

From: [Pyron, Jason](#)
To: [Pat Deibert](#)
Cc: [DElia, Jesse](#); [Dennis Mackey](#)
Subject: Re: Disturbance Discussion Table
Date: Friday, January 23, 2015 8:11:03 AM

I'm in meetings for FIAT all morning, but will make it work as Katie can help me. I spoke with Brent yesterday and he is also working on a revised table I believe.

On Thu, Jan 22, 2015 at 7:54 PM, Pat Deibert <pat_deibert@fws.gov> wrote:

Thanks Jesse

I can't open this on my phone but will look at it first thing in the morning. I still have some basic questions - maybe we should do an internal call a half hour before so we can all get on the same page. I'll send an invite in the morning if that works for folks.

P

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 22, 2015, at 5:39 PM, DElia, Jesse <jesse_delia@fws.gov> wrote:

Hey Pat,

Went back to the equation in the draft and here is how the variables are defined:

The variables in the equation are defined as:

Acres of a Biologically Significant Unit (BSU)

Acres of Anthropogenic Development within the BSU

Acres of Effective GRSG Habitat (sagebrush) within the BSU

So I'm interpreting that as they are just using the acres of sagebrush as "effective habitat." I used Jason's spreadsheet and equations to calculate 4 different scenarios - 25% of the BSU in effective habitat, 50%, 75%, and 90%. Calculations included the range from 50 acres to disturbance encompassing all of the effective habitat (100% disturbance). I've included graphs to show how the calculations vary under these different conditions. In all cases the Idaho BLM disturbance calculation is lower than the standard calculation (dist/effective habitat). Interestingly, when all of the effective habitat is disturbed (100% disturbance), Idaho's disturbance calculation is lower, sometimes significantly lower than 100%.

I've highlighted the % disturbance you would have at the point where Idaho BLM's calculation tripped 3%. Hopefully this is helpful for the discussion tomorrow. Please check and see if spot any errors. Thanks,

Jesse

On Thu, Jan 22, 2015 at 12:10 PM, Deibert, Pat <pat_deibert@fws.gov> wrote:
Thanks for sending Jason. I thought that effective habitat was defined as areas with 70 to 90% sagebrush land cover (based on Knick et al. 2013). So it wouldn't include all sagebrush cover. Did I read that incorrectly?

p

On Thu, Jan 22, 2015 at 1:00 PM, Pyron, Jason <jason_pyron@fws.gov> wrote:

Here's a new draft of the table that we quickly put together in Denver. I think that these calculations are correct.... please take a look I've made the assumption that the "effective habitat" is largely the same (i.e. sagebrush cover; fire is included) although it is measured differently (e.g. Key Habitat vs LandSat).

Please let me know if you have questions... or corrections.

Thanks,
Jason

--

Jason Pyron
Sage-Grouse Coordinator - Candidate Conservation
Idaho Fish & Wildlife Office
1387 S Vinnell Way, Room 368
Boise, Idaho 83709
Office (208-685-6958), Fax (208-378-5262)
jason_pyron@fws.gov

--

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?

--

Jesse D'Elia, Ph.D.
Candidate Species Conservation Coordinator
Endangered Species Division, Pacific Regional Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

911 NE 11th Avenue, 4th Floor, Portland, OR 97232
503.231.2349 phone; 503.231.6243 fax
jesse_delia@fws.gov

<DistrubanceExercise jdelia edits 1-22-15.xlsx>

--

Jason Pyron
Sage-Grouse Coordinator - Candidate Conservation
Idaho Fish & Wildlife Office
1387 S Vinnell Way, Room 368
Boise, Idaho 83709
Office (208-685-6958), Fax (208-378-5262)
jason_pyron@fws.gov