

From: [Matt Kales](#)
To: [Noreen Walsh](#)
Subject: FW: GRSG: revisions to state-specific issues in Dan's SGTF TPs
Date: Friday, January 16, 2015 2:24:57 PM

From: Mackey, Dennis [mailto:dennis_mackey@fws.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2015 2:23 PM
To: Matt Kales
Cc: Jodi Bush; Jeff Berglund; Jason Pyron; Pat Deibert; Jesse DELia; Michael Thabault; Nicole Alt; Theresa Rabot
Subject: Re: GRSG: revisions to state-specific issues in Dan's SGTF TPs

Hi Matt:

Good seeing you this week, and enjoyed dinner with you Tuesday.

Thanks for the followup on this topic:

Regarding RFPAs, Noreen is right, so please have Dan remark that "these are good things Idaho is doing and we support their efforts".

FYI on the other components, Governor Otter recently included in his budget to the Legislature, a request for all of those items (or similar) so I think if Dan touches on those by simply mentioning them per the current talking point that will make a positive connection.

Have a great weekend!

Dennis

On Fri, Jan 16, 2015 at 10:55 AM, Matt Kales <matt_kales@fws.gov> wrote:
Folks,

Good to see everyone this week, and thanks for working with Pat and Jesse to develop some state-specific content for Dan's talking points for next week's Governors' Sage-Grouse Task Force meeting. Noreen reviewed the content we sent her yesterday and had the following questions:

For Montana we said:

- o In **Montana** fully implement mandatory adherence to the EO by all state agencies (in sufficient time to be considered in our status review), with use of a minimum 1-mile lek buffer and application of the mitigation sequence (avoid, minimize, reclaim, compensate) to all core areas, connectivity areas and general habitats. Require compensatory mitigation for all projects that will result in direct, indirect, temporary and permanent impacts so as to achieve a net conservation gain for sage-grouse and their habitats.

Question for Jodi and Jeff: Noreen got the impression from speaking with you all this week that resolution of issues w/the state (Tim B.) was going well and we'd settled many of the above issues, so can you please indicate whether Dan should be highlighting the above as things we've agreed to or are these things the state still needs to do?

For Idaho we said:

- In **Idaho** finalize commitments for sage grouse conservation measures for state and private lands, including implementation of a mitigation strategy; development of mechanisms and funding for fire prevention and suppression (including additional Rural Fire Protection Associations); development of measures and funding for sage grouse habitat enhancement and restoration; and Increase capacity for sage grouse population and habitat monitoring.

Question for Dennis and Jason: Noreen understands ID to be a leader in supporting RFPAs so, similar to the MT question, should Dan couch his remarks more in terms of “these are good things ID is doing and we support their efforts” or are these things the state still needs to do?

Please advise ASAP on the above. Pat: FYI; I made some minor changes to CO and WY per Noreen’s direction and will send same back to you all once we finalize this product.

Thanks in advance.

MK

Matt Kales
Special Assistant for Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation
Office of the Regional Director
US Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region
Office: (303) 236-4576
Mobile: (720) 234-0257

--

Dennis Mackey
Deputy State Supervisor
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Boise, Idaho
Office: 208-378-5267
Cell: 208-860-1970