

---

***Proposed Resource Management Plan and  
Final Environmental Impact Statement***

***Bighorn Basin Resource Management Plan Revision Project***

---

***Appendix Y***

---

Greater Sage-Grouse Implementation Strategy

---

---



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction.....	Y-1
2.0	COT Objective 1: Stop Population Declines and Habitat Loss .....	Y-4
3.0	COT Objective 2: Implement Targeted Habitat Management and Restoration.....	Y-18
4.0	COT Objective 3: Develop and Implement State and Federal Conservation Strategies and Associated Incentive-based Conservation Actions and Regulatory Mechanisms .....	Y-19
4.1	Implementation Working Groups .....	Y-19
4.2	Implementation Tracking .....	Y-20
4.3	Public Involvement.....	Y-21
5.0	COT Objective 4: Proactive Conservation Actions.....	Y-21
6.0	COT Objective 5: Development of Monitoring Plans .....	Y-23
6.1	Greater Sage-Grouse Monitoring Framework.....	Y-23
6.2	Implementation (Decision) Monitoring .....	Y-27
6.3	Habitat (Vegetation) Monitoring .....	Y-28
6.3.1	Sagebrush Availability (Measure 1).....	Y-30
6.3.1.1	Establishing the Sagebrush Base Layer .....	Y-30
6.3.1.2	Monitoring Sagebrush Availability.....	Y-38
6.3.2	Habitat Degradation Monitoring (Measure 2).....	Y-41
6.3.2.1	Habitat Degradation Threat Combination and Calculation.....	Y-44
6.3.3	Energy and Mining Density (Measure 3) .....	Y-45
6.4	Population (Demographics) Monitoring .....	Y-47
6.5	Effectiveness Monitoring.....	Y-47
6.5.1	Fine and Site Scales .....	Y-51
6.5.2	Conclusion .....	Y-53
6.5.3	The BLM Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance and Monitoring Sub Team Membership .....	Y-53
7.0	References .....	Y-54
8.0	COT Objective 6: Prioritize, Fund, and Implement Research To Address Existing Uncertainties .....	Y-60
8.1	Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Adaptive Management Plan .....	Y-60
9.0	Glossary Terms .....	Y-64

## LIST OF TABLES

Table Y-1.	Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat within the Bighorn Basin Planning Area.....	Y-2
Table Y-2.	Implementation of RMP Decisions to Address COT Threats .....	Y-6
Table Y-3.	Indicators for Monitoring Implementation of the Strategy, Decisions, Greater Sage- Grouse Habitat, and Greater Sage- Grouse Populations at the Broad and Mid- scales.....	Y-26
Table Y-4.	Relationship between the 18 Threats and the 3 Habitat Disturbance Measures for Monitoring .....	Y-29
Table Y-5.	Datasets for Establishing and Monitoring Changes in Sagebrush Availability.....	Y-32
Table Y-6.	Ecological Systems in BpS and EVT Capable of Supporting Sagebrush Vegetation and Could Provide Suitable Seasonal Habitat for Greater Sage-Grouse .....	Y-33

Table Y-7. Ecological Systems with Conifers Most Likely to Encroach into Sagebrush Vegetation ..... Y-37

Table Y-8. Geospatial Data Sources for Habitat Degradation (Measure 2)..... Y-45

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure Y-1. Priority Habitat Management Areas and General Habitat Management Areas within the Planning Area Bighorn Basin Planning Area ..... Y-3

Figure Y-2. Proposed Project Boundary ..... Y-9

Figure Y-3. DDCT Assessment Area..... Y-10

Figure Y-4. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disturbance ..... Y-10

Figure Y-5. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disturbance (cont.)..... Y-11

Figure Y-6. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disturbance with Buffer ..... Y-11

Figure Y-7. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disturbance with Buffer (cont.)..... Y-12

Figure Y-8. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disruptive Features ..... Y-12

Figure Y-9. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disruptive Features Buffer ..... Y-13

Figure Y-10. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disruptive Features Buffer (cont.)..... Y-13

Figure Y-11. Greater Sage-Grouse Range, Populations, Subpopulations and Priority Areas for Conservation as of 2013 ..... Y-25

## **APPENDIX Y**

### **GREATER SAGE-GROUSE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The Bighorn Basin Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Final EIS provides specific goals, objectives, management actions, and required design features for the conservation of greater sage-grouse in Wyoming. These are the commitments made to meet the federal agencies' national policy and direction for the conservation of greater sage-grouse in light of the 2010 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) listing decision as warranted but precluded from listing under the Endangered Species Act. Through the National Planning Strategy, BLM and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) in coordination with USFWS have identified conservation measures to be included in the respective agencies' land use plans as the principal regulatory mechanisms to assure adequate conservation of the greater sage-grouse and its habitat on public lands.

The measures identified in this RMP have been developed in coordination with not just the USFWS, but also the State of Wyoming, including the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD), and local cooperating agencies including conservation districts and counties.

Wyoming has established Core Population Areas to help delineate landscape planning units by distinguishing areas of high biological value. These areas are based on the locations of breeding areas and are intended to help balance greater sage-grouse habitat requirements with demand for energy development (Doherty et al. 2011). The Proposed RMP is consistent with the Core Area Strategy, but contains additional restrictions to protect other resources, which results in added protections to greater sage-grouse habitat and achieving conservation objectives identified in the Conservation Objectives Team (COT) Report on BLM-managed public lands. The COT Report indicates that the Core Area Strategy is a substantial regulatory mechanism that contributes to the conservation of greater sage-grouse and balances the priorities of retaining a healthy greater sage-grouse population on the landscape and energy development.

This appendix will introduce the framework for implementation of greater sage-grouse conservation measures within the Cody and Worland Field Offices. Implementation is a combination of permitting activities under the auspices of management direction provided in the Land Use Plan (LUP), undertaking specific activities in pursuit of the goals and objectives identified in the plan and monitoring of sage brush habitat and populations.

The implementation framework outlined here is focused specifically towards greater sage-grouse and is reflective of how the national strategy will be assimilated into the existing statewide implementation efforts currently in place in Wyoming. This framework has been developed mindful of the varying scales at which implementation will be evaluated: at the local level to define successful conservation measures, at the state level to assess success of the statewide strategy, and across the species' range.

In 2013, the Director of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service tasked staff with the development of range-wide conservation objectives for the sage-grouse to define the degree to which threats need to be reduced or ameliorated to conserve sage-grouse so that it is no longer in danger of extinction or likely to become in danger of extinction in the foreseeable future. Recognizing that state wildlife agencies have management expertise and management authority for sage-grouse, the FWS created a COT of state and USFWS representatives to accomplish this task.


The COT conservation framework consisted of (1) identifying greater sage-grouse population and habitat status and threats, (2) defining a broad conservation goal, (3) identifying priority areas for conservation, and (4) developing specific conservation objectives and measures. The COT used three parameters—population and habitat representation, redundancy, and resilience (Shaffer and Stein 2010, Redford et al. 2011)—as guiding concepts in developing the conservation goal, priority areas for conservation, conservation objectives, and measures.

The COT report identified priority areas for greater sage-grouse population habitats as Priority Areas for Conservation or (PACs). PACs are recognized as key areas across the landscape that are necessary to maintain redundant, representative, and resilient populations” of the species. The COT Report describes maintaining the integrity of PACs as “the essential foundation for greater sage-grouse conservation.” PACs cover nearly 73 million acres across the west; within the Bighorn Basin Planning Area, more than 1.1 million acres of BLM-administered surface are considered priority habitat (Table Y-1). Thirty-five percent of the priority habitat in the Planning Area is BLM-administered surface and twenty-six percent is BLM-administered minerals. Based upon 2007 lek counts, and the population data contained in the COT Report, the Bighorn Basin Planning Area contains an estimated two percent of the range-wide population of greater sage-grouse. Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMAs) and General Habitat Management Areas (GHMAs) within the Planning Area are depicted in Figure Y-1.

**Table Y-1. Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat within the Bighorn Basin Planning Area**

<i>Populations / Subpopulations: Wyoming Basin and Powder River Basin Populations WAFWA Management Zone I and II</i>		
<b>Surface Estate</b>	<b>Priority Habitat Acres (%)</b>	<b>General Habitat Acres (%)</b>
Private	505,850 (28)	1,327,877 (36)
State	151,591 (8)	244,045 (7)
BLM	1,115,076 (62)	2,034,027 (55)
Other	13,652 (1)	86,707 (2)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,786,169</b>	<b>3,692,656</b>
<b>Fluid Mineral Estate</b>	<b>Priority Habitat Acres (%)</b>	<b>General Habitat Acres (%)</b>
Non-federal	360,032 (20)	1,099,993 (30)
BLM	1,426,137 (80)	2,592,663 (70)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,786,169</b>	<b>3,692,656</b>

**Figure Y-1. Priority Habitat Management Areas and General Habitat Management Areas within the Planning Area Bighorn Basin Planning Area**



The conservation objectives identified in the COT Report, targeted at maintaining redundant, representative, and resilient greater sage-grouse habitats and populations, is the basis by which the greater sage-grouse elements of the Bighorn Basin Proposed RMP were developed. Due to the variability in ecological conditions and the nature of the threats across the range of the greater sage-grouse, developing detailed, prescriptive species or habitat actions was not attainable at the range-wide scale. Specific strategies and actions necessary to achieve the conservation objectives have been developed by BLM and USFS in cooperation with state and local governments to ensure implementation of activities to meet the objectives identified in the COT report.

## **2.0 COT OBJECTIVE 1: STOP POPULATION DECLINES AND HABITAT LOSS**

*“There is an urgent need to ‘stop the bleeding’ of continued population declines and habitat losses by acting immediately to eliminate or reduce the impacts contributing to population declines and range erosion. There are no populations within the range of sage-grouse that are immune to the threat of habitat loss and fragmentation.” (COT Report 2013)*

The COT Report identified a series of threats to greater sage-grouse habitat and the extent of those threats at the population scale. The management actions identified in the RMP were specifically designed to reduce the threats, as they were identified. The Wyoming 9-Plan RMP encompasses lands within WAFWA Management Zones 1 and 2. To ensure that the threats are adequately addressed by the RMP, a strategy for reviewing activities and projects on public lands to determine the extent of their impact on greater sage-grouse habitat has also been developed. The following outlines the process by which all activities on public lands will be reviewed.

The BLM will ensure that any activities or projects in greater sage-grouse habitats would: 1) only occur in compliance with Bighorn Basin RMP greater sage-grouse goals and objectives for priority management areas; and 2) maintain neutral or positive greater sage-grouse population trends and habitat by avoiding, minimizing, and offsetting unavoidable impacts to assure a conservation gain at the scale of this land use plan and within greater sage-grouse population areas, state boundaries, and WAFWA Management Zones through the application of mitigation for implementation-level decisions. The mitigation process will follow the regulations from the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) (40 CFR 1508.20; e.g., avoid, minimize, and compensate), hereafter referred to as the mitigation hierarchy, while also following Secretary of the Interior Order 3330 and consulting BLM, USFWS and other current and appropriate mitigation guidance. If it is determined that residual impacts to greater sage-grouse from implementation-level actions would remain after applying avoidance and minimization measures to the extent possible, then compensatory mitigation projects will be used to offset residual impacts, or the project may be deferred or denied if necessary to achieve the goals and objectives for priority and general management areas in the Bighorn Basin RMP.

To ensure that impacts from activities proposed in greater sage-grouse PHMAs are appropriately approved and mitigated as necessary, the BLM will apply mitigation measures and conservation actions and potentially modify the location, design, construction, and/or operation of proposed land uses or activities to comply with statutory requirements for environmental protection. The mitigation measures and conservation actions (Appendix L) for proposed projects or activities in these areas will be identified as part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental review process, through interdisciplinary analysis involving resource specialists, project proponents, government entities, landowners or other Surface Management Agencies. Those measures selected for implementation will be identified in the Record of Decision (ROD) or Decision Record (DR) for those authorizations and will inform a potential lessee, permittee, or operator of the requirements that must be met when using BLM-administered public lands and minerals to mitigate, per the mitigation hierarchy referenced above, impacts from the activity or project such that greater sage-grouse goals and objectives are met. Because these actions create a clear obligation for the BLM to ensure any proposed mitigation action adopted in the environmental review process is performed, there is assurance that mitigation will lead to a reduction of environmental impacts in the implementation stage and include binding mechanisms for enforcement (CEQ Memorandum for Heads of Federal Departments and Agencies 2011).

To achieve the goals and objectives for PHMAs in the Bighorn Basin Planning Area, the BLM will assess all proposed land uses or activities such as road, pipeline, communication tower, or powerline construction,

fluid and solid mineral development, range improvements, and recreational activities proposed for location in PHMAs in a step-wise manner. The following steps identify a screening process for review of proposed activities or projects in these areas (Table Y-2). This process will provide a consistent approach and ensure that authorization of these projects, if granted, will appropriately mitigate impacts and be consistent with the RMP goals and objectives for greater sage-grouse. The following steps provide for a sequential screening of proposals.

**Table Y-2. Implementation of RMP Decisions to Address COT Threats**

<b>COT Threat</b>	<b>Threat Extent</b>	<b>Program Area</b>	<b>RMP Decision</b>	<b>Implementation Process</b>	<b>Tracking Mechanism</b>
Sagebrush Elimination	Present but Localized (MZ1) Present but Localized (Wyoming Basin Population)	Vegetation Management Wildland Fire Management			
Weeds/ Annual Grasses	Present but Localized (MZ1) Present but Localized (Wyoming Basin Population)	Vegetation Management Range Management Wildland Fire Management Recreation			
Energy	Present and Widespread (MZ1) Present and Widespread (Wyoming Basin Population)	Lands and Realty Fluid Minerals			
Fire	Present but Localized (MZ1) Present but Localized (Wyoming Basin Population)	Wildland Fire Management			
Grazing Range Management Structures	Present and Widespread (MZ1) Present and Widespread (Wyoming Basin Population)	Range Management Wild Horse and Burro Management Special Status Species Vegetation Management			
Free-Roaming Equids	Not Present (MZ1) Present but Localized (Wyoming Basin Population)	Wild Horse and Burro Management			
Conifer Encroachment	Present but Localized (MZ1) Present but Localized (Wyoming Basin Population)	Wildland Fire Management Vegetation Management			
Agriculture and Urbanization	Present but Localized (MZ1) Present but Localized (Wyoming Basin Population)	Lands and Realty			

**Table Y-2. Implementation of RMP Decisions to Address COT Threats (Continued)**

COT Threat	Threat Extent	Program Area	RMP Decision	Implementation Process	Tracking Mechanism
Mining	Present and Widespread (MZ1) Present but Localized (Wyoming Basin Population)	Lands and Realty Locatable Minerals Salable Minerals Non-energy Leasable Minerals Management			
Recreation	Present and Widespread (MZ1) Present and Widespread (Wyoming Basin Population)	Recreation Trails and Travel Management			
Infrastructure	Present and Widespread (MZ1) Present and Widespread (Wyoming Basin Population)	Lands and Realty Trails and Travel Management			

**Step 1 – Determine Proposal Adequacy**

This screening process is initiated upon formal submittal of a proposal for authorization for use of BLM/USFS lands. The actual documentation of the proposal would include at a minimum a description of the location, scale of the project and timing of the disturbance. The acceptance of the proposal(s) for review would be consistent with existing protocol and procedures for each type of use. Evaluating consistency with (at a minimum) state greater sage-grouse regulations.

**Step 2 – Evaluate Proposal Consistency with LUP**

Step 2.1 – The proposal will be reviewed to determine whether it would be allowed as prescribed in the Land Use Plan. For example, some activities or types of development are prohibited in greater sage-grouse habitat, such as wind developments in Priority Habitat. Evaluation of projects will also include an assessment of the current state of the Adaptive Management hard and soft triggers. If the proposal is for an activity that is specifically prohibited, the applicant should be informed that the application is being rejected since it would not be allowed, regardless of the design of the project.

Step 2.2 – The proposal will be reviewed to determine whether it conforms with the Density and Disturbance Limitations. If the proposed activity occurs within a PHMA, evaluate whether the disturbance from the activity exceeds the limit on the amount of disturbance allowed within the activity or project area (Density/Disturbance Calculation Tool [DDCT] process). If current disturbance within the activity area or the anticipated disturbance from the proposed activity exceeds this threshold, the project would be deferred until such time as the amount of disturbance within the area has been reduced below the threshold, redesigned so as to not result in any additional surface disturbance (collocation) or redesigned to move it outside of PHMA. Should the project be a result of a valid existing right, BLM will work to minimize the disturbance and determine any residual impacts that may require appropriate mitigation.

The maximum density of disruptive activities and surface disturbance allowed will be analyzed via the DDCT, and will be conducted by the Federal Land Management Agency on federal land and the project proponent on non-federal (private, state) land per the RMP 9 revision.

***State Agency Permit is needed, without a need for a federal permit:***

The first point of contact for addressing greater sage-grouse issues for any state permit application should be the WGFD. Project proponents (proponents) need to have a thorough description of their project and identify the potential effects on greater sage-grouse prior to submitting an application to the permitting agency. Project proponents should contact WGFD at least 45-60 days prior to submitting their application. More complex projects will require more time. It is understood that WGFD has a role of consultation, recommendation, and facilitation, and has no authority to either approve or deny the project. The purpose of the initial consultation with the WGFD is to become familiar with the project proposal and ensure the project proponent understands the DDCT and recommended stipulations.

***Federal Agency Permit is needed, with or without a State permit:***

When a project requires federal action prior to approval, the proponent should contact the federal agency responsible for reviewing the action. The federal agency and the proponent will determine the best process for completing the DDCT and receiving recommendations from WGFD. Project proponents (proponents) need to have a thorough description of their project and identify the potential effects on greater sage-grouse prior to submitting an application to the permitting agency.


### Maximum Density and Disturbance Process

**Density and Disturbance Calculation:** The DDCT is a spatially based tool that calculates both the average density of disruptive activities and total surface disturbance within the area affected by the project, or DDCT assessment area. The DDCT assessment area is created based on buffers around proposed projects (first buffer) in protected greater sage-grouse PHMAs, and subsequent buffers around any occupied, PHMA leks within the first buffer. A 4-mile buffer is used to identify 75% of the greater sage-grouse use around a lek. All activities will be evaluated within the context of maximum allowable disturbance (disturbance percentages, location and number of disturbances) of suitable greater sage-grouse habitat (see Appendix 1 for definition of suitable greater sage-grouse habitat and disturbance of suitable greater sage-grouse habitat) within the DDCT assessment area. This tool allows for better siting of projects rather than averaging the density/disturbance calculation per section.

