

---

# Appendix I

## Comparison of Alternatives Alleviation of USFWS-Identified Threats



BLM /Forest Service LUP Alternative Review Matrix Plan:

Subregion: Nevada and Northeast California

GSG Population(s): MZ III – Northwest Interior (NV), Southern Great Basin (NV Portion), Quinn Canyon Range (NV); MZ IV – Northern Great Basin; MZ V – Warm Springs Valley (NV), Western Great Basin (OR, CA, NV)

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
<b>Priority Areas for Conservation (PACs)</b>	Retain GRSG habitats within PACs <i>(pertains to PAC designation; actions below this line are evaluated independent of PAC designation for each Alternative).</i>	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	All GRSG habitats within PACs are addressed in the action alternatives. The PACs identified in the COT include non-habitat. This matches the SGMA identified in Alternative E. All other action alternatives include the mapped GRSG habitat within the PACs but do not include the non-habitat.					
	If PACs are lost to catastrophic events, implement appropriate restoration efforts.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	Specific actions are listed below in the appropriate sections that follow.					
	Restore and rehabilitate degraded GRSG habitat within PACS.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	Specific actions are listed below in the appropriate sections that follow.					
	Identify areas and habitats outside of PACs which may be necessary to maintain viability of GRSG. If development or vegetation manipulation activities outside of PACs are proposed, the project proponent should work with federal, state or local agencies and interested stakeholders to ensure consistency with GRSG habitat needs.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?				Implement the RDFs in areas outside of PPMA and PGMA where GRSG use has been observed or suspected, areas and habitats which may be necessary to maintain viability of GRSG, or where the activity would affect GRSG or their habitat in PPMA or PGMA.		
	Re-evaluate the status of PACs and adjacent GRSG habitat at least once every 5-years, or when important new information becomes available.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?				GRSG habitat categorization and use management boundaries would be evaluated and adjusted based continuing inventory and monitoring results every five years. Adjustments up to plus or minus ten percent of the mapped habitat within the population management zone would be made without further analysis.		

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
	Actively pursue opportunities to increase occupancy and connectivity between PACs.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	There are objectives for improving genetic and seasonal range connectivity in Alternatives B, D, and F. There are specific management actions identified in Alternative D.					
	Maintain or improve existing habitat conditions in areas adjacent to burned habitat.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?				PGMA near where PPMA has been burned by wildfire will be managed as PPMA until the burned habitat and GRSG use has been restored. The location and amount of PGMA to be managed as PPMA will be determined in coordination between the BLM and FS, the respective state wildlife agency, and in Nevada the Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team based on site specific evaluations.		
<b>Wildfire</b> <b>MZ III - NI=Y, SGB=Y, QCR=Y</b> <b>MZ IV - NGB=Y</b> <b>MZ V - WSV=Y, WGB=Y</b>		<b>SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES</b> All action alternatives will decrease habitat loss from prescribed fire and wildfire by limiting prescribed fire and prioritizing wildfire suppression efforts in the state, which meet the Conservation Objectives Team report objectives. Alternatives B, D, E, and F would also try to lessen the future probability of large fires in GRSG by putting in fire breaks which would further benefit GRSG. Alternatives B, D, and E, and F all move to lessen habitat loss from treatments within winter habitat to varying degrees, which is consistent with objective for sagebrush removal. All alternatives have a focus on native or desirable plants to be reseeded within PPMA while D and E provide added flexibility for judicial use of non-natives to meet habitat objectives. Alternative C is passive toward fire and fuels management emphasizing natural restorative processes following a reduction in anthropogenic disturbance. In alternative C, reduction in the threat of wildfire is implemented through a long-term perspective of overall improvement of habitat.						
			Varied treatment options – no standard.	Impacts such as habitat degradation and habitat loss from fuels treatments would be reduced because there would be no treatments in winter habitat, no prescribed fire in areas with less than 12 inches precipitation, and all projects would use native seeds. Habitat loss would be decreased because of the restrictions on fuels management treatments and	Relies on passive restoration efforts to indirectly reduce the risk of wildfires. Restores anthropogenic disturbance such as non-native seeding, fences, livestock grazing. No direct actions for reducing wildfire occurrence/threat.	Habitat loss would be reduced from the implementation of a system of fuel breaks. Fuel treatments would reduce impacts since they would need to be designed with the emphasis to maintain, protect, and expand sagebrush. Prescribed fire would not be allowed unless it is shown that noxious weeds will not be spread. Winter habitat loss would be limited through restricting	Expands fire suppression plans and strategies across all land jurisdictions within SGMAs. Identifies proactive pre-suppression, suppression, and restoration activities and completes habitat assessments to identify highest fire risk as well as highest restoration	Same as Alternative B

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
				<p>disruption of GRSG would be decreased with the treatments occurring outside of important seasons. Wildfire suppression efforts would be prioritized GRSG very high. Following best practices in IM 2011-138 will also limit negative impacts from firefighting activities. Requiring native seed and designing fuels treatments for long-term success would reduce the long-term impact of the short-term habitat loss and not have a negative long-term population impact.</p>		<p>when treatments could occur in these areas. Wildfire suppression planning would lessen the risk for habitat loss from wildfire. The emphasis on use of native seed or desirable plants would lessen the long-term habitat loss to GRSG habitat but provides for use of non-natives where natives may not meet objectives.</p>	<p>potential. Updates fire suppression plans. Takes measures to increase initial attack capability, effectiveness, and efficiency. Establishes and maintains a system of targeted fuel breaks and green strips. Designates Occupied and Suitable habitat as "high priority value" for suppression resource allocation.</p>	
	<p>Retain and restore healthy native sagebrush plant communities within the range of GRSG.</p>	<p>Restrict or contain fire within the normal range of fire activity (assuming a healthy native perennial sagebrush community), including size and frequency, as defined by the best available science.</p>		<p>B-FFM-HFM-9</p>	<p>C-FFM-HFM-9</p>	<p>D-FFM-4-6,8,10,12,19 D-FFM-HFM-1,20</p>	<p>E-FFM-2-6,10,12 E-FFM-HFM-1,9,14,36,49,50,56</p>	<p>F-FFM-HFM-9</p>
		<p>Eliminate intentional fires in sagebrush habitats, including prescribed burning of breeding and winter habitats.</p>		<p>B-FFM-HFM-9</p>		<p>D-FFM-HFM-4</p>	<p>E-FFM-HFM-2</p>	<p>F-FFM-HFM-9</p>
		<p>Design and implement restoration of burned sagebrush habitats to allow for natural succession to healthy native sagebrush plant communities.</p>		<p>B-VEG-3,9,11 B-FFM-HFM-22</p>	<p>C-VEG-4,5 C-FFM-HFM-22</p>	<p>D-VEG-2,3,6 D-FFM-8,13,14,18-20 D-FFM-HFM-1,9, 20, 21</p>	<p>E-SSS-ALDM-5 E-FFM-13,14,15 E-FFM-HFM-22,29-31,49,50-55</p>	<p>F-VEG-3,11 F-FFM-HFM-22,24</p>
		<p>Implement monitoring programs for restoration activities. To ensure success, monitoring must continue until restoration is complete, with sufficient commitments to make adequate corrections to management efforts if needed.</p>		<p>B-FFM-HFM-9 B-VEG-7</p>		<p>D-FFM-8,16,17, 20 D-VEG-18-20, 21 D-FFM-HFM-5</p>	<p>E-SSS-AM-5 E-FFM-16,17</p>	<p>F-FFM-HFM-9</p>

