

**From:** [Ted Koch](#)  
**To:** [Ronald Baxter](#); [Ed Turner](#)  
**Cc:** [Lara Juliusson](#); [Rich Young](#); [James Lindstrom](#)  
**Subject:** RE: GRS Mining Draft Threat GIS excel  
**Date:** Friday, January 16, 2015 9:27:51 AM

---

Ron et al.-

Agreed.

Ted

Ted Koch  
Nevada State Supervisor  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
1340 Financial Boulevard  
Reno, Nevada 89502  
775-861-6300

**From:** Baxter, Ronald [mailto:[ronald\\_baxter@fws.gov](mailto:ronald_baxter@fws.gov)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 15, 2015 3:23 PM  
**To:** Turner, Ed  
**Cc:** Ted Koch; Lara Juliusson; Rich Young; James Lindstrom  
**Subject:** Re: GRS Mining Draft Threat GIS excel

Yes I would agree that the maps should depict the footprint/buffer for those activities within populations, PACs, PHMA/PGMA, with the ability to pull out the numbers for each State (if that is possible without a ton of work - the goal being to include in the text a table of impacts by state for the different habitat designations [pops, pacs, PH/GH]). For instance a map could be made showing the footprint & buffers for coal in PHMA/PGMA with the ability to present the associated tabular data by state or MZ. Does this make sense? Since mining and the other activities analyzed here, for our purposes, are to help determine their effects (and as we discussed - provide a baseline for future comparisons) on sage grouse, I don't think we should include extraneous data on the maps (or tables).

Can others weigh in on this idea? - please...

Ron-

On Thu, Jan 15, 2015 at 2:59 PM, Turner, Ed <[ed\\_turner@fws.gov](mailto:ed_turner@fws.gov)> wrote:  
Hey Ron, Thanks for the info. I should be back in the office Tuesday.

Some issue on what I sent and I do think we need to talk next week.

Here are two more maps. But I have some questions and concerns about these and the generated numbers sent to you. As I look at these maps, they really represent the mining activity footprint and buffered area of the mining activity within the management zone as a whole.

Question, shouldn't we only consider a mining activity or its associated buffer area as a threat to the species if it falls on a Population Area, PAC, or on PHMA/GHMA area only? If so, I should only map the areas that meet those limiting factors, thus giving you maps that represent lesser areas of mining activity on the landscape.

Likewise, the tables should be altered to represent activity totals within the management zones or by state, but not label those values "indirect or direct impacts" as I have listed. I would think it would be best to change those labels as "mining footprint" or "mining buffer" for the overall management areas or amounts by state.

I could be making too much out of this, but just seems like we are showing or counting much more threat than actually exist if referring to the maps in present state on the management zones. (see maps that I changed a bit so you can see what I'm talking about).

The true threat values as I see it are represented in the populations, PACs, and PHMA/GHMA tables. The Management Zone / State tables just give you total mining activity/buffer.

Something to talk about and I can change the maps for your viewing and re-label the numerical tables if you agree.

Thanks, Ed

On Thu, Jan 15, 2015 at 2:48 PM, Baxter, Ronald <[ronald\\_baxter@fws.gov](mailto:ronald_baxter@fws.gov)> wrote:

This is great stuff Ed... I have only had a chance to glance through all this, but I think it looks great... I may have some quick questions next week (we get early dismissal tomorrow and Monday is a holiday...)

Gracias Amigo,

# R

On Thu, Jan 15, 2015 at 12:55 PM, Turner, Ed <[ed\\_turner@fws.gov](mailto:ed_turner@fws.gov)> wrote:  
Hello Ron, Looks liek the mining excel was too large.

Here it goes again

Sorry, Ed

--

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](mailto:Ed_Turner@fws.gov)  
760.431.9440 x266

--

Ronald J. Baxter  
Endangered Species Biologist  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
1340 Financial Blvd., Suite 234  
Reno, NV 89502  
(775) 861-6377 (office)  
(951) 237-8404 (cell)

--

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](mailto:Ed_Turner@fws.gov)  
760.431.9440 x266

--

Ronald J. Baxter  
Endangered Species Biologist  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
1340 Financial Blvd., Suite 234

Reno, NV 89502  
(775) 861-6377 (office)  
(951) 237-8404 (cell)