Mineral Wdrawal
**Date:** Wednesday, May 13, 2015 10:47:40 AM

---

(b) (5) [redacted]

Bret

On Wed, May 13, 2015 at 10:38 AM, Dreher, Robert <robert_dreher@fws.gov> wrote:

> I've taken a stab at editing these talking points to make them something closer to a statement by the Secretary (as I have noted, a clear statement by the Secretary would provide the greatest assurance to FWS). I've tried to navigate the delicate balance between assuring FWS that these withdrawals are likely to be implemented and avoiding pre-determination of the final decisions by stating that the Secretary "intends to act promptly" on BLM's recommendations, and providing a clear statement, ideally by the Secretary herself, of the benefits that withdrawal would provide in terms of assuring long-term protection of the Sagebrush Focal Areas. Nonetheless, the statement makes clear that there will be a decision process and promises to engage the public, States, and stakeholders. Finally, the statement indicates that the Secretary will consider a process for reconsideration of lands subject to withdrawal, on a site specific basis, where new information indicates that a mineral deposit of national significance exists and can be developed without adverse impact on sage grouse in the area.
>
> I deleted the language about providing "a more granular analysis" of mineral potential; I wanted to leave the question of whether there needs to be additional analysis, beyond what is contained in BLM's plans, open.
>
> On Wed, May 13, 2015 at 9:27 AM, Greenberger, Sarah <sarah_greenberger@ios.doi.gov> wrote:
>
>> (b) (5) [redacted] We can discuss how we navigate that line.
>
>
>> On Wed, May 13, 2015 at 1:13 AM, Dan Ashe <d_m_ashe@fws.gov> wrote:
>
>>> Here are my thoughts. If we are trying to get to a "not warranted" determination, then my team needs to have confidence that the Secretary actually intends to follow through on a BLM recommendation. Therefore, I suggest we remove some of the language that they will see as equivocal. I completely support Jim's recommended language, and suggest inserting it in this text.
>>>
>>> Dan.
>>>
>>> (b) (5) [redacted]
>>>
>>> [redacted]
>>>
>>> [redacted]
>>>
>>> [redacted]

(b) (5)

[redacted]

[redacted]

(b) (5)

[redacted]

Dan Ashe
Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

On May 12, 2015, at 1:44 PM, Lyons, James <james_lyons@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

My thoughts attached.

In sum: I would **only consider a revocation for minerals of national significance** (e.g., rare earth) AND either development would have no impact on GRSG or effects are minimal and can be mitigated to a net conservation gain.

Jim

On Tue, May 12, 2015 at 1:22 PM, Greenberger, Sarah <sarah_greenberger@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

Here are updated TPs to serve as a starting point for discussion tomorrow. They don't discuss a global review at any point. They still don't talk about the relative absence of development interest in these areas. We can work on that piece but I don't think it's central to the policy discussion at this point.

On Thu, May 7, 2015 at 5:17 PM, Greenberger, Sarah <sarah_greenberger@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

Here are the bullets we discussed today. Kate and I will work on phrasing the absence of interest/potential. Please get me edits/thoughts and I will compile. Thanks! Sarah

--
Jim Lyons
***Deputy Assistant Secretary***
***Land and Minerals Management***
***Jim_Lyons@ios.doi.gov***
**202-208-4318 (direct)**
**202-815-4412 (mobile)**

<Locatable Mineral Talking Points_v5_JRLcomments.docx>

--
**Bob Dreher**
Associate Director
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
(202) 208-4070

--
Bret Birdsong
Deputy Solicitor -- Land Resources
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240
202-208-4423 (main)
202-208-6321 (direct)
202-208-5584 (fax)
Bret.Birdsong@sol.doi.gov