

APPENDIX K—DRAFT GREATER SAGE-GROUSE AMENDMENT FOR THE LAND AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS: BRIDGER-TETON NATIONAL FOREST, MEDICINE BOW NATIONAL FOREST, THUNDER BASIN NATIONAL GRASSLAND PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE – ALTERNATIVE E

Current as of 09/19/2013

K.1 FOREST SERVICE PLAN COMPONENTS

Under the 1982 Planning Rule, a National Forest or National Grassland Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) contains the following six plan components: (1) goals and objectives, including desired conditions; (2) standards and guidelines; (3) management areas and management area direction (management prescriptions); (4) designation of suitable timber land and establishment of an allowable sale quantity, and identification of other suitable uses; (5) wilderness recommendations; (6) monitoring and evaluation requirements. Each of these components has a specific definition and purpose in a plan and must be clearly identified and succinctly described following the direction/guidance found in the planning rule (36 CFR subpart 219), planning manual (FSM 1920), planning handbook (FSH 1909.12). **Implementation tasks** are site-specific on-the-ground actions and are typically not addressed in LRMPs but may be listed in a “**Possible Action**” Appendix.

A **Desired Condition** (DC) is the plan component that states the “vision” for the unit, in whole or in part, describing the social, economic, and ecological attributes toward which management of the plan area is to be directed. The Goals listed in Chapter 2 of the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) were translated into DC in Table K-1.

Table K-1. Forest Service Desired Conditions for Alternative E

Goals as written in the DEIS for Alternative E	Forest Service Language for Desired Conditions for Alternative E
Conserve, recover, and enhance sage-grouse habitat on a landscape scale consistent with local, state, and federal management plans and policies, as practical, while providing for multiple use of BLM administered lands and National Forest System Lands.	Greater Sage-Grouse habitat is conserved, recovered, and enhanced on a landscape scale consistent with local, state, and federal management plans and policies.
Maintain and/or increase sage-grouse abundance and distribution by conserving, enhancing or restoring the sagebrush ecosystem upon which populations depend in cooperation with other state, local, industry, permittee and conservation partners.	Greater Sage-Grouse abundance and distribution is maintained and/or increased by conserving, enhancing, or restoring the sagebrush ecosystem upon which populations depend in cooperation with other state, local, industry, permittee, and conservation partners.
	Greater Sage-Grouse seasonal habitats are managed and habitat connectivity is maintained to support population objectives set by the State of Wyoming in cooperation with the Forest Service. (This text was translated from Objective #6. See table below.)

Objectives are projections of measurable and time-specific outcomes or accomplishments that, if achieved, would contribute to maintaining or reaching DCs during the plan period. Objectives are not requirements, however. Each objective must relate to a DC. Objectives are: potential outcomes, results, or things to accomplish. Objectives must not imply a program of work or a list of projects. Objectives are realistic stops along the way used to gauge our progress. Objectives listed in Chapter 2 of the DEIS were translated into DC in Table K-1.

Table K-2. Forest Service Objectives for Alternative E

Objectives as Written in the DEIS	Forest Service Language for Objectives for Alternative E
1) In cooperation with State of Wyoming and its agencies, local governments, private landowners, local sage-grouse working groups, partners and stakeholders, develop site-specific conservation strategies to maintain or enhance sage-grouse habitats and habitat connectivity.	Develop site-specific conservation strategies to maintain or enhance Greater Sage-Grouse habitats and habitat connectivity by _____ (insert date) in cooperation with State of Wyoming and its agencies, local governments, private landowners, local Greater Sage-Grouse working groups, partners and stakeholders.
2) Enhance quality/suitable habitat to support the expansion of sage-grouse populations on federally administered lands within the planning areas.	Enhance an average of ___ acres (insert quantity) per year of quality/suitable habitat to support the expansion of Greater Sage-Grouse populations on National Forest System Lands.
3) Manage sage-grouse seasonal habitats and maintain habitat connectivity to support population objectives set by the State of Wyoming in cooperation with the agencies.	See Desired Conditions above.
4) Identify and prioritize opportunities for habitat enhancement and conservation within sage-grouse core habitat areas based on threats and the ability to manage sage-grouse habitat.	4) By ____ (insert date), identify and prioritize opportunities for habitat enhancement and conservation within Greater Sage-Grouse core habitat areas based on threats and the ability to manage Greater Sage-Grouse habitat.
5) Restore native (or desirable) plants and create landscape patterns which most benefit sage-grouse.	5) Restore native (or desirable) plants and create landscape patterns which most benefit Greater Sage-Grouse on an average of _____ acres (insert quantity) per year.
6) Develop specific objectives to conserve, enhance or restore sage-grouse priority habitat based on Ecological Site Descriptions (ESD) (Forest Service may use other methods) and BLM land health evaluations (including within wetland and riparian areas) taking into account site history (historic treatments or habitat manipulations) that have changed the soil chemistry possibly altering the ESD. If an effective grazing system that meets sage-grouse habitat requirements is not already in place, analyze at least one alternative that conserves, restores, or enhances sage-grouse habitat in the NEPA document prepared for the permit renewal (Doherty et al. 2011b, Williams et al. 2011).	6) By ____ (insert date), develop specific objectives to conserve, enhance, or restore sage-grouse priority habitat. These objectives must be measurable and tied to baseline monitoring data or land health assessments/evaluations.
7) Establish measurable objectives related to sage-grouse habitat from baseline monitoring data, ESDs (Forest Service may use other methods), or land health assessments/evaluations.	Combined with Objective #6.

Objectives as Written in the DEIS	Forest Service Language for Objectives for Alternative E
8) Manage for vegetation composition and structure consistent with ecological site potential (Forest Service may use other methods) to achieve sage-grouse seasonal habitat objectives.	This Objective will be translated into a Required Design Feature.
9) Incorporate available site information collected using the Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework or similar methods to evaluate existing resource conditions and to develop any necessary resource solutions in cooperation with State of Wyoming and its agencies, the local governments, private landowners, project proponents, partners, and stakeholders.	This Objective will be translated into a Required Design Feature.
10) Incorporate management practices that will provide for maintenance and/or enhancement of sage-grouse habitats, including specific attention to maintenance of desired understories of sagebrush plant communities. When developing objectives for residual cover and species diversity, identify the ecological site types within the planning area and refer to the appropriate ESDs (Forest Service may use other methods).	This Objective will be translated into a Required Design Feature.
11) In determining appropriate management actions that will be considered, refer to the document, "Grazing Influence, Management, and Objective Development in Wyoming's Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat" (Cagney et al. 2010) for guidance. This peer reviewed document is the result of a collaborative effort in Wyoming to ensure proper livestock grazing practices with sage-grouse habitats. It is the culmination of efforts to gather and integrate current knowledge and practices regarding livestock grazing in respect to important sage-grouse habitats within Wyoming.	This Objective will be translated into a Required Design Feature.