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
		Immediately suppress fire in all sagebrush habitats.		B-FFM-HFM-18-20	C-FFM-HFM-18-20	D-FFM-4, 6, 8, 10, 12 D-FFM-HFM-1, 18,20	E-FFM-16,17	F-FFM-HFM-9
		Prevention of fires in GRSG habitats: Which (if any) of Options 1a - d were applied? a. Manage for the maintenance and restoration of healthy perennial grass and sagebrush vegetative communities. b. Manage land uses to minimize the spread of invasive species and or facilitate fire ignition. c. Address degraded sagebrush systems before fire occurs. d. Close rangelands that are highly susceptible to fire to OHV use during the fire season.		(a) B-VEG-2 (a)(b)(c) B-VEG-2,9 (d) B-CTTM-4	(a)(c) C-FFM-HFM-10 (a)(b)(c) C-VEG-2,9,13,22-32	(a) D-FFM-HFM-1,4,8,21 (b) D-FFM-5 D-FFM-HFM-1,9,20 D-LG-16 (c) D-FFM-6,8 D-FFM-HFM-1,8 (a)(b)(c) D-FFM-12 D-VEG-1,2,17,18,21 (d) D-CTTM-4	(a) E-SSS-MIT-5 (a)(c) E-FFM-HFM-29-31,33 (b) E-FFM-HFM-37	(a) F-VEG-2 (a)(b)(c) F-VEG-2,14 (d) F-CTTM-4
		Which (if any) of Options 2a - j were applied? Note: Only Options c, d, f, and g are appropriate for planning decisions. c) Establish defensible fire lines in areas where: (i) effectiveness is high, (iii) fire risk is likely, and (iii) negative impacts from these efforts are minimized. Avoid use of any vegetative stripping in healthy, unfragmented habitats, unless fire conditions and local ecological conditions so warrant. d) Carefully consider the use of backfires within PACs to minimize the potential for escape and further damage to GRSG and sagebrush habitats. f) Remove pinyon-juniper stands which are highly flammable in low elevation sagebrush habitats. g) Reduce risk of human caused fires by limiting activities that may result in fire during high risk fire seasons.		(c) B-FFM-HFM-12,13	(c) C-FFM-HFM-12,13,28	(c) D-FFM-6,7,12 D-FFM-HFM-1,3,8,20 D-VEG-16 (f) D-VEG-1,2,30 D-VEG-ISCE-4,7-9 D-VEG-CC-3 (g) D-FFM-5	(c) E-SSS-MIT-5 E-FFM-1,6 E-FFM-HFM-2,12,13,20,36,56 (d) E-FFM-11 E-FFM-HFM-41 (f) E-VEG-30 E-VEG-ISCE-4,8,11 E-FFM-HFM-22,55	

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
		<p>Which (if any) of Options 3a - e were applied? Note: Only Options c and d are appropriate for decisions in this EIS.</p> <p>c) Apply available seed where it is most likely to be effective and to areas of highest need.</p> <p>d) Ensure GRSG habitat needs are considered in restoration activities including managing for the range of variation, as appropriate for the local areas.</p>		(c)(d) B-FFM-HFM-21	(c)(d) C-FFM-HFM-21	(c)(d) D-FFM-HFM-1,21 D-FFM-6,14,19 (d) D-VEG-22,27,29-32	(c)(d) E-FFM-HFM-20,21	(c)(d) F-FFM-HFM-21
		<p>Was Option 4 applied?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporate IM 2011-138</li> </ul>		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
<b>Non-native, Invasive Plant Species - Weeds/Annual Grasses</b>		<p><b>SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES</b></p> <p>All action alternatives would meet the COT report objectives by implementing actions to maintain and restore healthy sagebrush communities. Alternative D provides the lowest surface disturbance threshold (no unmitigated loss of habitat), which would reduce opportunities for incursion of non-native species. Alternatives B and F propose 3 percent thresholds in priority habitats, and E would propose a 5 percent threshold. Alternatives B, D, E, and F prioritize restoration of areas with invasive weed infestations and emphasize restoration, which would further reduce habitat degradation. Alternative C prioritizes restoration of invasive infestations but limits restoration to natural processes following a reduction in anthropogenic uses (livestock removal, fencing and roads infrastructure removal).</p>						
			<p>Various control measures – no standard. Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation plans can help ameliorate the threat of invasive annuals and strategic wildland fire suppression can provide long-term protection to intact native vegetation, thereby preventing the spread and conversion to invasive annuals. Invasive annuals would continue to be introduced and spread as a result of ongoing vehicle traffic in and out of the planning area, recreational activities, wildlife, improper livestock grazing, fire, and surface-disturbing activities (energy and infrastructure).</p>	<p>Impacts on GRSG habitats would be minimized by controlling, suppressing, and eradicating noxious and invasive weeds under this alternative. Since this alternative would limit anthropogenic disturbance in priority habitat to 3 percent, this would likely limit the invasive annuals introduced. This alternative would also require native seed for restoration efforts and the use of BMPs for fire and fuels treatments also include invasive species prevention measures that would also help reduce habitat degradation and loss from invasive</p>	<p>Relies on passive restoration efforts to indirectly reduce the risk of invasive annuals. Minimizes use of herbicides and emphasizes mechanical treatment methods. Reduces spread of invasive annuals by eliminating livestock grazing.</p>	<p>Similar to Alternative B, except the disturbance limitation would be a no net loss approach in priority habitat instead of 3 percent. Disturbance thresholds would limit the invasive annuals introduced. Alternative D broadens treatment options through an IVM approach using fire, chemical, mechanical, and biological methods based on site potential.</p>	<p>Impacts would be similar to those described under Alternative D except surface disturbance could be allowed to go above 5 percent in Occupied habitat and up to 20 percent per year in Potential habitat. As a result, the likelihood for introduction and spread of invasive annuals would be higher than under Alternatives B or D. Agencies would be required to aggressively respond to new infestations to keep invasive</p>	<p>Similar to Alternative B. Limits anthropogenic disturbance to one instance per section and a cumulative 3 percent disturbance cap.</p>

