

From: [Lindstrom, James](#)
To: [Berglund, Jeff](#)
Cc: [Jodi Bush](#)
Subject: Re: GRSG: Lek data for analysis Nicole just requested
Date: Wednesday, November 19, 2014 4:42:45 PM
Attachments: [20141119_DraftMap_GRSG_MTPHMA_LekBuffonBLMLands.jpg](#)
[20141119_DraftMap_GRSG_MTPHMA_LekBuffPHMAonBLMLands.jpg](#)
[20141119_DraftMap_GRSG_MTPHMAonBLMLands.jpg](#)

Hi Jeff,

Still a little fuzzy on what exactly is wanted but I did some work and came up with the numbers below. FYI - this is only for BLM Surface Lands. I do not have a good layer for subsurface ownership.

- PHMA on BLM Surface Lands
 - 2,747,103.136 acres
- Active lek 0.6 mi Buffers on BLM Surface Lands
 - 216,213.262 acres
- Active lek 0.6 mi Buffers on BLM Surface Lands and within PHMA
 - 150,495.239 acres

A few notes on the data and analysis

- Leks are from MT Fish, Wildlife & Parks (8/18/2014)
- PHMA from BLM/Wildlife Habitat Spatial Analysis Lab (10/17/2014)
- Surface Ownership is from BLM Surface Management Agency layer (2013)
- Acres calculated using NAD83 UTM13 Projection

I've added a few maps showing the data and steps above. Let me know how far off I am or what else you need.

Jim

Jim Lindstrom
james.lindstrom@fws.gov
Cartographer
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Wyoming Ecological Services Field Office
(307) 772-2374 (Ext 240)

On Wed, Nov 19, 2014 at 2:24 PM, Berglund, Jeff <jeff.berglund@fws.gov> wrote:
Hi Jim. What we're trying to get at is the difference in protected acres in PHMA in Montana only, on BLM-administered surface and sub-surface lands, between two scenarios:
1) allowing no surface occupancy (e.g., protecting all) in PHMA - so this would basically just be all the PHMA in MT;
2) limiting the no surface occupancy designation to 0.6 mile buffers implemented around all confirmed active leks in PHMA.

Again, this is only for MT, and only for BLM-administered lands, and only for active leks. There shouldn't be any "important" habitat for MT - that's an Idaho designation. Probably ignore "core" also, and just go with the PHMA. We're trying to start getting a handle on what various approaches could mean on the ground. A map would be great also. This is to inform discussions that Noreen is having with BLM leadership this Friday (don't necessarily need a beautiful map for that - but would appreciate receiving the acreage differences, if possible). Internal use for now - likely will build on this with additional scenarios and criteria (like adding in reasonable foreseeable oil & gas development area layer, etc...) as time marches on... Does that get you where you need to be? Thanks for helping out,

Jeff

On Wed, Nov 19, 2014 at 2:04 PM, Lindstrom, James
<james_lindstrom@fws.gov> wrote:

Hi Jeff,

Laura asked me to help you on this. I have some time but don't know anything about what is going on with this so lets start over.

- **Give me a little background on this.**
 - What is this for? - Is it tied to the GRSG Status Review? Some totally other project?
 - What is the audience/ who is it intended for and how will it be used (report, presentation, discussion, ...)?
- **What are you looking for?**
 - I got the MT Fish, Wildlife & Parks lek data from Laura. Leks have various status notations.
 - I also have Draft Proposed PHMA and GHMA data from the BLM NOC. Habitat type is a short abbreviation sandwiched between EIS Name and Alternative in a EIS_HAB field. Looks like most are PH or GH but there is one marked Important and one marked Core.
 - What are you looking for out of this data?
 - Is there other data I need to be looking at?
 - What final products are you looking for?
- **What is the time frame for this work? When do you need the final product/s by?**

Let me know on that stuff and then we can get started.
Jim

Jim Lindstrom
james_lindstrom@fws.gov
Cartographer
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Wyoming Ecological Services Field Office
(307) 772-2374 (Ext 240)

On Wed, Nov 19, 2014 at 11:00 AM, Juliusson, Lara <lara_juliusson@fws.gov> wrote:

Jeff, Nicole asked me to pass this project along to another GIS team member if I was not able to work on it and complete it in a timely manner. Unfortunately, I am swamped with other tasks at this moment and am seeing if Jim can help you.

Jim, Here are the details for the ask, and the lek data that I received yesterday late afternoon are attached. I do not know anything more than this, so you will need to work directly with Jeff B.

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>

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

From: **Berglund, Jeff** <jeff_berglund@fws.gov>
Date: Wed, Nov 19, 2014 at 6:41 AM
Subject: Re: GRSG: Lek data for analysis Nicole just requested
To: "Juliusson, Lara" <lara_juliusson@fws.gov>
Cc: Jodi Bush <jodi_bush@fws.gov>

Hi Lara. So we want to perform this analysis in PHMA (core habitat), not general. Right - for now let's just use active leks. Also - what we're trying to do is show the difference between 0.6 mile NSO and PHMA-wide NSO on BLM-administered lands (surface and subsurface, if possible) so could you factor that in as well? And yes, a map would be great! Thanks so much and just let us know if there are additional questions,

Jeff

On Tue, Nov 18, 2014 at 5:10 PM, Juliusson, Lara <lara_juliusson@fws.gov> wrote:

OK, so now that I have the lek data, I want to confirm what it is you are looking for. Here's what I have:

Goal: Compare the area covered by leks buffered with a 0.6 mile radius with the area of GHMA in MT. These areas are both being considered for NSO protection.

Questions:

Is the above correct?

Leks have several statuses, including: Confirmed Active, Confirmed Inactive, Confirmed Extirpated, and Unconfirmed. I would assume you would want the analysis to only focus on Confirmed Active leks, correct?

Do you need a map visual? At the scale of MT, it might be hard to see the lek buffers, but I could widen the outline a bit to give an idea of area covered.

What else do you need?

Thanks,
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 Tue, Nov 18, 2014 at 12:37 PM, Berglund, Jeff <jeff_berglund@fws.gov> wrote:

Hi Lara - we don't have those GIS data here. Adam - would it be possible for you to send Lara lek location data for MT (or for her to retrieve it from an FTP site, etc.)? It's for sage-grouse management analysis purposes. Thanks!

Jeff

On Tue, Nov 18, 2014 at 12:27 PM, Juliusson, Lara <lara_juliusson@fws.gov> wrote:

Hi Jody and Jeff,

I may have more questions for you as this analysis progresses, but in order to decide how to proceed initially, how quickly can you provide me either with lek points for MT, or with leks buffered already by the 6/10s of a mile?

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>

--

Jeff Berglund
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Montana Field Office
585 Shepard Way, Suite 1
Helena, MT 59601
(406) 449-5225, ext. 206

--

Jeff Berglund
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Montana Field Office
585 Shepard Way, Suite 1
Helena, MT 59601
(406) 449-5225, ext. 206

--

Jeff Berglund
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Montana Field Office
585 Shepard Way, Suite 1
Helena, MT 59601
(406) 449-5225, ext. 206