

A proposed framework for identifying, documenting, and mapping concentrations, or “hotspots,” of potential threats to the Greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) during the 2015 status review

Drafted by the Potential Threats Concentration Team - July 1, 2014.

Deleted: June 13, 2014

Purpose

This document provides a framework to identify, document, and map concentrations of potential threats to the Greater sage-grouse during the 2015 status review. Our previous status review identified that potential threats may operate equally across the entire range of the Greater sage-grouse, or they may be concentrated within specific geographic areas. Due to this variability, the following framework builds on previous work to identify, refine, and map geographic “areas of interest” where potential threats to the Greater sage-grouse may be concentrated. By identifying “hotspots” of potential threats to the Greater sage-grouse, the framework provides spatially explicit data and maps that will be valuable to biologists and decision-makers during all stages of the status review. Additionally, the information could potentially be used by decision-makers if an evaluation of the Greater sage-grouse’s status under the Service’s newly finalized Significant Portion of the Range (SPR) policy is necessary at a later time.

Comment [Craig1]: I tried to keep this as close to a Purpose statement as possible, and moved the framework’s role, or benefits, to the overall status review framework below.

Deleted: e

Deleted: purpose of this

Deleted: is to

Formatted: Normal

Deleted: the

Deleted: within the Greater sage-grouse’s range

Deleted: P

Deleted:

Deleted: potential

Deleted: we propose

Deleted: to assist in

Deleted: ying

Deleted: of

Deleted: ion.

Deleted: identifying

Benefits to the Status Review

Documenting and considering the distribution of potential threats across a landscape or a species’ range is already an integral part of the status review process. The threats concentration framework does not duplicate this effort, but is an embedded process within the overall status review to capture and improve information regarding the concentration and spatial distribution of potential threats. The framework strengthens the information regarding potential threats that will be documented in the species report and available throughout the status review and to decision-makers. In other words, the threats concentration framework ensures that the status review’s species report not only provides full descriptions of the potential threats, but also documents the best available information regarding the spatial distribution and concentration of these potential threats across the range of the Greater sage-grouse.

Comment [Craig2]:

Craig’s Notes:

Benefits:
Informs status review.
Can be used by other teams (modeling, conservation efforts) or for policy later, if needed.

During its initial phase, the framework compiles and maps available data regarding threat concentrations from the existing literature, status reviews, and reports, such as the Conservation Objectives Team (COT) final report (February 2013). These early maps of potential threat concentrations will inform and help direct the modeling efforts. The framework then works closely with the modeling and data call teams to further investigate, refine, and map the spatial distribution of potential threats. Through a feedback loop, the framework identifies data needs regarding threats concentrations, and works with the other teams to improve the resolution of both the spatial data and models at appropriate scales. Finally, by visually illustrating gradients of potential threats, the framework’s final “hotspot” maps will provide valuable information to the status review. For example,

the “hotspot” maps could be overlaid with maps of ongoing conservation efforts developed by the conservation efforts database team to assess overlap.

Comment [Craig3]: This comes from discussion with Leif and Kathy regarding CE database.

If needed, framework products would also be readily available to Service decision makers who may need to quickly evaluate the status of the Greater sage-grouse and who may need to review the information using the Service's SPR policy. By collecting, cataloguing, and mapping the best available scientific information regarding concentrations of potential threats to the Greater sage-grouse during the status review, the framework ensures that any potential application of the SPR policy, if needed, is efficient, repeatable, scientifically based, transparent, and clearly articulated in the administrative record.

Comment [Craig4]: These statements aren't clear to me, and I don't think they belong under Purpose. They sound like a benefit to the overall process and a response to team discussion about the ongoing evaluation of threats during the status review, so I created a new heading.

I also pulled up paragraph from the summary here, because there was a lot of repetition and a Summary seems unnecessary now.

Disclaimer

The proposed framework *proactively* seeks and documents the best available scientific information regarding the concentration and spatial extent of potential threats to the Greater sage-grouse. The framework does not *preemptively* evaluate any of the collected information using the Service's SPR policy, or any other Federal policies or regulations. The proposed framework does not determine the status of any portions of the Greater sage-grouse's range, nor does it evaluate the potential significance of any portions within the range. However, the information collected by the framework would be readily available throughout the status review process and could be used at a later time, if needed, to evaluate significant portions of the Greater sage-grouse's range under the Service's SPR policy.

Deleted: Understanding where threats are concentrated will be an ongoing process; our understanding will be further refined as we work through the status review. The goal of identifying some of the well-documented threat concentrations early in the process is to aid in creating spatially explicit models at the appropriate scales, but the full description of threats will be completed through the species report.

Deleted: ¶ Threat concentration will be of use for decision makers throughout this process and could be valuable in evaluating the Greater sage-grouse under the Service's draft or final Significant Portion of the Range (SPR) policy. ¶

Deleted: . In other words, t

Formatted: Normal

Deleted: the Service's SPR policy, so its application does not depend on the finalization of that policy. Instead, the framework ensures that the

The proposed framework provides information and “hotspot” maps of potential threats that could inform an evaluation under the Service's SPR policy, but it operates independently of any regulation or policy. The framework ensures that the status review collects, documents, and maps relevant scientific information regarding concentrations of potential threats, information which could potentially be used during a review under the SPR policy. However, any geographic areas of interest that this framework identifies are not necessarily significant and may not encompass all possible scenarios.