Suitable Uses (See interim directive id_1909.12-2008-2, FSH 1909.12, section 11.14.) Suitable uses delineate which uses are permitted, restricted, or prohibited, and may include stipulations or restrictions. Suitable uses also identify lands where specific uses are excluded to protect resource values, or where certain lands are open or closed in response to legislative, regulatory, or policy requirements. No suitable uses are described in this plan amendment.

Special Areas (See interim directive id_1909.12-2008-2, FSH 1909.12, section 11.15.) No Special Areas are proposed in this plan amendment.

Standards guide agency action. A standard is an absolute requirement to be met in the design of projects and activities. A project or activity is consistent with a standard when its design is in accord with the explicit provisions of the standard; variance from a standard in any way is not allowed. Standards for this plan amendment are listed in the Table K-3.

Guidelines describe the technical specifications to design projects and activities. A project or activity can be consistent with a guideline in one of two ways: (1) the project or activity design is in accord with the explicit provisions of the guideline, or (2) the project or activity design varies from the explicit provisions of the guidelines but is as effective in meeting the purpose of the guideline to maintain or contribute to the attainment of relevant desired conditions and objectives. Guidelines should not be written in terms of a mandatory command or prohibition, but in terms of project design criteria that "should" or "should not"

be employed. Guidelines must use words like “should,” “consider,” “generally,” or similar language so as not to “require,” “commit,” “compel,” and so on. Guidelines for this plan amendment are listed in the Table K-1.

A “Possible Actions” Appendix may contain a brief summary of the types of actions, projects, or activities that may occur in the next three to five years to maintain or move toward the desired conditions. This appendix must explicitly state that the actions described are not commitments by the Agency to perform that work but are provided as a statement of “possible actions.” Possible Actions are not described for this plan amendment.

Required Design Features – Best management practices (BMP) are measures or recommended management practices. In contrast, required design features (RDF) listed in the Table K-3 are “required” to ensure regulatory certainty and the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse. Because of site-specific circumstances, some RDFs may not apply to all activities (e.g., a resource or conflict is not present on a given site) and/or may require slight variations. Proposed variations will be analyzed and may be applied in the site specific permitting process. All variations will require appropriate analysis and disclosure as part of activity authorization. It is anticipated that variations will be approved in very limited circumstances and only in coordination with the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. RDFs and other mitigation selected for implementation will be identified in the project level decision documents. The agency and/or proponent must implement all identified measures because they are commitments made as part of the agency decision.

The following table displays the draft language proposed for Land and Resource Management Plans for the Preferred Alternative (Alternative E) for the Bridger-Teton National Forest, Medicine Bow National Forest, and the Thunder Basin National Forest. The draft Forest Service language is displayed in comparison to BLM management actions displayed in Table 2-1 in Chapter 2 of this document.

Table K-3. Forest Service Translation of Management Actions into Standards, Guidelines, Objectives, and Required Design Feature for Alternative E.

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
#1	Continue to support the development of statewide sage-grouse seasonal habitat models for the State of Wyoming.	Required Design Feature (RDF).
#2	Field Offices and Ranger Districts will work with project proponents, partners, and stakeholders to avoid or minimize impacts and/or implement direct mitigation (e.g. relocating disturbance, timing restrictions, etc.), and utilize BMPs and off-site compensatory mitigation where appropriate.	RDF
#3	Utilize the Wyoming Sage-grouse Implementation Team (SGIT) and Local Working Group (LWG) plans or other state or cooperatively-developed plans, analyses, and other sources of information to guide development of conservation objectives for local management of sage-grouse habitats. The BLM and Forest Service will collaborate with the State of WY and appropriate federal agencies to develop appropriate conservation objectives. The BLM and Forest Service will collaborate with appropriate federal and state agencies as directed under the Governor’s Executive Order 13-3 in defining a framework for evaluating situations to determine if a significant causal relationship exists	MA #3 will be converted to an Objective.

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	between improper grazing (by wildlife or wild horses or livestock) and Greater Sage-Grouse conservation objectives where conservation objectives are not being achieved on federal land.	
#4	Include the collection of baseline data and outline post-project monitoring components into the project planning, as appropriate and necessary.	RDF
#5	The BLM/Forest Service will coordinate new recommendations, mitigation, and conservation measures applied for sage-grouse with the WGFD and other appropriate agencies, and local government cooperators, as well as the Wyoming SGIT. These measures will be analyzed in site-specific NEPA documents, as necessary.	RDF
#6	Apply appropriate seasonal restrictions for implementing vegetation management treatments according to the type of seasonal habitats present in a priority area. Vegetation treatments must include monitoring to determine achievement of objectives and their long-term success.	<p>Greater Sage-Grouse Seasonal Restrictions Standard:</p> <p>Apply appropriate seasonal restrictions in Greater Sage-Grouse core habitat for implementing vegetation management treatments and according to the type of seasonal habitats present. For utility transmission projects, construction should occur between July 1 and March 14 (or between July 1 and November 30 in winter concentration areas).</p> <p>Within Greater Sage-Grouse general habitat, apply appropriate sage-grouse seasonal timing constraints to construction of new right-of-ways (ROW) and special use authorizations (SUA) (This text was from MA #27).</p> <p>Monitoring Plan</p> <p>Vegetation treatments must include monitoring to determine achievement of objectives and their long-term success.</p>
#7	Ensure site-specific, measurable, conservation and mitigation objectives are included in project planning within sage-grouse habitats.	Required Design Feature.
#8	Each BLM and Forest Service planning unit will develop landscape-scale restoration, conservation, and maintenance strategies, including special management of seasonal habitats and identified connectivity zones outside of Greater Sage-Grouse Core/Priority Habitat Areas, working with voluntary partners and cooperating agencies. These strategies must be coordinated and reconciled with adjoining management entities that share habitats or populations.	MA #8 will be converted to an Objective.
#9	Design all range projects in a manner that minimizes potential for invasive species establishment. Monitor for, and treat invasive species associated with existing range improvements.	RDF
#10	Apply required design features (Appendix B) as mandatory Stipulations/Conditions of Approval (COA) within priority/core sage-grouse habitat for fluid minerals, travel management, lands and realty, range management, wild horse and burro, solid	RDF

