From: Juliusson, Lara
To: Turner, Ed
Cc: Skora, Genevieve
Subject: Re: GRSG Draft Free Roaming Equids Threat map and numbers
Date: Friday, March 20, 2015 12:03:09 PM

Thanks Ed,

I'm not sure how things are going to work now, but you might want to include the Species Lead Team on this decision. Up to you both, of course.

Lara

Lara Juliusson, Geographer/Ecologist
Sage-grouse Energy Team
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
Region 6, Lakewood, CO
Lara_Juliusson@fws.gov
303-236-9876
http://www.fws.gov/mountain-prairie/

Join me on LinkedIn
http://www.linkedin.com/pub/lara-juliusson/5/918/7a4

On Fri, Mar 20, 2015 at 12:26 PM, Turner, Ed <ed_turner@fws.gov> wrote:

> Hi Genevieve, I wanted to reach you before you left for the weekend and next week.
>
> I actually went back the the USFS base data and coded for the values in the table. The Combined data set I created for the threat mapping and base numbers was not going to work.
> I still need to add a field and determine if I can even make a map. Think now I need to try and make a map of USFS and BLM independent of each other's data, due to overlap and inconsistencies in the actual management usings and the AML's that they claim.
>
> As discussed yesterday in our call, the USFS has 11 out of 32 records that I can't classify AML based on the table provided by USFS due to varying numbers for multiple records of territories, or just because the information doesn't even exist. I think the problem lies in the fact that Tom had to try to get individual data from various forests and the stuff just didn't match.
>
> Ex. for Red Rock, they have a entry for Burro and an entry horse on separate lines. Because the AML's are the same for both and only the estimated 2014 numbers differ I can assume these will work and fill them in. If you look at Spring Mtn or Johnny (Johnnie in table?), those have multiple line entries too, but the min /max AML's differ, so which one would I choose to use. The area is only represented by one polygon form the USFS source data and not two. I don't think we can create additional polygons to represent the USFS data. We are using the data as source from them and should not alter that. At least that's my thinking. Plus looks like BLM will say something completely different for the same area.
>
> When I looked at the BLM in relation to the USFS (just using tables, I have yet to code the

BLM base data with their AML's), numbers are not jiving as far as I can tell. That would mean for mapped polygons we wouldn't really have a clear (possible correct) way to represent them with any level of confidence.

I'll try to get a USFS map out, then work on the BLM individually and see what that results in.
If we make maps of the two we just have to remember that the data from both can represent mixed values in areas and that because these data sources do not match completely geographically, we have overlapping areas that are being counted twice if looking at on the ground footprint acres/hectares.

I'll keep messing with it, but so far I do not have any confidence in what I will show.

I have included a USFS map and a table. I took the Min+Max AML and if under the 2014 estimate I classified the area as "Over", and opposite for "Under" I assume this is how you were thinking it should be.

Maybe Lara can give some input on what we should do. I will work on BLM table data codes now.

Sorry about all this , Ed

On Thu, Mar 19, 2015 at 12:53 PM, Skora, Genevieve <genevieve_skora@fws.gov> wrote:
> Great! Thanks again!
>
> On Thu, Mar 19, 2015 at 11:53 AM, Turner, Ed <ed_turner@fws.gov> wrote:
> > Hi Genevieve, Here is a quick map of the BIA lands in WA.
> >
> > On Thu, Mar 19, 2015 at 9:14 AM, Skora, Genevieve <genevieve_skora@fws.gov> wrote:
> > > Hi Ed,
> > >
> > > One of my reviewers asked if the map could show which HMAs are over AML. Does the GIS data you have a column showing % of AML? or do you have the Min/max or high/low AML columns?
> > >
> > > I'm also just noticing that WA and MT have no HMAs within GrSG range.
> > >
> > > I think WA may be explained as the equids up there may be tribal ownership. I don't suppose the GIS team has done a map of where tribal land and GrSG range intersect? I have a NV map showing this intersection.
> > >
> > > For MT, I'm trying to figure out where the Pryor Mtn HMA is situated. I thought it would fall within GrSG range, but maybe it is mostly outside of? I see (on an old spreadsheet that 17 ac of Pryor Mtn is within MZ II.
> > >
> > > Thanks,

- Gen

On Mon, Mar 16, 2015 at 2:34 PM, Turner, Ed <ed_turner@fws.gov> wrote:

Hello Genevieve, Here is a new draft map and draft numbers that will be used till we process the data as final.

I have gone back and removed the USFS territories that are considered inactive. The BLM data looks to represent active management areas as they note type of Herd within.

Hope this helps, Ed

--
Edwin Turner, Geographer
GIS Mapping and Analysis Branch
USFWS Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Ave. Suite 250
Carlsbad, CA 92008
760.431.9440 x266

Ed_Turner@fws.gov
760.431.9440 x266

--

Genevieve A. Skora
Biologist (Endangered Species)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Reno Fish & Wildlife Office
1340 Financial Blvd., Suite 234 | Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 861-6395 | *Genevieve_Skora@fws.gov*

--
Edwin Turner, Geographer
GIS Mapping and Analysis Branch
USFWS Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Ave. Suite 250
Carlsbad, CA 92008
760.431.9440 x266

Ed_Turner@fws.gov
760.431.9440 x266

--

Genevieve A. Skora
Biologist (Endangered Species)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Reno Fish & Wildlife Office
1340 Financial Blvd., Suite 234 | Reno, Nevada 89502
(775) 861-6395 | *Genevieve_Skora@fws.gov*

--

Edwin Turner, Geographer
GIS Mapping and Analysis Branch
USFWS Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office
2177 Salk Ave. Suite 250
Carlsbad, CA 92008
760.431.9440 x266

Ed_Turner@fws.gov
760.431.9440 x266