All lands within PHMA boundaries are considered suitable habitat unless documented. Mapped unsuitable habitat is treated neither as suitable habitat, nor disturbance, which results in the area being removed from the DDCT assessment area altogether.

1. Density/Disturbance Calculation Tool: Determine all occupied leks within PHMAs that may be affected by the project by placing a 4 mile boundary around the project boundary (as defined by the proposed area of disturbance related to the project). All occupied leks located within the 4 mile boundary and within PHMAs will be considered in this assessment (Figure Y-2).


Figure Y-2. Proposed Project Boundary



A 4-mile boundary will then be placed around the perimeter of each of these lek(s) (Figure Y-2).

The PHMAs within the combined 4-mile buffer around both the leks and the project boundary creates the DDCT assessment area for each individual project (Figure Y-3).

Figure Y-3. DDCT Assessment Area



Disturbance will be analyzed for the DDCT assessment area as a whole and for each individual lek within the DDCT assessment area (Figures Y-4 through Y-7).

Figure Y-4. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disturbance




Figure Y-5. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disturbance (cont.)



Figure Y-6. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disturbance with Buffer





Figure Y-7. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disturbance with Buffer (cont.)



Density of disruptive features will be analyzed for the DDCT assessment area as a whole and for each individual lek within the DDCT assessment area (Figures Y-8 through Y-10).

Figure Y-8. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disruptive Features



Figure Y-9. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disruptive Features Buffer




Figure Y-10. DDCT Assessment Area – Existing Disruptive Features Buffer (cont.)



If there are no leks identified for this assessment within the 4-mile boundary around the project boundary, the DDCT assessment area will be that portion of the 4-mile project boundary within the PHMAs.

2. Density and Disturbance analysis: The total number of discrete disruptive activity features, as well as the total disturbance acres within the DDCT assessment area will be determined through an evaluation of:
  - a. Existing disturbance (greater sage-grouse habitat that is disturbed due to existing anthropogenic activity and wildfire);
  - b. Approved permits (that have approval for on the ground activity) not yet implemented; and
  - c. Validating digitized disturbance through on the ground evaluation.

The complete analysis package (DDCT results, mapbook, and Worksheet), and recommendations developed by consultation and review outlined herein will be forwarded to the appropriate permitting agency(s). WGFD recommendations will be included, as will other recommendations from project proponents and other appropriate agencies. Project proponent shall have access to all information used in developing recommendations. Where possible and when requested by the project proponent, State agencies shall provide the project proponent with potential development alternatives other than those contained in the project proposal.

If the permit for which a proponent has applied expires, another DDCT analysis is required before issuing a new permit. An additional DDCT is not required for Permit extensions or renewals when no changes are being authorized. Any project will need to comply with the current Executive Order.

Step 2.3 – The BLM/USFS’s goal for any new activity or development proposal within PHMAs is to provide consistent implementation of project proposals which meet the BLM’s LUP goals and the population management objectives of the State. Activities would be consistent with the strategy where it can be sufficiently demonstrated that no declines to PHMA populations would be expected as a result of the proposed action. Published research suggests that impacts to greater sage-grouse leks associated primarily with infrastructure and energy development are discernible at a distance of at least 4 miles and that many leks within this radius have been extirpated as a direct result of development (Walker et al. 2007, Walker 2008). Research also suggests that an evaluation of habitats and greater sage-grouse populations that attend leks within an 11-mile radius from the project boundary in the context of “large” projects may be appropriate in order to consider all seasonal habitats that may be affected for birds that use the habitats associated with the proposal during some portion of the life-cycle of seasonally migratory greater sage-grouse (Connelly et al. 2000).

To determine the manner in which greater sage-grouse may be impacted by proposed undertakings, the following will be reviewed in the site specific NEPA analysis to quantify the effects:

- Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat delineation maps.
- Current science recommendations.
- The ‘Base Line Environment Report’ (USGS) which identifies areas of direct and indirect effect for various anthropogenic activities.
- Consultation with agency or State Wildlife Agency biologist.
- Other methods needed to provide an accurate assessment of impacts.

If the proposal will not have a direct or indirect impact on either the habitat or population, document the findings in the NEPA and proceed with the appropriate process for review, decision and implementation of the project.

**Step 3 – Apply Avoidance and Minimization Measures to Comply with Sage-Grouse Goals and Objectives**

If the project can be relocated so as to not have an impact on greater sage-grouse and still achieve objectives of the proposal and the disturbance limitations, relocate the proposed activity and proceed with the appropriate process for review, decision and implementation (NEPA and Decision Record). This Step does not consider redesign of the project to reduce or eliminate direct and indirect impacts, but rather authorization of the project in a physical location that will not impact greater sage-grouse. If the preliminary review of the proposal concludes that there may be adverse impacts to greater sage-grouse habitat or populations in Step 2 and the project cannot be effectively relocated to avoid these impacts, proceed with the appropriate process for review, decision and implementation (NEPA and Decision Record) with the inclusion of appropriate mitigation requirements to further reduce or eliminate impacts to greater sage-grouse habitat and populations and achieve compliance with greater sage-grouse objectives. Mitigation measures could include design modifications of the proposal, site disturbance restoration, post-project reclamation, etc. (see Appendix L). Compensatory or offsite mitigation may be required (Step 4) in situations where residual impacts remain after application of all avoidance and minimization measures.

**Step 4 – Apply Compensatory Mitigation or Reject/Defer Proposal**

If screening of the proposal has determined that direct and indirect impacts cannot be eliminated through avoidance or minimization, evaluate the proposal to determine if compensatory mitigation can be used to offset the remaining adverse impacts and achieve greater sage-grouse goals and objectives. If the impacts cannot be effectively mitigated, reject or defer the proposal. The criteria for determining this situation could include but are not limited to:

- The current trend within the Priority Habitat is down and additional impacts, whether mitigated or not, could lead to further decline of the species or habitat.
- The proposed mitigation is inadequate in scope or duration, has proven to be ineffective or is unproven in terms of science based approach.
- The project would impact habitat that has been determined to be a limiting factor for species sustainability.
- Other site specific information and analysis that determined the project would lead to a downward change of the current species population or habitat and not comply with greater sage-grouse goals and objectives.

If, following application of available impact avoidance and minimization measures, the project can be mitigated to fully offset impacts and assure conservation gain to the species and comply with greater sage-grouse goals and objectives, proceed with the appropriate process for review, decision and implementation (NEPA and Decision Record).

**Mitigation**

**General**

In undertaking BLM/USFS management actions, and, consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law, in authorizing third party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation, the BLM/USFS will require and assure mitigation that provides a net conservation gain to the species including accounting for any uncertainty associated with the effectiveness of such mitigation. This will be achieved by

avoiding, minimizing, and compensating for impacts by applying beneficial mitigation actions. Mitigation will follow the regulations from the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) (40 CFR 1508.20; e.g., avoid, minimize, and compensate), hereafter referred to as the mitigation hierarchy. If impacts from BLM/USFS management actions and authorized third party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation remain after applying avoidance and minimization measures (i.e., residual impacts), then compensatory mitigation projects will be used to provide a net conservation gain to the species. Any compensatory mitigation will be durable, timely, and in addition to that which would have resulted without the compensatory mitigation (see Glossary).

The BLM/USFS, via the WAFWA Management Zone Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, will develop a WAFWA Management Zone Regional Mitigation Strategy that will inform the NEPA decision making process including the application of the mitigation hierarchy for BLM/USFS management actions and third party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation. A robust and transparent Regional Mitigation Strategy will contribute to greater sage-grouse habitat conservation by reducing, eliminating, or minimizing threats and compensating for residual impacts to greater sage-grouse and its habitat.

The BLM's Regional Mitigation Manual MS-1794 serves as a framework for developing and implementing a Regional Mitigation Strategy. The following sections provide additional guidance specific to the development and implementation of a WAFWA Management Zone Regional Mitigation Strategy.

### ***Developing a WAFWA Management Zone Regional Mitigation Strategy***

The BLM/USFS, via the WAFWA Management Zone Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, will develop a WAFWA Management Zone Regional Mitigation Strategy to guide the application of the mitigation hierarchy for BLM/USFS management actions and third party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation. The Strategy should consider any State-level greater sage-grouse mitigation guidance that is consistent with the requirements identified in this Appendix. The Regional Mitigation Strategy should be developed in a transparent manner, based on the best science available and standardized metrics.

As described in Chapter 2, the BLM/USFS will establish a WAFWA Management Zone Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Team (hereafter, Team) to help guide the conservation of greater sage-grouse, within 90 days of the issuance of the Record of Decision. The Strategy will be developed within one year of the issuance of the Record of Decision.

The Regional Mitigation Strategy should include mitigation guidance on avoidance, minimization, and compensation, as follows:

- **Avoidance**
  - Include avoidance areas (e.g., right-of-way avoidance/exclusion areas, no surface occupancy areas) already included in laws, regulations, policies, and/or land use plans (e.g., Resource Management Plans, Forest Plans, State Plans); and,
  - Include any potential, additional avoidance actions (e.g., additional avoidance best management practices) with regard to greater sage-grouse conservation.
- **Minimization**
  - Include minimization actions (e.g., required design features, best management practices) already included in laws, regulations, policies, land use plans, and/or land-use authorizations; and,
  - Include any potential, additional minimization actions (e.g., additional minimization best management practices) with regard to greater sage-grouse conservation.

- **Compensation**
  - Include discussion of impact/project valuation, compensatory mitigation options, siting, compensatory project types and costs, monitoring, reporting, and program administration. Each of these topics is discussed in more detail below.
    - Residual Impact and Compensatory Mitigation Project Valuation Guidance
    - A common standardized method should be identified for estimating the value of the residual impacts and value of the compensatory mitigation projects, including accounting for any uncertainty associated with the effectiveness of the projects.
    - This method should consider the quality of habitat, scarcity of the habitat, and the size of the impact/project.
    - For compensatory mitigation projects, consideration of durability (see glossary), timeliness (see glossary), and the potential for failure (e.g., uncertainty associated with effectiveness) may require an upward adjustment of the valuation.
    - The resultant compensatory mitigation project will, after application of the above guidance, result in proactive conservation measures for greater sage-grouse (consistent with BLM Manual 6840 – Special Status Species Management, section .02).
- **Compensatory Mitigation Options**
  - Options for implementing compensatory mitigation should be identified, such as:
    - Utilizing certified mitigation/conservation bank or credit exchanges.
    - Contributing to an existing mitigation/conservation fund.
- **Compensatory Mitigation Siting**
  - Sites should be in areas that have the potential to yield a net conservation gain to the greater sage-grouse, regardless of land ownership.
  - Sites should be durable (see glossary).
  - Sites identified by existing plans and strategies (e.g., fire restoration plans, invasive species strategies, healthy land focal areas) should be considered, if those sites have the potential to yield a net conservation gain to greater sage-grouse and are durable.
- **Compensatory Mitigation Project Types and Costs**
  - Project types should be identified that help reduce threats to greater sage-grouse (e.g., protection, conservation, and restoration projects).
  - Each project type should have a goal and measurable objectives.
  - Each project type should have associated monitoring and maintenance requirements, for the duration of the impact.
  - To inform contributions to a mitigation/conservation fund, expected costs for these project types (and their monitoring and maintenance), within the WAFWA Management Zone, should be identified.
- **Compensatory Mitigation Compliance and Monitoring**
  - Mitigation projects should be inspected to ensure they are implemented as designed, and if not, there should be methods to enforce compliance.
  - Mitigation projects should be monitored to ensure that the goals and objectives are met and that the benefits are effective for the duration of the impact.

- **Compensatory Mitigation Reporting**
  - Standardized, transparent, scalable, and scientifically-defensible reporting requirements should be identified for mitigation projects.
  - Reports should be compiled, summarized, and reviewed in the WAFWA Management Zone in order to determine if greater sage-grouse conservation has been achieved and/or to support adaptive management recommendations.
- **Compensatory Mitigation Program Implementation Guidelines**
  - Guidelines for implementing the State-level compensatory mitigation program should include holding and applying compensatory mitigation funds, operating a transparent and credible accounting system, certifying mitigation credits, and managing reporting requirements.

#### *Incorporating the Regional Mitigation Strategy into NEPA Analyses*

The BLM/USFS will include the avoidance, minimization, and compensatory recommendations from the Regional Mitigation Strategy in one or more of the NEPA analysis' alternatives for BLM/USFS management actions and third party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation and the appropriate mitigation actions will be carried forward into the decision.

#### *Implementing a Compensatory Mitigation Program*

The BLM/USFS need to ensure that compensatory mitigation is strategically implemented to provide a net conservation gain to the species, as identified in the Regional Mitigation Strategy. In order to align with existing compensatory mitigation efforts, this compensatory mitigation program will be managed at a State-level (as opposed to a WAFWA Management Zone, a Field Office, or a Forest), in collaboration with our partners (e.g., Federal, Tribal, and State agencies).

To ensure transparent and effective management of the compensatory mitigation funds, the BLM/USFS will enter into a contract or agreement with a third-party to help manage the State-level compensatory mitigation funds, within one year of the issuance of the Record of Decision. The selection of the third-party compensatory mitigation administrator will conform to all relevant laws, regulations, and policies. The BLM/USFS will remain responsible for making decisions that affect Federal lands.

### **3.0 COT OBJECTIVE 2: IMPLEMENT TARGETED HABITAT MANAGEMENT AND RESTORATION**

*“Some sage-grouse populations warrant more than the amelioration of the impacts from stressors to maintain sage-grouse on the landscape. In these instances, and particularly with impacts resulting from wildfire, it may be critical to not only remove or reduce anthropogenic threats to these populations but additionally to improve population health through active habitat management (e.g., habitat restoration). This is particularly important for those populations that are essential to maintaining range-wide redundancy and representation.” (COT Report, 2013)*

In many areas of Wyoming, amelioration of threats isn't enough. Activities must be taken to enhance the habitat for continued success of greater sage-grouse. This objective identifies the areas where RMPs will put forth the commitments for habitat restoration and enhancement.

The Wyoming Game and Fish Department established local greater sage-grouse working groups over 10 years ago. Each of these local working groups developed conservation plans which have served to guide conservation of greater sage-grouse habitat at a local level. The management objectives for this federal

land use plan were developed in coordination with the State of Wyoming, recognizing the ongoing work which has been done over the last 10 years in Wyoming as a result of the conservation efforts identified by each of the local working groups.

Upon completion of the planning process, with issuance of an Approved Plan and Record of Decision, subsequent implementation decisions will be put into effect by developing implementation (activity-level or project-specific) plans. These implementation decisions will be based upon the objectives identified in the Approved Plan and Record of Decisions, and will be coordinated with local working groups.

#### **4.0 COT OBJECTIVE 3: DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT STATE AND FEDERAL CONSERVATION STRATEGIES AND ASSOCIATED INCENTIVE-BASED CONSERVATION ACTIONS AND REGULATORY MECHANISMS**

*“To conserve sage-grouse and habitat redundancy, representation, and resilience, state and federal agencies, along with interested stakeholders within range of the sage-grouse should work together to develop a plan, including any necessary regulatory or legal tools (or use an existing plan, if appropriate) that includes clear mechanisms for addressing the threats to sage-grouse within PACs. Where consistent with state conservation plans, sage grouse habitats outside of PACs should also be addressed. We recognize that threats can be ameliorated through a variety of tools within the purview of states and federal agencies, including incentive-based conservation actions or regulatory mechanisms. Federal land management agencies should work with states in developing adequate regulatory mechanisms. Federal land management agencies should also contribute to the incentive-based conservation and habitat restoration and rehabilitation efforts. In the development of conservation plans, entities (states, federal land management agencies, etc.) should coordinate with FWS. This will ensure that the plans address the threats contributing to the 2010 warranted but precluded determination, and that conservation strategies will meaningfully contribute to future listing analyses.” (COT Report, 2013)*

#### **4.1 Implementation Working Groups**

##### ***National Level***

In December 2011, Wyoming Governor Matt Mead and Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar co-hosted a meeting to address coordinated conservation of the greater sage-grouse across its range. Ten states within the range of the greater sage-grouse were represented, as were the U.S. Forest Service (FS), the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and the Department of the Interior (DOI) — including representatives from the DOI’s Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). The primary outcome of the meeting was the creation of a Sage-Grouse Task Force (Task Force) chaired by Governors Mead (WY) and Hickenlooper (CO) and the Director of the BLM. The Task Force was directed to develop recommendations on how to best advance a coordinated, multi-state, range-wide effort to conserve the greater sage-grouse, including the identification of conservation objectives to ensure the long-term viability of the species.

### **Regional Level**

Regional Level Teams (Sage Grouse Implementation Group)

### **State Level**

The Sage Grouse Implementation Team (SGIT) has been established through Wyoming Legislature (Wyoming Statute 9-19-101(a)) to review data and make recommendations to the Governor of Wyoming regarding actions and funding to enhance and restore greater sage-grouse habitats in Wyoming. Additionally, the SGIT is responsible for making recommendations to the Governor regarding regulatory actions necessary to maintain greater sage-grouse populations and greater sage-grouse habitats.

Adaptive Management Working Group has been established in consultation with the SGIT to provide appropriate guidance for agencies with the ability to affect greater sage-grouse populations and/or habitat through their permitting authority. The AMWG includes BLM, FS, FWS, and State of Wyoming.

### **Local Level**

In 2000, a Local Working Group was established by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department to develop and facilitate implementation of local conservation plans for the benefit of greater sage-grouse, their habitats, and whenever feasible, other species that use sagebrush habitats. This group prepared the Wyoming Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Plan (Wyoming Sage-Grouse Working Group 2003) to provide coordinated management and direction across the state. In 2004, local greater sage-grouse working groups were formed to develop and implement local conservation plans. Eight local working groups around Wyoming have completed conservation plans, many of which prioritize addressing past, present, and reasonably foreseeable threats at the state and local levels, and prescribe management actions for private landowners to improve greater sage-grouse conservation at the local scale, consistent with Wyoming's Core Population Area Strategy.

## **4.2 Implementation Tracking**

Because the State of Wyoming continues to retain management of the species, and through implementation of the Executive Order, BLM Wyoming will continue to coordinate tracking of populations, disturbance and conservation actions.

- DDCT GIS for tracking disturbance
- Population Counts
- Lek counts
- Conservation Actions

In addition to the tracking databases being maintained by the State of Wyoming, a national- Greater Sage-grouse Land Use Plan Decision Monitoring and Reporting Tool is being developed to describe how the BLM and the USFS will consistently and systematically monitor and report implementation-level activity plans and implementation actions for all plans within the range of greater sage-grouse. A description of this tool for collection and reporting of tabular and spatially explicit data will be included in the ROD or approved plan. The BLM and the USFS will provide data that can be integrated with other conservation efforts conducted by state and federal partners.

