

From: [Deibert, Pat](#)
To: [Jeff Berglund](#)
Cc: [Brent Esmoil](#)
Subject: draft prepared response to fluid minerals discussion in MT
Date: Monday, February 23, 2015 2:59:37 PM

Jeff - let me know what you think!

pat

Matt and all -

I spoke with Jeff Berglund regarding the buffers drop in language (including Attachment X), and the tiered buffer situation in MT in GH. The 0.6 mi NSO and 2 mi CSU in GH are allocative decisions in MT that we have defacto agreed to. (we never opposed 0.6 but did encourage greater distances). So this is not new information. However, this exercise has generated several questions:

1. If the 0.6 NSO and 2.0 CSU are allocative decisions, how does that affect the drop in language stating compliance with the USGS buffer report (as stated in their Attachment X to the buffer drop-in language)? Does allocation "trump" the attachment making the buffer discussion moot?
2. How will the proposed buffer language "mesh" with BLM mitigation policies?
3. How will the proposed buffer language fit into the screening criteria that BLM developed, with our input?

We believe these are questions that Noreen should pose tomorrow so that we can more fully understand how all of this interacts. Only with that information can we fully appreciate the conservation implications of this language.

Jeff also advised that he typically arrives for work at 6:30 a.m., so would be available to answer any last minute questions you or Noreen may have before the 8 a.m. call.

--

Pat Deibert, PhD
Certified Wildlife Biologist®
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
5353 Yellowstone Road, Suite 308A
Cheyenne, WY 82009
307-772-2374, ext. 226

got leks?