

From: [Freifeld, Holly](#)
To: [Hendricks, Kathleen](#)
Cc: [Schubert, Alex](#); [Lief Wiechman](#)
Subject: Re: GRSG: Re: Energy CED spreadsheet
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2015 9:58:10 AM

Hi Kathleen,

This might be easier to explain when we're on the webinar this afternoon, but I'll give it a go in writing (so that Alex gets it too)...

Energy Development:

When I query Energy Devel. projects in Idaho (on the CED "query data" page, not the FWS queries page, which has built-in filters), I get one hit: Rocky Mountain Power's multi-state line retrofitting project. This is a project that addresses the threat of infrastructure to sage-grouse, so you will see this one when you run your reports in the CED (because Infrastructure is identified as a key threat in ID). As Lief suggested on yesterday's webinar, it's probably a good idea to touch base with the other FO people involved when multi-state projects like this one pop up (...as you guys already have done!).

When someone enters a project in the CED, they can associate the project (or plan) with as many of the 13 threats as they wish. One result is that people sometimes chose threats to sage-grouse that their project might not actually address. The person who entered the RMP line retrofit selected two threats: Energy Development and Infrastructure, but line retrofitting addresses only the threat of infrastructure, not energy development.

Ag Conversion:

This is a somewhat more complex question.

When I query Ag Conversion projects in ID (again, on the "query data" page), I get 60+ projects back. Nearly all of these are listed as addressing multiple threats, not just ag conversion. More than 40 are identified as addressing the threat of fire; these will appear in the report you run for ID-MZ IV-Fire. A few are identified as addressing noxious weeds, so you'll get those on that report. The idea, then, is that you'd be evaluating their effectiveness in addressing *those threats* -- fire, or noxious weeds -- not ag conversion, which isn't considered to be a key threat in Idaho.

Again, people entering data sometimes misunderstood the connection between project and threat, or might have taken an...inclusive approach to identifying multiple threats addressed by their projects. In addition, big chunks of the data (e.g., BLM projects) were batch-uploaded, and the possibility exists that a small coding error could have resulted in a threat or threats being incorrectly associated with a bunch of projects. This is an important piece of the review you guys are doing: some quality control on points like this. We are asking that you guys flag suspect records - I'll tell you about that this afternoon.

The table at the beginning of the webinar (which you can also get ahold of here: [that shows the distribution of priority threats among MZs and states](#) was chewed over pretty thoroughly by the species leads. That said, Lief is fielding questions/concerns about that table and suggested changes.

Hope this makes sense!

Talk with you this afternoon - webinar link forthcoming...

Thanks,
Holly

~~~~~  
Holly Freifeld, Ph.D.  
Fish and Wildlife Biologist - Ecological Services  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pacific Region  
911 NE 11th Ave., 4th Floor, Portland, OR 97232  
ph: 503.231.2198  
[holly\\_freifeld@fws.gov](mailto:holly_freifeld@fws.gov)

On Wed, Feb 25, 2015 at 7:52 AM, Hendricks, Kathleen <[kathleen\\_hendricks@fws.gov](mailto:kathleen_hendricks@fws.gov)> wrote:

Hi Holly

I've watched a portion of the webinar and regarding the energy assignment, it says that Ag Conv is only MZ 1&6 and energy development is only MZ 1&2 (not Idaho?)....but according to Alex in WY and Jay in UT some of the energy projects affect ID as well? I need to go on the CED today and confirm.

Kathleen G. Hendricks  
Conservation Partnerships  
1387 South Vinnell Way  
Boise, Idaho 83709  
208-378-5742 work  
208-866-7467 cell

On Tue, Feb 24, 2015 at 4:35 PM, Schubert, Alex <[alex\\_schubert@fws.gov](mailto:alex_schubert@fws.gov)> wrote:  
Hmmm. Maybe then ID will not need to do a spreadsheet report for Energy Development?

On Tue, Feb 24, 2015 at 4:32 PM, Hendricks, Kathleen <[kathleen\\_hendricks@fws.gov](mailto:kathleen_hendricks@fws.gov)> wrote:

I'm watching the webinar now....says that Ag Conv is only MZ 1&6 and energy development is only MZ 1&2 (not Idaho?)

Kathleen G. Hendricks  
Conservation Partnerships  
1387 South Vinnell Way  
Boise, Idaho 83709  
208-378-5742 work  
208-866-7467 cell

On Tue, Feb 24, 2015 at 4:23 PM, Schubert, Alex <[alex\\_schubert@fws.gov](mailto:alex_schubert@fws.gov)> wrote:  
Thanks Jay, I think this will really help.

Alex

On Tue, Feb 24, 2015 at 4:22 PM, Hendricks, Kathleen  
<[kathleen\\_hendricks@fws.gov](mailto:kathleen_hendricks@fws.gov)> wrote:

Thanks Jay

I'm trying to watch the webinar now as I was out of the office so I have no idea of the assignment regarding energy. Stay tuned

Kathleen G. Hendricks  
Conservation Partnerships  
1387 South Vinnell Way  
Boise, Idaho 83709  
208-378-5742 work  
208-866-7467 cell

On Tue, Feb 24, 2015 at 4:15 PM, Martini, Jay <[jay\\_martini@fws.gov](mailto:jay_martini@fws.gov)> wrote:  
Hi Alex and Kathleen,

Attached is my spreadsheet. I'm definitely open to any suggestions.....

--

Jay Martini  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Utah Ecological Services Field Office  
2369 W. Orton Circle  
West Valley City, Utah 84119  
ph: 801-975-3330, ext. 144

--

Alex L. S. Schubert  
Fish and Wildlife Biologist  
Cheyenne Field Office  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
307-772-2374 ext. 238  
><((((('>

--

Alex L. S. Schubert  
Fish and Wildlife Biologist  
Cheyenne Field Office  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

307-772-2374 ext. 238

><(((('>