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
				weeds.			species from spreading, identify, and treat new infestations before they become larger problems, and contain known infestations of weeds in or near sagebrush habitats.	
<b>MZ III - NI=Y, SGB=Y, QCR=Y</b> <b>MZ IV - NGB=Y</b> <b>MZ V - WSV=Y, WGB=Y</b>	Maintain and restore healthy, native sagebrush plant communities.	Retain all remaining large intact sagebrush patches, particularly at low elevations.				D-FFM-4,6,12,19,20 D-VEG-1,17		
		Reduce or eliminate disturbances that promote the spread of these invasive species.				D-FFM-19 D-FFM-HFM-1,4,5,20 D-VEG-15,20	E-FFM-HFM-58	F-FFM-HFM-25-27
		Monitor and control invasive vegetation post-wildfire for at least three years.		B-FFM-HFM-9		D-FFM-16,17 D-FFM-HFM-5	E-FFM-16,17	E-FFM-HFM-9
		Require best management practices for construction projects in and adjacent to sagebrush habitats to prevent invasion.				D-FFM-HFM-1		
		Restore altered ecosystems such that non-native invasive plants are reduced to levels that do not put the area at risk of conversion if a catastrophic event were to occur.		B-FFM-HFM-21,22	C-FFM-HFM-21,22	D-FFM-HFM-1,8,21,22 D-FFM-8,19 D-VEG-1,18,25,32 D-VEG-ISCE-2,3	E-FFM-21,22,58-60	F-FFM-HFM-21,22,24
<b>Energy Development</b> <b>MZ III - NI=U, SGB=L, QCR=N</b> <b>MZ IV - NGB=L</b> <b>MZ V - WSV=Y, WGB=L</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES</b>							
	To varying degrees all alternatives meet the conservation objective for energy, which is to ensure that development will not impinge upon stable or increasing population trends. Alternatives B, C, and F provide protection from wind development to GRSG and their habitat since all three stipulate that wind development is excluded from priority habitat. Alternative C goes further to exclude development in all GRSG habitats (ACECs). Alternatives D and F exclude from both priority and general habitats. Alternative B excludes in priority habitat only. Alternative E provides for avoidance within SGMAs or occupied and suitable habitat (PPMA and PGMA).							
			Most GRSG habitat is open to renewable energy development.  Exclusion and avoidance areas include Congressionally designated areas, wilderness study areas, and some ACECs.  In the sub-region, within	In addition to exclusion and avoidance areas in Alternative A, renewable energy development would be managed as exclusion in priority habitat and avoidance in general habitat.  Habitat and population protections same as	Excludes renewable energy development from all ACECs, all GRSG habitats and recommends a 5-10-mile buffer between these habitats and wind development.  Habitat and population protections same as	Excludes renewable energy development within priority and general habitats with provision for on-site development within existing industrial infrastructure.  In the sub-region, within modeled GRSG nesting habitat there	Follows the State policy of “avoid, minimize, and mitigate” with oversight by the Nevada Sagebrush Ecosystem Council using best available science.  Seeks to avoid conflict by locating	Same as Alternative B.

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
			<p>modeled nesting habitat there are 983,600 of exclusion and 89,200 of avoidance acres of PPH and PGH. Proposed exclusion and avoidance areas provide an increased level of protection to modeled nesting habitat associated with leks representing 3 percent of the population for Avoidance areas and 12 percent of the population for the sub-region.</p> <p>Provides no specific actions for fluid minerals.</p>	<p>Alternative A. Provides specific actions for fluid minerals. See below.</p>	<p>Alternative A. Provides specific actions for fluid minerals. See below.</p>	<p>are 12,202,900 acres proposed for right of way exclusion and an additional 89,200 acres proposed for right of way avoidance of PPMA and PGMA. Proposed exclusion and avoidance areas provide an increased level of protection to modeled nesting habitat associated with leks represented by 94 percent of the modeled GRSG population for the sub-region occurring within the closure and exclusion proposed by this alternative.</p> <p>Provides specific actions for fluid minerals. See below.</p>	<p>developments in non-habitat wherever possible.</p> <p>Emphasizes co-location and existing corridors.</p> <p>Provides specific actions for fluid minerals. See below.</p>	
	<p>Energy development should be designed to insure that it will not impinge upon stable or increasing GSG population trends</p>	<p>Avoid energy development in PACs.</p>		<p>B-FFME-2,3,6 B-FM-1,3</p>	<p>C-LR-IS-1 C-FFME-3,11 C-FM-1</p>	<p>D-LR-WED-1 D-LR-IS-1,2 D-FFME-3,6 D-FM-1,2,3</p>	<p>E-LR-WED-1 E-LR-IS-1,2 E-FFME-3,6 E-FM-1</p>	<p>F-LR-WED-1,2 F-FFME-2,3,6 F-FM-1,3</p>
		<p>If avoidance is not possible in PACs due to pre-existing valid rights, adjacent development, or split estate issues, development should only occur in non-habitat areas, including all appurtenant structures, with an adequate buffer that is sufficient to preclude impacts on GRSG habitat from noise, and other human activities.</p>		<p>B-FFME-2,8</p>			<p>E-LR-LUA-9</p>	<p>F-FFME-2,8</p>
		<p>If development must occur in GRSG habitats due to existing rights and lack of reasonable alternative avoidance measures, the development should occur in the least suitable habitat for GRSG and be designed to ensure at a minimum that there are no detectable declines in GRSG</p>						

