

From: [Landenburger, Lisa A -FS](#)
To: [Dixon, Bev -FS](#); [Shoemaker, Rebecca](#); [Canfield, Jodie E -FS](#)
Cc: [Christiansen, Steve -FS](#)
Subject: RE: Can we agree on this last item?
Date: Thursday, August 07, 2014 10:12:54 AM

Rebecca, Bev –

Thanks for your input. I would like to respond to the points brought up by both of you.

Rebecca,

New acquisitions (even developed sites pre-dating 1998) would not already be in the 1998 baseline since we do not track developed sites on private lands. However, when a site is acquired via a land exchange it would then fall under federal / public ownership and the site would need to be accounted for in the baseline. Your suggestion is that we treat pre-98 and post-98 developed sites the same (i.e., both be amended to the baseline with mitigation strongly encouraged but not required) makes perfect sense to me. However, the conundrum is how do we deal with acquired roads.

Bev,

You are partially correct when you state that “*regardless of ownership, roads have been counted in access calculations.*” The access model only includes private roads that were known to exist in 1998. We do not track and update the access model with new private roads constructed post 1998. When the FS acquires new lands it could potentially acquire a bucket full of motorized routes that were constructed post-1998 and have never been accounted for in the access model. It could cause significant reductions in the calculated secure habitat for a given subunit. Although the mere acquisition does not reflect changes on the ground, it could have repercussions to the baseline values for secure habitat. The biggest concern in my mind is that private roads used infrequently under private ownership could become public access routes with significant increase in use. If the FS intends to manage against 1998 conditions, I would think it would want to close or mitigate for newly acquired roads that were constructed post 1998.

Unfortunately, the entire issue of land acquisition is completely absent in the Yellowstone C. S. Any language that we add would be new content. I would like to know how the NCDE deals with this issue, but I don’t think we are beholden to what they adopt. I think we need to really consider the implications before adopting new language.

Lisa Landenburger
Grizzly Bear GIS Database Coordinator, Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem
USGS Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center
USFS Affiliate, Region 1
Email: lalandenburger@fs.fed.us
phone: 406-994-7430

From: Dixon, Bev -FS
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 9:41 AM
To: Shoemaker, Rebecca; Landenburger, Lisa A -FS; Canfield, Jodie E -FS

Cc: Christiansen, Steve -FS

Subject: RE: Can we agree on this last item?

Lisa – always thinking ahead – that’s a good thing! You do bring up a good point about roads acquired through land acquisition... but there is a difference in that roads, regardless of ownership, have been counted in access calculations (unlike developed sites on private). So, where the standard is about secure habitat, ownership of roads would not make any difference. Status (open to public vs. admin only) could affect OMARD and TMARD, but since we have no control over the use of private roads, I believe we’ve been counting them as “open”. Just a few more things to consider...

From: Shoemaker, Rebecca [<mailto:rebecca.shoemaker@cfc.umt.edu>]

Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 9:23 AM

To: Landenburger, Lisa A -FS; Dixon, Bev -FS; Canfield, Jodie E -FS

Cc: Christiansen, Steve -FS

Subject: RE: Can we agree on this last item?

hmmmmm, 2 thoughts I guess.

#1) why not just drop the reference to pre-1998 because they would already be included in the 1998 baseline...right? what am I not understanding?

- Developments on private land are not counted against this standard; ~~however, developed sites that pre-date 1998 and which are acquired through land exchanges will be amended to the baseline with no mitigation necessary.~~ If lands containing developed sites are acquired, these will be added to the 1998 baseline without violating the standard. In this, mitigation is strongly encouraged, but not required.

#2) you bring up a good point lisa, what about roaded lands acquired through exchanges? In the NCDE cs, we have this condition as an acceptable change to the baseline value because it doesn’t reflect a change on the ground but you’re right, it could if previously inaccessible roads became open to public access. so...right off-hand, I agree with your suggestion to limit it to admin. use only. But I’m open to discussion and would like to speak w/ our FS partners in the NCDE to see what they’re comfortable with. Let me know if you want me to do that. I think the folks I usually speak w/ are on fires but I could try to track them down.

thanks, rebecca

Rebecca Shoemaker
Policy Biologist
USFWS Grizzly Bear Recovery Office
University Hall, Room 309
Missoula, MT 59812

406.243.4994

From: Landenburger, Lisa A -FS [<mailto:lalandenburger@fs.fed.us>]

Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 8:47 AM

To: Dixon, Bev -FS; Canfield, Jodie E -FS
Cc: Christiansen, Steve -FS; Shoemaker, Rebecca
Subject: RE: Can we agree on this last item?

Jodie,

After some thought, this opens a new can of worms since, what about acquisition of land that come with roads? Do we amend these to the baseline and adjust the secure habitat baseline accordingly? Private roads could suddenly be open to public with an increase in traffic which is not good for grizzly bears. Do we require that acquired roads become admin-only?? I am not ready to commit to this new language. Will need to talk with Dan when he's back in the office.

However, in the case we DO go with this, it still needs clarification since, the way it's currently written, it's unclear what pre-dates 1998 – the land exchange or the development of site.
Alternative:

- Developments on private land are not counted against this standard; however, developed sites that pre-date 1998 and which are acquired through land exchanges will be amended to the baseline with no mitigation necessary. In the case of acquiring sites constructed post-1998 which are desirable to maintain, mitigation is strongly encouraged, but not required.

Rebecca, what are your thoughts?

Lisa Landenburger
Grizzly Bear GIS Database Coordinator, Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem
USGS Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center
USFS Affiliate, Region 1
Email: lalandenburger@fs.fed.us
phone: 406-994-7430

From: Dixon, Bev -FS
Sent: Thursday, August 07, 2014 6:21 AM
To: Canfield, Jodie E -FS; Landenburger, Lisa A -FS
Cc: Christiansen, Steve -FS
Subject: RE: Can we agree on this last item?

Works for me.

From: Canfield, Jodie E -FS
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2014 3:27 PM
To: Landenburger, Lisa A -FS; Dixon, Bev -FS
Cc: Christiansen, Steve -FS
Subject: Can we agree on this last item?

- Developments on private land are not counted against this standard; however, developed sites acquired through land exchanges that pre-date 1998 are then included in the baseline. In the case of acquiring developed sites that were added later than 1998, and which are desirable to maintain, mitigation is encouraged, but not required.

Jodie Canfield
Custer Gallatin Wildlife Program Manager
(406) 587-6739

This electronic message contains information generated by the USDA solely for the intended recipients. Any unauthorized interception of this message or the use or disclosure of the information it contains may violate the law and subject the violator to civil or criminal penalties. If you believe you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the email immediately.