### 4.3 Public Involvement

A website where the public can quickly and easily access data concerning implementation will be developed and kept current on the Wyoming BLM database. Creating this website and maintaining it through the implementation cycle will be a vital part of implementation success. The public is welcome to provide implementation comments to the BLM any time during the cycle, but schedules for implementation planning decisions will be posted so the public can make timely comments. All Activity Plan Working Group meetings where recommendations are made to the BLM will be open to the public, and will provide for specific and helpful public involvement. This includes providing web-based information to the public prior to any Activity Plan Working Group meetings; such that members of the public can provide input to the working session, both early and mid-way through the scheduled meetings.

The state sponsored LWG and SGIT meetings are advertised and open to the public.

### 5.0 COT OBJECTIVE 4: PROACTIVE CONSERVATION ACTIONS

*“Proactive, incentive based, voluntary conservation actions (e.g., Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances, Natural Resources Conservation Service programs) should be developed and/or implemented by interested stakeholders and closely coordinated across the range of the species to ensure they are complimentary and address sage-grouse conservation needs and threats. These efforts need to receive full funding, including funding for necessary personnel.” (COT Report, 2013)*

In addition to the conservation activities identified through implementation of the Resource Management Plan in coordination with the Local Working Group Conservation Plans, BLM and USFS will continue to partner with other agencies and stakeholders to identify conservation actions to benefit greater sage-grouse habitat. Actions which may occur could include Candidate Conservation Agreements with accompanying Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances and designation of conservation easements.

Candidate Conservation Agreements are entered into when a potential threat to habitat is identified. BLM enters into CCAs with USFWS to identify potential threats and plan for conservation measures to address potential threats. The purpose of CCAs and the accompanying CCAAs for private lands is to prevent listing of any sensitive species under ESA.

BLM Wyoming has already entered into a Statewide CCA for range management on BLM lands in Wyoming. This CCA promotes proper livestock grazing and management through implementation of voluntary conservation measures and management practices that are consistent with greater sage-grouse population management and habitat conservation objectives on BLM lands.

Conservation Easements are identified private lands with greater sage-grouse habitat where the private landowners enter into voluntary agreements with the government to give up developmental rights which may adversely affect habitat. The most common way these areas may be used in Wyoming is for mitigation banks. Allowing development within some areas of historic greater sage-grouse habitat or marginal habitat will require appropriate mitigation. In some cases the most appropriate mitigation may be for project proponents to buy credits at a conservation easement, thus creating a mitigation bank. Overall, the benefit is to the greater sage-grouse, as it reduces the overall potential for fragmented habitat by ensuring there are areas with no development potential which could adversely affect the viability of the species.

**Sweetwater River Conservancy Habitat Conservation Bank**

The Sweetwater River Conservancy Habitat Conservation Bank is the first conservation bank established for greater sage-grouse. Located in central Wyoming, the bank manages habitat for greater sage-grouse allowing energy development and other activities to proceed on other lands within Wyoming. A conservation bank is a site or suite of sites established under an agreement with the USFWS, intended to protect, and improve habitat for species. Credits may be purchased which result in perpetual conservation easements and conservation projects on the land to offset impacts occurring elsewhere. The Sweetwater River Conservancy Habitat Conservation Bank launched with 55,000 deeded acres of greater sage-grouse habitat, and could expand up to 700,000 acres on other lands owned by the Sweetwater River Conservancy contingent upon demand (USFWS 2015).

**Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative**

The Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative is a long-term science based effort to assess and enhance aquatic and terrestrial habitats at a landscape scale in southwest Wyoming, while facilitating responsible development through local collaboration and partnership. Collaborative efforts address multiple concerns at a scale that considers all activities on the landscape, and can leverage resources that might not be available for single agency projects. Greater sage-grouse initiatives from the Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative have included habitat enhancement efforts (e.g., invasive weed treatment, prescribed grazing strategies), and greater sage-grouse research studies (Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative 2013).

**Powder River Basin Restoration Program**

The Powder River Basin Restoration Program is a collaborative partnership to restore and enhance greater sage-grouse habitat on a landscape level in the Powder River Basin. The basin encompasses 13,493,840 acres in northeast Wyoming and southeast Montana. Surface ownership is composed of approximately 70 percent private lands, 14 percent BLM-administered lands (including 8 percent in Wyoming and 6 percent in Montana), 8 percent Forest Service lands, and 8 percent States of Wyoming and Montana lands. Subsurface mineral ownership is 50 to 60 percent federal (BLM 2014).

The Powder River Basin Restoration Program is focusing on areas affected by the federal oil and gas development that has occurred over the past decade in the Powder River Basin in northeastern Wyoming. Its objectives are restoring or enhancing disturbed previously suitable habitat to suitable habitat for sagebrush obligate species, primarily greater sage-grouse. This includes multiple sites affected by coal bed natural gas abandonment reclamation efforts, wildfires, and noxious and invasive plants. Priority will be given to those areas recognized as priority habitats (e.g., PHMAs).

Habitat objectives are meeting the needs for nesting, brood-rearing, and late brood-rearing. The program would contribute to efforts focused on the management and control of mosquitoes carrying West Nile virus and would include funding, labor, treatment locations, and other needs as determined.

Additionally, efforts would be coordinated to reduce fuels in and near greater sage-grouse habitat, to enhance sagebrush stands, support restoration efforts, and reduce the risk of high-severity wildfire. Pine stands and juniper woodlands would be managed for structural diversity and to reduce fuels, especially near PHMA, human developments, and recreation areas.

### **Natural Resource Conservation Service Sage Grouse Initiative**

The US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service’s Sage-Grouse Initiative (SGI) is working with private landowners in 11 western states to improve habitat for greater sage-grouse (Manier et al. 2013). With 13.5 million acres of greater sage-grouse habitat in private ownership within MZ II/VII (Manier et al. 2013, p. 118), a unique opportunity exists for the Natural Resources Conservation Service to benefit greater sage-grouse and to ensure the persistence of large and intact rangelands by implementing the SGI.

Participation in the SGI program is voluntary, but willing participants enter into binding contracts or easements to ensure that conservation practices that enhance greater sage-grouse habitat, such as fence marking, protecting riparian areas, and maintaining vegetation in nesting areas, are implemented. Participating landowners are bound by a contract (usually 3 to 5 years) to implement, in consultation with Natural Resources Conservation Service staff, conservation practices if they wish to receive the financial incentives offered by the SGI. These financial incentives generally take the form of payments to offset costs of implementing conservation practices and easements or rental payments for long-term conservation.

While potentially effective at conserving greater sage-grouse populations and habitat on private lands, incentive-based conservation programs that fund the SGI generally require reauthorization from Congress under subsequent farm bills, meaning future funding is not guaranteed.

## **6.0 COT OBJECTIVE 5: DEVELOPMENT OF MONITORING PLANS**

*“A robust range-wide monitoring program must be developed and implemented for sage-grouse conservation plans, which recognizes and incorporates individual state approaches. A monitoring program is necessary to track the success of conservation plans and proactive conservation activities. Without this information, the actual benefit of conservation activities cannot be measured and there is no capacity to adapt if current management actions are determined to be ineffective.” (COT Report, 2013)*

### **6.1 Greater Sage-Grouse Monitoring Framework**

#### **Introduction**


The purpose of this U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) Greater Sage-grouse Monitoring Framework (hereafter, monitoring framework) is to describe the methods to monitor habitats and evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the BLM planning strategy (BLM IM 2012-044) and the USFS Land Use Plans to conserve the species and its habitat. The regulations for the BLM (43 CFR 1610.4-9) and the USFS (36 CFR part 209, published July 1, 2010) require that land use plans establish intervals and standards, as appropriate, for monitoring and evaluations, based on the sensitivity of the resource to the decisions involved. Therefore, BLM and USFS will use the methods described herein to collect monitoring data to evaluate implementation and effectiveness of the greater sage-grouse (hereafter, greater sage-grouse) planning strategy and the conservation measures contained in land use plans. The type of monitoring data to be collected at the land use plan scale will be described in the monitoring plan which will be developed after the signing of the ROD. For a summary of the frequency of reporting see Attachment A. Adaptive management will be informed by data collected at any and all scales.

To ensure the BLM and USFS have the ability to make consistent assessments about greater sage-grouse habitats across the range of the species, this framework lays out the methodology for monitoring the implementation and evaluating the effectiveness of BLM/USFS actions to conserve the species and its habitat through monitoring that informs effectiveness at multiple scales. Monitoring efforts will include data for measurable quantitative indicators of sagebrush availability, anthropogenic disturbance levels, and sagebrush conditions. Implementation monitoring results will provide information to allow the BLM and USFS to evaluate the extent that decisions from the BLM RMP and USFS land management plans (LMP) to conserve greater sage-grouse and its habitat have been implemented. Population monitoring information will be collected by state fish and wildlife agencies and will be incorporated into effectiveness monitoring as it is made available.

This multi-scale monitoring approach is necessary as greater sage-grouse are a landscape species and conservation is scale-dependent whereby conservation actions are implemented within seasonal habitats to benefit populations. The four orders of habitat selection (Johnson 1980) used in this monitoring framework are described by Connelly et al. (2003) and Stiver et al. (2014) as first order (broad scale), second order (mid-scale), third order (fine scale), and fourth order (site scale) to apply them to greater sage-grouse habitat selection. The various scales may show differences because of the methods used. The broad and mid-scale may provide a generalized direction, however the suitability baseline (pre-euro) is not considered an accurate baseline. The current baseline will provide better information on trends provided the data used in the analysis is sound. Based upon the management actions related to the BLM and Wyoming SGE0, the broad and mid-scale may greatly underestimate the impacts of the threats outlined in the COT report. Habitat selection and habitat use by greater sage-grouse occurs at multiple scales and is driven by multiple environmental and behavioral factors. Managing and monitoring greater sage-grouse habitats are complicated by the differences in habitat selection across the range and habitat utilization by individual birds within a given season. Therefore, the tendency to look at a single indicator of habitat suitability or only one scale limits the ability for managers to identify the threats to greater sage-grouse and to respond at the appropriate scale. For descriptions of these habitat suitability indicators for each scale, see the Sage-grouse Habitat Assessment Framework (HAF; Stiver et al. in press).

Monitoring methods and indicators in this monitoring framework are derived from the current peer-reviewed science. Range wide best-available datasets for broad and mid-scale monitoring will be acquired. If these existing datasets are not readily available or are inadequate, but are necessary to effectively inform the three measurable quantitative indicators (sagebrush availability, anthropogenic disturbance levels, and sagebrush conditions), the BLM will strive to develop datasets or obtain information to fill these data gaps. Datasets that are not readily available to inform the fine and site scale indicators will be developed. These data will be used to generate monitoring reports at the appropriate and applicable geographic scales, boundaries and analysis units: across the range of greater sage-grouse as defined by Schroeder et al. (2004), and clipped by WAFWA Management Zone (MZ) (Stiver et al. 2006) boundaries and other areas as appropriate for size (e.g., populations based on Connelly et al. 2004; Figure Y-11). This broad and mid-scale monitoring data and analysis will provide context for RMP/LMP areas; states; greater sage-grouse Priority Habitat, General Habitat and other greater sage-grouse designated management areas; and Priority Areas for Conservation (PACs) as defined in the Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Objectives: Final Report (COT, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2013). Throughout the remainder of the document, all of these areas will be referred to as “sage-grouse areas”.

Figure Y-11. Greater Sage-Grouse Range, Populations, Subpopulations and Priority Areas for Conservation as of 2013



**GRSG PACs, Subpopulations and Populations**

**LEGEND**

-  Subpopulations
-  COT PACs
-  Populations

**Sources:**

- Current Range: Schroeder et al., 2004
- Populations: Connelly et al., 2004
- Subpopulations: Connelly et al., 2004
- PACs: USFWS COT Report, 2013

This monitoring framework is divided into two sections. The broad- and mid-scale methods, described in Section 4.2, provide a consistent approach across the range of the species to monitor implementation decisions and actions, mid-scale habitat attributes (e.g., sagebrush availability and habitat degradation), and population changes to determine the effectiveness of the planning strategy and management decisions. (See Table Y-3, Indicators for monitoring implementation of the national planning strategy, RMP/LMP decisions, greater sage-grouse habitat, and greater sage-grouse populations at the broad and

mid-scales.) For greater sage-grouse habitat at the fine and site scales, described in Section 4.3, this monitoring framework describes a consistent approach (e.g., indicators and methods) for monitoring greater sage-grouse seasonal habitats. Funding, support, and dedicated personnel for broad- and mid-scale monitoring will be renewed annually through the normal budget process. For an overview of BLM and USFS multiscale monitoring commitments, see Attachment A.

**Table Y-3. Indicators for Monitoring Implementation of the Strategy, Decisions, Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat, and Greater Sage- Grouse Populations at the Broad and Mid-scales**

	Implementation	Habitat		Population (State Wildlife Agencies)
<i>Geographic Scales</i>		<i>Availability</i>	<i>Degradation</i>	<i>Demographics</i>
Broad Scale: From the range of greater sage-grouse to WAFWA Management Zones	BLM/USFS Planning Strategy goal and objectives	Distribution and amount of sagebrush within the range	Distribution and amount of energy, mining and infrastructure facilities	WAFWA Management Zone population trend
Mid-scale: From WAFWA Management Zone to populations	An analysis of RMP/LRMP decisions across the designated scale	Mid-scale habitat indicators (HAF 2014; Table 2, e.g., percent of sagebrush per unit area)	Distribution and amount of energy, mining and infrastructure facilities (Table 2)*	Individual population trend
Fine Scale: Pacs	A summary of DDCT actions related to BLM mineral and surface resources in conjunction with other ownerships	Areas that have greater than 5% sagebrush cover and non-habitat (unsuitable) that is less than 0.6miles from the suitable habitat.	Distribution and amount of anthropogenic disturbances and wildfire occurrences impacting specific PACs	PAC Trends
Site Scale: DDCT level	A summary of DDCT actions related to BLM mineral and surface resources	The available occupied habitat using the DDCT process	Distribution and amount of anthropogenic disturbances and wildfire occurrences impacting specific PACs	Individual lek Trends
Broad Scale: From the range of greater sage-grouse to WAFWA Management Zones	BLM/USFS Planning Strategy goal and objectives	Distribution and amount of sagebrush within the range	Distribution and amount of energy, mining and infrastructure facilities	WAFWA Management Zone population trend
Mid-scale: From WAFWA Management Zone to populations; PACs	RMP/LRMP decisions	Mid-scale habitat indicators (HAF 2014; Table 2, e.g., percent of sagebrush per unit area)	Distribution and amount of energy, mining and infrastructure facilities (Table 2)*	Individual population trend

\*HAF 2014; Table 2

### **Broad and Mid-Scales**

First-order habitat selection, the broad scale, describes the physical or geographical range of a species. The first-order habitat of the greater sage-grouse is defined by populations of greater sage-grouse associated with sagebrush landscapes, based on Schroeder et al. 2004, and Connelly et al. 2004, and on population or habitat surveys since 2004. An intermediate scale between the broad and mid-scales was delineated by WAFWA from floristic provinces within which similar environmental factors influence vegetation communities. This scale is referred to as the WAFWA Sage-Grouse Management Zones (MZs). Although no indicators are specific to this scale, these MZs are biologically meaningful as reporting units.

Second-order habitat selection, the mid-scale, includes greater sage-grouse populations and PACs. The second order includes at least 40 discrete populations and subpopulations (Connelly et al. 2004). Populations range in area from 150 to 60,000 mi<sup>2</sup> and are nested within MZs. PACs range from 20 to 20,400 mi<sup>2</sup> and are nested within population areas.

Other mid-scale landscape indicators, such as patch size and number, patch connectivity, linkage areas, and landscape matrix and edge effects (Stiver et al. in press) will also be assessed. The methods used to calculate these metrics will be derived from existing literature (Knick et al. 2011, Leu and Hanser 2011, Knick and Hanser 2011).

Midscale indicators using the HAF can grossly underestimate the occupation of anthropogenic activities because of the use of 30m pixels (page Table II – X). The HAF removes ‘non’habitat from the suitability availability. There are no parameters that are provided to protect adjacent suitable habitat from development on these nonhabitat parcels, thus making the adjacent nonhabitat a potential threat by indirect impacts.

The Wyoming BLM and USFS Offices will be actively participating in a fine and site scale monitoring that will more accurately reflect the impacts associated with direct and indirect effects of anthropogenic and wildfire impacts.

## **6.2 Implementation (Decision) Monitoring**

Implementation monitoring is the process of tracking and documenting the implementation (or the progress toward implementation) of RMP/LMP decisions. The BLM and the USFS will monitor implementation of project-level and/or site-specific actions and authorizations, with their associated conditions of approval/stipulations for greater sage-grouse, spatially (as appropriate) within Priority Habitat, General Habitat, and other greater sage-grouse designated management areas, at a minimum, for the Bighorn Basin Planning Area. These actions and authorizations, as well as progress toward completing and implementing activity-level plans, will be monitored consistently across all planning units and will be reported to BLM and USFS headquarters annually, as well as reported to the State of Wyoming with numerical and spatial data twice a year, and a HQ summary report every 5 years, for the Bighorn Basin Planning Area. A national-level Greater Sage-grouse Land Use Plan Decision Monitoring and Reporting Tool is being developed to describe how the BLM and the USFS will consistently and systematically monitor and report implementation-level activity plans and implementation actions for all plans within the range of greater sage-grouse. A description of this tool for collection and reporting of tabular and spatially explicit data will be included in the Record of Decision or approved plan. The BLM will provide data that can be integrated with other conservation efforts conducted by state and federal partners.