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
		population trends (see row below and COT report for measures to implement to facilitate this).						
		Which (if any) of Measure 3a - 3e were applied? a. Reduce and maintain the density of energy structures below which there are not impacts on the function of the GRSG habitats and do not result in decline in GRSG populations within the PACs. b. Design development outside PACs to maintain populations within adjacent PACs and allow for connectivity among PACs. c. Consolidate structures and infrastructure associated with energy development. d. Reclamation of disturbance resulting from a proposed project should only be considered mitigation and not portrayed as minimization. e. Design development to minimize tall structures or other features associated with the development.		(a) B-FFME-2,6,7		(c) D-LR-WED-3 D-LR-IS-2 (e) D-LR-LUA-5	(a) E-FFME-6 (c) E-LR-WED-3 E-LR-IS-2 (e) E-LR-LUA-5	(a) F-FFME-2,6,7
<b>Sagebrush Removal / Elimination</b>  <b>MZ III - NI=N, SGB=L, QCR=N</b>  <b>MZ IV – NGB=L</b>  <b>MZ V – WSV=N, WGB=L</b>	Avoid SB removal or manipulation in GSG breeding or wintering habitats. Exceptions can be considered where minor habitat losses are sustained while implementing other habitat improvement or maintenance efforts and in areas used as late summer brood habitat.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?		YES B-FFM-HFM-9,20 B-CTTM—6 B-LR-LUA-1,6 B-FFME-2,7,10 B-FM-3	YES C-LR-LUA-1	YES D-SSS-AM-3 D-VEG-15,17 D-FFM-6,8,12,13,19,20 D-FFM-HFM-1,20 D-CTTM-6 D-LR-LUA-1,6 D-FFME-10 D-FM-3	YES E-SSS-ACDM-6 E-FFM-11 E-FFM-HFM-2,9,20,41 E-CTTM-6 E-LR-LUA-1,6 E-LR-DMA-1 E-FM-3	YES F-CTTM-6 F-LR-LUA-1 F-FFME-2,7,10 F-FM-3
<b>Grazing</b>  <b>MZ III - NI=Y, SGB=Y, QCR=Y</b>  <b>MZ IV – NGB=Y</b>  <b>MZ V – WSV=Y, WGB=Y</b>		<b>SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES</b>						
		All action alternatives would manage grazing to better meet the ecological conditions that maintain or restore healthy sagebrush shrub and native perennial grass and forb communities and conserve the essential habitat components for GRSG (e.g. shrub cover, nesting cover), which is the Conservation Objectives Team report objective. All action alternatives emphasize GRSG in decision making for livestock grazing however, Alternative C eliminates livestock grazing from PPMA and PGMA. Alternative F adds utilization and rest goals but is otherwise similar to Alternatives B and D. Alternative E promotes proper livestock grazing practices and meeting RAC S&Gs and is similar to the No Action alternative. For wild horses there would be a focus on GRSG habitat and priority for gathers in GRSG habitat for Alternatives B, D, and F. These Alternatives include evaluation of HMAs and WHTs to consider adjustments in AML to meet GRSG habitat standards. Alternative E is similar requiring management at AML but does not include a prioritization for gathers based on GRSG management areas. Alternative C does not directly address WHB.						

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
			<p>Impacts on GRSG vary on each allotment since there is no set direction to specifically consider GRSG in grazing decisions. There could be localized to generalized landscape scale degradation to GRSG habitat from grazing.</p> <p>Structural range improvements are considered on a case-by-case basis while maintaining rangeland health which could lead to GRSG habitat degradation with the introduction of invasive species in some areas.</p> <p>Under Alternative A, 17,589,700 acres would be open for livestock grazing affecting 94 percent of the modeled populations within the sub-region.</p> <p>Wild horses would be managed within appropriate management levels.</p>	<p>Rangeland would be managed for vegetation composition and structure consistent with ecological site potential and within the reference state to achieve GRSG seasonal habitat objectives in Connelly et al. 2000 and Hagen et al. 2007. GRSG would benefit by having the structural components needed for all of their life cycle needs.</p> <p>Structural range improvements must conserve, maintain, enhance or restore GRSG habitat through improved grazing management system. Water development would need to be neutral or beneficial to GRSG.</p> <p>Same open/closed acreages as Alternative A.</p> <p>Wild horses would be managed within appropriate management levels with gathers in PGMA receiving highest priority. Wild horse HMAPs and WHTPs would be prioritized for evaluation of AML based on GRSG habitat needs.</p>	<p>Alternative C requires a substantial reduction in livestock grazing by removing all grazing use from priority and general habitats. Some allotments would have a decrease in AUMs and some would be closed if deemed necessary upon review. Habitat degradation would be lessened on remaining grazed allotments by establishing residual nesting cover, riparian stubble height, and upland trampling standards.</p> <p>Structural range improvements would be removed where possible.</p> <p>No new water developments would be authorized and existing water developments that are harmful to GRSG could be dismantled.</p> <p>Under Alternative C, livestock use would be closed on about 17,589,700 acres. About 94 Percent of the modeled GRSG population in the sub-region would be affected and anywhere from 100 to 88 percent of each sub-population.</p>	<p>Establishes desired cover percentages for sagebrush, grasses, and forbs in seasonal habitats developed from Great Basin specific GRSG habitat studies. GRSG would benefit by having the structural components needed for all of their life cycle needs.</p> <p>Prescribes standards for assessing GRSG habitat in the permit renewal process.</p> <p>Any new structural range improvements would be designed to conserve, enhance, or restore GRSG habitat through an improved grazing management system relative to GRSG objectives. New water developments within PH would be limited and need have a neutral effect or be beneficial to PH (such as by shifting livestock use away from critical areas). New developments must be designed to maintain continuity of predevelopment riparian or wet meadow vegetation and hydrology so there is no degradation of GRSG brood-rearing habitat.</p> <p>Same open/closed</p>	<p>Similar to Alternative D except: Applies management actions within occupied and suitable habitat within SGMAs.</p> <p>Utilizes GRSG habitat standards from Connelly et al 2000 instead of localized Great Basin specific habitat objectives.</p> <p>Promotes use of livestock grazing as a tool to improve GRSG habitat quantity, quality, or to reduce wildfire threat.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative B, except:</p> <p>Structural range improvements would be avoided in priority and general habitats.</p> <p>Evaluation of existing water developments would include dismantling where necessary.</p> <p>Proposes changes in grazing management in lieu of building new range management structures compatible with GRSG habitat objectives.</p> <p>Includes pre- and post-vegetation treatment monitoring requirements.</p>

