

From: [Matt Kales](#)
To: [Noreen Walsh](#)
Subject: Fwd: GRSG: 2 questions from RD re: our stronghold mapping exercise
Date: Wednesday, January 07, 2015 5:25:11 PM

Please see below. Happy to talk more or dig further. Thanks.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Juliussan, Lara" <lara_juliussan@fws.gov>
Date: January 7, 2015 at 5:17:23 PM MST
To: Matt Kales <matt_kales@fws.gov>
Cc: Pat Deibert <pat_deibert@fws.gov>, Michael Thabault
<michael_thabault@fws.gov>, Nicole Alt <nicole_alt@fws.gov>
Subject: Re: GRSG: 2 questions from RD re: our stronghold mapping exercise

Hi Matt, see answers below. Sorry in advance for some GIS-speak.

Short answer: We did not analyze subsurface mineral rights during our mapping exercise.

1. We did include some private land in the strongholds polygons as a result of the coarse nature of the analysis, and the introduction of overlay analysis errors such as slivers when combining data sets. Most of the private lands were in-holdings (about 540,000 acres) and a small amount were not (27,000 acres all in NV). However, we did not analyze subsurface mineral rights for this private land when we created our polygons. Recall that during the week we were working on the strongholds areas, we received subsurface data from the BLM, but due to time constraints, we did not consider it in our analysis.

For the private lands included in the stronghold areas, I just did a quick retrospective analysis with what we have from BLM for subsurface mineral rights, and here is what I found. Please note that on 10/24/14 Frank Quamen from the BLM stated that BLM NV and OR do not have a subsurface mineral ownership layer.

ID: 45,000 acres (appx.) private in-holding with BLM subsurface mineral rights

OR: No subsurface data available, and Frank in his email said that this may be because BLM may not have much of any subsurface management outside of what is BLM, or other federal surface, in these states.

MT: 37,000 acres (appx.) private in-holding with BLM subsurface mineral rights

NV: No subsurface data available, and Frank in his email said that this may be because BLM may not have much of any subsurface management outside of what is BLM, or other federal surface, in these states.

UT: 5,000 acres (appx.) private in-holding with BLM subsurface mineral rights

WY: 46,000 acres (appx.) private in-holding with BLM subsurface mineral rights

2. We did not do any analysis using subsurface data, therefore, we did not exclude any lands based on the private surface ownership/federal subsurface combination.

Hope this helps. Let me know if you have other 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>

On Wed, Jan 7, 2015 at 3:33 PM, Matt Kales <matt_kales@fws.gov> wrote:

Lara,

Noreen has 2 additional questions about the “stronghold” mapping exercise we undertook late last year. Both questions involve subsurface mineral rights:

1. Did we include in our polygons private surface lands with federal subsurface rights (or did we exclude all private lands, with the exception of inholdings, based on surface ownership)?
2. Relatedly, did we exclude any lands from our polygons that were biologically significant but are in private surface ownership but have federal subsurface rights?

Noreen will be at WAFWA and related meetings tomorrow through Sunday so we'd be grateful for your feedback on the above soon, since this issue is likely to be a topic of discussion. Thanks in advance.

Matt

Matt Kales

Special Assistant for Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation

Office of the Regional Director

US Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region

Office: (303) 236-4576

Mobile: (720) 234-0257