From: Deibert, Pat
To: Michael Bean
Cc: Noreen Walsh
Subject: Re: If you have time
Date: Tuesday, April 22, 2014 12:08:13 PM

Hello again Michael -

I tapped into some GIS folks that are familiar with the BLM monitoring network and gained a little insight. They states that one (of several) reason BLM opted to use LANDFIRE is because it had been used recently in the published literature including the Knick et al. 2011 paper.

We never discussed what the BLM's intentions were for the reference statement beyond acknowledging the coarse scale of LANDFIRE, and I would venture that the BLM here is simply making a factual statement. The other statement was:

"Additionally, LANDFIRE pixel-level is 30 meters square, a 5 km buffer is essentially a buffer of 166 pixels (minus the difference between a circular buffer and a square buffer), so Knick's study wouldn't violate the "local" or "pixel level" statement in the Monitoring Framework."

Hopefully this helps!

Pat

On Mon, Apr 21, 2014 at 2:42 PM, Michael Bean <michael_bean@ios.doi.gov> wrote:

> ... Can you help me understand the following? The study by Knick et al that found that 99 percent of all active leks had less than 3 percent of the area within 5 km of the lek developed was based on LANDFIRE data. The current draft of BLM's Monitoring Framework has a section on "Accuracy and Appropriate use of LANDFIRE data sets." It says that "LANDFIRE EVT data are not designed to be used at a local level. ... LANDFIRE data should never be used at the pixel level ... for any reporting. The smallest geographic extent use of the data for this purpose is at the PAC level."
> In effect, is BLM saying that Knick et al should not have used the LANDFIRE data as they did?

--
Pat Deibert
National Sage-grouse Conservation Coordinator
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
5353 Yellowstone Road, Suite 308A
Cheyenne, WY 82009
307-772-2374, ext. 226

got leks?