

From: [Hansen, Craig](#)
To: [Jeff Everett](#)
Subject: Re: GRSG 2015: DRAFT conifer chapter
Date: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 2:56:47 PM

Great work, Jeff. Thank you! I look forward to reading. My best to the sick boy at home! No fun.

Craig.

--

Craig Hansen
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
(303) 236-4749
Schedule: M T Th F

On Tue, Feb 24, 2015 at 2:20 PM, Jeff Everett <jeff_everett@fws.gov> wrote:

All –

Attached is a very rough draft of the conifers chapter. It needs some polishing and there are significant place holders for CED results and USGS modeling, etc. It is really rough, but I didn't want to wait any longer to get the draft circulating. I am teleworking from home this week with a very sick little boy and I do not have access to Sharepoint from home, thus this email. I do plan to be on the writing team call this afternoon. Some background on how I got to this point and the steps I have taken:

First, I read through the 2010 and the COT report. I have to say I think the conifers section(s) of the 2010 finding were really well written – concise and right to the point, so I borrowed very heavily from those sections and plugged them into the current template. Not all of it fits perfectly but the meat of it is there. Same thing with some of the language from the COT report.

Then, I did the recent literature search through Web of Science and a few other searches to see what has been published since 2010 – the big one of course is Baruch-Mordo, but also Knick and a few others. There isn't really very much, and a lot of it has to do with pre- and post-fire vegetation communities etc., without a lot of direct connection to sage-grouse.

Next, I had a conversation with Jeremy Maestas from NRCS here in OR, recognizing that SGI would most likely be the single largest contributor to threat amelioration and his own expertise on the subject; we chatted before the original January 15 CED deadline and discussed what NRCS was going to submit. Part of the conversation centered around how what they have seen is that there is very little new Phase 1 conifer encroachment taking place throughout the landscape – most of what they are seeing is infilling from Phase 1 to Phase 2. I think this could be very important to this chapter and I am waiting on more information to write that section, but I don't have it yet. This part could be huge.

There are parts of the template – particularly the timing chart – that don't fit this

threat very well. The threat to sage-grouse from conifers manifests itself in the habitat on a continual basis – it is not really seasonal in nature. As such there are impacts to sage-grouse throughout the year from a disturbance perspective, with direct impacts from lek attendance to nest success to brood survival to winter habitat use. This point needs to be fleshed out some but there is placeholder language in there.

There are big gaps in this draft – we are waiting on significant pieces from the CED and USGS, and I am reluctant to write the elevator speech/executive summary part until the very end when we have that. I think those pieces will have a ripple effect through this entire chapter.

All of that is to say, this draft probably is not as complete nor well written as you would like at this point, particularly recognizing the late hour. I have some flexibility in my schedule over the next couple of days, and tomorrow I will dive into the citations section. I will have the ability to respond to comments on this draft as they come in. Special thanks to Jesse and Craig who already have provided some guidance.

Cheers

J-

Jeff Everett

Wildlife Biologist

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Oregon Fish & Wildlife Office

2600 SE 98th Ave Suite 100

Portland, OR 97266

503-231-6952 office

503-807-6192 cell

