From: Turner, Ed
To: Juliusson, Lara
Cc: James Lindstrom; Drue DeBerry; Kate Norman
Subject: Re: GrSG GIS Team - Please review and comment ASAP
Date: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 1:27:15 PM
Attachments: 20150220_ConsistencyInAcreage_LJ_Ed.docx

Lara, Here are my thoughts. Overall, things will be different unless we base the numbers on the new data runs we are currently doing. If we need to build state by state, do we really have that much time?

Just let me know and I'll will start looking for stuff.

Thanks, Ed

On Tue, Feb 24, 2015 at 9:00 AM, Juliusson, Lara <lara_juliusson@fws.gov> wrote:

> 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

--

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

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 f~~Field 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

Comment [TE1]: This seems like a big problem. The local offices are using data from the state level and using old occupied range. Any work that they do regardless of the specific data, must use the up-to-date current range. If the local offices are using GIS and localized data, values will not match.

Comment [TE2]: This is true, but will they consider the GIS/Modeling effort as a general rangewide guide and then comment that they have refined state level data to direct local conservation, etc.? Seems to me that will open pathways for legal challenges.

Comment [TE3]: This seems like the best plan if looking at things as a whole, rangewide.

Comment [TE4]: This is correct, possible not all state offices will have like data or even data that can be used in GIS/Modeling formats. We are talking about a timeline that is based on the use of data (range data) created at national offices and manipulated by us to within the management zones and current range of the species. The national offices pull and compile the state office data they collect. Do we really have the time to search each state, try to build or convert each states data or lack thereof, and then blend it as a rangewide data? We currently have been following the OF-Report guidance and creating on the ground data based on rangewide . If we do attempt to build all new data to rangewide level from state or local office submissions we could be talking about a timeline that is not possible. Do we have the time to do this and what if states are lacking data? I would assume the data will differ greatly from state to state if it even exist.

	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) 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.

Comment [TE5]: I don't know how to comment on this other than the numbers will naturally be different. Look at WA, they look at areas that are not considered occupied, but Management Units that I assume differ from USFWS MgmtZones? What about the other states within the GRSG range did they match? Is that why they are not represented in the table? Table only notes 5 of the 14 states that are touched by the 2015 USFWS GRSG Management Zone extent.