

From: [Nicholas, Amy](#)
To: [angela.burgess](#); [craig.hansen](#); [Dawn Davis](#); [Genevieve Skora](#); [Heather McPherron](#); [Holly Freifeld](#); [Jeff Berglund](#); [Jeff Everett](#); [Jennifer Siani](#); [Joy Gober](#); [Kim Garner](#); [Lara Drizd](#); [Lief Wiechman](#); [Lisa Solberg Schwab](#); [Ronald Baxter](#); [Sarah Fierce](#); [Teresa Stein](#)
Cc: [Kate Norman](#)
Subject: GRSG 2015 Conclusion language
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 2:03:14 PM

Hi All,

As I mentioned at last meeting, there was discussion today about conclusion language given comments we have received. Below are sideboards on how to approach and things to include given this is a species report and not a policy document. This mainly relates to information that will go into the **Assessment of Potential Threat** section of your chapter, but applies to language throughout. (FYI bi-state has some good examples). If you have any questions, don't hesitate to call!

Sideboards for Assessment of Potential Threat:

What we concluded in 2010...

- 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 we know now....

- 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**

FYI from SSA....

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”).

1:47 PM (14 minutes ago)

Amy Nicholas, Ph.D.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
5353 Yellowstone Road, Suite 308A
Cheyenne, WY 82009
307-772-2374 Ext. 242