

From: [DElia, Jesse](#)
To: [Pat Deibert](#)
Subject: Re: GRSG 2015: Acreage discrepancies (INPUT BY COB 2/23/2015)
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2015 3:31:07 PM

Hi Pat,

Following up from our conversation today, would be good for all of us to get on the same page to provide some guidance back to the GIS team on what corporate dataset to use in habitat calculations - for direct and indirect impact analyses and other calculations. My thoughts below on their writeup.

If our corporate dataset for "habitat" acres is based on Schroeder's 2004 map (1:2,000,000 scale) I see why there are big discrepancies in numbers between our dataset and the State numbers. Schroeder et al. were really looking at changes in the species' range - they acknowledge in the paper that each State has their own scale for mapping and that they reduced the resolution of some of the State data as a compromise to get a consistent looking map across the range (which is a reasonable thing to do when developing a range map). Where States have finer resolution data their acres of habitat are likely to be smaller (some subset of the range map).

My understanding is that we will be getting data from the modeling efforts that will give us a more refined view (higher resolution) of sage-grouse distribution through a Habitat Similarity Index (see <http://www.sagegrouseinitiative.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Knick-Modeling-Ecological-Requirements-2.pdf> ; page 8). Knick is producing a companion map now that will cover the Rocky Mountain side -thus giving us a consistent model output across the entire range. This could be clipped to the modified Schroeder map to give an estimate of potential habitat within the occupied range - consistent spatial scale and repeatable and transparent methods - rangewide. This is similar to the approach used in bi-state where they estimated suitable habitat acreage using a resource selection function model.

Let me know if you think it would be helpful to have a conversation with a bigger group - Lief, Dawn, Kevin, Steve...thanks.
Jesse

On Tue, Feb 24, 2015 at 2:46 PM, Juliusson, Lara <lara_juliusson@fws.gov> wrote:
Hi Kate,

With Drue's permission, I passed the document for review along to the rest of the GIS Team.

The document with comments from Ed and myself are uploaded to SharePoint here:
https://portal.doi.net/usfws/SG/docs/20150220_ConsistencyInAcreage_LJ_Ed.docx

Jim did not provide a track change document and Rich Young was out of town.

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>

On Fri, Feb 20, 2015 at 12:41 PM, Norman, Kate <kate_norman@fws.gov> wrote:

Per our conversation this morning, I have posted a document (problem statement) for review.

Drue provided initial feedback this morning; I would appreciate your further input as you have time **today or Monday**. Please open in Internet Explorer and edit using track changes.

Thank you!
K

Library View

<https://portal.doi.net/usfws/SG/docs/Forms/GIS.aspx>

Document

20150220_ConsistencyInAcreage

--

Kate Norman, Sage-Grouse Project Manager
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6
134 Union Blvd, Lakewood CO 80228
PO Box 25486, DFC, Mailstop 60120, Denver CO 80225
Office: 303-236-4214
Mobile: 703-927-2445
kate_norman@fws.gov

--

Jesse D'Elia, Ph.D.

Candidate Species Conservation Coordinator
Endangered Species Division, Pacific Regional Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
911 NE 11th Avenue, 4th Floor, Portland, OR 97232

503.231.2349 phone; 503.231.6243 fax
jesse_delia@fws.gov