

From: [Juliussan, Lara](#)
To: [Pat Deibert](#); [Lief Wiechman](#); [Kate Norman](#)
Subject: Fwd: Review of Delivered ADPP and "No Action" data 2/24/15, Fwd: GRSG: ADPP Data Standardization
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 9:02:48 AM
Attachments: [CEA CED PlanningDecisionLayer_DeliveryStructure.docx](#)
[FWSGRSGDataCall_20150220_DeliveryMemo.pdf](#)

Also for everyone's info. The review I sent Drue on Tuesday.

Lara

Lara Juliussan, Geographer/Ecologist
Sage-grouse Energy Team
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
Region 6, Lakewood, CO
Lara_Juliussan@fws.gov
303-236-9876
<http://www.fws.gov/mountain-prairie/>

Join me on LinkedIn

<http://www.linkedin.com/pub/lara-juliussan/5/918/7a4>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Juliussan, Lara <lara_juliussan@fws.gov>
Date: Tue, Feb 24, 2015 at 12:03 PM
Subject: Review of Delivered ADPP and "No Action" data 2/24/15, Fwd: GRSG: ADPP Data Standardization
To: Drue DeBerry <drue_deberry@fws.gov>

Hi Drue,

I have reviewed the ADPP and "No Action" data that the BLM provided on 2/20/15 via hard drive.

ADPP Data

Quick summary: The NOC did not compile the ADPP data provided by each of 15 EISs into rangewide datasets useful for regional or rangewide analysis, as agreed to and described in the email and attachment below. Instead, as noted in their memo provided with the data (also attached) "*The ADPP data delivered are the raw data as submitted by the BLM EIS; they were not altered by the BLM NOC.*" This means that instead of approximately 36 compiled ADPP decision layers, there are approximately 500 layers that FWS will need to geographically combine into the 36 layers, if cross-EIS analyses are required.

Issues: In addition to requiring that FWS staff perform the time-consuming GIS merge operations necessary to allow EIS analysis across boundaries, this will mean that FWS personnel will need to either,

1. Correct edge matching issues (overlaps, gaps) at EIS boundaries as needed, thereby interpreting and modifying BLM's data, OR

2. Accept that there will be possible geometric errors that may result in acreage double-counting (where there are overlaps at boundaries), and/or result in undercounting (where there are gaps at boundaries), OR
3. Only perform statistical analysis on a per EIS basis, that is, not make spatial analysis across boundaries for other geographies.

My rough estimate of the amount of time it will take a FWS GIS staff person to merge layers into one rangewide layer per decision (36 files) is 20-40 hours. My rough estimate of the amount of time it would take to interpret and correct edge-matching issues is another 1 to 2 weeks.

"No Action" Data

Quick summary: The NOC did not compile the "no-action" alternative data provided by each of 15 EISs into rangewide datasets useful for regional or rangewide analysis. This means that instead of approximately 26 compiled "No Action" layers, there are approximately 300 layers that FWS will need to geographically combine into the 66 layers, if cross-EIS analyses are required.

Issues: In addition to requiring that FWS staff perform the time-consuming GIS merge operations necessary to allow EIS analysis across boundaries, this will mean that FWS personnel will need to either,

1. Correct edge matching issues (overlaps, gaps) at EIS boundaries as needed, thereby interpreting and modifying BLM's data, OR
2. Accept that there will be possible geometric errors that may result in acreage double-counting (where there are overlaps at boundaries), and/or result in undercounting (where there are gaps at boundaries), OR
3. Only perform statistical analysis on a per EIS basis, that is, not make spatial analysis across boundaries for other geographies.

My rough estimate of the amount of time it will take a FWS GIS staff person to merge layers into one rangewide layer per decision (26 files) is 10-30 hours. My rough estimate of the amount of time it would take to interpret and correct edge-matching issues is another 0.5 weeks to 1.5 weeks.