Deleted: ,

Deleted: ful

Deleted: to an evaluation

Deleted: under

Deleted: either the draft or final

Deleted: A

Deleted: e

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: Summary

Deleted: document provides a proposed

Deleted: to

Deleted: in

Deleted: ing

Deleted: ting

Deleted: ping


Deleted: a

The Framework

Potential threats to the Greater sage-grouse may occur rangewide, or they may be localized, isolated, or concentrated within a particular area. This framework assists status review biologists identify, document, and map concentrations of potential threats to the Greater sage-grouse during the 2015 status review. The framework is one component of the status review process, linking efforts from the multiple status review teams (e.g. Data Call, DPS, GIS, and Modeling) to ensure that any differences in the magnitude, scope, and geographic extent of potential threats are documented in the species status report.

The threats concentration framework has three (3) phases:

- **Phase 1 – First Product:** In its first stage, the framework identifies and compiles areas where threat concentrations are well-documented. The framework maps these as “areas of interest” (first product) and will inform modeling efforts.
- **Phase 2 – Refine:** During the early phases of the status review (e.g. data call and collection), the framework assists the status review teams collect and document scientific information regarding potential concentrations and the spatial extent of any potential threats. Phase 2 uses the first product maps to prioritize data collection, develop and improve models, and refine our understanding of potential threats.
- **Phase 3 – Final Product:** After collecting data and refining models, the framework synthesizes the information and produces revised maps of any “areas of interest” or “hotspots” where potential threats may be concentrated.



Deleted: This information would then be readily available to Service decision makers who may need to quickly evaluate the status of the Greater sage-grouse and who may need to review the information using the Service's SPR policy. By collecting, cataloguing, and mapping the best available scientific information regarding concentrations of potential threats to the Greater sage-grouse during the status review, the framework ensures that any potential application of the SPR policy, if needed, is efficient, repeatable, scientifically based, transparent, and clearly articulated in the administrative record. ¶ Documenting and considering the distribution of potential threats across a landscape or a species' range is already an integral part of the status review process. The threats concentration framework does not duplicate this effort, but is an embedded check within the status review to ensure that questions regarding any spatial differences in the magnitude of potential threats are documented in the species report. The framework also works with the modeling teams to further investigate and map the spatial distribution of potential threats.

—Page Break—

Formatted: Space After: 10 pt

Deleted: the

Deleted: initial

Deleted: Service

Deleted: will

Deleted: y

Deleted: These

Deleted: areas will be mapped as

Deleted: for

Deleted: work

Deleted: in

Deleted: ting

Deleted: ing

Deleted: (Figure 1).

Deleted: ,




Phase 1: First Product





The threats concentration team reviewed the existing literature, the March 23, 2010, finding, and the COT report (February 2013) to compile already available, well-documented information regarding concentrations of potential threats.

Table 1 summarizes available information regarding the concentration of potential threats to the Greater sage-grouse.

Formatted: Heading 1

Comment [Craig5]: The table's fields will not justify properly. Has something to do with the template styles?? Also, sub-row headers don't repeat across pages...

Potential Threat	Rangewide or Select Concentrations?	Potential Areas of Interest			Available Maps	Citations
		States	MZs	PACs		
Agricultural Conversion	Select	MT, ND, SD, WA	I, VI			
Conifer Encroachment	Primarily in the west, but localized elsewhere.	CA, CO, ID, NV, OR, UT	III, IV, V, VII			
Energy Development	Rangewide	All	All			

Potential Threat	Rangewide or Select Concentrations?	Potential Areas of Interest			Available Maps	Citations
Invasive Plants (Exotic annual grasses)	West	CA, ID, NV, OR, UT, WA	III, IV, V, VI		 <p>Created By: FWS WYES Map Date: 8/30/2012 Source: FWS WAFWA ESRI</p>	
Infrastructure	Rangewide	All	All		 <p>Created By: FWS WYES Map Date: 8/30/2012 Source: FWS WAFWA ESRI</p>	
Urbanization	Rangewide, but localized	All	I, II, III, IV, VII, and Bi-State		 <p>Created By: FWS WYES Map Date: 8/30/2012 Source: FWS WAFWA ESRI</p>	
Wildfire	West	CA, ID, NV, OR, UT, WA	III, IV, V, VI		 <p>Created By: FWS WYES Map Date: 8/30/2012 Source: FWS WAFWA ESRI</p>	

Potential Threat	Range-wide or Select Concentrations?	Potential Areas of Interest			Available Maps	Citations
Small population sizes	Dakotas and Colorado	ND, SD, CO				
Sagebrush Removal						
Mining						
Grazing						
Free-Roaming Equids						
Recreation						