## **6.3 Habitat (Vegetation) Monitoring**

The USFWS, in its 2010 listing decision for the sage-grouse, identified 18 threats contributing to the destruction, modification, or curtailment of greater sage-grouse habitat or range (75 FR 13910 2010). The BLM will, therefore, monitor the relative extent of these threats that remove sagebrush, both spatially and temporally, on all lands within an analysis area, and will report on amount, pattern, and condition at the appropriate and applicable geographic scales and boundaries. These 18 threats have been aggregated into three broad- and mid-scale measures to account for whether the threat predominantly removes sagebrush or degrades habitat. (See Table 4, Relationship between the 18 Threats and the 3 Habitat Disturbance Measures for Monitoring.) The three measures are:

1. Sagebrush Availability (percent of sagebrush per suitable unit area)
2. Habitat Degradation (percent of human activity per unit area)
3. Energy and Mining Density (facilities and locations per suitable unit area)

These three habitat disturbance measures will evaluate disturbance on all lands within priority habitat, regardless of land ownership. The direct area of influence will be assessed with the goal of accounting for actual removal of sagebrush on which greater sage-grouse depend (Connelly et al. 2000) and for habitat degradation as a surrogate for human activity. Measure 1 (sagebrush availability) examines where disturbances have removed plant communities that support sagebrush (or have broadly removed sagebrush from the landscape). Measure 1, therefore, monitors the change in sagebrush availability—or, specifically, where and how much of the sagebrush community is available on lands that can support sagebrush within the range of greater sage-grouse. The sagebrush community is defined as the ecological systems that have the capability of supporting sagebrush vegetation and seasonal greater sage-grouse habitats within the range of greater sage-grouse (see Section B.1., Sagebrush Availability). Measure 2 (see Section B.2., Habitat Degradation Monitoring) and Measure 3 (see Section B.3., Energy and Mining Density) focus on where habitat degradation is occurring within suitable sagebrush soils by using the footprint/area of direct disturbance and the number of facilities at the mid-scale to identify the relative amount of degradation per geographic area of interest and in areas that have the capability of supporting sagebrush and seasonal greater sage-grouse use. Measure 2 (habitat degradation) not only quantifies footprint/area of direct disturbance but also establishes a surrogate for those threats most likely to have ongoing activity. Because energy development and mining activities are typically the most intensive activities in sagebrush habitat, Measure 3 (the density of active energy development, production, and mining sites) will help identify areas of particular concern for such factors as noise, dust, traffic, etc., that degrade greater sage-grouse habitat.

**Table Y-4. Relationship between the 18 Threats and the 3 Habitat Disturbance Measures for Monitoring**

FWS Listing Decision Threat	Sagebrush Availability	Habitat Degradation	Density of Energy and Mining
Agriculture	X		
Urbanization	X		
Wildfire	X		
Conifer encroachment	X		
Treatments	X		
Invasive Species	X		
Energy (oil and gas wells and development facilities)		X	X
Energy (coal mines)		X	X
Energy (wind towers)		X	X
Energy (solar fields)		X	X
Energy (geothermal)		X	X
Mining (active locatable, leasable, and salable developments)		X	X
Infrastructure (roads)		X	
Infrastructure (railroads)		X	
Infrastructure (power lines)		X	
Infrastructure (communication towers)		X	
Infrastructure (other vertical structures)		X	
Other developed rights of ways		X	

Note: Data availability may preclude specific analysis of individual layers. See the detailed methodology for more information.

The methods to monitor disturbance found herein differ slightly from methods used in the Sage-Grouse Baseline Environmental Report (BER; Manier et al. 2013) that provided a baseline of datasets of disturbance across jurisdictions. One difference is that, for some threats, the data in the BER were for federal lands only. In addition, threats were assessed individually in that report, using different assumptions from those in this monitoring framework about how to quantify the location and magnitude of threats. The methodology herein builds on the BER methodology and identifies datasets and procedures to utilize the best available data across the range of the greater sage-grouse and to formulate a consistent approach to quantify impact of the threats through time. This methodology also describes an approach to combine the threats and calculate the three measures.

### **6.3.1 Sagebrush Availability (Measure 1)**

Greater sage-grouse populations have been found to be more resilient where a percentage of the landscape is maintained in sagebrush (Knick and Connelly 2011), which will be determined by sagebrush availability. Measure 1 has been divided into two sub measures to describe sagebrush availability on the landscape:

- Measure 1a: the current amount of sagebrush on the geographic area of interest, and
- Measure 1b: the amount of sagebrush on the geographic area of interest compared with the amount of sagebrush the landscape of interest could ecologically support.

**Measure 1a** (the current amount of sagebrush on the landscape) will be calculated using this formula: [the existing updated sagebrush layer] divided by [the geographic area of interest]. The appropriate geographic areas of interest for sagebrush availability include the species' range, WAFWA MZs, populations, and PACs. In some cases these greater sage-grouse areas will need to be aggregated to provide an estimate of sagebrush availability with an acceptable level of accuracy.

**Measure 1b** (the amount of sagebrush for context within the geographic area of interest) will be calculated using this formula: [existing sagebrush divided by [pre-EuroAmerican settlement geographic extent of lands that could have supported sagebrush]]. This measure will provide information to set the context for a given geographic area of interest during evaluations of monitoring data. The information could also be used to inform management options for restoration or mitigation and to inform effectiveness monitoring.

The sagebrush base layer for Measure 1 will be based on geospatial vegetation data adjusted for the threats listed in Table Y-4. The following subsections of this monitoring framework describe the methodology for determining both the current availability of sagebrush on the landscape and the context of the amount of sagebrush on the landscape at the broad and mid-scales.

#### **6.3.1.1 Establishing the Sagebrush Base Layer**

The current geographic extent of sagebrush vegetation within the rangewide distribution of greater sage-grouse populations will be ascertained using the most recent version of the Existing Vegetation Type (EVT) layer in LANDFIRE (2013). LANDFIRE EVT was selected to serve as the sagebrush base layer for five reasons: 1) it is the only nationally consistent vegetation layer that has been updated multiple times since 2001; 2) the ecological systems classification within LANDFIRE EVT includes multiple sagebrush type classes that, when aggregated, provide a more accurate (compared with individual classes) and seamless sagebrush base layer across jurisdictional boundaries; 3) LANDFIRE performed a rigorous accuracy assessment from which to derive the rangewide uncertainty of the sagebrush base layer; 4) LANDFIRE is consistently used in several recent analyses of sagebrush habitats (Knick et al. 2011, Leu and Hanser 2011, Knick and Hanser 2011); and 5) LANDFIRE EVT can be compared against the geographic extent of lands that are believed to have had the capability of supporting sagebrush vegetation pre-EuroAmerican settlement [LANDFIRE Biophysical Setting (BpS)]. This fifth reason provides a reference point for understanding how much sagebrush currently remains in a defined geographic area of interest compared with how much sagebrush existed historically (Measure 1b). Therefore, the BLM and the USFS have determined that LANDFIRE provides the best available data at broad and mid-scales to serve as a sagebrush base layer for monitoring changes in the geographic extent of sagebrush. The BLM and the USFS, in addition to aggregating the sagebrush types into the sagebrush base layer, will aggregate the accuracy assessment reports from LANDFIRE to document the cumulative accuracy for the sagebrush base layer. The BLM—through its Assessment, Inventory, and Monitoring

(AIM) program and, specifically, the BLM’s landscape monitoring framework (Taylor et al. 2014)—will provide field data to the LANDFIRE program to support continuous quality improvements of the LANDFIRE EVT layer. The sagebrush layer based on LANDFIRE EVT will allow for the mid-scale estimation of the existing percent of sagebrush across a variety of reporting units. This sagebrush base layer will be adjusted by changes in land cover and successful restoration for future calculations of sagebrush availability (Measures 1a and 1b).

This layer will also be used to determine the trend in other landscape indicators, such as patch size and number, patch connectivity, linkage areas, and landscape matrix and edge effects (Stiver et al. in press). In the future, changes in sagebrush availability, generated annually, will be included in the sagebrush base layer. The landscape metrics will be recalculated to examine changes in pattern and abundance of sagebrush at the various geographic boundaries. This information will be included in effectiveness monitoring (See Section D., Effectiveness Monitoring).

Within the BLM, field office-wide existing vegetation classification mapping and inventories are available that provide a much finer level of data than what is provided through LANDFIRE. Where available, these finer-scale products will be useful for additional and complementary mid-scale indicators and local-scale analyses (see Section 4.3, Fine and Site Scales). The fact that these products are not available everywhere limits their utility for monitoring at the broad and mid-scale, where consistency of data products is necessary across broader geographies.

The sagebrush layer based on LANDFIRE EVT will allow for the mid-scale estimation of existing percent sagebrush across a variety of reporting units. This sagebrush base layer will be adjusted by changes in land cover and successful restoration for future calculations of sagebrush availability (Measures 1a and 1b).

This layer will be used to determine the trend in other landscape indicators, e.g., patch size and number, patch connectivity, linkage areas, and landscape matrix and edge effects (Stiver et al. in press). In the future, changes in sagebrush availability, generated bi-annually, will be included in the sagebrush base layer. The landscape metrics will be recalculated to examine changes in pattern and abundance of sagebrush at the various geographic boundaries. This information will be included in effectiveness monitoring (See Section D).

### ***Data Sources for Establishing and Monitoring Sagebrush Availability***

In much the same manner as how the LANDFIRE data was selected as the data source, described above, the criteria for selecting the datasets (Table Y-5) for establishing and monitoring the change in sagebrush availability, Measure 1, were threefold:

- Nationally consistent dataset available across the range
- Known level of confidence or accuracy in the dataset
- Continual maintenance of dataset and known update interval

**Table Y-5. Datasets for Establishing and Monitoring Changes in Sagebrush Availability**

<b>Dataset</b>	<b>Source</b>	<b>Update Interval</b>	<b>Most Recent Version Year</b>	<b>Use</b>
BioPhysical Setting (BpS) v1.1	LANDFIRE	Static	2008	Denominator for sagebrush availability (1.b.)
Existing Vegetation Type (EVT) v1.2	LANDFIRE	Static	2010	Numerator for sagebrush availability
Cropland Data Layer (CDL)	National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS)	Annual	2012	Agricultural Updates; removes existing sagebrush from numerator of sagebrush availability
National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD) Percent Imperviousness	Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium (MRLC)	5 Year	2011 available in March 2014	Urban Area Updates; removes existing sagebrush from numerator of sagebrush availability
Fire Perimeters	GeoMac	Annual	2013	< 1,000 acres Fire updates; removes existing sagebrush from numerator of sagebrush availability
Burn Severity	Monitoring Trends in Burn Severity (MTBS)	Annual	2012 available in April 2014	> 1,000 acres Fire Updates; removes existing sagebrush from numerator of sagebrush availability except for unburned sagebrush islands

**LANDFIRE Existing Vegetation Type (EVT) Version 1.2**

LANDFIRE EVT represents existing vegetation types on the landscape derived from remote sensing data. Initial mapping was conducted using imagery collected in approximately 2001. Since the initial mapping there have been two update efforts: version 1.1 represents changes before 2008, and version 1.2 reflects changes on the landscape before 2010. Version 1.2 will be used as the starting point to develop the sagebrush base layer.

Ecological systems from the LANDFIRE EVT to be used in the sagebrush base layer were determined by greater sage-grouse subject matter experts through the identification of the ecological systems that have the capability of supporting sagebrush vegetation and could provide suitable seasonal habitat for the greater sage-grouse (Table Y-6). Two additional vegetation types that are not ecological systems were added to the EVT and are *Artemisia tridentata* ssp. *vaseyana* Shrubland Alliance and *Quercus gambelii* Shrubland Alliance. These alliances have species composition directly related to the Rocky Mountain Lower Montane - Foothill Shrubland ecological system and the Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland ecological system, both of which are ecological systems in LANDFIRE BpS. In LANDFIRE EVT however, in some map zones, the Rocky Mountain Lower Montane - Foothill Shrubland ecological system and the Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland ecological system were named *Artemisia tridentata* ssp. *vaseyana* Shrubland Alliance and *Quercus gambelii* Shrubland Alliance respectively.

**Table Y-6. Ecological Systems in BpS and EVT Capable of Supporting Sagebrush Vegetation and Could Provide Suitable Seasonal Habitat for Greater Sage-Grouse**

<b>Ecological System</b>	<b>Sagebrush Vegetation that the Ecological System has the Capability to Produce</b>
Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	<i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> ssp. <i>longiloba</i> <i>Artemisia bigelovii</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia frigida</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i>
Columbia Plateau Scabland Shrubland	<i>Artemisia rigida</i>
Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland	<i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> ssp. <i>longicaulis</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> ssp. <i>longiloba</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i>
Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>xericensis</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i>
Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i> <i>Artemisia spinescens</i>
Wyoming Basins Dwarf Sagebrush Shrubland and Steppe	<i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> ssp. <i>longiloba</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i> <i>Artemisia tripartita</i> ssp. <i>rupicola</i>
Columbia Plateau Low Sagebrush Steppe	<i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> ssp. <i>longiloba</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i>
Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	<i>Artemisia cana</i> ssp. <i>cana</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>xericensis</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i> <i>Artemisia tripartita</i> ssp. <i>tripartita</i> <i>Artemisia frigida</i>
Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>spiciformis</i>
Northwestern Great Plains Mixed grass Prairie	<i>Artemisia cana</i> ssp. <i>cana</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i> <i>Artemisia frigida</i>
Northwestern Great Plains Shrubland	<i>Artemisia cana</i> ssp. <i>cana</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i>
Western Great Plains Sand Prairie	<i>Artemisia cana</i> ssp. <i>cana</i>
Western Great Plains Floodplain Systems	<i>Artemisia cana</i> ssp. <i>cana</i>
Columbia Plateau Steppe and Grassland	<i>Artemisia</i> spp.

**Table Y-6. Ecological Systems in BpS and EVT Capable of Supporting Sagebrush Vegetation and Could Provide Suitable Seasonal Habitat for Greater Sage-Grouse (Continued)**

Ecological System	Sagebrush Vegetation that the Ecological System has the Capability to Produce
Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia bigelovii</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i>
Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	<i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia frigida</i>
Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i>
Inter-Mountain Basins Curl-Leaf Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i>
<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i> Shrubland Alliance (EVT only)	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i>
<i>Quercus gambelii</i> Shrubland Alliance (EVT only)	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i>

**Accuracy and Appropriate Use of LANDFIRE Datasets**

Because of concerns over the thematic accuracy of individual classes mapped by LANDFIRE, all ecological systems listed in Table Y-6 will be merged into one value that represents the sagebrush base layer. With all ecological systems aggregated, the combined accuracy of the sagebrush base layer (EVT) will be much greater than if all categories were treated separately.

LANDFIRE performed the original accuracy assessment of their EVT product on a map zone basis. There are 20 LANDFIRE map zones that cover the historic range of greater sage-grouse as defined by Schroeder (2004). Attachment C lists the user and producer accuracies for the aggregated ecological systems that make up the sagebrush base layer and also defines user and producer accuracies. The aggregated sagebrush base layer for monitoring had producer accuracies ranging from 56.7% to 100% and user accuracies ranging from 57.1% to 85.7%.

LANDFIRE EVT data are not designed to be used at a local level. In reports of the percent sagebrush statistic for the various reporting units (Measure 1a), the uncertainty of the percent sagebrush will increase as the size of the reporting unit gets smaller. LANDFIRE data should never be used at the 30m pixel level (900m2 resolution of raster data) for any reporting. The smallest geographic extent for using the data to determine percent sagebrush is at the PAC level; for the smallest PACs, the initial percent sagebrush estimate will have greater uncertainties compared with the much larger PACs.

### ***Agricultural Adjustments for the Sagebrush Base Layer***

The dataset for the geographic extent of agricultural lands will come from the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) Cropland Data Layer (CDL) (<http://www.nass.usda.gov/research/Cropland/Release/index.htm>). CDL data are generated annually, with estimated producer accuracies for “large area row crops ranging from the mid 80% to mid-90%,” depending on the state ([http://www.nass.usda.gov/research/Cropland/sarsfaqs2.htm#Section3\\_18.0](http://www.nass.usda.gov/research/Cropland/sarsfaqs2.htm#Section3_18.0)). Specific information on accuracy may be found on the NASS metadata website (<http://www.nass.usda.gov/research/Cropland/metadata/meta.htm>). CDL provided the only dataset that matches the three criteria (nationally consistent, known level of accuracy, and periodically updated) for use in this monitoring framework and represents the best available agricultural lands mapping product.

The CDL data contain both agricultural classes and nonagricultural classes. For this effort, and in the baseline environmental report (Manier et al. 2013), nonagricultural classes were removed from the original dataset. The excluded classes are:

- Barren (65 & 131), Deciduous Forest (141), Developed/High Intensity (124), Developed/Low Intensity (122), Developed/Med Intensity (123), Developed/Open Space (121), Evergreen Forest (142), Grassland Herbaceous (171), Herbaceous Wetlands (195), Mixed Forest (143), Open Water (83 & 111), Other Hay/Non Alfalfa (37), Pasture/Hay (181), Pasture/Grass (62), Perennial Ice/Snow (112), Shrubland (64 & 152), Woody Wetlands (190).

The rule set for adjusting the sagebrush base layer for agricultural lands (and for updating the base layer for agricultural lands in the future) is that once an area is classified as agriculture in any year of the CDL, those pixels will remain out of the sagebrush base layer even if a new version of the CDL classifies that pixel as one of the nonagricultural classes listed above. The assumption is that even though individual pixels may be classified as a nonagricultural class in any given year, the pixel has not necessarily been restored to a natural sagebrush community that would be included in Table Y-6. A further assumption is that once an area has moved into agricultural use, it is unlikely that the area would be restored to sagebrush. Should that occur, however, the method and criteria for adding pixels back into the sagebrush base layer would follow those found in the sagebrush restoration monitoring section of this monitoring framework.

### ***Urban Adjustments for the Sagebrush Base Layer***

The National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD) Percent Imperviousness was selected as the best available dataset to be used for urban updates. These data are generated on a five-year cycle and specifically designed to support monitoring efforts. Other datasets were evaluated and lacked the spatial specificity that was captured in the NLCD product. Any new impervious pixel will be removed from the sagebrush base layer during the update process. Although the impervious surface layer includes a number of impervious pixels outside of urban areas, there are two reasons why this is acceptable for this process. First, an evaluation of national urban area datasets did not reveal a layer that could be confidently used in conjunction with the NLCD product to screen impervious pixels outside of urban zones because unincorporated urban areas were not being included thus leaving large chunks of urban pixels unaccounted for in this rule set. Secondly, experimentation with setting a threshold on the percent imperviousness layer that would isolate rural features proved to be unsuccessful. No combination of values could be identified that would result in the consistent ability to limit impervious pixels outside urban areas. Therefore, to ensure consistency in the monitoring estimates, it was determined to include all impervious pixels.

### **Fire Adjustments for the Sagebrush Base Layer**

Two datasets were selected for performing fire adjustments and updates: GeoMac fire perimeters and Monitoring Trends in Burn Severity (MTBS). An existing data standard in the BLM requires that all fires of more than 10 acres are to be reported to GeoMac; therefore, there will be many small fires of less than 10 acres that will not be accounted for in the adjustment and monitoring attributable to fire. Using fire perimeters from GeoMac, all sagebrush pixels falling within the perimeter of fires less than 1,000 acres will be used to adjust and monitor the sagebrush base layer.