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
					No specific recommendations for reduction of wild horse impacts. Recommends reduced capabilities regarding methods for capture/control.	accreages as Alternative A.  Wild horses would be managed similarly to Alternative B.		
	Conduct grazing management for all ungulates in a manner consistent with local ecological conditions that maintains or restores healthy sagebrush shrub and native perennial grass and forb communities and conserves the essential habitat components for GRSG (shrub and nesting cover). Areas which do not currently meet this standard should be managed to restore these components. Adequate monitoring of grazing strategies and their results, with necessary changes in strategies, is essential to ensuring that desired ecological conditions and GRSG response are achieved. Livestock and wild ungulate numbers must be managed at levels that allow native sagebrush vegetative communities to minimally achieve Proper Functioning Conditions (PFC; for riparian areas) or Rangeland Health Standards (RHS; uplands).	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?  Which (if any) of Options 1 - 5 were applied? Note: Only Options 1, 3, and 4 are appropriate for decisions in this EIS. 1. Ensure that allotments meet ecological potential and wildlife habitat requirements, and that the health and diversity of the native perennial grass community is consistent with the ecological site. 3. Incorporate GRSG habitat needs or habitat characteristics into relevant resource and allotment management plans, including the desired conditions. 4. Conduct habitat assessments and, where necessary, determine factors causing any failure to achieve the habitat characteristics. Make adjustments as appropriate.		(1) B-LG-7,10-13,16,17,20-22 (3) B-LG-2,6,8 (4) B-LG-4,5,9	(1) C-LG-1	(1) D-LG-10,13,16,20-22,28,29 (3) D-LG-25,30 (4) D-LG-2,4,26,27	(1) E-LG-10,16,20-22,32-34 (3) E-LG-8,30,31 (4) E-LG-4	(1) F-LG-7,10-13,16,17,20-22 (3) F-LG-2,8 (4) F-LG-4,5,9
<b>Range Management Structures (no ratings)</b>	Avoid or reduce the impact of range management structures on GRSG.	Range management structures should be designed and placed to be neutral or beneficial to GRSG.		B-LG-14,15,18,19	C-VEG-12	D-LG-14,15,20		F-LG-14,15,18,19
		Structures that are currently contributing to negative impacts on either GRSG or their habitats should be removed or modified to remove the threat.		B-LG-19,20,21		D-LG-18,20,21	E-LG-21	F-LG-19,20,21

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
Free-Roaming Equid Management MZ III - NI=Y, SGB=Y, QCR=Y MZ IV - NGB=L MZ V - WSV=Y, WGB=Y	Protect GRSG from the negative influences of grazing by free roaming equids.	Develop, implement, and enforce adequate regulatory mechanisms to protect GRSG habitat from negative influences of grazing by free-roaming equids.		B-WHB-3,4		D-WHB-1	E-WHB-1	F-WHB-4
		Manage free-roaming equids at levels that allow native sagebrush vegetative communities to minimally achieve PFC (for riparian areas) or RHS (for uplands).		B-WHB-2		D-WHB-1	E-WHB-1	F-WHB-2
Pinyon-juniper Expansion / Conifers		<b>SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES</b> All action alternatives except Alternatives C and F meet the Conservation Objectives Team report objective, which is to remove pinyon-juniper from areas of sagebrush that are most likely to support GRSG at a rate that is at least equal to rate of pinyon-juniper incursion. Alternative E is the most aggressive toward removal of juniper assuming that economic incentives are a viable means of increasing removal for biomass or other uses. Alternative D specifically targets conifer encroachment and establishes new GRSG habitat objectives regarding conifer. Alternative B contains similar objectives but does not specifically target juniper. Alternatives C and F represent more passive approaches with C not addressing direct conifer removal and F recognizing a need in specific instances where conifer is considered invasive rather than re-establishing within historic range.						
MZ III - NI=N, SGB=Y, QCR=Y MZ IV - NGB=Y MZ V - WSV=Y, WGB=Y	Remove pinyon-juniper from areas of sagebrush that are most likely to support GRSG (post-removal) at a rate at least equal to the rate of pinyon-juniper incursion	No conservation measures specified. Is conservation objective addressed applying locally-derived measures?		YES	NO	YES	YES	YES
		Which (if any) of Options 1 - 4 were applied? 1. Favor the use of mechanical treatments for removing pinyon and/or juniper as they are more selective in removal of invading plants and allows understory habitats to remain intact. 2. Use prescribed fire in high elevation mountain big sage sites with caution to prevent fire escape and any subsequent establishment of invasive annual grasses or other weeds. 3. Reduce juniper cover in GRSG habitats to less than 5 percent but preferably eliminate entirely. 4. Employ all necessary actions to maintain the benefit of pinyon and/or juniper removal for GRSG habitats		(2) B-FFM-HFM-9		(1) D-VEG-30 D-VEG-ISCE-7,8 (3) D-VEG-3,30 D-FFM-HFM-4 (4) D-VEG-1,2 D-VEG-ISCE-4,8	(1) E-VEG-30 E-VEG-ISCE-8,11 (3) E-VEG-30 (4) E-VEG-ISCE-4,5,7,8	(2) B-FFM-HFM-9

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F	
<b>Agricultural Conversion</b>  <b>MZ III - NI=N, SGB=L, QCR=N</b>  <b>MZ IV – NGB=L</b>  <b>MZ V – WSV=N, WGB=L</b>	Avoid further loss of sagebrush habitat for agricultural activities (both animal and plant production) and prioritize restoration. In areas where taking agricultural lands out of production has benefited GSG, the programs supporting these actions should be targeted and continued (e.g., CRP/SAFE). Threat amelioration activities should, at a minimum, be prioritized within PACS, but should be considered in all GSG habitats.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?  Which (if any) of Options 1 - 4 were applied? 1. Revise Farm Bill policies and commodity programs that facilitate ongoing conversion of native habitats to marginal croplands (e.g., through the addition of a ‘Sodsaver’ provision), to support conservation of remaining sagebrush-steppe habitats. 2. Continue and expand incentive programs that encourage the maintenance of sagebrush habitats. 3. Develop criteria for set-aside programs which stop negative habitat impacts and promote the quality and quantity GRSg habitat. 4. If lands that provide seasonal habitats for GRSg are taken out of a voluntary program, such as CRP or SAFE, precautions should be taken to ensure withdrawal of the lands minimizes the risk of direct take of GRSg (e.g., timing to avoid nesting season). Voluntary incentives should be implemented to increase the amount of GRSg habitats enrolled in these programs.					(4) E-VEG-HCA-1		
<b>Mining</b>  <b>MZ III - NI=Y, SGB=L, QCR=N</b>  <b>MZ IV – NGB=L</b>  <b>MZ V – WSV=N, WGB=L</b>		<b>SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES</b> To varying degrees all action alternative meet the Conservation Objectives Team report objective, which is to maintain stable to increasing GRSg population trends and no net loss of GRSg habitat in in areas affected by mining. Alternatives B and F would withdraw priority habitat from mineral entry while Alternative C would withdraw all occupied GRSg habitat. Under Alternatives D and E, no withdrawals are proposed. Application of existing laws and RDFs would be enforced along with aggressive reclamation/rehabilitation.							
			Continued impacts on GRSg are anticipated such as habitat loss, fragmentation, disturbance to the GRSg, and habitat degradation due to the	Priority habitat would be withdrawn from locatable mineral entry.  Existing claims within withdrawals would be subject to validity	Same as Alternative B except decisions would be applied to a larger geographical area (all occupied habitat).	GRSg habitat would be open to locatable mineral entry. Stipulations placed on the type, amount, timing, and location of mining would	GRSg habitat would be open to locatable mineral entry. The implementation of other temporal and spatial		

