

From: [Norman, Kate](#)
To: [Amy Nicholas](#)
Cc: [Carey Galst](#); [Craig Hansen](#); [Holly Freifeld](#); [Mary Grim](#); [Pat Deibert](#)
Subject: GRSB 2015: Conclusion Language
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 12:26:58 PM

Following a check in with Nicole, I think this is ready for prime time.

Nicole made a couple of additional suggestions including using alternate language to "threat"

All of her edits are tracked on our SharePoint
(<https://portal.doi.net/usfws/SG/docs/Forms/US.aspx>).

If you wouldn't mind sharing this with your team, that would be super!

Thanks,
K

Sideboards for Conclusion Paragraph:

- Quote 2010 conclusion (eg. “We find that the threat of disease is not significant to the point that the greater sage-grouse warrants listing at this time.”)
- What are the impacts at various scales:
 - Individuals
 - Populations
 - Management Zone
 - “Range”
- Regulatory mechanisms may be ameliorating these impacts including x, y z. See cumulative effects and/or regulatory mechanisms chapter for further explanation.
- Based on the new science, we conclude that THIS STRESSOR is affecting the species in X way.

Language

- **Avoid the terms “threatened or threatening” as a verb or adverb and “threat” as noun; may consider using:**
 - **Impact**
 - **Stressor**

- **Negatively affecting**
- **Negligible impact (on its own), but could have cumulative impacts**

SSA discovered “threat” is used differently by different programs; they don’t have a standardized language:

- *Use “source of impact” – other language*

Threats

The term “threats” was we discovered used differently by different programs. We had a choice to either try for one unified definition or not use the term. We chose not to use the term “threat” in the SSA Framework partly because of the ambiguous understanding and application across our program- rather we ask that you be specific in your cause and effect analyses – and because until the analysis is complete it is too early to call something a threat...you have yet to do the analysis to determine if a change on the landscape is driving the populations resiliency. Perhaps someday we will all have the same working definition of threat and apply it consistently across the programs, but until then, please utilize the terminology in the framework."

An example of ambiguity in ESA terminology is the word “threats.” Threat does not have a common definition across all ESA programs (see footnote 2 in the January 16, 2009, Department of Interior Solicitor Memorandum, M-37021). Instead of the word threat, the SSA Framework asks for specificity on the source of an environmental stressor or a direct effect, and how that “cause” affects individuals, populations, and the species using demographic parameters (i.e., “effects”).

--

Kate Norman, Sage-Grouse Project Manager
 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6
 134 Union Blvd, Lakewood CO 80228
 PO Box 25486, DFC, Mailstop 60120, Denver CO 80225
 Office: 303-236-4214
 Mobile: 703-927-2445
kate_norman@fws.gov