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	(leasable minerals (coal), locatable minerals, West Nile Virus, mineral materials, non-energy solid leasable minerals, vegetation management, fire and fuels management, and noise.	
#11	Integrated vegetation management would be used to control, suppress, and eradicate, where possible, noxious and invasive species per BLM Handbook H-1740-2 and Forest Service Manual 2080.	RDF
#12	<p>Existing Notices and Approved Plans of Operations under 43 CFR 3809¹: For projects that overlap priority/core habitat areas, operators may be requested to submit modifications to the accepted notice or approved plan of operations so that the operations minimally impact core area habitats. The Authorized Officer (AO) may convey to the operator suggested conservation measures, based upon the notice or plan level operations and the geographic area of those operations [also called the project area which is defined in CFR 3809.5]. These suggested conservation measures include measures that support the overall goals and objectives of the priority/core population area strategy and may not be reasonable or applicable to the BLM/Forest Service's determination of whether the proposed operations will cause unnecessary or undue degradation under 43 CFR 3809.5. The request containing the suggested conservation measures must make clear that the operator's compliance is not mandatory.</p> <p>Notices or Plans of Operation, or modifications thereto, submitted following the issuance of this guidance: As part of the 15-day completeness review of notices [or modifications thereto] and 30-day completeness review of plans of operations [or modifications thereto], the proposed project area(s) where exploration, development, mining, access and reclamation would take place should be reviewed for overlap of sage-grouse priority/core habitat areas in the corporate Geographic Information System (GIS) database. If there is overlap, the BLM/Forest Service AO may notify the operator of ways that they may minimize impacts to core area habitats and request the operator to amend its notice or plan to include such measures. The request to amend the submitted notice or plan of operations must make clear that the operator's compliance is not mandatory and that including such measures is not a requirement for completeness of either the notice or a plan of operations, nor is it a condition of acceptance of the notice or approval of the plan of operations.</p>	RDF
#13	As new occupied sage-grouse habitat is found or occurs either through additional inventories or	New Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat Designation Standard.

¹ These regulations apply to the exploration and development of locatable minerals on placer claims and lode claims, as well as exploration on tunnel sites and mineral processing operations on mill sites. The location and maintenance of claims and sites are regulated under 43 CFR Subpart 3830.

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	expansion into previously un-occupied habitat, the agencies will incorporate these areas into the general sage-grouse habitat category and manage them as such, until the earliest review occurs by the SGIT. At that time they will be considered for priority/core habitat status or continue to be managed as general habitat, and will be added to the statewide map at that time.	As new occupied sage-grouse habitat is found or occurs either through additional inventories or expansion into previously un-occupied habitat, manage these areas according to Forest/Grassland Plan direction for general Greater Sage-Grouse habitat until the earliest review occurs by the SGIT. After SGIT review and designation, apply appropriate management standards and guidelines for Greater Sage-Grouse core, general or non-habitat.
#14	Contribute to actions that help to ground-truth the statewide sage-grouse seasonal habitat models for the State of Wyoming.	RDF
#15	Use the Sage-grouse Habitat Assessment Framework or best available assessment tool (approved by the AO/Responsible Official) when assessing or evaluating sage-grouse habitats at multiple scales.	RDF
#16	<p>The official Wyoming sage-grouse lek database is maintained by the WGFD in accordance with Appendix 4B of the Umbrella Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the WGFD and the BLM/Forest Service (WGFD and BLM 1990).</p> <p>The MOU states that agencies will meet at least annually to coordinate and review the accuracy of data and incorporate the most up-to-date information.</p>	MA #16 will be converted to an Objective.
#17	Many sage-grouse seasonal habitats within and outside of core habitat areas are encumbered by valid existing rights, such as mineral leases or existing rights-of-way. Fluid mineral leases often will include less stringent lease stipulations than the timing, distance, and density requirements identified for consideration in this policy. Agencies (BLM/Forest Service) will work with proponents holding valid existing leases that include less stringent lease stipulations than the timing, distance, and density restrictions described within this plan to ensure that measurable sage-grouse conservation objectives (such as, but not limited to, consolidation of infrastructure to reduce habitat fragmentation and loss, and effective conservation of seasonal habitats and habitat connectivity to support management objectives set by the WGFD) are included in all project proposals.	RDF
#18	Limit motorized travel to existing roads, primitive roads, and trails at a minimum, until such time as travel management planning is complete and routes are either designated or closed within sage-grouse priority/core habitats.	<p>Continue Current Management.</p> <p>Forest/National Grassland Plans do not need to be amended to add this direction as a standard or guideline because travel management is complete and all National Forest System Lands are closed to off road/off trail motorized vehicle use.</p>
#19	Complete activity level travel plans within five years of the record of decision (ROD) for this planning effort. During activity level planning, where appropriate, designate routes in priority habitat with current administrative/agency purpose or need to	MA #19 will be converted to an Objective. Within five years of the record of decision for this plan amendment, assess existing travel plans for consistency with Greater Sage-Grouse conservation objectives.

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	administrative access only. Existing plans should be assessed for consistency with sage-grouse conservation objectives.	
#20	Construct roads needed for production activities to minimum design standards within sage-grouse priority/core habitats, in compliance with the DDCT.	RDF
#21	Field Office and Ranger District staff will work with project proponents (including those within the BLM/Forest Service) and the WGFD to site their projects in locations that meet the purpose and need for their project, but have been determined to contain the least sensitive habitats, whether inside or outside of sage-grouse priority/core habitat areas.	RDF
#22	Evaluate opportunities to coordinate management plans and strategies on multiple allotments where coordination under a single management plan/strategy would result in enhancing Greater Sage-Grouse populations or its habitat as determined in coordination with the State wildlife agency and with project proponents, partners, and stakeholders	RDF
#23	The Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse 9-plan RMP/LRMP Amendments (hereafter, land use plans [LUP]) will include the requirement for the development of EIS/project level adaptive management strategies in support of the population management objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse set by the State of Wyoming (State of WY EO 2011-05). These adaptive management strategies will be developed in partnership with the WGFD, project proponents, partners, and stakeholders and will incorporate the best available science. The purpose of these strategies is to ensure amelioration of Greater Sage-Grouse population declines by providing the framework in which management will be changed, if negative impacts are detected through a rigorous monitoring program.	RDF
#24	All existing LUPs decisions will be retained unless vacated or modified by decisions in this plan amendment.	RDF
#25	The Wyoming BLM and Forest Service typically manage the public lands to meet objectives of the State of Wyoming. At this time the population objective is to maintain at least 67% of the 2005-2008 Greater Sage-Grouse Core Area Population within the State of Wyoming. The Wyoming BLM and Forest Service will coordinate with the State of Wyoming in implementation planning to develop a statewide adaptive management plan, including mitigation where appropriate, and a framework to evaluate causal factors. The adaptive management plan will identify adaptive management triggers; indicators to be measured; and appropriate mitigation, restoration, and reclamation actions, including targets and benchmarks for responses.	MA #25 will be converted to an Objective.