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
			<p>variability of restrictions.</p> <p>There is no surface disturbance limitation recommendation included in this alternative.</p> <p>There are 1,226,900 acres of PPH and 374,700 acres of PGH withdrawn. Withdrawal within modeled GRSG nesting habitat includes 834,600 acres of PPH and PGH combined. Current withdrawals provide an increased level of protection to modeled nesting habitat associated with leks representing 32 percent of the GRSG population for the sub-region.</p>	<p>exams or buy-out.</p> <p>Alternative B would include a total of 4,664,700 acres open to locatable mineral entry and a withdrawal of 12,693,500 acres of PPMA and 374,700 acres of PGMA. Within modeled nesting habitat there are 10,720,200 acres of PPMA and PGMA combined. Withdrawn lands would provide an increased level of protection to modeled nesting habitat associated with leks representing 97 percent of the GRSG population for the sub-region.</p>	<p>Under Alternative C, PPMA (17,732,900 acres) would be closed to mineral materials sales. Within modeled nesting habitat there are 15,485,100 acres of PPMA. Closure would provide an increased level of protection to all acres of PPMA within modeled nesting habitat associated with leks representing 100 percent of the population for the sub-region</p>	<p>minimize net loss in priority habitats.</p> <p>Acres and effects to populations same as Alternative A.</p>	<p>restrictions may lessen some of the impacts of mining.</p> <p>Acres and effects to populations same as Alternative A.</p>	
	<p>Maintain stable to increasing GRSG populations and no net loss of GRSG habitats in areas affected by mining</p>	<p>No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?</p> <p>Which (if any) of Options 1 - 4 were applied?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Avoid new mining activities and/or any associated facilities within occupied habitats, including seasonal habitats.</li> <li>2. Avoid leasing in GRSG habitats until other suitable habitats can be restored to habitats used by GRSG.</li> <li>3. Reclamation plans should focus on restoring areas disturbed by mining and associated facilities to healthy sagebrush ecosystems, including evidence of use by GRSG.</li> <li>4. Reclamation of abandoned mine lands should focus on restoring areas to healthy sagebrush ecosystems where</li> </ol>		<p>YES</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>YES</p>
				<p>(1) B-SAL-1 B-NEL-1 (3) B-SAL-2 (4) B-SAL-2</p>		<p>(1) D-SAL-1 D-NEL-1 (3) D-SAL-2 (4) D-SAL-2</p>	<p>(1) E-LR-W-1 E-LOC-3 (3) E-LR-W-1 E-LOC-3,6,7 (4) E-LR-W-1 E-LOC-3</p>	<p>(1) F-SAL-1 F-NEL-1 (3) F-SAL-2 (4) F-SAL-2</p>

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
		possible.						
<b>Recreation</b> <b>MZ III - NI=Y, SGB=Y, QCR=Y</b> <b>MZ IV - NGB=Y</b> <b>MZ V - WSV=Y, WGB=U</b>			<b>SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES</b> All action alternatives would partially meet the Conservation Objectives Team report objective, which is that areas subject to recreation activities should maintain healthy native sagebrush communities based on local ecological conditions and with consideration of drought conditions, and managed direct and indirect human disturbance (including noise) to avoid interruption of normal GRSG behavior. Alternatives B and F close PPMA to cross-country travel. Alternative D extends provisions of Alternatives B and F to include all general habitats which is presumed to be the intent of Alternative C. These alternatives would prevent proliferation of new routes, include direction for seasonal closures, route realignment, provisions for valid existing rights, etc. Alternative E recommends study of impact of OHV use on GRSG habitats and recommends an “avoid, minimize, and mitigate” approach which translates as limiting travel to existing roads as in Alternative D. While Alternatives B, C, D, E, and F are similar in provisions for travel management, Alternative D and E extend protections to both priority and general GRSG habitats (occupied and suitable in E).					
			Cross-country motorized travel is generally allowed across BLM lands in Nevada with the exception of Congressionally designated areas and some ACECs. BLM lands in the California-managed Field Offices are limited to existing or designated routes. Forest Service lands are closed within Congressionally designated areas and limited elsewhere.  Under current management 874,000 acres are Closed to motorized vehicles, 4,113,300 acres are Limited to existing routes for motorized vehicles, and 12,745,000 acres are Open to all modes of cross country travel.  Closed: PPH 731,000 PGH 143,600 mod. nest hab. 834,600 sub-reg pop affected 20 percent  Limited: PPH 3,083,600 PGH 1,029,700 mod. nest hab. 3,681,900	In addition to current limited and closed designations in the No Action alternative, all PPMA would be designated as limited to existing roads pending travel management planning and roads designation.  Provides guidance for restricting new road construction and mitigation where roads are allowed under prior existing rights.  Provides for road closure and rehabilitation.  Provides for seasonal road closures.  874,000 acres are Closed to motorized vehicles, 12,992,100 acres are Limited, and 3,866,100 acres are Open to all modes of cross country travel.  Closed: PPMA 731,000 PGMA 143,600 mod. nest hab 834,600 sub-reg pop affected 20 percent	Alternative lacks specificity regarding travel management but states that all lands will be closed to cross-country travel and some roads that intrude into lek or winter habitats will be removed or seasonally closed.  Same as Alternative D.	In addition to provisions of Alternative B regarding priority habitat, PGMA would also be limited to existing roads pending travel management planning and roads designation.  874,000 acres are Closed to motorized vehicles, 16,858,200 acres are Limited, and 0 acres are Open to all modes of cross country travel.  Closed: PPMA 731,000 PGMA 143,600 mod. nest hab 834,600 sub-reg pop affected 20 percent  Limited: PPMA 11,962,500 PGMA 4,895,700 mod. nest hab 12,172,700 sub-reg pop affected 94 percent  Open: N/A	Same as Alternative D.	Management would be similar to Alternative B except specifies in priority habitat camping and other non-motorized recreation would be prohibited during certain seasons within 4 miles of a lek. In addition, there would be no new route construction within 4 miles of a lek. These decisions would reduce disturbance to nesting and brood-rearing GRSG and their habitat.

