

From: [Turner, Ed](#)
To: [Lara Juliusson](#)
Subject: Fwd: GRSG Mining tables and graphics
Date: Tuesday, January 20, 2015 3:03:27 PM
Attachments: [FINAL MINING TABLE.xlsx](#)
[FINAL COAL TABLE.xlsx](#)

Hello Lara, Hope all is well, was nice meeting and getting to work with you last week.

I have a question, I was going to complete that data I was building for the Mining effort and wanted to address Ron's question about the source. I was sourcing the base mining/coal data as BLM. Do you think this is the correct way to do this? The data I used was all compiled from BLM and we received it via sciencebase link or from the emails you received from BLM. I'm assuming because it was compiled by BLM and BLM is treating it as their data, we should source as such?? I know these data have other underlying sources, but BLM compiled many together as one data.

I will provide Ron a data list of what was compiled by me using the BLM data, plus the data that Jim created sourced as USFWS GRSG 2015 Status Review Data.

Another question, Looks like we are just going to get numbers for the management zones, but still build data complete with populations, pacs' ph/ghMA's like Mink had requested. Referring to your correspondence with Jim this morning, sounds like we need to add in his IPA data to that can too??? Maybe something to talk about Wed on call?

If so, I will add it into the mining and rerun the overall numbers.

Thanks for help with source and all, Ed

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

From: **Baxter, Ronald** <ronald_baxter@fws.gov>
Date: Tue, Jan 20, 2015 at 12:51 PM
Subject: GRSG Mining tables and graphics
To: Ed Turner <ed_turner@fws.gov>
Cc: Amy Nicholas <amy_nicholas@fws.gov>, Ted Koch <ted_koch@fws.gov>

Hi Ed: It was nice to finally meet you last week - too bad I had to run off...

So I have put together two tables, 1 for mining and 1 for coal, based on the data you supplied last week (attached). Looks good, and apparently now the lower level of analysis is the MZ (although Management wants to the other data around in case we need it later). A few things remain:

1) Does the mining data include the Bi-State sage-grouse? (Not an issue for coal). If so, those data should be eliminated. Looking at the map, it appears it was left in, yes? So if you would please, drop out the data for bi-state and revise data table and the map accordingly. Otherwise let me know if the BSSG data was not included in

the current data table.

2) For the maps, could you please label the MZs? Although referenced plenty of time throughout the document, the graphic should include their names to prevent the reader from going back and forth.

3) Please check the footnote on the tables to be sure they are still correct (?)

4) I will need to add a reference either in the text or as a footnote as to the source of the data. Could you please let me know what it(they) is(are)?

A further question is, do we have "time series" data for mining and coal? In other words, is there data available to show the past [say] decade of mining and coal activity by year to provide a basis for projections into the future? Just have to ask...

Thanks,
Ron

--

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
760.431.9440 x266

PRESENT DAY MINING
(all types excluding geothermal, coal, and oil gas)

WAFWA Management Zone	Total Acres	Acres Directly Impacted	Percent	Acres Indirectly Impacted	Percent	Total Acres Impacted	Percent
I	86,787,887.58	803,156.42	0.93	4,704,632.12	5.42	5,507,789.46	6.35
II	60,278,907.42	1,955,305.31	3.24	6,611,623.32	10.97	8,566,931.88	14.21
III	78,519,700.41	6,132,463.77	7.81	19,757,272.24	25.16	25,889,743.81	32.97
IV	79,977,332.42	2,268,159.66	2.84	11,806,781.70	14.76	14,074,944.20	17.60
V	40,175,660.91	313,978.59	0.78	3,059,210.25	7.61	3,373,189.63	8.40
VI	15,992,753.01	965.77	0.01	148,338.48	0.93	149,304.25	0.93
VII	38,693,517.71	1,486,476.90	3.84	5,835,528.73	15.08	7,322,009.47	18.92
Totals:	400,425,759.46	12,960,506.42	3.24	51,923,386.84	12.97	64,883,912.71	16.20

¹ Indirect influence is determined by applying a 2.5 kilometer buffer to the features

PRESENT DAY COAL MINING

WAFWA Management Zone	Total Acres	Acres Directly Impacted	Percent	Acres Indirectly Impacted	Percent	Total Acres Impacted	Percent
I	86,787,887.58	246,584.88	0.28	4,322,914.72	4.98	4,569,499.88	5.27
II	60,278,907.42	71,799.30	0.12	4,531,829.75	7.52	4,603,629.17	7.64
III	78,519,700.41	3,108.25	0.003	2,527,791.82	3.22	2,530,900.06	3.22
IV	79,977,332.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
V	40,175,660.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VI	15,992,753.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
VII	38,693,517.71	2,592.58	0.01	1,384,748.18	3.58	1,387,340.77	3.59
Totals:	400,425,759.46	324,085.01	0.08	12,767,284.47	3.19	13,091,369.88	3.27

¹. Indirect influence is determined by applying a buffer (19km) to the features (based on distances derived from *Johnson et al. 2011*, and *Taylor et al. 2012* as referenced in *USGS 2013a p. 74*)