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	The plan will include both short-term and long-term monitoring. The adaptive management plan will guide the development of project level adaptive management strategies.	
#26	Sage-grouse core habitat areas would be managed as ROW avoidance areas for new ROW or SUA permits (Map 2-13).	Easement and SUA Guideline. Avoid allowing new easement or SUA in Greater Sage-Grouse core habitat.
#27	In addition to Alternative A: Within general sage-grouse habitat: Where new ROWs/SUAs are necessary in general sage-grouse habitat, new ROWs/SUAs would be co-located within existing ROWs/SUAs where technically feasible. Appropriate sage-grouse seasonal timing constraints would be applied.	RDF and see #6 Greater Sage-Grouse Seasonal Restrictions Standard.
#28	In addition to Alternative A: New transmission projects would be allowed within the proposed 2-mile wide transmission line corridor (see Attachment D, Map 1 and 2 from WY EO 2011-5) through sage-grouse core habitat population areas in south-central and southwestern Wyoming and within one half mile on either side of existing 115 kV or larger transmission lines, creating a corridor no wider than 1 mile. Construction should occur between July 1 and March 14 (or between July 1 and November 30 in winter concentration areas). Projects in these corridors will not be counted against the 5% disturbance cap (Reference Manual). New transmission projects proposed outside of these corridors would be considered where it can be demonstrated that declines in sage-grouse populations could be avoided through project design and/or mitigation. In conducting review of powerline transmission proposals, the use of the Framework for Sage-grouse Impacts Analysis for Interstate Transmission Lines or other appropriate documents is necessary. These transmission and distributions lines should be sited to minimize any potential impact on sage-grouse or their habitats, and must consider siting along or adjacent to existing long-term linear disturbance features whenever possible (i.e., along existing occupied above ground utilities, roads). New projects within sage-grouse core habitats that may require future distribution and transmission lines would include the proposed distribution and transmission lines in their Density and Disturbance Calculation Tool (DDCT) as part of the proposed disturbance. Lines permitted but not located in a transmission corridor will be considered towards the 5% disturbance calculation (line disturbance is equal to ROW width multiplied by length and includes all access roads, staging areas, and other surface disturbance associated with construction outside of the ROW).	Transmission Easement and Authorization Standard: New transmission projects proposed outside of the following areas must demonstrate that declines in sage-grouse populations would be avoided through project design and/or mitigation: Within a 2-mile wide corridor in south-central and southwestern Wyoming (see Attachment D, Map 1 and 2 from WY EO 2011-5). Within ½ mile on either side of existing 115 kv or larger transmission lines creating a corridor no more than 1 mile wide. RDF In conducting review of powerline transmission proposals, the use of the Framework for Sage-grouse Impacts Analysis for Interstate Transmission Lines or other appropriate documents is necessary. These transmission and distributions lines should be sited to minimize any potential impact on sage-grouse or their habitats, and must consider siting along or adjacent to existing long-term linear disturbance features whenever possible (i.e., along existing occupied above ground utilities, roads). See #6 Greater Sage-Grouse Seasonal Restrictions Standard. RDF New transmission projects in these corridors will not be counted against the 5% disturbance cap (Reference Manual): Within a 2-mile wide corridor in south-central and southwestern Wyoming (see Attachment D, Map 1 and 2 from WY EO 2011-5) Within ½ mile on either side of existing 115 kv or larger transmission lines creating a corridor no more than 1 mile wide. New projects in other locations within sage-grouse core habitats that may require future distribution and transmission lines would include the proposed

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
		distribution and transmission lines in their DDCT as part of the proposed disturbance. Lines permitted but not located in a transmission corridor will be considered towards the 5% disturbance calculation (line disturbance is equal to ROW width multiplied by length and includes all access roads, staging areas, and other surface disturbance associated with construction outside of the ROW).
#29	No similar action.	No similar action.
#30	Maintenance/replacement of existing structures would be allowed subject to valid and existing rights. Upgrades would be considered, subject to mandatory RDFs (Appendix B). Existing guy wires should be removed or appropriately marked with bird flight diverters to make them more visible to sage-grouse inflight. Structures that provide less suitable perching opportunities for raptors/corvids should be installed (e.g., perch deterrents or other anti-perching devices), or existing towers should be retrofitted with perch deterrents to limit sage-grouse predation.	RDF
#31	Where existing leases or ROWs or SUAs have had some level of development (e.g., road, fence, well) and are expired and no longer in use, the site would be reclaimed by removing these features and restoring the habitat. In areas where existing facilities cannot be removed, buried or modified perch deterrents would be required.	RDF
#32	Wind energy development would be prohibited in sage-grouse core habitat areas, unless it can be sufficiently demonstrated that the development activity would not result in declines of sage-grouse core habitat populations. Sufficient demonstration of “no declines” should be coordinated with the WGFD and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Areas that are currently unavailable due to the need to protect sensitive resources would remain unavailable to wind energy development.	Wind Energy Development Restriction Standard. Do not allow wind energy development in Greater Sage-Grouse core habitat unless it can be sufficiently demonstrated that the development activity would not result in declines of Greater Sage-Grouse core habitat populations. RDF Sufficient demonstration of “no declines” of core habitat populations for wind energy development should be coordinated with the WGFD and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Continue Current Management. Areas that are currently unavailable due to the need to protect sensitive resources would remain unavailable to wind energy development.
#33	No similar action.	No similar action.
#34	In addition to the Alternative A: The use of guy wires for meteorological (MET) tower supports would be avoided within sage-grouse core habitat areas. All existing and any new unavoidable guy wires should be marked with recommended bird deterrent devices. The siting of new temporary MET towers within sage-grouse core habitat areas would be avoided within two miles of active sage-grouse leks, unless they are out of the direct line of sight of the active	RDF The use of guy wires for MET tower supports would be avoided within sage-grouse core habitat areas. All existing and any new unavoidable guy wires should be marked with recommended bird deterrent devices. MET Tower Restriction Guideline. Avoid authorizing new MET towers within two miles of active sage-grouse leks, unless they are

