

From: [Noreen Walsh](#)
To: [Pat Deibert](#)
Cc: [Ren Lohofener](#); [Richard Hannan](#); [Mary Grim](#); [Theresa Rabot](#); [Matt Kales](#)
Subject: RE: Idaho?
Date: Tuesday, January 13, 2015 4:59:01 PM

Me too, I thought that was being used across all the plans.

From: Pat Deibert [mailto:pat_deibert@fws.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2015 3:38 PM
To: Noreen Walsh
Cc: Ren Lohofener; Richard Hannan; Mary Grim; Theresa Rabot
Subject: Re: Idaho?

I don't know the specifics for ID but we spent months working on a monitoring strategy with BLM and fs. It was completed last October with the intent that it would be used in all the plans. I am confused why that is not the template.

P

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 13, 2015, at 3:34 PM, Noreen Walsh <noreen_walsh@fws.gov> wrote:

Well, that is curious to me. Looping in Terry and Pat.

From: Lohofener, Ren [mailto:ren_lohofener@fws.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2015 3:26 PM
To: Richard Hannan; Noreen Walsh
Cc: Grim, Mary
Subject: Idaho?

Sarah Greenberger has evidently told BLM that we should look to Idaho for a method of calculating the disturbance cap.

Is this different from what we are doing or other states - except WY - are doing?

thanks!
Ren