From: Turner, Ed
To: Skora, Genevieve
Cc: Lara Juliusson
Subject: Re: GRSG Draft Free Roaming Equids Threat map and numbers
Date: Friday, March 20, 2015 12:35:58 PM

Thanks Genevieve, That seems to make more sense. They may address each herd type differently, but overall they are beyond the limits. just don't know what numbers to log, maybe just log the higher set. Or add more fields for herd and such. Will look at that and check the classification on those ones with zeros.

Thanks, Ed

On Fri, Mar 20, 2015 at 12:14 PM, Skora, Genevieve <genevieve_skora@fws.gov> wrote:

> Hi Ed,
>
> The way I read the data for Red Rock is either that the AML is 50 equids (wild horses and burros together) or AML is 50 horses and 50 burros. Either way with 101 horses and 106 burros in FY14, Red Rock is over AML. I can't explain the zeros in the acres and FS acres columns, probably they didn't want to double count the acres in the total.
>
> For Johnnie and Spring Mountain - so it looks like the FS does have separate horse AMLs and burro AMLs where they both occur in the same HMA. For both Johnnie and Spring Mountain - both the horses and burros are over the max AML, so these HMAs can both be coded over AML/"2014 Est Over".
>
> For the HMAs that have min/max AML, but their 2014 est WH and/or B are zero, I would caution against using "2014 Est Under", my preference would be to use "within AML" - even though that doesn't not seem accurate. My feeling is that these HMAs are inactive or on their way to being inactive, but the min/max AMLs have not yet been updated.
>
> I'm going to email Tom and cc you to see if we can get the official FS answer.
>
> - Gen
>
> On Fri, Mar 20, 2015 at 11:26 AM, 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

--
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