

From: [Juliussan, Lara](#)
To: [DeBerry, Drue](#)
Cc: [Kevin Doherty](#)
Subject: Re: BLM consolidated westwide decision data
Date: Thursday, February 26, 2015 7:04:25 AM

Drue,

If we accept the BLM's decision that very large gaps and overlaps are already addressed, and do not consider gaps/overlaps in any possible merging that we would undertake, the processing time I provided to you previously would be the 30-70 hours of just merging, with no corrections for all plan decisions.

- Very large gaps and overlaps are addressed, but the data submitted conforms to the EIS boundaries provided to us from each EIS in 2013. In this layer, there are small gaps, slivers & overlaps that exist (NVCA is a good example). We did not address these, nor could we in the timeframes we have been working with since the onset of this project. This issue was deemed to be resolved to an acceptable level by the CEA team by having the EISs create and provide their boundaries to us. These replaced the incredibly poor boundaries initially developed using the GSSP LUP polygons.

If we did the processing ourselves, I would still be concerned about data integrity and the fact that the BLM and us would be duplicating efforts and creating two different data sets.

Lara

Lara Juliussan, Geographer/Ecologist
Sage-grouse Energy Team
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
Region 6, Lakewood, CO
Lara_Juliussan@fws.gov
303-236-9876
<http://www.fws.gov/mountain-prairie/>

Join me on LinkedIn

<http://www.linkedin.com/pub/lara-juliussan/5/918/7a4>

On Wed, Feb 25, 2015 at 11:29 AM, DeBerry, Drue <drue_deberry@fws.gov> wrote:

We will do our best, but have some initial responses to this (in red):

- One file geodatabase for each of the three categories, CEA, CED and No Action
- I'm not sure if it should be up to BLM to decide which categories these fit in - this is somewhat subjective. We will need FWS to tell us how you want it, being very specific. Does this mean we should merge the No Action data, which we already provided on a per EIS basis in a form that included every alternative submission, and resubmit to them? That doubles the time to do this.
- Each planning decision layer with all EISs merged together (e.g. one rangewide layer for "closed to Oil and Gas development", etc.)
- We can do this. Note though that it will take double the time to do this if you need that for No Action as well.
- An attribute will be retained in the data specifying what EIS it belongs to (e.g. "Lewistown") as well as what alternative it comes from ("AltDProposed", "Proposed", etc.)
- Not a problem
- Along plan boundaries, any large overlaps will be removed and large gaps filled, so as to allow acreage

- calculations with minimal double-counting, or under-counting
- Very large gaps and overlaps are addressed, but the data submitted conforms to the EIS boundaries provided to us from each EIS in 2013. In this layer, there are small gaps, slivers & overlaps that exist (NVCA is a good example). We did not address these, nor could we in the timeframes we have been working with since the onset of this project. This issue was deemed to be resolved to an acceptable level by the CEA team by having the EISs create and provide their boundaries to us. These replaced the incredibly poor boundaries initially developed using the GSSP LUP polygons.
- Feature classes will use agreed-upon naming conventions indicating Deliberative, Process, Privileged, Pre-Decisional, as well as standard decision names, e.g., "Livestock_Available".
- We will use the standard naming convention for the decision dataset names. All data submitted in Feb. were renamed to begin with "Deliberative_Process_Privileged_DATASETNAME".
- Metadata will be included that summarizes any unique information contained in the raw source metadata for each EIS in the merged file. Example: "NVCA_GRSB_Priority_Proposed derived from Coates' model categories X and Y."
- Unfortunately, this is unfeasible for us to do in the established time frames. Data sources vary by each EIS and data layer. Each EIS would be required to provide this information for every dataset they provided. The CEA Team in 2013 decided to not require metadata from EISs to expedite the process. The vast majority of metadata on the datasets we received from them did not contain this information or meet BLM standards for distribution. We applied a standardized metadata template to each copy of data provided to FWS to rectify this situation to the best of our ability.
- Metadata that describes which EISs are not included within a particular decision type. E.g., "NonEnergy_Leaseable_Open" includes no Bighorn Basin plan data. Alternatively, this information could be provided in a spreadsheet showing which EISs included which allocation decisions. So that we can track what areas have what decisions.
- We have and will provide a spreadsheet with this information

Please give me a call if you would like to discuss any of this.

Thanks,
Frank

On Wed, Feb 25, 2015 at 9:49 AM, DeBerry, Drue <drue_deberry@fws.gov> wrote:
Frank,

I think the timing will work. Thank you.

To make sure our approaches to merging are similar, are you planning on:

- One file geodatabase for each of the three categories, CEA, CED and No Action
- Each planning decision layer with all EISs merged together (e.g. one rangewide layer for "closed to Oil and Gas development", etc.)
- An attribute will be retained in the data specifying what EIS it belongs to (e.g. "Lewistown") as well as what alternative it comes from ("AltDProposed", "Proposed", etc.)
- Along plan boundaries, any large overlaps will be removed and large gaps filled, so as to allow acreage calculations with minimal double-counting, or under-counting
- Feature classes will use agreed-upon naming conventions indicating Deliberative, Process, Privileged, Pre-Decisional, as well as standard decision names, e.g., "Livestock_Available".
- Metadata will be included that summarizes any unique information contained in the raw source metadata for each EIS in the merged file. Example: "NVCA_GRSB_Priority_Proposed derived from Coates' model categories X and Y."
- Metadata that describes which EISs are not included within a particular decision type. E.g., "NonEnergy_Leaseable_Open" includes no Bighorn Basin plan data. Alternatively, this information could be provided in a spreadsheet showing which EISs included which allocation decisions. So that we can track

what areas have what decisions.

If it is possible to prioritize, our top priority data sets (for modeling needs) are:

OandG_OpenStandardStips

O_and_G_OpenModerateStips

O_G_Closed

O_G_OpenMajorStips

Thanks,

Drue

Drue DeBerry
Sage-Grouse Energy Coordinator
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
134 Union Blvd.
Lakewood, CO 80228
(303) 236-4264

drue_deberry@fws.gov

On Tue, Feb 24, 2015 at 2:20 PM, Quamen, Frank <fquamen@blm.gov> wrote:

Hi Drue,

Good talking with you. I spoke with my GIS specialists, and they thought they could have the decision data merged west-wide by the end of March. It would be sooner, but we have a Cumulative Effects Analysis deadline. Does that time frame work for your needs?

Thanks,

Frank

--

Frank Quamen, Wildlife Biologist
BLM National Operations Center
Denver Federal Center Building 40
303-236-6310

--

Frank Quamen, Wildlife Biologist
BLM National Operations Center
Denver Federal Center Building 40
303-236-6310