

From: [Wiechman, Lief](#)
To: [Michael Thabault](#)
Subject: Fwd: UT and CED
Date: Wednesday, January 21, 2015 1:17:19 PM

Hi Mike,

Not sure if this is being or has been mentioned at SGTF, but I was wondering how you'd like to proceed with a response to UT.

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

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

From: **Wiechman, Lief** <lief_wiechman@fws.gov>
Date: Fri, Jan 16, 2015 at 3:24 PM
Subject: Re: UT and CED
To: Nicole Alt <nicole_alt@fws.gov>, Michael Thabault <michael_thabault@fws.gov>, Pat Deibert <pat_deibert@fws.gov>
Cc: Matt Kales <matt_kales@fws.gov>

See drafted email. Let me know if you want me to send (or forward you the email thread from which y'all can)... I don't mind. Feel free to edit.

Without mentioning our scale of analysis, I'm not sure how or what the TP for leadership should be re: next week's meeting aside from [location is one of the considerations used in analyzing the data and evaluating the conservation benefit to the species range wide as this is a range wide review and that's why the CED is so valuable given it's geospatial component.](#)

Maybe we can discuss today or Tuesday morning. Sorry for the delay, assisting with stronghold issues.

Hi John,

We appreciate your concerns and perspective on this. In terms of how the data are analyzed, we will take into consideration numerous aspects including where conservation efforts and plans have been, are, or will be implemented and multiple scales at which they may provide conservation benefit to the species. We have, and will continue to communicate updates (such as these population boundary updates) with species experts(internally and externally)

and state biologists. I think this is important to keep in mind and is a primary reason for asking for data with the associated spatial component and a benefit of the CED.

Unfortunately, updating the population boundaries in the CED isn't an option for us at this stage given the large amount of information that has been provided in the CED and the potential technical updating and potential corruption to existing records provided by all conservation partners, in addition to the amount of data we have to review and the time in which we have to do it.

Take care and our thanks to you, Alan, Nathan, and everyone else that helped provide all of the efforts for Utah. Utah was second only to Wyoming in the number of records provided by the state. And now onto the analysis...

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 Thu, Jan 15, 2015 at 9:08 AM, John Harja <johnharja@utah.gov> wrote:
Thanks Lief for the info.

I was aware of the opinion that state boundaries are some type of issue.

We disagree with this view with respect to a few of the Utah populations. The ones in Utah in the Box Elder, Uintah and Rich areas are clearly separated from the populations in the neighboring states by topography and different habitat areas. Hamlin Valley and Ibapah are more clearly part of a cross-jurisdictional population.

Utah asks again that these populations be identified separately.

John

On Wed, Jan 14, 2015 at 8:48 AM, Wiechman, Lief <lief_wiechman@fws.gov> wrote:
Hi John,

I can provide some background on the population updates. Last summer, we were presented with maps from WAFWA and the BLM containing updated population boundaries. We were informed that while there was no biological rationale for continuous populations being separated by state boundaries (as grouse do not observe them). So, for the purposes of our status review, we removed the state boundaries where appropriate. These layers have been shared or made available to our partners, and are being used as a base layer for our auto-clipping process in the CED.

In relation to your concern about plans, the CED will prompt you to identify the plan

boundary and where it has been, is, or will be implemented. The auto-clipping process will still identify the 'Wyoming Basin' for example, but the project/plan boundary is what/where we will consider the effort and it's associated benefit.

Hopefully that clears things up -- and if not, let me know and we can discuss further ([307.214.8426](tel:307.214.8426)).

Take care,

LW

Lief Wiechman

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

On Tue, Jan 13, 2015 at 11:38 AM, John Harja <johnharja@utah.gov> wrote:
Lief:

I was the source of the issue, though Alan may agree.

Several of our SGMAs have been subsumed into the larger Great Basin and Wyoming Basin populations.

This does not allow us to feature or WRI projects, fire plans, conifer removal plans and the like in terms of the Utah Plan.

Our data is very localized, and indicative of success.

Can you separate the Box Elder, Hamlin Valley, Ibapah and Rich-Morgan-Summit areas in the CED from the larger populations?

Thanks. John

On Tue, Jan 13, 2015 at 11:18 AM, Greg Sheehan <gregsheehan@utah.gov> wrote:

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

From: **Wiechman, Lief** <lief_wiechman@fws.gov>

Date: Mon, Jan 12, 2015 at 6:47 AM

Subject: Re: UT and CED

To: Noreen Walsh <noreen_walsh@fws.gov>

Cc: Greg Sheehan <gregsheehan@utah.gov>, Michael Thabault <michael_thabault@fws.gov>, Kathy Hollar <kathy_hollar@fws.gov>, Larry Crist <Larry_crist@fws.gov>

Hi Greg,

Absolutely we can try to address your concern. If at all possible, we should try to connect with you (or Alan Clark) today as Utah (WRI) submitted all of it's data for batch upload last week - in case there's anything we need to change prior to completing the upload. My assumption is the Utah/WRI submission covered collaborative efforts between the state (DNR, DWR, WRI) and other partners (BLM, USFS, etc).

Kathy and I are traveling this week and you or your designee can reach me at [307.214.8426](tel:307.214.8426).

Lief Wiechman

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

On Sun, Jan 11, 2015 at 2:00 PM, Noreen Walsh <noreen_walsh@fws.gov> wrote:

Hi Greg, good to visit with you this week.

Thanks for raising the issue this morning about a challenge you are seeing with the CED and the drop down menus and efforts that may cross state boundaries. I didn't want to lose sight of it, so by cc here I am asking our CED experts, Lief or Kathy, to assist you or your designee. Let us know if you want one of them to work with you directly, or if you have a POC at UDWR that you want them to call, and they will see how we might help make sure that we get that information into the database in the best way and with a full understanding of its importance.

Best regards,

Noreen

Noreen Walsh

Regional Director

Mountain-Prairie Region

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

303 236 7920

--

Gregory Sheehan

Director

Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

[801-538-4702](tel:801-538-4702)

[801-556-7707](tel:801-556-7707) cell

"Coming together is the beginning. Keeping together is progress. Working together is success."