For fires greater than 1,000 acres, MTBS was selected as a means to account for unburned sagebrush islands during the update process of the sagebrush base layer. The MTBS program (<http://www.mtbs.gov>) is an ongoing, multiyear project to map fire severity and fire perimeters consistently across the United States. One of the burn severity classes within MTBS is an unburned to low-severity class. This burn severity class will be used to represent unburned islands of sagebrush within the fire perimeter for the sagebrush base layer. Areas within the other severity classes within the fire perimeter will be removed from the base sagebrush layer during the update process. Not all wildfires, however, have the same impacts on the recovery of sagebrush habitat, depending largely on soil moisture and temperature regimes. For example, cooler, moister sagebrush habitat has a higher potential for recovery or, if needed, restoration than does the warmer, dryer sagebrush habitat. These cooler, moister areas will likely be detected as sagebrush in future updates to LANDFIRE.

### **Conifer Encroachment Adjustment for the Sagebrush Base Layer**

Conifer encroachment into sagebrush vegetation reduces the spatial extent of greater sage-grouse habitat (Davies et al. 2011, Baruch-Mordo et al. 2013). Conifer species that show propensity for encroaching into sagebrush vegetation resulting in greater sage-grouse habitat loss include various juniper species, such as Utah juniper (*Juniperus osteosperma*), western juniper (*Juniperus occidentalis*), Rocky Mountain juniper (*Juniperus scopulorum*), pinyon species, including singleleaf pinyon (*Pinus monophylla*) and pinyon pine (*Pinus edulis*), ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*), lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta*), and Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) (Gruell et al. 1986, Grove et al. 2005, Davies et al. 2011).

A rule set for conifer encroachment was developed to be used for determination of the existing sagebrush base layer. To capture the geographic extent of sagebrush that is likely to experience conifer encroachment, ecological systems within LANDFIRE EVT version 1.2 (NatureServe 2011) were identified if they have the capability of supporting the conifer species (listed above) and have the capability of supporting sagebrush vegetation. Those ecological systems (Table Y-7) were deemed to be the plant communities with conifers most likely to encroach into sagebrush vegetation. Sagebrush vegetation was defined as including sagebrush species (Attachment B) that provide habitat for the greater sage-grouse and are included in the Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework. An adjacency analysis was conducted to identify all sagebrush pixels that were directly adjacent to these conifer ecological systems and these immediately adjacent sagebrush pixels were removed from the sagebrush base layer.

**Table Y-7. Ecological Systems with Conifers Most Likely to Encroach into Sagebrush Vegetation**

EVT Ecological Systems	Coniferous Species and Sagebrush Vegetation that the Ecological System has the Capability to Produce
Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	<i>Pinus edulis</i> <i>Juniperus osteosperma</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i> <i>Artemisia bigelovii</i> <i>Artemisia pygmaea</i>
Columbia Plateau Western Juniper Woodland and Savanna	<i>Juniperus occidentalis</i> <i>Pinus ponderosa</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia rigida</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i>
East Cascades Oak-Ponderosa Pine Forest and Woodland	<i>Pinus ponderosa</i> <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i>
Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	<i>Pinus monophylla</i> <i>Juniperus osteosperma</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i>
Northern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland and Savanna	<i>Pinus ponderosa</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i>
Rocky Mountain Foothill Limber Pine-Juniper Woodland	<i>Juniperus osteosperma</i> <i>Juniperus scopulorum</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i>
Rocky Mountain Poor-Site Lodgepole Pine Forest	<i>Pinus contorta</i> <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> <i>Pinus ponderosa</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i>
Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	<i>Pinus edulis</i> <i>Juniperus monosperma</i> <i>Artemisia bigelovii</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i>

**Table Y-7. Ecological Systems with Conifers Most Likely to Encroach into Sagebrush Vegetation (Continued)**

EVT Ecological Systems	Coniferous Species and Sagebrush Vegetation that the Ecological System has the Capability to Produce
Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	<i>Pinus ponderosa</i> <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> <i>Pinus edulis</i> <i>Pinus contorta</i> <i>Juniperus</i> spp. <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>Vaseyana</i>

***Invasive Annual Grasses Adjustments for the Sagebrush Base Layer***

There are no invasive species datasets from 2010 to the present (beyond the LANDFIRE data) that meet the three criteria (nationally consistent, known level of accuracy, and periodically updated) for use in the determination of the sagebrush base layer. For a description of how invasive species land cover will be incorporated in the sagebrush base layer in the future, see Section B.1.b., Monitoring Sagebrush Availability.

***Sagebrush Restoration Adjustments for the Sagebrush Base Layer***

There are no datasets from 2010 to the present that could provide additions to the sagebrush base layer from restoration treatments that meet the three criteria (nationally consistent, known level of accuracy, and periodically updated); therefore, no adjustments were made to the sagebrush base layer calculated from the LANDFIRE EVT (version 1.2) attributable to restoration activities since 2010. Successful restoration treatments before 2010 are assumed to have been captured in the LANDFIRE refresh.

**6.3.1.2 Monitoring Sagebrush Availability**

***Updating the Sagebrush Availability Sagebrush Base Layer***

Sagebrush availability will be updated annually by incorporating changes to the sagebrush base layer attributable to agriculture, urbanization, and wildfire. The monitoring schedule for the existing sagebrush base layer updates is as follows:

- **2010 Existing Sagebrush Base Layer** = [Sagebrush EVT] minus [2006 Imperviousness Layer] minus [2009 and 2010 CDL] minus [2009/10 GeoMac Fires < 1,000 acres] minus [2009/10 MTBS Fires excluding unburned sagebrush islands] minus [Conifer Encroachment Layer]
- **2012 Existing Sagebrush Update** = [Base 2010 Existing Sagebrush Layer] minus [2011 Imperviousness Layer] minus [2011 and 2012 CDL] minus [2011/12 GeoMac Fires < 1,000 acres] minus [2011/12 MTBS Fires that are greater than 1,000 acres, excluding unburned sagebrush islands within the perimeter]

- **2013 and beyond Existing Sagebrush Updates** = [Previous Existing Sagebrush Update Layer] minus [Imperviousness Layer (if new data are available)] minus [Next 2 years of CDL] minus [Next 2 years of GeoMac Fires < 1,000 acres] minus [Next 2 years MTBS Fires that are greater than 1,000 acres, excluding unburned sagebrush islands within the perimeter] plus [restoration/monitoring data provided by the field]

### **Sagebrush Restoration Updates**

Restoration after fire, after agricultural conversion, after seedings of introduced grasses, or after treatments of pinyon pine and/or juniper, are examples of updates to the sagebrush base layer that can add sagebrush vegetation back in. When restoration has been determined to be successful through range wide, consistent, interagency fine and site-scale monitoring, the polygonal data will be used to add sagebrush pixels back into the broad and mid-scale sagebrush base layer.

### **Measure 1b – Context for the change in the amount of sagebrush in a landscape of interest**

Measure 1b describes the amount of sagebrush on the landscape of interest compared with the amount of sagebrush the landscape of interest could ecologically support. Areas with the potential to support sagebrush were derived from the BpS data layer that describes sagebrush pre Euro-American settlement (biophysical setting (BpS) v1.2 of LANDFIRE). This measure (1b) will provide information during evaluations of monitoring data to set the context for a given geographic area of interest. The information could also be used to inform management options for restoration, mitigation and inform effectiveness monitoring.

The identification and spatial locations of natural plant communities (vegetation) that are believed to have existed on the landscape (BpS) were constructed based on an approximation of the historical (pre Euro-American settlement) disturbance regime and how the historical disturbance regime operated on the current biophysical environment. BpS is composed of map units which are based on NatureServe's (2011) terrestrial ecological systems classification.

The ecological systems within BpS used for this monitoring framework are those ecological systems that have the capability of supporting sagebrush vegetation and could provide seasonal habitat for the greater sage-grouse. These ecological systems are listed in Table Y-6 with the exception of the *Artemisia tridentata* ssp. *vaseyana* Shrubland Alliance and the *Quercus gambelii* Shrubland Alliance. Ecological systems selected included sagebrush species or subspecies that are included in the Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework and are found in Attachment B.

Attributable to the lack of any reference data, the BpS layer does not have an associated accuracy assessment. Visual inspection, however, of the BpS data reveals inconsistencies in the labeling of pixels among LANDFIRE map zones. The reason for these inconsistencies between map zones are the decision rules used to map a given ecological system will vary between map zones based on different physical, biological, disturbance and atmospheric regimes of the region. This can result in artificial edges in the map that are an artifact of the mapping process. However, metrics will be calculated at broad spatial scales using BpS potential vegetation type, not small groupings or individual pixels, therefore, the magnitude of these observable errors in the BpS layer is minor compared with the size of the reporting units. Therefore, since BpS will be used to identify broad landscape patterns of dominant vegetation, these inconsistencies will only have a minor impact on the percent sagebrush availability calculation.

LANDFIRE BpS data are not designed to be used at a local level. In reporting the percent sagebrush statistic for the various reporting units, the uncertainty of the percent sagebrush will increase as the size

of the reporting unit gets smaller. LANDFIRE data should never be used at the pixel level (30m<sup>2</sup>) for any reporting. The smallest geographic extent use of the data for this purpose is at the PAC level and for the smallest PACs the initial percent sagebrush remaining estimate will have greater uncertainties compared with the much larger PACs.

### **Tracking**

BLM and USFS will analyze and monitor sagebrush availability (Measure 1) on a bi-annual basis and it will be used to inform effectiveness monitoring and initiate adaptive management actions as necessary. The 2010 estimate of sagebrush availability will serve as the base year and an updated estimate for 2012 will be reported in 2014 after all datasets become available. The 2012 estimate will capture changes attributable to fire, agriculture, and urban development. Subsequent updates will always include new fire and agricultural data and new urban data when available. Restoration data that meets criteria of adding sagebrush areas back into the sagebrush base layer will begin to be factored in as data allows. Attributable to data availability, there will be a two year lag (approximately) between when the estimate is generated and when the data used for the estimate becomes available (e.g., the 2014 sagebrush availability will be included in the 2016 estimate).

### **Future Plans**

Geospatial data used to generate the sagebrush base layer will be available through BLM's EGIS Web Portal and Geospatial Gateway or through the authoritative data source. Legacy datasets will be preserved, so that trends may be calculated. Additionally, accuracy assessment data for all source datasets will be provided on the portal either spatially, where applicable, or through the metadata. Accuracy assessment information was deemed vital to share to help users understand the limitation of the sagebrush estimates and will be summarized spatially by map zone and included in the Portal.

LANDFIRE plans to begin a remapping effort in 2015. This remapping has the potential to greatly improve overall quality of the data products primarily through the use of higher quality remote sensing datasets. Additionally, BLM and the Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium (MRLC) are working to improve the accuracy of vegetation map products for broad and mid-scale analyses through the Grass/Shrub mapping effort in partnership with the MRLC. The Grass/Shrub mapping effort applies the Wyoming multi-scale sagebrush habitat methodology (Homer et al. 2009) to spatially depict fractional percent cover estimates for five components range and west-wide. These five components are percent cover of sagebrush vegetation, percent bare ground, percent herbaceous vegetation (grass and forbs combined), annual vegetation, and percent shrubs. One of the benefits of the design of these fractional cover maps is that they facilitate monitoring "with-in" class variation (e.g., examination of declining trend in sagebrush cover for individual pixels). This "with-in" class variation can serve as one indicator of sagebrush quality that cannot be derived from LANDFIRE's EVT information. The Grass/Shrub effort is not a substitute for fine scale monitoring, but will leverage fine scale data to support the validation of the mapping products. An evaluation will be conducted to determine if either dataset is of great enough quality to warrant replacing the existing sagebrush layers. The earliest possible date for this evaluation will not occur until 2018 or 2019 depending on data availability.

### 6.3.2 Habitat Degradation Monitoring (Measure 2)

The measure of habitat degradation will be calculated by combining the footprints of threats identified in Table Y-4. The footprint is defined as the direct area of influence of “active” energy and infrastructure; it is used as a surrogate for human activity. Although these analyses will try to summarize results at the aforementioned meaningful geographic areas of interest, some may be too small to report the metrics appropriately and may be combined (smaller populations, PACs within a population, etc.). Data sources for each threat are found in Table Y-8, Geospatial data sources for habitat degradation. Specific assumptions (inclusion criteria for data, width/area assumptions for point and line features, etc.) and methodology for each threat, and the combined measure, are detailed below. All datasets will be updated annually to monitor broad- and mid-scale year-to-year changes and to calculate trends in habitat degradation to inform adaptive management. A 5-year summary report will be provided to the USFWS.

#### **Habitat Degradation Datasets and Assumptions**

**Energy (oil and gas wells and development facilities):** This dataset will compile information from three oil and gas databases: the proprietary IHS Enerdeq database, the BLM Automated Fluid Minerals Support System (AFMSS) database, and the proprietary Platts (a McGraw-Hill Financial Company) GIS Custom Data (hereafter, Platts) database of power plants. Point data from wells active within the last 10 years from IHS and producing wells from AFMSS will be considered as a 5-acre (2.0ha) direct area of influence centered on the well point, as recommended by the BLM WO-300 (Minerals and Realty Management). Plugged and abandoned wells will be removed if the date of well abandonment was before the first day of the reporting year (i.e., for the 2015 reporting year, a well must have been plugged and abandoned by 12/31/2014 to be removed). Platts oil and gas power plants data (subset to operational power plants) will also be included as a 5-acre (2.0ha) direct area of influence.

**Additional Measure: Reclaimed Energy-related Degradation.** This dataset will include those wells that have been plugged and abandoned. This measure thereby attempts to measure energy-related degradation that has been reclaimed but not necessarily fully restored to greater sage-grouse habitat. This measure will establish a baseline by using wells that have been plugged and abandoned within the last 10 years from the IHS and AFMSS datasets. Time lags for lek attendance in response to infrastructure have been documented to be delayed 2–10 years from energy development activities (Harju et al. 2010). Reclamation actions may require 2 or more years from the Final Abandonment Notice. Sagebrush seedling establishment may take 6 or more years from the point of seeding, depending on such variables as annual precipitation, annual temperature, and soil type and depth (Pyke 2011). This 10-year period is conservative and assumes some level of habitat improvement 10 years after plugging. Research by Hemstrom et al. (2002), however, proposes an even longer period—more than 100 years—for recovery of sagebrush habitats, even with active restoration approaches. Direct area of influence will be considered 3 acres (1.2ha) (J. Perry, personal communication, February 12, 2014). This additional layer/measure could be used at the broad and mid-scale to identify areas where sagebrush habitat and/or potential sagebrush habitat is likely still degraded. This layer/measure could also be used where further investigation at the fine or site scale would be warranted to: 1) quantify the level of reclamation already conducted, and 2) evaluate the amount of restoration still required for sagebrush habitat recovery. At a particular level (e.g., population, PACs), these areas and the reclamation efforts/success could be used to inform reclamation standards associated with future developments. Once these areas have transitioned from reclamation standards to meeting restoration standards, they can be added back into the sagebrush availability layer using the same methodology as described for adding restoration treatment areas lost to wildfire and agriculture conversion (see

Monitoring Sagebrush Restoration in Section B.1.b., Monitoring Sagebrush Availability). This dataset will be updated annually from the IHS dataset.

**Energy (coal mines):** Currently, there is no comprehensive dataset available that identifies the footprint of active coal mining across all jurisdictions. Therefore, point and polygon datasets will be used each year to identify coal mining locations. Data sources will be identified and evaluated annually and will include at a minimum: BLM coal lease polygons, U.S. Energy Information Administration mine occurrence points, U.S. Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement coal mining permit polygons (as available), and U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Mineral Resources Data System mine occurrence points. These data will inform where active coal mining may be occurring. Additionally, coal power plant data from Platts power plants database (subset to operational power plants) will be included. Aerial imagery will then be used to digitize manually the active coal mining and coal power plants surface disturbance in or near these known occurrence areas. While the date of aerial imagery varies by scale, the most current data available from Esri and/or Google will be used to locate (generally at 1:50,000 and below) and digitize (generally at 1:10,000 and below) active coal mine and power plant direct area of influence. Coal mine location data source and imagery date will be documented for each digitized coal polygon at the time of creation. Subsurface facility locations (polygon or point location as available) will also be collected if available, included in density calculations, and added to the active surface activity layer as appropriate (if an actual direct area of influence can be located).

**Energy (wind energy facilities):** This dataset will be a subset of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Digital Obstacles point file. Points where “Type\_” = “WINDMILL” will be included. Direct area of influence of these point features will be measured by converting to a polygon dataset as a direct area of influence of 3 acres (1.2ha) centered on each tower point. See the BLM’s “Wind Energy Development Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement” (BLM 2005). Additionally, Platts power plants database will be used for transformer stations associated with wind energy sites (subset to operational power plants), also with a 3-acre (1.2ha) direct area of influence.

**Energy (solar energy facilities):** This dataset will include solar plants as compiled with the Platts power plants database (subset to operational power plants). This database includes an attribute that indicates the operational capacity of each solar power plant. Total capacity at the power plant was based on ratings of the in-service unit(s), in megawatts. Direct area of influence polygons will be centered over each point feature representing 7.3ac (3.0ha) per megawatt of the stated operational capacity, per the report of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), “Land-Use Requirements for Solar Power Plants in the United States” (Ong et al. 2013).

**Energy (geothermal energy facilities):** This dataset will include geothermal wells in existence or under construction as compiled with the IHS wells database and power plants as compiled with the Platts database (subset to operational power plants). Direct area of influence of these point features will be measured by converting to a polygon dataset of 3 acres (1.2ha) centered on each well or power plant point.

**Mining (active developments; locatable, leasable, salable):** This dataset will include active locatable mining locations as compiled with the proprietary InfoMine database. Aerial imagery will then be used to digitize manually the active mining surface disturbance in or near these known occurrence areas. While the date of aerial imagery varies by scale, the most current data available from Esri and/or Google will be used to locate (generally at 1:50,000 and below) and digitize (generally at 1:10,000 and below) active mine direct area of influence. Mine location data source and imagery date will be documented for each digitized polygon at the time of creation. Currently, there are no known compressive databases available for leasable or salable mining sites beyond coal mines. Other data sources will be evaluated

and used as they are identified or as they become available. Point data may be converted to polygons to represent direct area of influence unless actual surface disturbance is available.

**Infrastructure (roads):** This dataset will be compiled from the proprietary Esri StreetMap Premium for ArcGIS. Dataset features that will be used are: Interstate Highways, Major Roads, and Surface Streets to capture most paved and “crowned and ditched” roads while not including “two-track” and 4-wheel-drive routes. These minor roads, while not included in the broad- and mid-scale monitoring, may support a volume of traffic that can have deleterious effects on greater sage-grouse leks. It may be appropriate to consider the frequency and type of use of roads in a NEPA analysis for a proposed project. This fine- and site-scale analysis will require more site-specific data than is identified in this monitoring framework. The direct area of influence for roads will be represented by 240.2ft, 84.0ft, and 40.7ft (73.2m, 25.6m, and 12.4m) total widths centered on the line feature for Interstate Highways, Major Roads, and Surface Streets, respectively (Knick et al. 2011). The most current dataset will be used for each monitoring update. Note: This is a related but different dataset than what was used in BER (Manier et al. 2013). Individual BLM/USFS planning units may use different road layers for fine- and site-scale monitoring.

