

The CHE Manual and HQT will be updated through a process (allowing stakeholder input) driven by the Exchange Administrator where changes will ultimately be approved by the OC. Have adaptive management triggers been considered?

The Exchange uses a Reserve Account to manage the risk of losing credits (and they consider it as providing part of the net benefit- Manual p.46-47). To cover unintentional losses, 4% of total anticipated credits for the sight is put into the reserve (but only as credits are released). If the project is on split-estate, an additional 7% is added to the reserve. The Exchange can modify this value with approval from the OC. What sources of unintentional loss are covered by the 4%? How will you evaluate over time if 11% is sufficient to cover the potential for oil and gas development due to split estate? Why did you decide to treat any and all fires as force majeure events?

Would adding consideration of limiting habitats in a Service Area improve the evaluation of habitat functionality?

Why did you decide to design the Exchange in a way that would allow replacement of functional acres, regardless seasonal habitat functionality lost or gained (functional acres of winter habitat can be used to compensate for loss of summer functional acres)?

Did you consider having different baseline functional values by Service Area? Why did you set the baseline functional value at 20% throughout Colorado?

Are there any modifications that would improve the Exchange's ability to target credits where they will provide the highest conservation return on investment?

Why are you confident that a net conservation benefit can be achieved through the CHE?

Why did you choose the winter habitat scoring curves for sagebrush height specific to slopes <5% and >5%? Is the HQT scoring curve for sagebrush canopy cover appropriate for wintering and breeding habitat? Specifically, if other vegetation factors are favorable, could 5% sagebrush canopy cover result in 50% functionality of wintering and breeding habitat?

Why did you choose the modifier values for percent invasive grass cover? The HQT uses a modifier to account for the detrimental effects of invasive grasses at the site (4th order) scale (HQT p.24). The functionality of habitat (as determined by other vegetation features) is multiplied by a score based on the amount of the site that is covered by invasive grasses. Colorado data were used to develop the multiplier scores. If the site is more than 15% invasive grass cover, the modifier forces the functionality of that site to zero.

Why did you choose the modifier values for conifer cover? The HQT uses a modifier to account for the detrimental effects of conifer cover at the site (4th order) scale (HQT p.26). The functionality of habitat (as determined by other vegetation features) is multiplied by a score based on the amount of conifer cover within 1km radius of each map unit. If the area within the map unit and 1km buffer is more than 10% conifer cover, the modifier forces the functionality of that map unit to zero.

Deleted: Given that the USGS Buffer Report recommends a 3.1 to 5 mile lek buffer, is the 0.6 mile avoidance of lek perimeters required by the ...

Deleted: Are

Deleted: needed, or is the proposed process ...

Deleted: How much would your confidence in ...

Deleted: anticipated

Deleted: Is

Deleted: % enough if oil and gas development ...

Deleted: Is

Deleted: enough where there is

Deleted: The Exchange has identified these val ...

Deleted:

Deleted: This is important because the Exchange ...

Deleted: Should

Deleted: be a factor in determining the

Deleted: of habitat

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: Should limiting factor seasonal habita ...

Deleted: The Exchange is designed

Deleted:

Deleted: to

Deleted: of the

Deleted: s the

Deleted: was

Deleted: in

Deleted: .

Deleted: Should this be changed?

Deleted: "Credits and debits are determined by ...

Deleted:

Deleted: FWS has expressed concerns about th ...

Deleted: FWS has expressed concern that this ...

Deleted: "Are you confident that credits will ...

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: The Service is in agreement that term ...

Deleted: Is the HQT adequate?¶

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: For example, are the data used for

Deleted: appropriate

Deleted: Vegetation attributes at the site level ...

Deleted: Are the modifier values for percent ...

Deleted: ¶

How did you decide on the decay curves for indirect effects? To capture the indirect effects of infrastructure, the HQT uses distance-decay curves that specify the weight and distance of the effects resulting from different types of disturbance (HQT p.27, Appendix B).

Deleted: Are the modifier values for conifer cover appropriate?¶

How did you settle on the modifier values for distance to lek? The HQT uses a modifier to account for the importance of lek proximity for breeding habitat at the local scale. The functionality of habitat (as determined by other vegetation features) is multiplied by a score based on the distance of the map unit from a known lek. If the map unit is more than 10km from a known lek, the modifier decreases the functionality of that map unit to 10% of the measured value.

Deleted: For example, active oil and gas wells are considered 100% indirect effect up to 2.1 km. Are the decay curves used adequate to account for indirect effects? Will different decay curves be appropriate for different exchanges/states?¶

Deleted:

The HQT uses a modifier to account for the need for sagebrush cover in close proximity to summer habitat. The functionality of habitat (as determined by other vegetation features) is unchanged if there is 5% sagebrush canopy cover within 300m of the sample point. If there is not 5% sagebrush canopy cover within 300m of the sample point, the functionality of that habitat is reduced to zero. Is the 5% sagebrush canopy cover within 300m modifier adequate to account for the importance of cover in summer habitat?

Deleted: Are the modifier values for distance to lek appropriate?¶

How did you decide on the values and distances to be used for the LDI? Are there plans to update or reassess these values on a regular basis? The density of anthropogenic disturbance is factored into the HQT (HQT p.31, Appendix D) through the Landscape Disturbance Index (LDI). The LDI discounts the number of functional acres calculated for an area within a 12.4 square mile area radius buffer with the lower threshold (i.e. no disturbance) equivalent to 1 well pad and associated road or less and an upper threshold (i.e. full disturbance) of 6.5 well pads and associated roads or more.

Deleted: It is unknown how often these data will be updated. Are the values appropriate?