From:	Wiechman, Lief
To:	Matt Kales
Subject:	Re: GRSG: status on revised CED content for Dan/Noreen"s SGTF briefing package?
Date:	Monday, October 06, 2014 4:07:48 PM
Attachments:	SGTF Talking Points (10.06.14).docx

I'm fine with that.
Attached is an updated version, but I gotta run... Will continue to improve this tonight.
I'll see you at 900.

LW

Lief Wiechman
Sage-Grouse Ecologist
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Mountain-Prairie Region
307.772.2374 x236
lief_wiechman@fws.gov

On Mon, Oct 6, 2014 at 3:57 PM, Matt Kales <matt_kales@fws.gov> wrote:

> Okay, thanks. Here's that short summary of the FOIA/privacy issues Nicole drafted earlier:
>
> **From:** Wiechman, Lief [mailto:lief_wiechman@fws.gov]
> **Sent:** Monday, October 06, 2014 3:53 PM
> **To:** Matt Kales
> **Subject:** Re: GRSG: status on revised CED content for Dan/Noreen's SGTF briefing package?
>
> I'm working on it now, will try to get it to you in the next 10 minutes before I gotta head to day care to grab the little one.
>
> If I can't get it finished, you'll have it before you go to bed tonight.
>
> Sorry, I'm in the weeds today.
>
> I'm adding:
>
> - info on data security
>
> - protection of Private Lands Info
>
> - amount of outreach we've done

Lief Wiechman

Sage-Grouse Ecologist

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Mountain-Prairie Region

307.772.2374 x236

lief_wiechman@fws.gov

On Mon, Oct 6, 2014 at 3:48 PM, Matt Kales <matt_kales@fws.gov> wrote:

Please advise. Am meeting with Noreen at 415 to go over everything. Thanks.

Matt Kales

Special Assistant for Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation

Office of the Regional Director

US Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region

Office: (303) 236-4576

Mobile: (720) 234-0257

USFWS
Conservation Efforts Database
SGTF Talking Points
10.1.2014

Background

The Conservation Efforts Database (CED) is an easy-to-use web-based database that is capable of capturing the geospatial information related both on-the-ground efforts and plans (regulatory mechanisms, conservation strategies, and volunteer and incentive-based programs) for use the greater sage-grouse status review. In addition to the quantitative metrics that assist with our analysis, data providers also have the ability to enter and/or upload supplemental narrative information that provides context to the actions and help 'tell the story' of sage-grouse conservation in their agency or organization.

The CED was developed by a FWS, USGS, and GN LCC Team (CED Team) with valuable input from our partners, to collect information from conservation partners in a standardized way so that we can assess the distribution of various conservation activities and evaluate their effectiveness in ameliorating threats to greater sage-grouse range-wide. Conservation partners can enter information in the CED by working with the CED Team to batch upload data, or by entering information on individual plans and projects through the website https://conservationefforts.org.

Key Features

Spatially explicit
Safe and secure

Current Status and Outreach

The CED website opened on August 11, 2014. Information about the CED was including in an appendix included in the 'Data Call' letters sent to our partners in early August. Included in that letter was information about webinars that the Service would provide. Approximately 75 partners have participated in one of the six webinars hosted by the CED Team, and over 50 individuals participated in a custom webinar for Oregon SageCon (developing the State Management Plan). Individuals from the Alberta Department of Environment and Sustainable Resource Development and fish and game/wildlife agencies in Colorado, Montana, South Dakota, Wyoming, Idaho, Oregon, and Nevada have attended the webinars as well as members from the BLM, USFS, and a few NGOs. We have communicated the need for, and asked our state partners to provide 'points of contacts' in the form of 'approving officials' to the Executive Oversight Committee last month at the meeting in St. Louis (presented by M. Thabault). We have also made this request known to our partners represented on the RISC Team on last week's monthly call.

According to Google Analytics, the CED has been viewed in over 600 sessions, but only 5 agencies have fully registered :

- Bureau of Land Management
- Nevada Dept of Conservation and Natural Resources
- Idaho Dept of Fish and Game
- Oregon Dept of Fish and Wildlife
- Alberta ESRD

Private Lands Information

The Service understands the need to protect private land owners information while continuing to provide information related to conservation efforts and actions on private lands. We have been working closely with the NRCS to derive ways to 'buffer' or 'wobble' spatial information related to these efforts that have taken place on private lands. In addition, we have tailored the questions asked and metrics requested to exclude any proprietary or private information in the CED. As we have stated and made abundantly clear throughout this data collection is

that once it has been submitted to the FWS via the CED, it is part of the public record. Oversimplified, if partners have concerns over this information being compromised or requested via FOIA to exclude potentially sensitive information from the data provided or contact us for alternative methods of delivery.

Next Steps

The CED Team is working with the BLM to batch upload information related to land use plans and treatments conducted on the landscape. USFS and NRCS have been approached several times to start the batch upload process for the CED. USFS is establishing their internal teams and process to most efficiently work with the CED. NRCS and the FWS modeling team are working to resolve PII and landowner confidentiality issues, but a solution has yet to be developed.

Many partners have registered as "Demonstration users," allowing them to test the system. However, until pre-registration information (i.e., "approving officials") to ensure agency quality control/organization is provided, "Demonstration User" is the only allowed user access. We have made the request to our partners to identify these approving officials, and will continue to reach out in an effort to have data entered as soon as possible

Future Considerations

The Service still has to identify the status of the CED after the status review is complete. Rationale to maintain and update the CED for sage-grouse and other candidate species include but is not limited to:

· Litigation Support: If the Service determines that listing is not warranted, I feel confident that litigation will be forthcoming, and the CED will need to be queried to support litigation actions. If the Service determines that listing is warranted and publishes a proposed rule to list as T or E, litigation will not start until a year has passed and a final agency decision is available to litigate (again, a high likelihood that litigation will occur).

· Possible Use for Compensatory Mitigation: The BLM/FS EIS's call for the development of Mitigation Strategies for GRSG at the scale of WAFWA Management Zones. Given that the CED is built on a data sharing platform, and that it transcends state boundaries, I opine that it could be easily be modified to track conservation "credits" and "debits" once the accounting and conservation metrics have been developed by the mitigation policy teams.

· Use by Individual States: Informal discussions have occurred in at least one state that currently lacks a geospatial database for reporting conservation efforts. As part of the "tech transfer" mission of the USGS, the CED could be used by individual states for tracking beneficial actions.