**Infrastructure (railroads):** This dataset will be a compilation from the Federal Railroad Administration Rail Lines of the USA dataset. Non-abandoned rail lines will be used; abandoned rail lines will not be used. The direct are of influence for railroads will be represented by a 30.8ft (9.4m) total width (Knick et al. 2011) centered on the non-abandoned railroad line feature.

**Infrastructure (power lines):** This line dataset will be derived from the proprietary Platts transmission lines database. Linear features in the dataset attributed as “buried” will be removed from the disturbance calculation. Only “In Service” lines will be used; “Proposed” lines will not be used. Direct area of influence will be determined by the kV designation: 1–199 kV (100ft/30.5m), 200–399 kV (150ft/45.7m), 400–699 kV (200ft/61.0m), and 700-or greater kV (250ft/76.2m) based on average right-of-way and structure widths, according to BLM WO-300 (Minerals and Realty Management).

**Infrastructure (communication towers):** This point dataset will be compiled from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) communication towers point file; all duplicate points will be removed. It will be converted to a polygon dataset by using a direct area of influence of 2.5 acres (1.0ha) centered on each communication tower point (Knick et al. 2011).

**Infrastructure (other vertical structures):** This point dataset will be compiled from the FAA’s Digital Obstacles point file. Points where “Type\_” = “WINDMILL” will be removed. Duplicate points from the FCC communication towers point file will be removed. Remaining features will be converted to a polygon dataset using a direct area of influence of 2.5 acres (1.0ha) centered on each vertical structure point (Knick et al. 2011).

**Other Developed Rights-of-Way:** Currently, no additional data sources for other rights-of-way have been identified; roads, power lines, railroads, pipelines, and other known linear features are represented in the categories described above. The newly purchased IHS data do contain pipeline information; however, this database does not currently distinguish between above-ground and underground pipelines. If additional features representing human activities are identified, they will be added to monitoring reports using similar assumptions to those used with the threats described above.

### **6.3.2.1 Habitat Degradation Threat Combination and Calculation**

The threats targeted for measuring human activity (Table Y-4) will be converted to direct area of influence polygons as described for each threat above. These threat polygon layers will be combined and features dissolved to create one overall polygon layer representing footprints of active human activity in the range of greater sage-grouse. Individual datasets, however, will be preserved to indicate which types of threats may be contributing to overall habitat degradation. This measure has been divided into three sub measures to describe habitat degradation on the landscape. Percentages will be calculated as follows:

- **Measure 2a.** Footprint by geographic area of interest: Divide area of the active/direct footprint by the total area of the geographic area of interest (% disturbance in geographic area of interest).
- **Measure 2b.** Active/direct footprint by historical sagebrush potential: Divide area of the active footprint that coincides with areas with historical sagebrush potential (BpS calculation from habitat availability) within a given geographic area of interest by the total area with sagebrush potential within the geographic area of interest (% disturbance on potential historical sagebrush in geographic area of interest).
- **Measure 2c.** Active/direct footprint by current sagebrush: Divide area of the active footprint that coincides with areas of existing sagebrush (EVT calculation from habitat availability) within a given geographic area of interest by the total area that is current sagebrush within the geographic area of interest (% disturbance on current sagebrush in geographic area of interest).

**Table Y-8. Geospatial Data Sources for Habitat Degradation (Measure 2)**

Degradation Type	Subcategory	Data Source	Direct Area of Influence	Area Source
Energy (oil & gas)	Wells	IHS; BLM (AFMSS)	5.0ac (2.0ha)	BLM - WO-300
	Power Plants	Platts (power plants)	5.0ac (2.0ha)	BLM - WO-300
Energy (coal)	Mines	BLM; USFS; Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Envofrement; USGS Mineral Resources Data System	Polygon area (digitized)	Esri/ Google Imagery
	Power Plants	Platts (power plants)	Polygon area (digitized)	Esri Imagery
Energy (wind)	Wind Turbines	Federal Aviation Administration	3.0ac (1.2ha)	BLM - WO-300
	Power Plants	Platts (power plants)	3.0ac (1.2ha)	BLM - WO-300
Energy (solar)	Fields/Power Plants	Platts (power plants)	7.3ac - (3.0 ha)/MW	NREL
Energy (geothermal)	Wells	IHS	3.0ac (1.2ha)	BLM - WO-300
	Power Plants	Platts (power plants)	Polygon area (digistized)	Esri Imagery
Mining	Locatable Developments	InfoMine	Polygon area (digitized)	Esri Imagery
Infrastructure (roads)	Surface Streets (Minor Roads)	Esri StreetMap Premium	40.7 ft (12.4m)	USGS
	Major Roads	Esri StreetMap Premium	84.0 ft (25.6m)	USGS
	Interstate Highways	Esri StreetMap Premium	240.2 ft (73.2m)	USGS
Infrastructure (railroads)	ActiveLines	Federal Railroad Administration	30.8ft (9.4m)	USGS
Infrastructure (powerlines)	1-199 kV Lines	Platts (transmission lines)	100 ft (30.5 m)	BLM - WO-300
	200-399 kV Lines	Platts (transmission lines)	150 ft (45.7m)	BLM - WO-300
	400-699 kV Lines	Platts (transmission lines)	200 ft (61.0m)	BLM - WO-300
	700+ kV Lines	Platts (transmission lines)	250 ft (76.2m)	BLM - WO-300
Infrastructure (communication)	Towers	Federal Communications Commission	2.5 ac (1.0 ha)	BLM - WO-300

### **6.3.3 Energy and Mining Density (Measure 3)**

The measure of density of energy and mining will be calculated by combining the locations of energy and mining threats identified in Table Y-4. This measure will provide an estimate of the intensity of human activity or the intensity of habitat degradation. The number of energy facilities and mining locations will be summed and divided by the area of meaningful geographic areas of interest to calculate density of these activities. Data sources for each threat are found in Table Y-8. Specific assumptions (inclusion criteria for data, width/area assumptions for point and line features, etc.) and methodology for each threat, and the combined measure, are detailed below. All datasets will be updated annually to monitor broad- and mid-scale year-to-year changes and 5-year (or longer) trends in habitat degradation.

### Energy and Mining Density Datasets and Assumptions

- **Energy (oil and gas wells and development facilities)** (See Section B.2., Habitat Degradation Monitoring.)
- **Energy (coal mines)** (See Section B.2., Habitat Degradation Monitoring.)
- **Energy (wind energy facilities)** (See Section B.2., Habitat Degradation Monitoring.)
- **Energy (solar energy facilities)** (See Section B.2., Habitat Degradation Monitoring.)
- **Energy (geothermal energy facilities)** (See Section B.2., Habitat Degradation Monitoring.)
- **Mining (active developments; locatable, leasable, salable)** (See Section B.2., Habitat Degradation Monitoring.)

### Energy and Mining Density Threat Combination and Calculation

Datasets for energy and mining will be collected in two primary forms: point locations (e.g., wells) and polygon areas (e.g., surface coal mining). The following rule set will be used to calculate density for meaningful geographic areas of interest including standard grids and per polygon:

1. Point locations will be preserved; no additional points will be removed beyond the methodology described above. Energy facilities in close proximity (an oil well close to a wind tower) will be retained.
2. Polygons will not be merged, or features further dissolved. Thus, overlapping facilities will be retained, such that each individual threat will be a separate polygon data input for the density calculation.
3. The analysis unit (polygon or 640-acre section in a grid) will be the basis for counting the number of mining or energy facilities per unit area. Within the analysis unit, all point features will be summed, and any individual polygons will be counted as one (e.g., a coal mine will be counted as one facility within population). Where polygon features overlap multiple units (polygons or pixels), the facility will be counted as one in each unit where the polygon occurs (e.g., a polygon crossing multiple 640-acre sections would be counted as one in each 640-acre section for a density per 640-acre-section calculation).
4. In methodologies with different-sized units (e.g., MZs, populations, etc.) raw facility counts will be converted to densities by dividing the raw facility counts by the total area of the unit. Typically this will be measured as facilities per 640 acres.
5. For uniform grids, raw facility counts will be reported. Typically this number will also be converted to facilities per 640 acres.
6. Reporting may include summaries beyond the simple ones above. Zonal statistics may be used to smooth smaller grids to help display and convey information about areas within meaningful geographic areas of interest that have high levels of energy and/or mining activity.
7. Additional statistics for each defined unit may also include adjusting the area to include only the area with the historical potential for sagebrush (BpS) or areas currently sagebrush (EVT).

Individual datasets and threat combination datasets for habitat degradation will be available through the BLM's EGIS web portal and geospatial gateway. Legacy datasets will be preserved so that trends may be calculated.

## 6.4 Population (Demographics) Monitoring

State wildlife management agencies are responsible for monitoring greater sage-grouse populations within their respective states. WAFWA will coordinate this collection of annual population data by state agencies. These data will be made available to the BLM according to the terms of the forthcoming Greater Sage-Grouse Population Monitoring Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (2014) between WAFWA and the BLM. The MOU outlines a process, timeline, and responsibilities for regular data sharing of greater sage-grouse population and/or habitat information for the purposes of implementing greater sage-grouse LUPs/amendments and subsequent effectiveness monitoring. Population areas were refined from the “*Greater Sage-grouse (Centrocercus urophasianus) Conservation Objectives: Final Report*” (COT 2013) by individual state wildlife agencies to create a consistent naming nomenclature for future data analyses. These population data will be used for analysis at the applicable scale to supplement habitat effectiveness monitoring of management actions and to inform the adaptive management responses.

## 6.5 Effectiveness Monitoring

Effectiveness monitoring will provide the data needed to evaluate BLM and USFS actions toward reaching the objective of the national planning strategy (BLM IM 2012-044) – to conserve greater sage-grouse populations and their habitat– and the objectives for the land use planning area. Effectiveness monitoring methods described here will encompass multiple larger scales, from areas as large as the WAFWA MZ to the scale of the Bighorn Basin LUP. Effectiveness data used for these larger-scale evaluations will include all lands in the area of interest, regardless of surface ownership/management, and will help inform where finer-scale evaluations are needed, such as population areas smaller than an LUP or PACs within an LUP (described in Section 4.2, Fine and Site Scales). Data will also include the trend of disturbance within these areas of interest to inform the need to initiate adaptive management responses as described in the Bighorn Basin land use plan.

The BLM and the USFS will coordinate with the State of Wyoming in evaluating the compliance of all actions within greater sage-grouse PHMAs. Evaluation of current disturbance, disruptions and conservation actions within a greater sage-grouse PHMA will be conducted to determine if all entities are in compliance with their specific standards and whether or not it indeed has not caused declines of greater sage-grouse populations. This approach also helps focus scarce resources to areas experiencing habitat loss, degradation, or population declines, without excluding the possibility of concurrent, finer-scale evaluations as needed where habitat or population anomalies have been identified through some other means.

To determine the effectiveness of the greater sage-grouse national planning strategy, the BLM and the USFS will evaluate the answers to the following questions and prepare a broad- and mid-scale effectiveness report:

1. Sagebrush Availability and Condition:
  - a. What is the amount of sagebrush availability and the change in the amount and condition of sagebrush?
  - b. What is the existing amount of sagebrush on the landscape and the change in the amount relative to the pre-EuroAmerican historical distribution of sagebrush (BpS)?
  - c. What is the trend and condition of the indicators describing sagebrush characteristics important to greater sage-grouse?

2. Habitat Degradation and Intensity of Activities:
  - a. What is the amount of habitat degradation and the change in that amount?
  - b. What is the intensity of activities and the change in the intensity?
  - c. What is the amount of reclaimed energy-related degradation and the change in the amount?
  - d. What is the population estimation of greater sage-grouse and the change in the population estimation?
3. How are the BLM and the USFS contributing to changes in the amount of sagebrush?
4. How are the BLM and the USFS contributing to disturbance?

The compilation of broad- and mid-scale data (and population trends as available) into an effectiveness monitoring report will occur on a 5-year reporting schedule (see Attachment A), which may be accelerated to respond to critical emerging issues (in consultation with the USFWS and state wildlife agencies). In addition, effectiveness monitoring results will be used to identify emerging issues and research needs and inform the BLM and the USFS adaptive management strategy (see the adaptive management section of this Environmental Impact Statement).

To determine the effectiveness of the greater sage-grouse objectives of the land use plan, the BLM and the USFS will evaluate the answers to the following questions and prepare a plan effectiveness report:

1. Is this plan meeting the greater sage-grouse habitat objectives?
2. Are greater sage-grouse areas within the LUP meeting, or making progress toward meeting, land health standards, including the Special Status Species/wildlife habitat standard?
3. Is the plan meeting the disturbance objective(s) within greater sage-grouse areas?
4. Are the greater sage-grouse populations within this plan boundary and within the greater sage-grouse areas increasing, stable, or declining?

The effectiveness monitoring report for this LUP will occur on a 5-year reporting schedule (see Attachment A) or more often if habitat or population anomalies indicate the need for an evaluation to facilitate adaptive management or respond to critical emerging issues. Data will be made available through the BLM's EGIS web portal and the geospatial gateway.

### **Methods**

At the broad and mid-scales (PACs and above) the BLM and the USFS will summarize the vegetation, disturbance, and (when available) population data. Although the analysis will try to summarize results for PACs within each greater sage-grouse population, some populations may be too small to report the metrics appropriately and may need to be combined to provide an estimate with an acceptable level of accuracy. Otherwise, they will be flagged for more intensive monitoring by the appropriate landowner or agency. The BLM and the USFS will then analyze monitoring data to detect the trend in the amount of sagebrush; the condition of the vegetation in the greater sage-grouse areas (MacKinnon et al. 2011); the trend in the amount of disturbance; the change in disturbed areas owing to successful restoration; and the amount of new disturbance the BLM and/or the USFS has permitted. These data could be supplemented with population data (when available) to inform an understanding of the correlation between habitat and PACs within a population. This overall effectiveness evaluation must consider the lag effect response of populations to habitat changes (Garton et al. 2011).

Calculating Question 1, National Planning Strategy Effectiveness: The amount of sagebrush available in the large area of interest will use the information from Measure 1a (I.B.1., Sagebrush Availability) and calculate the change from the 2012 baseline to the end date of the reporting period. To calculate the change in the amount of sagebrush on the landscape to compare with the historical areas with potential to support sagebrush, the information from Measure 1b (I.B.1., Sagebrush Availability) will be used. To calculate the trend in the condition of sagebrush at the mid-scale, three sources of data will be used: the BLM's Grass/Shrub mapping effort (Future Plans in Section B.1., Sagebrush Availability); the results from the calculation of the landscape indicators, such as patch size (described below); and the BLM's Landscape Monitoring Framework (LMF) and greater sage-grouse intensification effort (also described below). The LMF and greater sage-grouse intensification effort data are collected in a statistical sampling framework that allows calculation of indicator values at multiple scales.

Beyond the importance of sagebrush availability to greater sage-grouse, the mix of sagebrush patches on the landscape at the broad and mid-scale provides the life requisite of space for greater sage-grouse dispersal needs (see the HAF). The configuration of sagebrush habitat patches and the land cover or land use between the habitat patches at the broad and mid-scales also defines suitability. There are three significant habitat indicators that influence habitat use, dispersal, and movement across populations: the size and number of habitat patches, the connectivity of habitat patches (linkage areas), and habitat fragmentation (scope of unsuitable and non-habitats between habitat patches). The most appropriate commercial software to measure patch dynamics, connectivity, and fragmentation at the broad and mid-scales will be used, along with the same data layers derived for sagebrush availability.

The BLM initiated the LMF in 2011 in cooperation with the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). The objective of the LMF effort is to provide unbiased estimates of vegetation and soil condition and trend using a statistically balanced sample design across BLM lands. Recognizing that greater sage-grouse populations are more resilient where the sagebrush plant community has certain characteristics unique to a particular life stage of greater sage-grouse (Knick and Connelly 2011, Stiver et al. in press), a group of greater sage-grouse habitat and sagebrush plant community subject matter experts identified those vegetation indicators collected at LMF sampling points that inform greater sage-grouse habitat needs. The experts represented the Agricultural Research Service, BLM, NRCS, USFWS, WAFWA, state wildlife agencies, and academia. The common indicators identified include: species composition, foliar cover, height of the tallest sagebrush and herbaceous plant, intercanopy gap, percent of invasive species, sagebrush shape, and bare ground. To increase the precision of estimates of sagebrush conditions within the range of greater sage-grouse, additional plot locations in occupied greater sage-grouse habitat (Sage-Grouse Intensification) were added in 2013. The common indicators are also collected on sampling locations in the NRCS National Resources Inventory Rangeland Resource Assessment (<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/technical/nra/nri/?&cid=stelprdb1041620>).

The greater sage-grouse intensification baseline data will be collected over a 5-year period, and an annual greater sage-grouse intensification report will be prepared describing the status of the indicators. Beginning in year 6, the annual status report will be accompanied with a trend report, which will be available on an annual basis thereafter, contingent on continuation of the current monitoring budget. This information, in combination with the Grass/Shrub mapping information, the mid-scale habitat suitability indicator measures, and the sagebrush availability information will be used to answer Question 1 of the National Planning Strategy Effectiveness Report.

Calculating Question 2, National Planning Strategy Effectiveness: Evaluations of the amount of habitat degradation and the intensity of the activities in the area of interest will use the information from Measure 2 (Section B.2., Habitat Degradation Monitoring) and Measure 3 (Section B.3., Energy and

Mining Density). The field office will collect data on the amount of reclaimed energy-related degradation on plugged and abandoned and oil/gas well sites. The data are expected to demonstrate that the reclaimed sites have yet to meet the habitat restoration objectives for greater sage-grouse habitat. This information, in combination with the amount of habitat degradation, will be used to answer Question 2 of the National Planning Strategy Effectiveness Report.

Calculating Question 3, National Planning Strategy Effectiveness: The change in greater sage-grouse estimated populations will be calculated from data provided by the state wildlife agencies, when available. This population data (Section C., Population [Demographics] Monitoring) will be used to answer Question 3 of the National Planning Strategy Effectiveness Report.

Calculating Question 4, National Planning Strategy Effectiveness: The estimated contribution by the BLM or the USFS to the change in the amount of sagebrush in the area of interest will use the information from Measure 1a (Section B.1., Sagebrush Availability). This measure is derived from the national datasets that remove sagebrush (Table Y-5). To determine the relative contribution of BLM and USFS management, the current Surface Management Agency geospatial data layer will be used to differentiate the amount of change for each management agency for this measure in the geographic areas of interest. This information will be used to answer Question 4 of the National Planning Strategy Effectiveness Report.

