| | |
|---|---|
| **From:** | Juliusson, Lara |
| **To:** | James Lindstrom; Ed Turner |
| **Cc:** | Drue DeBerry; Kate Norman |
| **Subject:** | GrSG GIS Team - Please review and comment ASAP |
| **Date:** | Tuesday, February 24, 2015 10:00:26 AM |
| **Attachments:** | 20150220_ConsistencyInAcreage_LJ.docx |

---

Hi Jim and Ed,

I am hoping you could provide a quick turn-around review of this document. Rich is out of the office.

This issue paper is fairly self-explanatory, and was the result of a meeting that I could not attend last week because I was out of town. The initial driver of this question were the acreage calculations that I provided for the external affairs state fact sheets on surface ownership in GrSG range. However, the issue is actually a bit larger than this one example, pertaining to how we determine what data sources we use for GIS anlysis .

Please let me know if you can provide your comments and return by COB today.

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

# Local vs. Rangewide GIS data

## Problem Statement:

The EA folks are working on fact sheets describing conservation efforts. The GRrSG GIS team has identified best available spatial data ~~(2015 BLM SMA data) layers for these efforts~~ that are consistent across the range. For example, 2015 BLM SMA data, 2014 Schroeder currently occupied GrSG range, etc. Note that 2014 FWS modifications to occupied range boundaries were approved by the GrSG Species Lead Team. ~~Individual states or~~~~Some of the~~ fField offices ~~may have~~are currently using different numbers that ~~are~~ were derived from localized sources including States, BLM and other partners, and potentially older (2004) Schroeder occupied range~~local knowledge~~ (not necessarily spatial data).

~~Currently, there is~~The concern ~~over having~~is that we do not want ~~to~~ inconsistent data used between ~~these efforts~~EA fact sheets and what is used for the rangewide analysis and modeling efforts for the species status assessment.

## Options:

- We could use different numbers/data for different efforts. The Fact Sheets could use local data that isn't GIS-based.
    - **PRO:** The fact sheets would have more refined data that matches existing literature and cited sources.
    - **CON:** The numbers will be inconsistent with what will be used for modeling and analysis~~.~~
- We could use the same data (GIS Team layers) for all the efforts including the status review analysis and fact sheets.
    - **PRO:** The numbers will be consistent between the status review and our communication materials.
    - **CON:** The numbers may not match what our local offices have previously shared. We need to know if
- We could try to modify the GIS layers to be more consistent with the numbers provided by the states. This may require a great deal of work.
    - **PRO:** This would allow consistency between the status review and the other materials; it would also potentially improve accuracy of data layers.
    - **CON:** Large amount of work and may be difficult to maintain consistency across the range. Every state might not provide refined data. It may be difficult to use state data in modeling efforts.

## Additional Information:

Numbers from Field Office Fact Sheets

| State | GIS Data acreage based on 2014 Schroeder | Field Office acreage | Source of FO acreage |
|---|---|---|---|

| | occupied range | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Oregon** | 18.9 million | ~14 million acres | Oregon BLM, ODFW (Historically Oregon had 17.7 million acres of habitat. They currently have 14-15 million acres, 80% of historic distribution)<br><br>http://www.blm.gov/or/news/files/sage-grouse_fact_sheet.pdf |
| **Idaho** | 16.9 million | ~14 million acres | IDFG, Draft BLM RMP |
| **Washington** | 2.7 million | 4.2 million | Includes all WDFW Sage Grouse Management Units (not all areas are occupied but accounts for potential expansion through recovery. |
| **Nevada*** | 37.6 million | Combined CA/NV 30.7 million acres | |
| **California** | 4.3 million | | |

*Dr. Peter Coates' GIS data: a total of 30,776,101 total acres with CA and NV. ~~Not sure where the~~The additional 11 or so million acres discrepancy was explained to R1 as the difference between using Coates' new habitat data to represent range, and using the Schroeder 2014 occupied range boundaries.