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	lek.	out of the direct line-of-sight of the active lek.
#35	No similar action.	No similar action.
#36	The BLM/Forest Service would retain public ownership of sage-grouse core habitat. Exceptions would be considered where there is mixed ownership and land exchanges would allow for additional or more contiguous federal ownership patterns within sage-grouse core habitat areas. For sage-grouse core habitat areas with minority federal ownership, an additional, effective mitigation agreement would be included for any disposal of federal land. As a final preservation measure, consideration should be given to pursuing permanent conservation easement.	Land Ownership Adjustment Standard (Combined MA#36 and #38). Retain public ownership of core Greater Sage-Grouse habitat. Only allow Federal land sale or exchange when there is mixed ownership and land exchanges would allow for additional or more contiguous Federal ownership patterns within the Greater Sage-Grouse habitat area. In these cases, require a mitigation agreement and a permanent conservation easement on the federal parcel that is sold or exchanged. Utilize sage-grouse habitat requirements to prioritize parcels for exchange or acquisition.
#37	Areas where acquisitions (including subsurface mineral rights) or conservation easements would benefit sage-grouse habitat would be identified.	MA #37 will be converted to an Objective.
#38	Sage-grouse habitat requirements would be utilized to prioritize parcels for exchange or acquisition within core habitat areas.	See #34. Land Ownership Adjustment Standard.
#39	Within core habitat, non-mineral withdrawals would be evaluated to determine if the withdrawal action is consistent with sage-grouse conservation.	MA #39 will be converted to an Objective.
#40	Continue Current Management.	Continue Current Management.
#41	The BLM/Forest Service would work cooperatively with permittees, leasees and other landowners to develop voluntary grazing management strategies that integrate both public and private lands into single management units to improve sage-grouse habitat.	RDF
#42	Continue Current Management.	Continue Current Management.
#43	No similar action.	No similar action.
#44	In Addition to Alternative A: Within sage-grouse core habitat, as appropriate, site specific sage-grouse habitat objectives and management considerations would be incorporated into all BLM and Forest Service grazing allotments through Allotment Management Plans (AMP), permit renewals, Forest Service Annual Operating Instructions, and/or equivalent planning processes.	MA #44 will be converted to an Objective.
#45	BLM and Forest Service policies and the equivalent Annual Operating Instructions would be used to evaluate land health standards progress towards or achievement in sage-grouse core habitats and, where not achieved, to determine if existing grazing management practices or levels of grazing use on public lands are significant factors in failing to meet, maintain or make progress towards achieving the standards and conform with the guidelines, which through this process will identify appropriate actions to address non-achievement and non-conformance.	MA #45 will be converted to an Objective

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
#46	Continue Current Management.	Continue Current Management.
#47	No similar action.	No similar action.
#48	In addition to Alternative A: If periods of drought occur, where appropriate, the AO would evaluate strategies to address drought through coordination with grazing permittee/lessee and annual billings processes. In cooperation with livestock grazing permittees/lessees, drought contingency plans would be developed at the appropriate landscape unit that provide for a consistent/appropriate BLM/Forest Service response. Plans should establish policy for addressing ongoing drought and post-drought recovery.	RDF
#49	In addition to Alternative A: In sage-grouse general and core habitat, existing range improvements (e.g., fences, watering facilities) would continue to be evaluated and modified when necessary. The potential risk to Greater Sage-Grouse and its habitats from existing structural range improvements would be evaluated. The potential for modification of those structural range improvements identified as posing a risk would be addressed. Supplements and supplemental feeding would continue to be authorized where appropriate.	MA #49 will be converted to an Objective
#50	In addition to Alternative A: Livestock trailing that is authorized would include terms and conditions designed to avoid sensitive areas and/or time periods for sage-grouse. The authorization would include specific routes and timeframes for trailing.	RDF
#51	In Addition to Alternative A: Grazing between riparian habitats and upland habitats would be balanced to promote the production and availability of beneficial forbs to Greater Sage-Grouse for use during nesting and brood-rearing. Grazing in meadows, mesic habitats, and riparian pastures would also be balanced to promote the production and availability of beneficial grasses and forbs for use during late brood-rearing within core habitat areas, while maintaining upland conditions and functions.	RDF
#52	Range improvement projects would be planned and authorized on BLM and National Forest System Lands in a way that contributes to rangeland health and maintains and/or improves Greater Sage-Grouse and its habitat.	RDF
#53	Existing water developments associated with springs and seeps would be evaluated and associated pipelines/structures to those developments having a negative effect on sage-grouse core habitats would be modified.	MA #53 will be converted to an Objective
#54	Exceptions waivers and modifications to lease stipulations, Conditions of Approval (COA), and	Continue current management.

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	Terms and Conditions (T&C), etc. for sage-grouse would continue to be considered on a case-by-case basis consistent with approved LUP and other BLM/Forest Service policy and regulations as they relate to exceptions within sage-grouse core and general habitat.	
#55	No similar action.	No similar action.
#56	In addition to Alternative A: The agencies would allow oil and gas leasing consistent and subject to the leasing stipulations analyzed in the timing, distance, disturbance, and density restrictions sections (Map 2-8).	See timing, distance, disturbance, and density restrictions standards.
#57	A minimum lease size of 640 contiguous acres of federal mineral estate would be applied within sage-grouse core habitat areas. Smaller parcels may be leased only when 640 contiguous acres of federal mineral estate is not available and leasing is necessary to remain in compliance with laws, regulations and policy; for example, to protect the federal mineral estate from drainage or to commit the federal mineral estate to unit or communitization agreements.	Fluid Mineral Estate Lease Size Standard Require a minimum lease size of 640 contiguous acres of federal mineral estate in Greater Sage-Grouse core habitat areas. Smaller parcels may be leased only when 640 contiguous acres of federal mineral estate is not available and leasing is necessary to remain in compliance with laws, regulations and policy; for example, to protect the federal mineral estate from drainage or to commit the federal mineral estate to unit or communitization agreements.
#58	In addition to Alternative A (except for the Bridger-Teton National Forest (BTNF): Geophysical exploration projects that are designed to minimize habitat fragmentation within sage-grouse core habitat would be allowed, except where prohibited or restricted by existing LUP decisions. BTNF LRMP: Seismic Activity Standard - Helicopter-access seismic activity would be permitted. Also: Seismic Activity Termination Guideline - Seismic activity should be seasonally restricted.	Geophysical Exploration Standard Geophysical exploration projects must be designed to minimize Greater Sage-Grouse habitat fragmentation.
#59	In addition to Alternative A: In cases where Federal oil and gas leases have been issued with stipulations varying from those in Appendix E for the protection of sage-grouse or their habitats being provided in the applicable LUP decision, as revised or amended, their inclusion would be considered as permit COAs, when approving exploration and development activities through completion of the environmental record of review (43 CFR 3162.5), including appropriate documentation of compliance with the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). Overall consideration shall be given to minimizing the impact to sage-grouse through a project design that avoids, minimizes, reduces, rectifies, and/or adequately compensates for direct and indirect impacts to sage-grouse core habitat or use and includes applicable and technical COAs (see this table's Appendix). Selection and application of these measures shall be based on current science and research on the effects to important breeding, nesting, brood-rearing, and wintering areas. For	RDF