Calculating Question 5, National Planning Strategy Effectiveness: The estimated contribution by the BLM or the USFS to the change in the amount of disturbance in the area of interest will use the information from Measure 2a (Section B.2., Monitoring Habitat Degradation) and Measure 3 (Section B.3., Energy and Mining Density). These measures are all derived from the national disturbance datasets that degrade habitat (Table Y-8). To determine the relative contribution of BLM and USFS management, the current Surface Management Agency geospatial data layer will be used to differentiate the amount of change for each management agency for these two measures in the geographic areas of interest. This information will be used to answer Question 5 of the National Planning Strategy Effectiveness Report.

Answers to the five questions for determining the effectiveness of the national planning strategy will identify areas that appear to be meeting the objectives of the strategy and will facilitate identification of population areas for more detailed analysis. Conceptually, if the broad-scale monitoring identifies increasing sagebrush availability and improving vegetation conditions, decreasing disturbance, and a stable or increasing population for the area of interest, there is evidence that the objectives of the national planning strategy to maintain populations and their habitats have been met. Conversely, where information indicates that sagebrush is decreasing and vegetation conditions are degrading, disturbance in greater sage-grouse areas is increasing, and/or populations are declining relative to the baseline, there is evidence that the objectives of the national planning strategy are not being achieved. Such a determination would likely result in a more detailed analysis and could be the basis for implementing more restrictive adaptive management measures.

With respect to the land use plan area, the BLM and the USFS will summarize the vegetation, disturbance, and population data to determine if the LUP is meeting the plan objectives. Effectiveness information used for these evaluations includes BLM/USFS surface management areas and will help inform where finer-scale evaluations are needed, such as seasonal habitats, corridors, or linkage areas. Data will also include the trend of disturbance within the greater sage-grouse areas, which will inform the need to initiate adaptive management responses as described in the Bighorn Basin land use plan.

Calculating Question 1, Land Use Plan Effectiveness: The condition of vegetation and the allotments meeting land health standards (as articulated in “BLM Handbook 4180-1, Rangeland Health Standards”) in greater sage-grouse areas will be used to determine the LUP’s effectiveness in meeting the vegetation

objectives for greater sage-grouse habitat set forth in the plan. The field office/ranger district will be responsible for collecting this data. In order for this data to be consistent and comparable, common indicators, consistent methods, and an unbiased sampling framework will be implemented following the principles in the BLM’s AIM strategy (Taylor et al. 2014; Toevs et al. 2011; MacKinnon et al. 2011), in the BLM’s Technical Reference “Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health” (Pellant et al. 2005), and in the HAF (Stiver et al. in press) or other approved WAFWA MZ-consistent guidance to measure and monitor greater sage-grouse habitats. This information will be used to answer Question 1 of the Land Use Plan Effectiveness Report.

Calculating Question 2, Land Use Plan Effectiveness: Sage-grouse areas within the LUP that are achieving land health stands (or, if trend data are available, that are making progress toward achieving them)—particularly the Special Status Species/wildlife habitat land health standard—will be used to determine the LUP’s effectiveness in achieving the habitat objectives set forth in the plan. Field offices will follow directions in “BLM Handbook 4180-1, Rangeland Health Standards,” to ascertain if greater sage-grouse areas are achieving or making progress toward achieving land health standards. One of the recommended criteria for evaluating this land health standard is the HAF indicators.

Calculating Question 3, Land Use Plan Effectiveness: The amount of habitat disturbance in greater sage-grouse areas identified in this LUP will be used to determine the LUP’s effectiveness in meeting the plan’s disturbance objectives. National datasets can be used to calculate the amount of disturbance, but field office data will likely increase the accuracy of this estimate. This information will be used to answer Question 3 of the Land Use Plan Effectiveness Report.

Calculating Question 4, Land Use Plan Effectiveness: The change in estimated greater sage-grouse populations will be calculated from data provided by the state wildlife agencies, when available, and will be used to determine LUP effectiveness. This population data (Section C., Population [Demographics] Monitoring) will be used to answer Question 4 of the Land Use Plan Effectiveness Report.

Results of the effectiveness monitoring process for the LUP will be used to inform the need for finer-scale investigations, initiate adaptive management actions as described in the Bighorn Basin land use plan, initiate causation determination, and/or determine if changes to management decisions are warranted. The measures used at the broad and mid-scales will provide a suite of characteristics for evaluating the effectiveness of the adaptive management strategy.

### **6.5.1 Fine and Site Scales**

Fine-scale (third-order) habitat selected by greater sage-grouse is described as the physical and geographic area within home ranges during breeding, summer, and winter periods. At this level, habitat suitability monitoring should address factors that affect greater sage-grouse use of, and movements between, seasonal use areas. The habitat monitoring at the fine and site scale (fourth order) should focus on indicators to describe seasonal home ranges for greater sage-grouse associated with a lek or lek group within a population or subpopulation area. Fine- and site-scale monitoring will inform LUP effectiveness monitoring (see Section D., Effectiveness Monitoring) and the hard and soft triggers identified in the LUP’s adaptive management section.

The BLM and USFS will coordinate with the State of Wyoming to share conservation, disturbance and vegetation analysis data to provide a core by core evaluation to make necessary adjustments in activity, priorities and other actions.

Site-scale habitat selected by greater sage-grouse is described as the more detailed vegetation characteristics of seasonal habitats. Habitat suitability characteristics include canopy cover and height of

sagebrush and the associated understory vegetation. They also include vegetation associated with riparian areas, wet meadows, and other mesic habitats adjacent to sagebrush that may support greater sage-grouse habitat needs during different stages in their annual cycle.

As described in the Conclusion (Section 3.4), details and application of monitoring at the fine and site scales will be described in the implementation-level monitoring plan for the Bighorn Basin land use plan. The need for fine- and site-scale-specific habitat monitoring will vary by area, depending on proposed projects, existing conditions, habitat variability, threats, and land health. Examples of fine- and site-scale monitoring include: habitat vegetation monitoring to assess current habitat conditions; monitoring and evaluation of the success of projects targeting greater sage-grouse habitat enhancement and/or restoration; and habitat disturbance monitoring to provide localized disturbance measures to inform proposed project review and potential mitigation for project impacts. Monitoring plans should incorporate the principles outlined in the BLM’s AIM strategy (Toevs et al. 2011) and in “AIM-Monitoring: A Component of the Assessment, Inventory, and Monitoring Strategy” (Taylor et al. 2014). Approved monitoring methods are:

- “BLM Core Terrestrial Indicators and Methods” (MacKinnon et al. 2011);
- The BLM’s Technical Reference “Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health” (Pellant et al. 2005); and,
- “Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multiscale Assessment Tool” (Stiver et al. in press).

Other state-specific disturbance tracking models include: the BLM’s Wyoming Density and Disturbance Calculation Tool (<http://ddct.wygisc.org/>) and the BLM’s White River Data Management System in development with the USGS. Population monitoring data (in cooperation with state wildlife agencies) should be included during evaluation of the effectiveness of actions taken at the fine and site scales.

Fine- and site-scale greater sage-grouse habitat suitability indicators for seasonal habitats are identified in the HAF. The HAF has incorporated the Connelly et al. (2000) greater sage-grouse guidelines as well as many of the core indicators in the AIM strategy (Toevs et al. 2011). There may be a need to develop adjustments to height and cover or other site suitability values described in the HAF; any such adjustments should be ecologically defensible. To foster consistency, however, adjustments to site suitability values at the local scale should be avoided unless there is strong, scientific justification for making those adjustments. That justification should be provided. WAFWA MZ adjustments must be supported by regional plant productivity and habitat data for the floristic province. If adjustments are made to the site-scale indicators, they must be made using data from the appropriate seasonal habitat designation (breeding/nesting, brood-rearing, winter) collected from greater sage-grouse studies found in the relevant area and peer-reviewed by the appropriate wildlife management agency(ies) and researchers.

When conducting land health assessments, the BLM should follow, at a minimum, “Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health” (Pellant et al. 2005) and the “BLM Core Terrestrial Indicators and Methods” (MacKinnon et al. 2011). For assessments being conducted in greater sage-grouse designated management areas, the BLM should collect additional data to inform the HAF indicators that have not been collected using the above methods. Implementation of the principles outlined in the AIM strategy will allow the data to be used to generate unbiased estimates of condition across the area of interest; facilitate consistent data collection and rollup analysis among management units; help provide consistent data to inform the classification and interpretation of imagery; and provide condition and trend of the indicators describing sagebrush characteristics important to greater sage-grouse habitat (see Section D., Effectiveness Monitoring).

## 6.5.2 Conclusion

This Greater Sage-Grouse Monitoring Framework was developed for all of the Final Environmental Impact Statements involved in the greater sage-grouse planning effort. As such, it describes the monitoring activities at the broad and mid-scales and provides a guide for the BLM to collaborate with partners/other agencies to develop the Bighorn Basin land use plan-specific monitoring plan.

## 6.5.3 The BLM Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance and Monitoring Sub Team Membership

Gordon Toevs (BLM-WO)

Duane Dippon (BLM-WO)

Frank Quamen (BLM-NOC)

David Wood (BLM-NOC)

Vicki Herren (BLM-NOC)

Matt Bobo (BLM-NOC)

Michael “Sherm” Karl (BLM-NOC)

Emily Kachergis (BLM-NOC)

Doug Havlina (BLM-NIFC)

Mike Pellant (BLM-GBRI)

John Carlson (BLM-MT)

Jenny Morton (BLM-WY)

Robin Sell (BLM-CO)

Paul Makela (BLM-ID)

Renee Chi (BLM-UT)

Sandra Brewer (BLM-NV)

Glenn Frederick (BLM-OR)

Robert Skorkowsky (USFS)

Dalinda Damm (USFS)

Rob Mickelsen (USFS)

Tim Love (USFS)

Pam Bode (USFS)

Lief Wiechman (USFWS)

Lara Juliusson (USFWS)

## **7.0 REFERENCES**

- Baruch-Mordo, S., J.S. Evans, J.P. Severson, D.E. Naugle, J.D. Maestas, J.M. Kiesecker, M.J. Falkowski, C.A. Hagen, and K.P. Reese. 2013. Saving sage-grouse from the trees: A proactive solution to reducing a key threat to a candidate species. *Biological Conservation* 167:233–241.
- Connelly, J.W., M.A. Schroeder, A.R. Sands, and C.E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage grouse populations and their habitats. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 28:967–985.
- Connelly, J.W., K.P. Reese, and M.A. Schroeder. 2003. Monitoring of Greater Sage-Grouse habitats and populations. Station Bulletin 80. College of Natural Resources Experiment Station, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID.
- Connelly, J.W., S.T. Knick, M.A. Schroeder, and S.J. Stiver. 2004. Conservation assessment of Greater Sage-Grouse and sagebrush habitats. Unpublished report. Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Cheyenne, WY. Available online: [http://sagemap.wr.usgs.gov/docs/Greater\\_Sage-grouse\\_Conservation\\_Assessment\\_060404.pdf](http://sagemap.wr.usgs.gov/docs/Greater_Sage-grouse_Conservation_Assessment_060404.pdf).
- Davies, K.W., C.S. Boyd, J.L. Beck, J.D. Bates, T.J. Svejcar, and M.A. Gregg. 2011. Saving the sagebrush sea: An ecosystem conservation plan for big sagebrush plant communities. *Biological Conservation* 144:2573–2584.
- Fry, J.A., G. Xian, S. Jin, J.A. Dewitz, C.G. Homer, L. Yang, C.A. Barnes, N.D. Herold, and J.D. Wickham. 2011. Completion of the 2006 National Land Cover Database for the conterminous United States. *PE&RS* 77(9):858–864.
- Garton, E.O., J.W. Connelly, J.S. Horne, C.A. Hagen, A. Moser, and M. Schroeder. 2011. Greater Sage-Grouse population dynamics and probability of persistence. In: *Greater Sage-Grouse: Ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats*, edited by S.T. Knick and J.W. Connelly, 293–382. *Studies in Avian Biology*, vol. 38. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Grove, A.J., C.L. Wambolt, and M.R. Frisina. 2005. Douglas-fir's effect on mountain big sagebrush wildlife habitats. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 33:74–80.
- Gruell, G.E., J.K. Brown, and C.L. Bushey. 1986. Prescribed fire opportunities in grasslands invaded by Douglas-fir: State-of-the-art guidelines. General Technical Report INT-198. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Ogden, UT. 19pp.
- Harju, S.M., M.R. Dzialak, R.C. Taylor, L.D. Hayden-Wing, J.B. Winstead. 2010. Thresholds and time lags in effects of energy development on Greater Sage-Grouse populations. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 74(3):437–448.
- Hemstrom, M.A., M.J. Wisdom, M.M. Rowland, B. Wales, W.J. Hann, and R.A. Gravenmier. 2002. Sagebrush-steppe vegetation dynamics and potential for restoration in the Interior Columbia Basin, USA. *Conservation Biology* 16:1243–1255.
- Homer, C.G., C.L. Aldridge, D.K. Meyer, M.J. Coan, and Z.H. Bowen. 2009. Multiscale sagebrush rangeland habitat modeling in southwest Wyoming: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2008–1027. 14pp.
- Johnson, D.H. 1980. The comparison of usage and availability measurements for evaluating resource preference. *Ecology* 61:65–71.

- Knick, S.T., and J.W. Connelly (editors). 2011. Greater Sage-Grouse: Ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats. *Studies in Avian Biology*, vol. 38. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Knick, S.T., and S.E. Hanser. 2011. Connecting pattern and process in greater sage-grouse populations and sagebrush landscapes. In: *Greater Sage-Grouse: Ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats*, edited by S.T. Knick and J.W. Connelly, 383–405. *Studies in Avian Biology*, vol. 38. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Knick, S.T., S.E. Hanser, R.F. Miller, D.A. Pyke, M.J. Wisdom, S.P. Finn, E.T. Rinkes, and C.J. Henny. 2011. Ecological influence and pathways of land use in sagebrush. In: *Greater Sage-Grouse: Ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats*, edited by S.T. Knick and J.W. Connelly, 203–251. *Studies in Avian Biology*, vol. 38. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- LANDFIRE: LANDFIRE Existing Vegetation Type layer. (2013, June – last update.) U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey. [Online.] Available online: <http://landfire.cr.usgs.gov/viewer/>[2013, May 8].
- Leu, M., and S.E. Hanser. 2011. Influences of the human footprint on sagebrush landscape patterns: implications for sage-grouse conservation. In: *Greater Sage-Grouse: Ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats*, edited by S.T. Knick and J.W. Connelly, 253–271. *Studies in Avian Biology*, vol. 38. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- MacKinnon, W.C., J.W. Karl, G.R. Toevs, J.J. Taylor, M. Karl, C.S. Spurrier, and J.E. Herrick. 2011. BLM core terrestrial indicators and methods. Tech Note 440. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, National Operations Center, Denver, CO.
- Manier, D.J., D.J.A Wood, Z.H. Bowen, R.M. Donovan, M.J. Holloran, L.M. Juliusson, K.S. Mayne, S.J. Oyler-McCance, F.R. Quamen, D.J. Saher, and A.J. Titolo. 2013. Summary of science, activities, programs, and policies that influence the rangewide conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*): U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2013–1098. 170pp.
- NatureServe. 2011. International ecological classification standard: Terrestrial ecological classifications. NatureServe Central Databases, Arlington, VA. Data current as of July 31, 2011.
- Ong, S., C. Campbell, P. Denholm, R. Margolis, and G. Heath. 2013. Land-use requirements for solar power plants in the United States. National Renewable Energy Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy Technical Report NREL/TP-6A20-56290. 39pp. Available online: <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy13osti/56290.pdf>.
- Pellant, M., P. Shaver, D.A. Pyke, and J.E. Herrick. 2005. Interpreting indicators of rangeland health, version 4. Technical Reference 1734-6. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, National Science and Technology Center, Denver, CO. BLM/WO/ST-00/001+1734/REV05. 122pp.
- Perry, J. Personal communication. February 12, 2014.
- Pyke, D.A. 2011. Restoring and rehabilitating sagebrush habitats. In: *Greater Sage-Grouse: Ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats*, edited by S.T. Knick and J.W. Connelly, 531–548. *Studies in Avian Biology*, vol. 38. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

## **Appendix Y – Greater Sage-Grouse Implementation Strategy**

---

- Schroeder, M.A., C.L. Aldridge, A.D. Apa, J.R. Bohne, C.E. Braun, S.D. Bunnell, J.W. Connelly, P.A. Deibert, S.C. Gardner, M.A. Hilliard, G.D. Kobriger, S.M. McAdam, C.W. McCarthy, J.J. McCarthy, D.L. Mitchell, E.V. Rickerson, and S.J. Stiver. 2004. Distribution of sage-grouse in North America. *Condor* 106: 363–376.
- Stiver, S.J., A.D. Apa, J.R. Bohne, S.D. Bunnell, P.A. Deibert, S.C. Gardner, M.A. Hilliard, C.W. McCarthy, and M.A. Schroeder. 2006. Greater Sage-Grouse comprehensive conservation strategy. Unpublished report. Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Cheyenne, WY. Available online: <http://www.wafwa.org/documents/pdf/GreaterSage-grouseConservationStrategy2006.pdf>.
- Stiver, S.J., E.T. Rinkes, D.E. Naugle, P.D. Makela, D.A. Nance, and J.W. Karl. In press. Sage-grouse habitat assessment framework: Multiscale habitat assessment tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. Technical Reference. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Denver, CO.
- Taylor, J., E. Kachergis, G. Toevs, J. Karl, M. Bobo, M. Karl, S. Miller, and C. Spurrier. 2014. AIM-monitoring: A component of the BLM assessment, inventory, and monitoring strategy. Tech Note 445. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, National Operations Center, Denver, CO.
- Toevs, G.R., J.J. Taylor, C.S. Spurrier, W.C. MacKinnon, M.R. Bobo. 2011. Bureau of Land Management assessment, inventory, and monitoring strategy: For integrated renewable resources management. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, National Operations Center, Denver, CO.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. National Agricultural Statistics Service Cropland Data Layer. {YEAR}. Published crop-specific data layer [online]. USDA-NASS, Washington, D.C. Available online: <http://nassgeodata.gmu.edu/CropScape/> (accessed {DATE}; verified. {DATE}).
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. 2001. Handbook H-4180-1, Release 4-107. Rangeland health standards handbook. Available online: [http://www.blm.gov/style/medialib/blm/wo/Information\\_Resources\\_Management/policy/blm\\_handbook.Par.61484.File.dat/h4180-1.pdf](http://www.blm.gov/style/medialib/blm/wo/Information_Resources_Management/policy/blm_handbook.Par.61484.File.dat/h4180-1.pdf).
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. 2005. Wind Energy Development Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). BLM Washington Office, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. 2011. BLM national Greater Sage-Grouse land use planning strategy. Instruction Memorandum No. 2012-044. BLM Washington Office, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. 2010. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; 12-month findings for petitions to list the Greater Sage-Grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) as threatened or endangered. Proposed Rule. Federal Register 75: 13910–14014 (March 23, 2010).
- U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. 2013. Greater Sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) conservation objectives: Final report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, CO.

