

From: [Matt Kales](#)
To: [Noreen Walsh](#)
Subject: FW: GRSG: 2 questions re: ADPP data
Date: Monday, February 23, 2015 2:19:10 PM

FYI – nothing back from Stephanie on this yet. If we don't hear back before the NPT call, I recommend we use this to frame our questions for tomorrow. Thanks.

From: Matt Kales [mailto:matt_kales@fws.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2015 12:35 PM
To: Stephanie Carman
Cc: Pat Deibert
Subject: GRSG: 2 questions re: ADPP data

Stephanie,

Thanks again for your time last Friday and the update on current planning issues. In advance of tomorrow's NPT call, and following our conversation and the federal coordination call earlier today, Pat and I would be grateful for some additional details on two issues you flagged:

- Lend tenure: we understand because BLM completed NEPA on this issue before the federal family completed the NPT guidance (which indicates all priority habitat will be retained), some states in the range (WY & CO) carried forward earlier direction and identified some priority habitat as available for disposal. Rather than supplement, BLM has developed the below language to condition any such disposal:

"Lands classified as priority habitat and general habitat (or habitat classification appropriate for the sub-region) for Greater Sage-Grouse will be retained in federal management unless: (1) the agency can demonstrate that disposal of the lands will provide a net conservation gain to the Greater Sage-Grouse or (2) the agency can demonstrate that the disposal of the lands will have no direct or indirect adverse impact on conservation of the Greater Sage-Grouse."

We assume we'll be able to determine from the GIS data you delivered to us Friday which lands in CO and WY are affected. In the meantime, can you please (a) confirm our understanding of the issue is accurate and (b) the above language is final? That will help us provide feedback to the NPT.

- Fluid mineral development in MT: similarly, we understand because BLM completed NEPA for some planning units in MT before the federal family completed the NPT guidance (which indicated fluid minerals in general habitat are subject to standard or moderate stipulations), some general habitat (~500,000 acres) in MT available for fluid mineral development will be managed with standard stipulations. Again, we assume we'll be able to see where those lands lie from the GIS data, but it would be helpful if you could recapitulate what we discussed on Friday re: lek buffers and how/where/when the standard stipulations would apply. Lastly, we understand this issue is essentially moot if an area is included in an SFA.

Lastly, on another note, it sounds like BLM is planning on delivering a webinar to partners before the North American/WAFWA EOC, as opposed to scheduling a SGTF meeting in concert with the North American. It would be helpful for us to know your plans so we can schedule our folks accordingly.

Thanks again, and we look forward to speaking with you/all tomorrow.

Matt

Matt Kales, Senior Advisor for Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation
Office of the Regional Director
US Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region
Office: (303) 236-4576
Mobile: (720) 234-0257