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	<p>proposed operations in core habitat areas, the Surface Use Plan of Operations (SUPO) (see 43CFR 3162.3-1(f)) shall address, at a minimum, the anticipated noise, density and amount of disturbance, mechanical movement (e.g., pump jacks), permanent and temporary facilities, traffic, phases of development over time, offsite mitigation, and expected periods of use associated with the proposed project. Seasonal habitats or project features related to potential sage-grouse impacts that are not addressed in the SUPO based on site-specific or project-specific considerations shall be noted in the project file, along with a rationale for not including them.</p> <p>In this process, the BLM/Forest Service would evaluate, among other things:</p> <p>Whether the conservation measure is “reasonable” (43 CFR 3101.1-2) and consistent with valid existing rights;</p> <p>Whether the action is in conformance with the approved LUP; and the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>The BLM/Forest Service would work with project proponents in these situations to promote measurable sage-grouse conservation objectives such as, but not limited to, consolidation of project related infrastructure to reduce habitat fragmentation and loss and to promote effective management objectives set by the State.</p> <p>The BLM/Forest Service would continue to work with project proponents (including those from within the BLM/Forest Service) and the Wyoming Game & Fish to site their projects in locations that meet the purpose and need for their project, but have been determined to contain the least sensitive habitats (based on vegetation, topography, or other habitat features) and resources whether inside or outside of core habitat areas. Valid existing rights will be recognized and respected.</p>	
#60	Same as Alternative A	Continue current management
#61	No similar action.	No similar action.
#62	Master Development Plans would be considered and encouraged for projects involving multiple proposed disturbances within core habitat area.	RDF
#63	Within sage-grouse core habitat, unitization would be encouraged as a means of minimizing adverse impacts to sage-grouse to reduce fragmentation and surface disturbing and disruptive activities.	RDF
#64	Same as Alternative A.	Continue Current Management.
#65	A reclamation bond would be required commensurate with the scope, scale, size of the project within sage-grouse core habitat. Partial bonding may be appropriate depending on these factors.	RDF

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
#66	Same as Alternative A.	Continue Current Management.
#67	In addition to Alternative A: Where the federal government owns the mineral estate, and the surface is non-federal ownership, the BLM will work cooperatively with the surface owner to apply the same sage-grouse conservation measures as applied on public land on a voluntary basis, for core and non-core habitat respectively.	No similar action. The Forest Service does not own sub-surface mineral estate under lands that are not National Forest System Lands.
#68	In addition to Alternative A: Where the federal government owns the surface, and the mineral estate is in non-federal ownership, work cooperatively with permittees, leasees and other surface landowners to negotiate and, apply the same sage-grouse conservation measures as applied on public land, for core and general habitat respectively. Apply appropriate design features to mitigate surface disturbance.	RDF
#69	No similar action.	No similar action.
#70	No similar action.	No similar action.
#71	In addition to Alternative A: Coal – Surface Mining Methods— Upon receipt of a coal lease application in sage-grouse core areas, 43 CFR 3461.5, Criterion 15 would be applied and the area would be identified as suitable for further coal leasing consideration after consultation with the state and where applicable, surface management agency, to determine that all or certain stipulated methods of coal mining will not have a significant long-term impact on the sage-grouse. Special conditions could be required as identified during the leasing process to protect sage-grouse resources.	No similar action. The Forest Service does not determine suitability or unsuitability for coal leasing.
#72	In addition to Alternative A: Coal – Underground Mining Methods Upon receipt of a coal lease application proposing underground mining methods that include surface operations and impacts within sage-grouse core area, Criterion 15 would be applied and the area would be identified as suitable for further coal leasing consideration after consultation with the state and where applicable, surface management agency, to determine that all or certain stipulated methods of coal mining will not have a significant long-term impact on the sage-grouse. Stipulated methods may include (but not limited to) underground mining methods with no placement of surface facilities. Unsuitability is not applied to underground operations without surface impacts (43 CFR 3461.1) This would be consistent with what IM WY WY-2012-019 states; that the BLM/Forest Service will assess potential impacts to sage-grouse through the NEPA process, and that the State regulatory agency would apply this mitigation, as well protective measures consistent with the State	No similar action. The Forest Service does not determine suitability or unsuitability for coal leasing.