**ATTACHMENT A: AN OVERVIEW OF MONITORING COMMITMENTS**

	Broad and Mid-scales					Fine & Site Scales
	Implement- ation	Sagebrush Availability	Habitat Degradation	Population	Effectiveness	
<b>How will the data be used?</b>	Tracking and documenting implementation of land use plan decisions and inform adaptive management	Tracking changes in land cover (sagebrush) and inform adaptive management	Tracking changes in disturbance (threats) to sage-grouse habitat and inform adaptive management	Tracking trends in sage-grouse populations (and/or leks; as determined by state wildlife agencies) and inform adaptive management	Characterizing the relationship among disturbance, implementation actions, and sagebrush metrics and inform adaptive management	Measuring seasonal habitat, connectivity at the fine scale, and habitat conditions at the site scale, calculating disturbance and inform adaptive management
<b>Who is collecting the data?</b>	BLM FO and FS Forest	NOC and NIFC	National data sets (NOC), BLM FOs and FS Forests as applicable	State wildlife agencies through WAFWA	Comes from other broad and mid-scale monitoring types, analyzed by the NOC	BLM FO and SO, FS Forests and RO (with partners) including disturbance
<b>How often are the data collected, reported and made available to FWS?</b>	Collected and reported annually; summary every 5 years	Updated and changes reported annually; summary reports every 5 years	Collected and changes reported annually; summary reports every 5 years	State data reported annually per WAFWA MOU; summary reports every 5 years	Collected and reported every 5 years (coincident with LUP evaluations)	Collection and trend analysis ongoing, reported every 5 years or as needed to inform adaptive management
<b>What is the spatial scale?</b>	Summarized by LUP with flexibility for reporting by other units	Summarized by PACs (size dependent) with flexibility for reporting by other units	Summarized by PACs (size dependent) with flexibility for reporting by other units	Summarized by PACs (size dependent) with flexibility for reporting by other units	Summarized by MZ, and LUP with flexibility for reporting by other units (e.g., PAC)	Variable (e.g., projects and seasonal habitats)
<b>What are the potential personnel and budget impacts?</b>	Additional capacity or re-prioritization of ongoing monitoring work and budget realignment	At a minimum, current skills and capacity must be maintained; data mgmt cost are TBD	At a minimum, current skills and capacity must be maintained; data mgmt and data layer purchase cost are TBD	No additional personnel or budget impacts for BLM or USFS	Additional capacity or re-prioritization of ongoing monitoring work and budget realignment	Additional capacity or re-prioritization of ongoing monitoring work and budget realignment
<b>Who has primary and secondary responsibilities for reporting?</b>	1) BLM FO & SO; FS Forest & RO 2) BLM & FS Planning	1) NOC 2) WO	1) NOC 2) BLM SO, FS RO & appropriate programs	1) WAFWA & state wildlife agencies 2) BLM SO, FS RO, NOC	1) Broad and mid-scale at the NOC, LUP at BLM SO, USFS RO	1) BLM FO & FS Forests 2) BLM SO & FS RO
<b>What new processes/tools are needed?</b>	National implementation data sets and analysis tools	Updates to national land cover data	Data standards and roll-up methods for these data	Standards in population monitoring (WAFWA)	Reporting methodologies	Data standards data storage; and reporting

**ATTACHMENT B: LIST OF ALL SAGEBRUSH SPECIES AND SUBSPECIES INCLUDED IN THE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR BUILDING THE EVT AND BPS LAYERS**

- *Artemisia arbuscula* subspecies *longicaulis*
- *Artemisia arbuscula* subspecies *longiloba*
- *Artemisia bigelovii*
- *Artemisia nova*
- *Artemisia papposa*
- *Artemisia pygmaea*
- *Artemisia rigida*
- *Artemisia spinescens*
- *Artemisia tripartita* subspecies *rupicola*
- *Artemisia tripartita* subspecies *tripartita*
- *Tanacetum nuttallii*
- *Artemisia cana* subspecies *bolanderi*
- *Artemisia cana* subspecies *cana*
- *Artemisia cana* subspecies *viscidula*
- *Artemisia tridentata* subspecies *wyomingensis*
- *Artemisia tridentata* subspecies *tridentata*
- *Artemisia tridentata* subspecies *vaseyana*
- *Artemisia tridentata* subspecies *spiciformis*
- *Artemisia tridentata* subspecies *xericensis*
- *Artemisia tridentata* variety *pauciflora*
- *Artemisia frigida*
- *Artemisia pedatifida*

**ATTACHMENT C: USER AND PRODUCER ACCURACIES FOR AGGREGATED ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS WITHIN LANDFIRE MAP ZONES**

LANDFIRE Map Zone Name	User Accuracy	Producer Accuracy	% of Map Zone within Historic Schroeder
Wyoming Basin	76.9%	90.9%	98.5%
Snake River Plain	68.8%	85.2%	98.4%
Missouri River Plateau	57.7%	100.0%	91.3%
Grand Coulee Basin of the Columbia Plateau	80.0%	80.0%	89.3%
Wyoming Highlands	75.3%	85.9%	88.1%
Western Great Basin	69.3%	75.4%	72.9%
Blue Mountain Region of the Columbia Plateau	85.7%	88.7%	72.7%
Eastern Great Basin	62.7%	80.0%	62.8%
Northwestern Great Plains	76.5%	92.9%	46.3%
Northern Rocky Mountains	72.5%	89.2%	42.5%
Utah High Plateaus	81.8%	78.3%	41.5%
Colorado Plateau	65.3%	76.2%	28.8%
Middle Rocky Mountains	78.6%	73.3%	26.4%
Cascade Mountain Range	57.1%	88.9%	17.3%
Sierra Nevada Mountain Range	0.0%	0.0%	12.3%
Northwestern Rocky Mountains	66.7%	60.0%	7.3%
Southern Rocky Mountains	58.6%	56.7%	7.0%
Northern Cascades	75.0%	75.0%	2.6%
Mogollon Rim	66.7%	100.0%	1.7%
Death Valley Basin	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%

There are two anomalous map zones with 0% user and producer accuracies, attributable to no available reference data for the ecological systems of interest.

User accuracy is a map-based accuracy that is computed by looking at the reference data for a class and determining the percentage of correct predictions for these samples. For example, if I select any sagebrush pixel on the classified map, what is the probability that I'll be standing in a sagebrush stand when I visit that pixel location in the field? Commission Error equates to including a pixel in a class when it should have been excluded (i.e., commission error = 1 – user's accuracy).

Producer accuracy is a reference-based accuracy that is computed by looking at the predictions produced for a class and determining the percentage of correct predictions. In other words, if I know that a particular area is sagebrush (I've been out on the ground to check), what is the probability that the digital map will correctly identify that pixel as sagebrush? Omission Error equates to excluding a pixel that should have been included in the class (i.e., omission error = 1 – producer's accuracy).

## 8.0 COT OBJECTIVE 6: PRIORITIZE, FUND, AND IMPLEMENT RESEARCH TO ADDRESS EXISTING UNCERTAINTIES

*“Increased funding and support for key research projects that will address uncertainties associated with sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat management is essential. Effective amelioration of threats can only be accomplished if the mechanisms by which those threats are imposed on the redundancy, representation, and resilience of the species and its habitats are understood.” (COT Report, 2013)*

In accordance with BLM policy, the Record of Decision and Approved Plan will establish intervals and standards for evaluations as part of the implementation strategy. Priorities will be established based on the identified threats in the Planning Area, the conservation objectives included as part of the Approved Plan, and any potential uncertainties associated with sage-grouse and associated habitat management. A part of this strategy will include development of a budget to accomplish each of the identified tasks and fund potential research topics to address any uncertainties.

As new science pertaining to sage-grouse and habitat is continuously evolving, refined management strategies may be necessary to ensure that BLM and USFS are utilizing the most current science, information, and data regarding sage-grouse. It is for this reason that BLM and USFS have collaborated with the State of Wyoming and USFWS to develop an adaptive management strategy as a part of the planning process.

### 8.1 Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Adaptive Management Plan

The greater sage-grouse adaptive management plan provides regulatory assurance that unintended negative impacts to greater sage-grouse habitat will be addressed before consequences become severe or irreversible. This adaptive management plan:

- utilizes science based soft and hard adaptive management triggers,
- addresses multiple scales of data, and
- utilizes an adaptive management working group.

#### ***Adaptive Management Triggers***

Adaptive management triggers are essential for identifying when potential management changes are needed in order to continue meeting greater sage-grouse conservation objectives. With respect to sage-grouse, all regulatory entities in Wyoming, including the BLM and FS, use soft and hard triggers. Soft and hard triggers are focused on three metrics: 1) number of active leks, 2) acres of available habitat, and 3) population trends based on annual lek counts.

#### ***Soft Triggers:***

Soft triggers are indicators that management or specific activities may not be achieving the intended results of conservation action or that unanticipated changes to populations or habitats have occurred that have the potential to place habitats or populations at risk. The soft trigger is any deviation from normal trends in habitat or population in any given year. Metrics include, but are not limited to, annual lek counts, wing counts, aerial surveys, habitat monitoring, and DDCT evaluations. BLM and/or FS field offices, with the assistance of their respective land and resource management plan implementation groups, local WGFD offices, and local sage-grouse working groups will evaluate the metrics with the

Adaptive Management Working Group (AMWG) on an annual basis. The purpose of these strategies is to address localized greater sage-grouse population and habitat changes by providing the framework in which management will change if monitoring identifies negative population and habitat anomalies in order to avoid crossing a hard trigger threshold.

**Hard Triggers:**

Hard triggers are indicators that management is not achieving desired conservation results. Hard triggers would be considered a catastrophic indicator that the species is not responding to conservation actions, or that a larger-scale impact or set of impacts is having a negative effect.

Within the range of normal population variables, hard triggers shall be determined to take effect when two of the three metrics exceeds 60% of normal variability for the area under management in a single year, or when any of the three metrics exceeds 40% of normal variability for a three year time period within a five-year range of analysis. A minimum of three consecutive years in a five-year period is used to determine trends (i.e., Y1-2-3, Y2-3-4, Y3-4-5).

**Adaptive Management Response**

**Soft Trigger Response:**

Soft triggers require immediate monitoring and surveillance to determine causal factors and may require curtailment of activities in the short- or long-term, as allowed by law. The project level adaptive management strategies will identify appropriate responses where the project's activities are identified as the causal factor. The management agency (BLM and/or FS) and the AMWG will implement an appropriate response strategy to address causal factors not attributable to a specific project or to make adjustments at a larger regional or state-wide level.

**Hard Trigger Response:**

Upon determination that a hard trigger has been tripped, the BLM and/or FS will immediately defer issuance of discretionary authorizations for new actions for a period of 90 days. In addition, within 14 days of a determination that a hard trigger has been tripped, the AMWG will convene to develop an interim response strategy and initiate an assessment to determine the causal factor or factors (hereafter called the causal factor assessment).

**Interim Strategy**

An interim response strategy will be developed, and implemented to the extent permitted by law, within 90 days of determination that a hard trigger has been tripped. The technical team (see Implementation Groups below) will be consulted to identify the scope and scale of the interim strategy. Based on the recommendation of the AMWG, the BLM and/or FS will implement an interim response strategy through an Instruction Memorandum or other management mechanisms to direct management until the causal factor(s) and appropriate response(s) can be determined. The interim response strategy will consist of appropriate management measures undertaken at the project stage, supported by the best available science, to address the specific metric which has been tripped and may include deferral of some activities as appropriate. Measures that were analyzed in this EIS and the COT, NTT reports, and NPT guidance will be reviewed in addition to current science to identify the most appropriate measures to be implemented as part of the interim response strategy. The BLM and/or FS will comply with all applicable law in implementing such response(s), and, if applicable, will undertake a plan amendment or revision under BLM and/or FS's planning regulations and policies.

The interim strategy will be implemented for the biologically significant unit (BSU), which, in Wyoming, is PHMAs, regardless of whether PHMAs cross multiple planning boundaries. If it has been identified that more than one PHMA has the same hard triggers being tripped, or is trending towards triggers being tripped, the interim strategy will be implemented at the appropriate scale.

### ***Causal Factor Assessment***

The causal factor assessment will be completed within 180 days of determination that a hard trigger threshold has been crossed. Once the causal factor assessment is completed by the AMWG, the interim response strategy will be modified to adequately address the causal factors in consultation with the technical team. If a causal factor or factors cannot be identified, the interim response strategy shall stay in place until the cause can be determined and any new planning decision can be implemented.

### ***EIS Level Projects***

Each major project (EIS level) will include adaptive management strategies in support of the population management objectives for greater sage-grouse set by the State of Wyoming, and will be consistent with the Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Adaptive Management Plan. These adaptive management strategies will be developed in partnership with the AMWG, WGFD, project proponents, partners, and stakeholders, incorporating the best available science.

### ***Implementation Groups***

#### ***Sage-Grouse Implementation Team***

The State of Wyoming's strategy is implemented by the Sage-Grouse Implementation Team (SGIT), established by Executive Order in 2008 and codified in 2014 by the Wyoming Legislature (W.S. § 9-19-101). The SGIT is a Governor appointed body with representation by federal agencies (BLM, USFS, FWS, Natural Resources Conservation Service), state agencies (Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, Department of Agriculture, Department of Environmental Quality, Wildlife and Natural Resource Trust Fund, Oil and Gas Conservation Commission, and Office of State Lands and Investments), the Wyoming Legislature, county governments, energy developers, mining companies, landowners, and non-governmental organizations. The BLM, US Fish and Wildlife Service NRCS and the US Forest Service all have an equal role in the SGIT.

#### ***Land and Resource Management Plan – Implementation Teams***

Land and Resource Management Plans are implemented through implementation teams. These implementation teams include cooperating agencies who participated in the development of this land use plan representing local, state, and federal agencies. These implementation teams will coordinate with the AMWG and others to evaluate metrics and management responses necessary to meet greater sage-grouse conservation objectives within their Planning Area.

#### ***Adaptive Management Working Group and Technical Team***

An Adaptive Management Working Group (AMWG) will be established in consultation with the SGIT to provide appropriate guidance for agencies with the ability to affect sage-grouse populations and/or habitat through their permitting authority. The AMWG will include BLM, USFS, USFWS, and State of Wyoming. The purpose of this group will be to initiate a response strategy should it be determined that a hard trigger has been tripped or if soft triggers are showing a trend across a region. A hard trigger may be tripped at any time, thus, upon identification of such event, current available population and habitat data will be reviewed by the AMWG with the assistance of a technical team comprised of agency

biologists, scientists familiar with the Management Zone in question, and other individuals as appropriate (e.g., habitat managers, respective landowners, other appropriate representatives) to confirm that a hard trigger has been tripped. Upon verification of data showing that a hard trigger has been tripped, the AMWG will convene within 14 days.

The AMWG will review monitoring data which has been collected by the appropriate local sage-grouse working groups in conformance with data collection standards. This group will meet annually to review all data collected in the prior year regarding sage grouse populations and habitats. Monitoring data will have been analyzed (by WGFD for population based metrics (leks, wing counts, etc., and by land managers [BLM, FS, State of Wyoming] for habitat based metrics [DDCT, etc.]) Should the monitoring data suggest a trend toward a soft or hard trigger being tripped, they will 1. Identify what metric is indicating that trend (population or habitat); and 2. Identify a technical team to review the data and compile a range of activities which may be causing the trend. Should review of the monitoring data identify that multiple soft triggers have been tripped in one PHMA, or the same triggers have been tripped across multiple PHMAs, the technical team will be tasked with verifying the scope and intensity of the trends.

Once the analysis of the trends has been completed by the technical team and reported back to the AMWG, the AMWG will make recommendations to the appropriate land managing agency regarding an interim adaptive management strategy to be implemented. Implementation will occur via the appropriate regulations and policy applicable for that agency. At that time, the State of Wyoming will conduct a review of the regulatory authority implementing the Sage Grouse Core Area Strategy to determine if a State of Wyoming adaptive management strategy is warranted.

Upon review of the annual data by the AMWG and technical team, the State of Wyoming, as part of the AMWG, will contact neighboring states within the respective Management Zone to inform them of any findings. Should a hard trigger be tripped, the trigger which has been tripped and any recommended adaptive management strategy being implemented will be shared with the appropriate neighboring state(s). Should the need arise for implementation of a multi-state adaptive management strategy; the AMWG will coordinate to develop an effective response.

### *Small Leks*

Small leks will be given special consideration. Due to geographic variations a definition of “small” is not provided, rather determination of “small” will be made by the AMWG based upon recommendations of the scientific community. Generally, “small” is considered 10 or fewer males for a three year time period within a five-year range of analysis. If a trigger is hit based upon such a lek, then the adaptive management working group will evaluate the site-specific circumstances and determine appropriate remedial action.

## **9.0 GLOSSARY TERMS**

**Additionality:** The conservation benefits of compensatory mitigation are demonstrably new and would not have resulted without the compensatory mitigation project. (BLM Manual Section 1794).

**Avoidance mitigation:** Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action. (40 CFR 1508.20(a)) (e.g., may also include avoiding the impact by moving the proposed action to a different time or location.)

**Compensatory mitigation:** Compensating for the (residual) impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments. (40 CFR 1508.20)

**Compensatory mitigation projects:** Specific, on-the-ground actions to improve and/or protect habitats (e.g., chemical vegetation treatments, land acquisitions, conservation easements).

**Compensatory mitigation sites:** The durable areas where compensatory mitigation projects will occur.

**Durability (protective and ecological):** The administrative, legal, and financial assurances that secure and protect the conservation status of a compensatory mitigation site, and the ecological benefits of a compensatory mitigation project, for at least as long as the associated impacts persist. (BLM Manual Section 1794).

**Minimization mitigation:** Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation. (40 CFR 1508.20 (b))

**Residual impacts:** Impacts from an authorized land use that remain after applying avoidance and minimization mitigation; also referred to as unavoidable impacts.

**Timeliness:** The conservation benefits from compensatory mitigation accruing as early as possible or before impacts have begun. (BLM Manual Section 1794)