

From: [Wiechman, Lief](#)
To: [Kathy Hollar](#); [Holly Freifeld](#); [Pat Deibert](#); [Jesse D'Elia](#); [Dawn Davis](#)
Cc: [Michael Thabault](#); [Nicole Alt](#); [Lara Juliusson](#); [Kate Norman](#)
Subject: Re: CED to Sp.Report
Date: Monday, January 12, 2015 8:01:57 PM
Attachments: [20150112_CED_Process.docx](#)

All,

Improvements made. If you haven't reviewed the previous version, look at this one instead. Added objectives near the bottom. We could incorporate them into the document (at the beginning) or just use them to explain.

Apologies for the multiple versions.

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

On Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 3:02 PM, Wiechman, Lief <lief_wiechman@fws.gov> wrote:

All,

Please take a look and let me know what your thoughts are -- Understanding this is coming to you late and half of you are in travel as you get this.

I fully understand this is somewhat wordy, and some steps could be combined, but I want to be explicit so that those who will be tasked with this and who are unfamiliar with the CED to this point in time, will know what's up. I'll begin to create .ppt slides now for incorporation into our presentation tomorrow morning, and will update if/when I get edits/comments. That stuff is preferred sooner than later...

See you tomorrow.

(go Ducks)

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

Collection, Organization, and Analysis of Conservation Efforts

January 13th 2015

1. **QUERY:** Create 'canned queries' to extract records (data and associated information, narratives, and supplemental docs) from Conservation Efforts Database (CED). These queries would be organized by threat and WAFWA Management Zone (MZ) and include all efforts conducted to ameliorate the 13 threats identified in the Conservation Objectives Team (COT) Final Report (2013).
2. **FILTER:** Use filter(s) to narrow scope of records to be reviewed.
 - a. Filter: Rapidly identify whether the action conducted address a threat that is (1) present, and (2) of primary concern for the MZ, as identified by the Near Term Greater-Sage Grouse Conservation Action Plan (NTCAP; 2012) and the COT Report (2013). This may result in the analysis of some efforts being temporarily deferred if the threat is localized to one or two areas (or populations) in a MZ that is otherwise relatively 'free' of the threat in question (i.e. Conifer Encroachment may not be a present or primary threat widespread across MZ I or II)
3. **REPORTS:** USGS will take the criteria/fields identified in **Step 2** to generate reports from the CED. This process will be automated so we can update our numbers at any point in time in the future. The reports generated will provide a summary of metrics (total acres, miles) and number of projects, in addition to a summarized list of each record included in the summary. **Reports will be structured similarly to the reports available in the HaBITS system.**
4. **DEFER:** Projects that do not meet the criteria in **Step 2** will be deferred (with documented reasons/rationale for deferring said projects at this time).
5. **ASSESSMENT:** All projects that are **not deferred** will be passed on to each respective Field Office (FO). FO biologists will be assigned to these records pertaining to the primary threats present in their state (and ultimately rolling up to applicable MZ). FO biologists will then coordinate with the author of each threat chapter from the Species Report to review, and certify that all records **meet effectiveness criteria** - prioritizing those that have large acreages, those in critical areas. The CED has a Map Viewer built-in to do coarse and simplistic queries to illustrate where each respective project (or plan) has or will be implemented to aid FO biologists in prioritization if need be.
 - a. If the filters applied in the preceding steps have not appropriately removed 'noise' from the efforts to be evaluated, FO biologists use their discretion and local knowledge prioritize which efforts need to be evaluated. This step will ensure the data we are quantifying have been quality controlled and that actions purported to be effective have provided conservation benefit to the species.
 - b. Develop general certification considerations to determine which efforts 'qualify' for effectiveness will be used here. Creation of this worksheet will ensure consistent sideboards for analysis across all threats, FOs
6. **DOCUMENT RATIONALE:** FO Biologists will provide reasons/rationale for certifying or deferring projects at this time. Documentation will be entered in CED (either directly or through excel spreadsheets or geodatabase) identifying decision to consider and advance or consider and defer. The CED (or through spreadsheet or geodatabase) will have fields for FO biologists to indicate whether we agree (certify) with the self-reported effectiveness assessment, or if we do not (defer), from a drop-down menu to explain why: (no info on effectiveness provided, incomplete info on effectiveness provided, threat not present in that population, etc.), and text box to provide additional info if needed.
7. **UPLOAD and REFINER QUERIES:** USGS will batch upload all certification/deferment information to associated records in CED. A second set of 'refined canned queries' will then be executed to extract only those efforts that are addressing present and primary threats, and that have been certified as effective by our FO biologists.

Comment [LW 1]:
Use example from 'HaBITS' that Kathy showed

Comment [LW 2]:
This is the application of the "certification criteria" and where we should focus our energies for the upcoming workshop. Staff exercise to break out into small groups by effort to brainstorm what effective efforts look like, then regroup into small groups by threat to crosswalk between the two.

Comment [LW 3]:
Possibly actions that are addressing an secondary/ancillary threat

Draft and Pre-Decisional – Not for Distribution

Greater Sage-Grouse 2015 Status Review – Collection, Organization, and Analysis of Conservation Efforts

Page 1

8. **QUANTITATIVE MEASURES:** This information will also be supplied to GIS Team so they may proceed with the creation of maps, and assist with the quantification of acres/miles of threat addressed (conservation efforts) and outstanding (total threat less the conservation efforts). The GIS Team would then be able to use any new information provided after the analysis has begun to update these maps, and associated analysis as partners continue to provide information related to conservation efforts. Concurrently the information would be shared with the Modeling Team, and subsequently, after metrics have been quantified, with the Writing Team.
9. **ANALYSIS SUPPORT:** Quantitative measures generated from refined queries will be used, in conjunction with other information (e.g., data-call info) to develop narrative write ups for each threat chapter and for the Factor D analysis.
10. **PLAN EVALUATION:** FO biologists will then query and evaluate local, state, and federal planning efforts. If necessary (for critical actions that have not yet been implemented or deemed effective), PECE will be surgically applied - and these actions will be included in this analysis.
11. **SPECIES REPORT:** Assignments are made to write sections of the factor D analysis. This section will be organized by WAFWA MZ and will include summaries of both conservation efforts (**Steps 1-9**, above) and regulatory (**Step 10**) that have been implemented and deemed effective. Work will start on this section immediately, with quantitative metrics to be added when they are available.

Objectives:

1. Efficiently review CED data to ensure FWS biologists are spending time on the efforts of greatest conservation benefit in a given geography.
2. Reduce discounting or devaluing individual conservation efforts that can cumulatively be of significance (i.e. - death by 1,000 cuts and recovery by 1,000 bandaids).
3. Streamline ability to incorporate new information for the September 2015 status report, and subsequent years if needed.
4. Allow for most concise, defensible, and repeatable process for incorporating information related to conservation into species report.