

**From:** [Deibert, Pat](#)  
**To:** [Wiechman, Lief](#)  
**Cc:** [DElia, Jesse](#); [Dawn Davis](#)  
**Subject:** Re: proposed draft e-mail to the GIS/writing team  
**Date:** Friday, February 27, 2015 10:03:12 AM

---

what Lief said.

On Thu, Feb 26, 2015 at 4:11 PM, Wiechman, Lief <[lief\\_wiechman@fws.gov](mailto:lief_wiechman@fws.gov)> wrote:

If I follow your question, Jesse... I think we discussed having those direct (and eventually indirect) analysis happen on all 3 layers. However, it was brought up (by Steve?) that the use of the occupied range may prove to be less useful depending on what the modeled distribution looks like.

So, in summary (and I think this would be good to review and clarify in Kate's notes that she asked us to look at)... I think we talked about getting direct footprint over (1) occupied range, (2) modeled distribution, and (3) modeled abundance, and then to the same (when/where appropriate) with indirect over the same 3 layers.

But now we're getting off the topic of the email - so I looped Dawn in.

LW

***Lief Wiechman***

Sage-grouse Ecologist  
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service  
Mountain-Prairie Region  
Cell: 307.214.8426  
Office: 307.772.2374 x236  
[lief\\_wiechman@fws.gov](mailto:lief_wiechman@fws.gov)

On Thu, Feb 26, 2015 at 4:06 PM, Wiechman, Lief <[lief\\_wiechman@fws.gov](mailto:lief_wiechman@fws.gov)> wrote:  
(if Jesse wasn't so quick - attached my same reply so we have 1 thread)

Looks fine to me...

2nd bullet under GIS TEAM - consider adding text to clarify 'status review range (updated from Schroeder et al. 2004)' or something. Given the confusion in ID and elsewhere.

As a next step forward, do we need to know what the GIS team has produced (in bullet list form), so if any changes in guidance come up in the near future, we know what the ramifications will be (I'm thinking of any changes that will occur to the 'status review occupied range' map after ID is sorted out? Not sure if we do, just wanted to get your thoughts.

LW

***Lief Wiechman***

Sage-grouse Ecologist  
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service  
Mountain-Prairie Region  
Cell: 307.214.8426

On Thu, Feb 26, 2015 at 4:04 PM, DELia, Jesse <[jesse\\_delia@fws.gov](mailto:jesse_delia@fws.gov)> wrote:  
Thanks Pat,

I think this is a good e-mail, but I have a question regarding what layer they are using to do the footprint analysis now; vs. the layer they will use to do the indirect effects analysis. Shouldn't these be the same - i.e., based on the species distribution model? I'm not sure how meaningful it will be to get acreage of direct impact using the range map - which is at a 1:2,000,000 scale.

Are we simply asking them to continue to compile direct footprint layers that we will overlay with abundance and distribution models later to get both the direct and indirect acres?

Jesse

On Thu, Feb 26, 2015 at 2:58 PM, Deibert, Pat <[pat\\_deibert@fws.gov](mailto:pat_deibert@fws.gov)> wrote:

Jesse and Lief - at last the long-promised e-mail. Let me know what you think - feel free to edit/change/etc. I'd like to get this out tomorrow to the different teams if possible.

thanks!

p

As a follow-up to the call on Tuesday of this week, the species lead team has proposed that we become the liaison between the three key teams working on the species report - the GIS team, the writing team and the modeling team. We hope this will facilitate communication and allow for more expedient resolution of any issues that might arise, simply because we are involved in reviewing the products of all three teams. This "change", and our outline for next steps, has been agreed to by leadership.

GIS Team:

- Please continue to work on the footprints for the various chapters where we will be doing GIS overlays (e.g. current oil/gas, current ag conversion, infrastructure, mining).
- Continue to use current range for mapping and for initial analysis (acres impacted) WITH ONE EXCEPTION. We have found a discrepancy with the range in MZ IV. It may be nothing, but we need to do our due diligence and make sure that adjustments are not needed. We hope to have that resolved by mid-next-week and will advise you of the results. So footprint mapping can continue in this MZ, but you might want to hold off on doing any calculations as they may change.
- As we get the abundance and distribution models completed, we will also ask for your assistance in intersecting with those layers. At that time will be doing additional analyses that will include the indirect effects calculations. The SLT is working on how that will proceed, so this is a heads up only.

Writing team:

- Continue to work on the chapters and with the GIS team to achieve the footprint analyses.
- If you need GIS analyses beyond calculating the footprint of a threat please copy the SLT on that correspondence. This is simply to ensure we are being consistent across all three teams and don't run into a technical kerfluffle later.
- After we get the abundance and distribution models the GIS team will help overlay those layers with the footprints. Then we will do calculations of indirect effects in the areas of high abundance. The SLT is working out the details of how that will be accomplished.

That's all for now. If you have questions please give one of us a call.

Thanks!

Pat Deibert, PhD  
Certified Wildlife Biologist®  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
5353 Yellowstone Road, Suite 308A  
Cheyenne, WY 82009  
307-772-2374, ext. 226

got leks?

--

**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](mailto:jesse_delia@fws.gov)

--

Pat Deibert, PhD  
Certified Wildlife Biologist®  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
5353 Yellowstone Road, Suite 308A  
Cheyenne, WY 82009  
307-772-2374, ext. 226

got leks?