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	Policy for solid leasable mining action at the permitting stage.	
#73	Coal exploration activities could be allowed in sage-grouse core habitats, if they can be completed in compliance to surface occupancy, and disturbance and density stipulations analyzed through the DDCT process.	See surface occupancy, disturbance and density standards, and guidelines.
#74	<p>In addition to Alternative A: Exploration licenses and prospecting permits would be considered with appropriate mitigating measures.</p> <p>All non-energy leasable mineral activities would be considered in sage-grouse core habitats, provided that the activities can be completed in compliance to surface occupancy, and disturbance and density stipulations analyzed through the DDCT process.</p>	See density and disturbance standards and guidelines.
#75	<p>The withdrawal of sage-grouse cord habitat areas from mineral entry would be considered for recommendation based on risk to sage-grouse and its habitat in core habitat areas from conflicting locatable mineral potential and development.</p> <p>Operators may be requested to submit modifications to the accepted notice or approved plan of operations so that the operations minimally impact sage-grouse core area habitats. The AO may convey to the operator suggested conservation measures, based upon the notice or plan level operations and the geographic area of those operations [also called the project area which is defined in CFR 3809.5].</p> <p>These suggested conservation measures include measures that support the overall goals and objectives of the core population area strategy, though measures listed for protection of sage-grouse breeding, nesting, brood-rearing, and wintering may not be reasonable or applicable to the BLM/Forest Service's determination of whether the proposed operations will cause unnecessary or undue degradation under 43 CFR 3809.5. The request containing the suggested conservation measures must make clear that the operator's compliance is not mandatory.</p> <p>Notices or Plans of Operation, or modifications thereto, submitted following the issuance of this guidance: As part of the 15-day completeness review of notices [or modifications thereto] and 30-day completeness review of plans of operations [or modifications thereto], the proposed project area(s) where exploration, development, mining, access and reclamation would take place should be reviewed for overlap of sage-grouse core areas in the corporate GIS database. If there is overlap, the BLM/Forest Service AO may notify the operator of ways that they may minimize impacts to core area habitats and request the operator to amend its notice or plan to include such measures. The request to amend the submitted notice or plan of</p>	<p>The following portion of the text from MA #75 will be converted to an Objective.</p> <p>The withdrawal of sage-grouse core habitat areas from mineral entry would be considered for recommendation based on risk to sage-grouse and its habitat in core habitat areas from conflicting locatable mineral potential and development.</p> <p>RDF</p> <p>Operators may be requested to submit modifications to the accepted notice or approved plan of operations so that the operations minimally impact sage-grouse core area habitats. The AO may convey to the operator suggested conservation measures, based upon the notice or plan level operations and the geographic area of those operations [also called the project area which is defined in CFR 3809.5].</p> <p>These suggested conservation measures include measures that support the overall goals and objectives of the core population area strategy, though measures listed for protection of sage-grouse breeding, nesting, brood-rearing, and wintering may not be reasonable or applicable to the BLM/Forest Service's determination of whether the proposed operations will cause unnecessary or undue degradation under 43 CFR 3809.5. The request containing the suggested conservation measures must make clear that the operator's compliance is not mandatory.</p> <p>Notices or Plans of Operation, or modifications thereto, submitted following the issuance of this guidance: As part of the 15-day completeness review of notices [or modifications thereto] and 30-day completeness review of plans of operations [or modifications thereto], the proposed project area(s) where exploration, development, mining, access and reclamation would take place should be reviewed for overlap of sage-grouse core areas in the corporate GIS database. If there is overlap,</p>

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	operations must make clear that the operator's compliance is not mandatory and that including such measures is not a requirement for completeness of either the notice or a plan of operations, nor is it a condition of acceptance of the notice or approval of the plan of operations.	the BLM/Forest Service AO may notify the operator of ways that they may minimize impacts to core area habitats and request the operator to amend its notice or plan to include such measures. The request to amend the submitted notice or plan of operations must make clear that the operator's compliance is not mandatory and that including such measures is not a requirement for completeness of either the notice or a plan of operations, nor is it a condition of acceptance of the notice or approval of the plan of operations.
#76	In addition to Alternative A: All salable mineral activities within core habitat areas would be considered, provided they can be completed in compliance within surface occupancy, seasonal restrictions, and disturbance and density stipulations analyzed through the DDCT process.	See density and disturbance standards and guidelines.
#77	Restoration of saleable mineral pits no longer in use would be considered to meet sage-grouse habitat conservation objectives. Emphasis would be given to reclamation/restoration of sage-grouse core habitat as a viable long term goal to improve the sage-grouse habitat.	MA #77 will be converted to an Objective.
#78	In addition to Alternative A: BLM Special Recreation Permits (SRP) and Forest Service Recreation Special Use Authorizations (RSUA) would be allowed in core habitat unless negative impacts to sage-grouse cannot be adequately mitigated.	Recreation Special Use Authorizations Standard Do not allow RSUA in Greater Sage-Grouse core habitat areas unless negative impacts can be adequately mitigated.
#79	No similar action.	No similar action.
#80	Do not designate new sage-grouse conservation Areas of Critical Environmental Concern/ Special Interest Areas (ACEC/SIA).	Does not apply to National Forest System Lands.
#81	No similar action.	No similar action.
#82	The Casper Field Office Poison Spider Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Park (285 acres) would remain as an "open" OHV area. The non-sand dune portions of the following OHV "open" areas within sage-grouse core habitat areas would be limited to existing roads and trails: <u>Rawlins Field Office:</u> Dune Pond Cooperative Management Area (3,736 acres) <u>Rock Springs Field Office:</u> Portion of the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area (529 acres).	Does not apply to National Forest System Lands.
#83	Same as Alternative A.	Continue Current Management.
#84	New primary and secondary (BLM route category) or Route Category level 4 and 5 (Forest Service) roads would be avoided within 1.9 miles of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks within sage-grouse core habitat areas. Other new roads would be avoided within 0.6 miles of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks within core habitat areas.	New Road Construction Standard Avoid authorizing construction of new primary and secondary roads (Levels 4 and 5 roads) within 1.9 miles of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks within sage-grouse core habitat areas. Avoid authorizing construction of other new roads within 0.6 miles of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks within core habitat areas.

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
#85	Within sage-grouse core habitat, no upgrading of existing routes that would change route category (BLM route category: road, primitive road, or trail; Forest Service route category: level 1, level 2, or level 3) or capacity would be allowed unless the upgrading would have minimal impact on sage-grouse in sage-grouse core habitat, was necessary for motorist safety, or eliminated the need to construct a new road.	Road Reconstruction Standard. Do not allow upgrading of existing routes that would change the route category or capacity unless the upgrading would have minimal impact on sage-grouse in sage-grouse core habitat, is necessary for motorist safety, or eliminates the need to construct a new road.
#86	In sage-grouse core habitat, existing roads or realignments would be used to access valid existing rights that are not yet developed. If valid existing rights cannot be accessed via existing roads, any new road would be constructed to the absolute minimum standard necessary, and the surface disturbance would be added to the total disturbance in the sage-grouse core habitat area. If that disturbance exceeds 5% for that area, additional, effective mitigation necessary would be evaluated and implemented to offset the resulting loss of sage-grouse habitat.	RDF Also, see Disturbance Standard.
#87	Kemmerer RMP: Roads and two-track routes determined to be unauthorized or redundant and unnecessary for resource management purposes would be reclaimed to achieve surrounding native conditions. For roads, primitive roads and trails not designated in travel management plans within sage-grouse core habitat areas, natural reclamation of roads and trails would be allowed in appropriate situations where additional resource damage is not foreseeable. This would include primitive route/roads that were not designated in Wilderness Study Areas and within lands with wilderness characteristics that have been selected to be managed to retain those characteristics for protection.	RDF
#88	Within sage-grouse core habitats, when reseeding roads and trails, appropriate seed mixtures would be used and the use of transplanted sagebrush would be considered.	RDF
#89	Within sage-grouse core and general habitat, the BLM/Forest Service would manage for vegetation composition and structure that reflects ESDs or other methods that reference site potential or comparable standard to achieve sage-grouse and other resource objectives.	RDF
#90	Within sage-grouse core habitat in northeast Wyoming, vegetation treatments in nesting and wintering that would reduce sagebrush canopy to less than 15% would not be conducted unless it can be shown to be beneficial to sage-grouse habitat.	Northeast Wyoming Vegetation Treatment Restriction Standard. Do not conduct vegetation treatments within sage-grouse core habitat in northeast Wyoming in nesting and wintering that would reduce sagebrush canopy to less than 15% unless it can be shown to be beneficial to sage-grouse habitat.
#91	In addition to Alternative A: For vegetation treatments in sagebrush within core habitat areas,	RDF Also, see density and disturbance standards and guidelines.

