

From: [Matt Kales](#)
To: [Michael Thabault](#)
Subject: RE: GRSG blm buffer stuff
Date: Monday, January 12, 2015 3:54:06 PM

I need a beer(s).

From: Michael Thabault [mailto:michael_thabault@fws.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 3:14 PM
To: Matt Kales
Subject: Fwd: GRSG blm buffer stuff

FYI

Michael Thabault
Assistant Regional Director
Ecological Services
Mountain Prairie Region

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Deibert, Pat" <pat_deibert@fws.gov>
Date: January 12, 2015 at 3:05:21 PM MST
To: Michael Thabault <michael_thabault@fws.gov>
Subject: Re: GRSG blm buffer stuff

silly you. me too.

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:03 PM, Michael Thabault
<michael_thabault@fws.gov> wrote:
I had assumed pats write up was the consolidation and the singular response.

Michael Thabault
Assistant Regional Director
Ecological Services
Mountain Prairie Region

On Jan 12, 2015, at 2:32 PM, Matt Kales <matt_kales@fws.gov> wrote:

From: Noreen Walsh [mailto:noreen_walsh@fws.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 2:31 PM
To: Matt Kales
Subject: RE: GRSG blm buffer stuff

One thing to clarify with Mary: I read Jim's revision to say that you cannot mitigate out of the buffer zone in PHMA.

From: Matt Kales [mailto:matt_kales@fws.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 2:29 PM
To: Noreen Walsh; Michael Thabault

Subject: RE: GRSG blm buffer stuff

Okay. Working with Pat to clarify.

From: Noreen Walsh [mailto:noreen_walsh@fws.gov]

Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 2:23 PM

To: Matt Kales; Michael Thabault

Subject: RE: GRSG blm buffer stuff

I need a consolidated approach – this sounds like 3? Please advise.

From: Matt Kales [mailto:matt_kales@fws.gov]

Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 2:20 PM

To: Noreen Walsh

Cc: Michael Thabault; Nicole Alt; Pat Deibert

Subject: FW: GRSG blm buffer stuff

Importance: High

Hi. Here's the team's feedback on the latest buffer approach. Thanks.

From: Deibert, Pat [mailto:pat_deibert@fws.gov]

Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 12:43 PM

To: Michael Thabault

Cc: Matt Kales; Nicole Alt

Subject: GRSG blm buffer stuff

Mike - I have been so bold as to provide comments on top of the version that Jim Lyons edited. Conceptually we are in a better place than we were last week. Please advise if you have any questions. I also heard from both Jesse and Mary and simply cut and paste their comments below. I agree completely with both of them, but I think Mary's comment may have been addressed with Jim's edits.

pat

From Jesse:

I haven't had a chance to analyze this in any detail given the short turn around. The general steps in Jim's e-mail make intuitive sense. I do have a concern that BLM is managing for the minimum interpreted range for lek buffers in priority habitat. Not sure if that is the appropriate use of those minimums or not - maybe a question for USGS. My read is that the maximum of the range encompasses areas where negative effects have been detected - if so we can expect that there will be a continued erosion of habitat quality in priority areas using minimum interpreted range for lek buffers.

From Mary:

I would not be ok with trading buffers for mitigation in PHMA.

--

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?

--

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?