

From: [Berglund, Jeff](#)
To: [Pat Deibert](#)
Cc: [Jodi Bush](#)
Subject: Re: Question on state plan
Date: Wednesday, October 08, 2014 2:37:02 PM

So it's not necessarily that it wouldn't work - it's that we were pushing for more conservation benefit (more certainty) via application of a larger buffer, given the differences between WY and MT:

- The WY EO applies to most state activities – all state activities/agencies must comply (unsure of the MT regulatory scope, but requested State review),
- WY core contains 84% of their GSG population (MT contains 76%),
- WY GSG habitat primarily occurs in contiguous public ownership blocks (MT more fragmented),
- In WY, core areas were mapped to include additional habitat beyond that strictly necessary to prevent Endangered Species Act listing of the GSG, with the intent that the additional habitat would accommodate continuation of existing land uses and landowner activities (MT Strategy did not enact a similar approach),
- WY core habitat encompasses 35% of GSG habitat (MT 28% and would need to add approximately 2.2 mil ac of core to approximate the WY figure);
- In WY, 37% of core occurs in private ownership and 54% in federal ownership (MT 54% of core occurs in private ownership and 35% in federal ownership - so potentially less regulatory scope).
- There is early evidence based on a 40% reduction in leased hectares within core areas that WY policy is reducing potential for future fragmentation inside core areas (Copeland et al. 2013), but the 5% anthropogenic disturbance cap may still lead to some GSG decline in core areas (WY good, but still not perfect).
- Given these differences, and based on disturbance and nesting distance from leks in MT, studies cited in an extensive literature review distributed to the council by FWP, and other studies, FWS recommended the council increase the lek NSO to > 0.6 miles to **bolster the conservation benefit of the Strategy**.
- 4 miles ideal, but left it to council to determine what they were willing/able to do along the **continuum** between 0.6 and 4 miles. Council elected 1 mile - FWS supported that as being an **improvement** over 0.6 mile and adding to Strategy effectiveness.
- Also, the noise measure in the EO is really weak, so it really doesn't add much to the conservation package (as it does in WY).

Hope this helps...

On Wed, Oct 8, 2014 at 2:28 PM, Pat Deibert <pat_deibert@fws.gov> wrote:

Sitting in a BLM state meeting and Noreen asked me the question of why 0.6 buffer works in wy but not mt. Can u give me any clarity?

Also Noreen will be meeting 1 on1 with Tim baker (who is here) tomorrow - likely this won't be the only question you receive.....

P

Sent from my iPhone

--

Jeff Berglund
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Montana Field Office
585 Shepard Way, Suite 1
Helena, MT 59601
(406) 449-5225, ext. 206