Processing Time Rough Estimate Summary:

Merge only:

ADPP + "No Action" = 30 to 70 hours

Correct Edge-Matching errors:

ADPP + "No Action" = 1.5 to 3.5 weeks

Upload and Metadata within ScienceBase Summary:

Quick summary: Although the GIS layers (approximately 800) provided include metadata from the BLM EISs, this metadata will not automatically import into ScienceBase. We have two options when uploading the ScienceBase. We can,

1. Upload and save these files in general folders without ScienceBase metadata and refer users

- to the guide document provided by the BLM and the individual file metadata,
2. Upload and copy and paste key elements of the GIS metadata to Sciencebase
3. Export metadata formats that will import into ScienceBase for each file

My rough estimate of the amount of time it will take to upload and save to general folders is 8-16 hours. To upload and copy and paste key elements of the metadata is 1 to 2 weeks. To export a metadata format that will import into ScienceBase is 1.5 to 3 weeks.

Let me know if you have questions,

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>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Quamen, Frank** <fquamen@blm.gov>

Date: Fri, Nov 21, 2014 at 2:02 PM

Subject: Fwd: GRSB: ADPP Data Standardization

To: Lief Wiechman <Lief_wiechman@fws.gov>

Cc: Vicki Herren <vherren@blm.gov>, Robin Sell <rsell@blm.gov>, Alisa Froistad <afroistad@blm.gov>, Lara Juliusson <lara_juliusson@fws.gov>, Kathy Hollar <kathy_hollar@fws.gov>

Hi Lief,

Responding to your e-mail to Vicki...

We are anticipating that, much like how we delivered the threat data, we will have:

- 2 folders (one for CED, one for CEA)
- The CEA will be one geodatabase
- Each planning decision layer will include all of the EISs (e.g. one rangewide layer for "closed to Oil and Gas development")

(See Alisa's email below for additional clarification)

Does this work for you?

Thanks,

Frank

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Froistad, Alisa** <afroistad@blm.gov>
Date: Thu, Nov 20, 2014 at 5:26 PM
Subject: Fwd: GRSG: ADPP Data Standardization
To: Frank Quamen <fquamen@blm.gov>

Frank,

Attached is a Word document with an image of how I envision the CEA/CED Planning Decision Layer delivery structure to look. A couple things to note:

- Like the Threats/Disturbance data, Robin has an interest in delivering the CEA and CED data in separate "folders" (file geodatabase, .gdb).
- Each planning decision layer will include the spatial data for all EIS' that delivered spatial data for that planning decision.
- Per a previous e-mail from Kathy Hollar, "[All information on Administrative Draft Proposed Plan decision layers will be labeled "Deliverative, Pre-Decisional" throughout all uses."](#)

Hope that helps. Let me know any of this is unclear.

Alisa

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Wiechman, Lief** <lief_wiechman@fws.gov>
Date: Thu, Nov 20, 2014 at 2:50 PM
Subject: GRSG: ADPP Data Standardization
To: Vicki Herren <vherren@blm.gov>, Robin Sell <rsell@blm.gov>, Alisa Froistad <afroistad@blm.gov>
Cc: Lara Juliusson <lara_juliusson@fws.gov>, Kathy Hollar <kathy_hollar@fws.gov>

Hi Vicki,

The Service would like to check our assumptions regarding the format of the spatial ADPP pre-decisional data to be delivered by the BLM by December 31st, 2014. Per our conversations, we've referred to 21 layers x 15 EIS (including corrected Lander data), however, we're wondering if it won't actually be standardized so we have "apple to apples" across EIS boundaries, so-to-speak.

Our understanding is that these data will be delivered as 21 ArcGIS file geodatabases, and each file geodatabase will depict spatially the relevant management decision across all EISs. If any of the 21 management decisions requires delivery by area subsets (MZ, EIS, etc.) resulting in more than one file geodatabase per decision, these files will be standardized (common field names and attribute values), so that they may be easily merged for use by the Service.

Our assumption is that the NOC already has this or would do this prior to delivery. Give me a

call if you'd like to discuss or clarify.

