

From: [Deibert, Pat](#)
To: [Berglund, Jeff](#)
Cc: [Brent Esmoil](#)
Subject: Re: draft prepared response to fluid minerals discussion in MT
Date: Monday, February 23, 2015 3:23:21 PM

accepting all edits and sending on - thanks for the help!

p

On Mon, Feb 23, 2015 at 3:20 PM, Berglund, Jeff <jeff_berglund@fws.gov> wrote:
Looks good - a few other tweaks to consider below... Thanks!

On Mon, Feb 23, 2015 at 2:59 PM, Deibert, Pat <pat_deibert@fws.gov> wrote:

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 **combination** in GH are allocative decisions in MT (**for fluid minerals only**) that we have defacto agreed to. (we never opposed 0.6 **NSO/2 mi CSU** but did encourage greater distances **where appropriate based on screening criteria, etc. Also, it's important to note that in commenting on the MT State plan in December 2013, which proposed a 0.25 mi lek buffer in GH, we encouraged a minimum 0.6 mi lek buffer in GH**). 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) **and visa-versa**? Does allocation "trump" the attachment making the buffer discussion moot **for fluid mineral development in GH**?
2. How will the proposed buffer language "mesh" with BLM mitigation policies? **Would residual impacts from the 0.6/2 mi fluid mineral allocation in GH be mitigated to net conservation gain?**
3. How will the proposed **allocation and** buffer language fit into (**interact with**) the screening criteria that BLM developed, with our input?
4. **Could the 0.6 mi NSO/2 mi CSU allocation be considered the "default minimum" buffer for fluid mineral development in GH, with the opportunity to apply other distances in Attachment X as appropriate?**

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?

--

Jeff Berglund
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Montana Field Office
585 Shepard Way, Suite 1
Helena, MT 59601
(406) 449-5225, ext. 206

--

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?