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
			sub-reg pop affected 49 percent  Open: PPH 8,878,900 PGH3,866,100 mod. nest hab 11,292,000 sub-reg pop affected 77 percent	Limited: PPMA 11,962,500 PGMA 1,029,600  mod. nest hab 10,720,200 sub-reg pop affected 94 percent  Open: N/A				
	In areas subjected to recreational activities, maintain healthy native sagebrush communities based on local ecological conditions and with consideration of drought conditions, and manage direct and indirect human disturbance (including noise) to avoid interruption of normal GRSG behavior.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?  Which (if any) of Options 1 - 2 were applied? 1. Close important GRSG use areas to off-road vehicle use. 2. Avoid development of recreational facilities in GRSG habitats.		YES  (1) B-CTTM-1,4 (2) B-CTTM-7	NO	YES  (1) D-CTTM-1,4 (2) D-REC-2	YES  (1) E-REC-3 (2) E-REC-3,4 E-CTTM-3,5	YES  (1) F-REC-2 F-CTTM-1,4,5 (2) F-CTTM-7
<b>Ex-Urban Development / Urbanization</b>		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES</b></p> All action alternatives would partially meet the Conservation Objectives Team report objective to limit urban and exurban development in GRSG habitats and maintain intact native sagebrush communities by managing land tenure, consolidating and otherwise minimizing the impacts of infrastructure supporting adjacent development, and burial/removal of infrastructure. Alternatives B, C, D and F favor land acquisition as a tool for conserving important habitat on private lands. Alternative E favors easements and covenants without change of ownership. All alternatives prescribe ROW exclusion or avoidance (see Infrastructure) and collocation of infrastructure to minimize footprint. Alternatives B, D, E, and F contain specific actions directed at burial or removal of existing infrastructure such as powerlines. Alternatives B, C, D, and F call for retention of all GRSG habitats in public ownership and Alternative E for review of amendments to city and county which would intensify development in GRSG habitat.						
			Most LUPs include a management action that allows for acquisition of lands that have important resource values including GRSG. Land tenure adjustments could result in consistent management across the landscape.  Some lands with GRSG habitat are identified for disposal. Typically these lands are located near the existing urbanized area where there are mixed land ownership patterns, which makes it difficult to manage for	Retains public ownership of PPMA with exceptions for considering which improve ownership patterns in a manner which enhances GRSG habitat management. Takes advantage of opportunities to remove or bury existing infrastructure associated with urban/ex-urban development and to collocate infrastructure to consolidate impacts. (See Infrastructure below)	Same as Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.	Relies on conservation easements and covenants as means of retaining important habitats on private lands. Adds a management action for review of municipal land use planning to ensure that GRSG habitats are considered. Infrastructure considerations and similar to Alternative B.	Same as Alternative B.

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
			specific purposes including GRSG protection.					
<b>MZ III - NI=N, SGB=L, QCR=N</b> <b>MZ IV - NGB=Y</b> <b>MZ V - WSV=Y, WGB=N</b>	Limit urban and exurban development in GRSG habitats and maintain intact native sagebrush communities	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
		Which (if any) of Options 1 - 5 were applied? Note: Only Options 2, 3, and 5 are appropriate for decisions in this EIS. 2. Acquire and manage GRSG habitat to maintain intact ecosystems. 3. Consolidate infrastructure that supports urban and exurban development. 5. Do not relinquish public lands for the purpose of urban development in GRSG habitat.		(2) B-LR-LT-2 (3) B-LR-LUA-1,2 (5) B-LR-LT-1	(2) C-LR-LT-2 (3) C-LR-LUA-1,2 (5) C-LR-LT-1	(2) D-LR-LT-2 (3) D-LR-LUA-1,2 (5) D-LR-LT-1	(2) E-LR-LT-2 (3) E-LR-LUA-1,2 (5) E-LR-U-1	(3) F-LR-LUA-1,2 (5) F-LR-LT-1
<b>Infrastructure</b> <b>MZ III - NI=Y, SGB=Y, QCR=Y</b> <b>MZ IV - NGB=Y</b> <b>MZ V - WSV=Y, WGB=L</b>		<b>SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES</b>						
		All alternatives meet the conservation objective for infrastructure identified in the Conservation Objectives Team report, which is to avoid development within PACs. Alternatives B, C, and F all close certain areas to new ROWs. The difference between these alternatives is the amount of GRSG habitat that would be closed and the type of ROWs that would be prohibited or restricted. Alternative C closes all occupied GRSG habitat to new ROWs and is the most restrictive. Alternative B and F identify priority habitats as ROW exclusion zones and Alternative D as ROW avoidance. Alternative E provides for ROW avoidance in SGMAs. All alternatives seek to avoid conflict with GRSG habitat, to utilize existing corridors, and to co-locate within existing development footprints.						
			New ROWs could cause additional fragmentation to habitat, habitat loss, and functional loss of the habitat, especially in areas adjacent to above-ground and site-type ROWs. Exclusion and avoidance areas include Congressionally designated areas, wilderness study areas, and some ACECs.  In the sub-region, within modeled nesting habitat there are 983,600 of exclusion and 89,200 of avoidance acres of PPH and PGH. Proposed exclusion and avoidance areas provide an	In addition to exclusion and avoidance in Alternative A, all PPMA would be managed as ROW exclusion and all PGMA as ROW avoidance.  Emphasizes opportunities for co-location within designated corridors and within the footprint of existing disturbance.  Recommends removing, burying, or modifying existing power lines within priority habitat.	All GRSG habitat would be managed as ROW exclusion resulting in no further habitat fragmentation, indirect and direct loss, and habitat degradation.  Provides for review of all existing transmission lines to amend ROWs to require features that enhance GRSG habitat security.  Avoidance areas provide a level of protection the same as Alternative B.	In addition to exclusion and avoidance in Alternative A, all PPMA would be managed as ROW avoidance.  Avoidance acreage covers about 94 percent of the modeled sub-regional GRSG population with exclusion acreage being around 12 percent of the modeled sub-regional population.  Otherwise similar to Alternative B.	Follows the State policy of “avoid, minimize, and mitigate” with oversight by the Nevada Sagebrush Ecosystem Council using best available science.  Seeks to avoid conflict by locating developments in non-habitat wherever possible.  Emphasizes co-location and existing corridors.	Same as Alternative B.