Thanks,

LW

Lief Wiechman







































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

--

Alisa Froistad
Data Administrator
Parallel Incorporated Contractor
Bureau of Land Management
National Operations Center
E-mail: afroistad@blm.gov
Phone: (303) 236-2268

--

Frank Quamen, Wildlife Biologist
BLM National Operations Center
Denver Federal Center Building 40
303-236-6310

- [-]  CEA_PlanningDecisionLayers.gdb
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Geothermal_OpenStandardStips_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_GRSB_General_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_GRSB_Priority_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Lands_Disposal_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Livestock_Available_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Locatable_Open_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_NonenergyLeasable_Open_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_OandG_OpenStandardStips_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_ROW_Open_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Salable_Open_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Solar_OpenZone_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Travel_Open_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Utility_ExistingCorridor_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Utility_ProposedCorridor_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Wind_Open_Proposed
- [-]  CED_PlanningDecisionLayers.gdb
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Coal_Unsuitable_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Geothermal_Closed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Geothermal_OpenMajorStips_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Geothermal_OpenModerateStips_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Lands_Retention_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Livestock_Unavailable_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Locatable_ExistingWithdrawals_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Locatable_RecommendedWithdrawals_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_NonenergyLeasable_Closed_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_OandG_Closed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_OandG_OpenMajorStips_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_OandG_OpenModerateStips_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_ROW_Avoidance_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_ROW_Exclusion_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Salable_Closed_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Solar_AvoidanceVariance_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Solar_Exclusion_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Travel_Closed_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Travel_Limited_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Wind_Avoidance_Proposed
 -  Deliverative_Predcisional_Wind_Exclusion_Proposed

FWS GRSG Data Call – ADPP and No Action through Preferred Data Delivery 20150220

The contents of this delivery are in response to the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) data request for geospatial data for use in helping to make a listing decision for the Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG).

Sixteen EISs were referred to for this data compilation – Bighorn Basin, Billings/Pompey's Pillar National Monument, Buffalo, HiLine, Idaho and Southwestern Montana, Lander, Lewistown, Miles City, 9-Plan, North Dakota, Nevada and Northeastern California, Northwest Colorado, Oregon, South Dakota, Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument, and Utah. Do note, not all EISs contain data for each decision layer. The Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument and Lander EIS data are Record of Decision data.

The Administrative Draft Proposed Data (ADPP) are located, by EIS, in the “GRSG_ADPP_Data_ForFWS_20150220” folder. The ADPP data delivered are the raw data as submitted by the BLM EIS; they were not altered by the BLM NOC. In each EIS folder there are two geodatabases, one for the CEA related data and one for the CED related data. The CEA related data includes the General and Priority habitat data, as well as data for actions not beneficial to the GRSG (i.e. areas open to activity). The CED related data includes the data for actions beneficial to the GRSG (i.e. areas closed to activity). Do note, not all EISs contain data for each decision category. The Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument and Lander EIS data is are Record of Decision data.

The No Action through Preferred data requested by the FWS are located, by EIS, in the “GRSG_NoAction_Preferred_Data_ForFWS_20150220” folder. The No Action through Preferred data were included here as they are not officially part of the data call. These data have been pre-processed by the BLM NOC Wildlife Habitat Spatial Analysis Lab for Cumulative Effects Analysis. Each feature class contains one record representing the geometry for each submitted alternative. Do note, not all EISs contain data for each decision category or alternative. The Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument does not have alternatives so it is not included in the No Action through Preferred data.

A basic QA/QC was conducted to ensure the data submitted by the BLM EIS met the following BLM NOC data submission requirements:

- 1) Data were clipped to the EIS boundary.
- 2) Data were clipped to areas where the BLM has management authority.
- 3) Data were not clipped to GRSG habitat.
- 4) Data within a program area for the same alternative did not overlap (e.g., the four Oil and Gas decision categories do not overlap).

Any analysis performed on the raw ADPP data may reveal null or invalid geometry. The BLM assumes no responsibility for errors or omissions of external data. No warranty is made by the BLM as to the accuracy, reliability, or scientific justification for the buffer sizes used. FWS should verify the validity of these buffer sizes independently and must take ownership of those buffer sizes if used for their analyses.

The data delivered is in feature class (.gdb) formats. To expedite the process of ensuring the metadata meets BLM FGDC metadata standards, any existing metadata was overwritten with standardized language specific to this data request. Contact the BLM NOC for original metadata information (if provided by the EIS).

A PDF with information regarding all the data expected to be delivered in this delivery is located at the root of the delivery folder. Data included in this delivery are listed with their location in the delivery structure and their corresponding file names. Data previously delivered, and not included in this delivery, are listed in gray font at the end of the PDF.