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
			increased level of protection to modeled nesting habitat associated with leks representing 3 percent of the population for Avoidance areas and 12 percent of the population exclusion for the sub-region.	Avoidance zones total 4,872,200 acres under Alternative B and exclusion zones total 12,860,700 acres.  Avoidance areas provide a level of protection to 64 percent of the modeled sub-regional population and exclusion 94 percent of the modeled sub-regional population.	Exclusion areas presumable provide a level of protection to 100 percent or all occupied GRSG habitat.			
	Avoid development of infrastructure within PACs	No new development of infrastructure within PACs. Designated, but not yet developed infrastructure corridors should be re-located outside of PACs unless it can be demonstrated that these corridors will have no impacts on the maintenance of neutral or positive GRSG population trends or habitats. New infrastructure should be avoided where individual state plans have identified key connectivity corridors outside of PACs.		B-LR-LUA-1,4 B-FFME-2 B-FM-1 B-LOC-1 B-SAL-1	C-LR-LUA-1 C-LR-IS-1	D-LR-LUA-1 D-LR-WED-1 D-LR-IS-1 D-FM-1,2 D-LOC-1 D-SAL-1	E-LR-LUA-1 E-LR-WED-1 E-LR-IS-1 E-LOC-1,2,3,4	F-LR-LUA-1,4 F-LR-WED-1 F-FFME-2 F-FM-1 F-LOC-1 F-SAL-1
		Where state GRSG management plans provide an effective strategy for infrastructure those strategies should be implemented. In all other situations the conservation options in the COT report should be considered.						
		Which (if any) of Options 1 - 10 were applied? 1. Avoid construction of these features in GRSG habitat, both within and outside of PACs. 2. Power transmission corridors which cannot avoid PACs should be buried, if technically feasible, and disturbed habitat restored. a. If avoidance is not possible, consolidate new structures		(1) B-LR-LUA-1 B-FFME-2 B-FM-1 B-LOC-1 B-SAL-1 B-NEL-1 B-MSE-1 (2) B-LR-LUA-6 (4) B-CTTM-1,6	(1) C-LR-LUA-1 C-LR-IS-1	(1) D-LR-LUA-1 D-LR-WED-1 D-LR-IS-1 D-FM-1,2 D-LOC-1 D-SAL-1 D-NEL-1 D-MSE-1 (2) D-LR-LUA-6,18 (4)	(1) E-LR-LUA-1 E-LR-WED-1 E-LR-IS-1 E-LOC-1,2,3,4 (2) E-SSS-ACDM-2 E-LR-LUA-6 (3) E-LR-LUA-3,5,17,18 (5)	(1) F-LR-LUA-1 F-LR-WED-1 F-FFME-2 F-FM-1 F-LOC-1 F-SAL-1 F-NEL-1 F-MSE-1 (4) F-CTTM-1,6 (5)

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
		<p>with existing features and/or preclude development of new structures within locally important GRSG habitats.</p> <p>b. Consolidate with existing features should not result in a cumulative corridor width of greater than 200 m.</p> <p>c. Habitat function lost from placement of infrastructure should be replaced.</p> <p>3. Infrastructure corridors should be designed and maintained to preclude introduction of invasive plant species.</p> <p>4. Restrictions limiting use of roads should be enforced.</p> <p>5. Remove transmission lines and roads that are duplicative or not functional.</p> <p>6. Transmission line towers should be constructed to severely reduce or eliminate nesting and perching by avian predators.</p> <p>7. Avoid installation of compressor stations in PACs or other GRSG habitats.</p> <p>8. All commercial pipelines should be buried and habitat that is disturbed needs to be reclaimed with current and future emphasis placed on suppression of non-native invasive plant species.</p> <p>9. Mitigate impacts on habitat from development of these features.</p> <p>10. Remove or decommission non-designated roads within sagebrush habitats.</p>		<p>(5) B-CTTM-4,9 (6) B-LR-LUA-2,7 (9) B-FFME-6,9 (10) B-LR-LUA-3 B-CTTM-4,9</p>		<p>D-CTTM-1,6 (5) D-LR-LUA-15 C-CTTM-4,9 (6) D-LR-LUA-2 (9) D-SSS-OPM-5 D-SSS-AM-3 D-FFME-6 (10) D-LR-LUA-3 D-LR-LUA-15 C-CTTM-4,9</p>	<p>E-LR-LUA-15 (6) E-SSS-4,5,6 E-LR-LUA-2,5,7 (7) E-LR-LUA-5 (8) E-LR-LUA-3,5 (9) E-SSS-OPM-5 E-SSS-AM-5 E-SSS-MIT-1-7 E-LOC-1 (10)</p>	<p>F-CTTM-4,9 (6) F-LR-LUA-2 (9) F-FFME-6,9 (10) F-LR-LUA-3 F-CTTM-4,9</p>

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Alternative F
Fences (no ratings)	Minimize the impact of fences on GSG populations	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
		Which (if any) of Options 1 - 3 were applied? 1. Mark fences that are in high risk areas for collision. 2. Identify and remove unnecessary fences. 3. Placement of new fences and livestock management facilities should consider their impact on GRS and be placed at least 1 km from occupied leks.		(1) B-LG-21 (2) B-LR-LUA-3 (3) B-LG-18		(1) D-LG-21 (2) D-LR-LUA-3 (3) D-LG-18	(1) E-LG-21 E-LR-DMA-1	(1) F-LG-21 (2) F-LR-LUA-3 (3) F-LG-18
<sup>1</sup> Threat Ratings from COT Report	<sup>2</sup> Subjective Consistency (with COT Report) Rating Continuum	<sup>3</sup> Actions as Labeled in Table 2-1 of DEIS	<sup>4</sup> Other Abbreviations					
Y: Pres. and Widespread	High Concern &/or Very Low Consistency	FM/PF = Fuels Management/Prescribed Fire	COT = Conservation Objectives Team					
L: Pres. and Localized		GH = Sage-Grouse Habitat - General Habitat Areas	N = No, action appears to be inconsistent with objective					
N: Not Known to be Pres.		GSG ACEC = Greater Sage-Grouse Area	NA = Not Applicable					
NA	Lower Concern &/or Higher Consistency	HC = Sage-Grouse - Habitat Compensation	PAC = Priority Areas for Conservation					
	NA	IS = Invasive species	PRB = Powder River Basin Population					
		LG = Livestock Grazing	U = Unknown / unclear from EIS as to whether action is consistent with objective					
		LTA = Land Tenure Adjustment	Y = Yes, action appears to be consistent with objective					
		PPA = Sage-Grouse Habitat - Protection Priority Areas						
		RA = Sage-Grouse Habitat - Restoration Areas						
		RE = Renewable Energy						
		RWA = Riparian and Wetland Areas						
		SG = Sage-Grouse						
		TM/OHV = Travel Management/Off-Highway Vehicle						
		V = Vegetation						

This page intentionally left blank.