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	<p>refer to Appendix A, WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-Grouse (WGFD 2011, as updated) and the BLM's Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2011-138 (Sage-grouse Conservation Related to Wildland Fire and Fuels Management).</p> <p>These recommended protocols will be used in determining whether proposed treatment constitutes a "disturbance" that would contribute toward the 5% threshold within sage-grouse core habitat maintenance. Additionally, these protocols would be used to determine whether the proposed treatment configuration would be expected to have neutral or beneficial impacts for core populations or if they represent additional habitat loss or fragmentation. Treatments to enhance sagebrush/grasslands habitat for sage-grouse would be evaluated based upon habitat quality and the functionality/use of treated habitats post-treatment.</p> <p>The BLM and the Forest Service would work collaboratively with partners at the state and local level to maintain and enhance sage-grouse habitats.</p>	
#92	<p>For vegetation treatments in sagebrush within core habitat areas, refer to Attachment 6 – WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-grouse (WGFD 2011, as updated). These recommended protocols, subject to seasonal conditions of approval, would be used in determining whether proposed treatment constitutes a "disturbance" that would contribute toward the 5% threshold for habitat maintenance.</p> <p>Additionally, these protocols would be used to determine whether the proposed treatment configuration would be expected to have neutral or beneficial impacts for core populations or if they represent additional habitat loss or fragmentation.</p> <p>Treatments to enhance sagebrush/grasslands habitat for sage-grouse would be evaluated based upon habitat quality and the functionality/use of treated habitats post-treatment.</p> <p>The BLM and Forest Service would work collaboratively with partners at the state and local level to maintain and enhance sage-grouse habitats.</p>	MA #92 is a duplicate of MA #91.
#93	Grazing would be deferred on treated areas for two full growing seasons unless vegetation objectives or vegetation recovery indicates a shorter or longer rest period is necessary based on vegetation monitoring results.	RDF
#94	For vegetation treatments in sagebrush within core habitat areas, refer to Attachment 6 – WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-grouse (WGFD 2011, as updated).	RDF
#95	Reclamation of surface disturbances in sage-	RDF

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	<p>grouse core habitats would be consistent with the Wyoming Reclamation Policy (USDI BLM 2009b) and Appendix C or Forest Service Reclamation policy.</p> <p>A monitoring plan would be developed for each restoration or reclamation project and reporting progress and changes in resource condition.</p>	
#96	<p>Areas for vegetation restoration and/or restoration criteria that include state sage-grouse conservation plans and appropriate local information would be identified. The use of native plants and seeds for restoration would be required unless the probability for success is low (non-native plants and seeds may be used as long as they meet sage-grouse habitat objectives), and restoration management would be designed to obtain long-term persistence based on ESD.</p> <p>Reestablishment of sagebrush cover and desirable understory plants would be the highest priority for restoration efforts.</p> <p>Landscape patterns that most benefit sage-grouse would be restored and created, considering potential changes in climate.</p>	RDF
#97	<p>Within sage-grouse core habitat, implementation of restoration projects would be prioritized based on environmental variables that improve chances for project success in areas most likely to benefit sage-grouse.</p> <p>Restoration would be prioritized in seasonal habitats that are thought to be limiting sage-grouse distribution and/or abundance.</p>	RDF
#98	<p>In addition to Alternative A: Where probability of success or native seed availability is low or where there is a specific identified purpose that cannot be met with natives, non-native seeds could be used provided they meet sage-grouse habitat conservation objectives.</p>	RDF
#99	<p>Post Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ES&R) and BAER management would be designed to ensure long term persistence of seeded or pre-burn native plants. This may require temporary or long-term changes in livestock grazing, wild horse and burro, and travel management, etc., to achieve and maintain the desired condition of ES&R and BAER projects to benefit sage-grouse (Eiswerth and Shonkwiler 2006).</p>	RDF
#100	<p>The role of existing seedings that are currently composed of primarily introduced perennial grasses in and adjacent to core sage-grouse habitats would be evaluated to determine if they should be restored to sagebrush or habitat of higher quality for sage-grouse. If these seedings are part of an AMP/ Conservation Plan or if they provide value in conserving or enhancing the rest of the core</p>	MA #100 will be converted to an Objective.

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	habitats, no restoration would be necessary. The compatibility of these seedings for sage-grouse habitat or as a component of a grazing system would be assessed during the land health assessments (or other analyses [Forest Service only]) (Davies et al. 2011).	
#101	Priority would be given for implementing specific sage-grouse habitat restoration projects in areas invaded by annual grasses first to sites that are adjacent to or surrounded by sage-grouse priority habitats. Areas invaded by annual grasses would be second priority for restoration when the sites are not adjacent to priority habitat, but are within 2 miles of priority habitat. The third priority for areas invaded by annual grasses habitat restoration projects would be sites beyond 2 miles of priority habitat. The intent would be to focus restoration outward from existing, intact habitat.	RDF
#102	In fire prone areas where sagebrush seed is required for sage-grouse habitat restoration, the BLM/Forest Service would consider establishing seed harvest areas that are managed for seed production and are a priority for protection from outside disturbances.	RDF
#103	Vegetation treatment proposals must include evaluation of soils, precipitation, invasive/exotic plants, as well as the current condition of sage-grouse core habitats.	RDF
#104	The BLM/Forest Service could implement treatments within sage-grouse core habitat areas where outbreaks of grasshopper or Mormon cricket populations are expected to rise above economic levels. Treatments must be conducted only following reduced agent-area treatments (RAATS) protocols. The BLM/Forest Service would work collaboratively with partners at the federal, state, and local levels, including the Wyoming Weed and Pest Districts within the counties where the treatment is to occur, to maintain and enhance sage-grouse habitats in a manner consistent with the core population area strategy for conservation. The BLM/Forest Service would be directed to utilize the Wyoming Grasshopper and Mormon Cricket Control website as a resource for updated information when conducting analysis of grasshopper and Mormon cricket control in sage-grouse habitats.	Continue Current Management.
#105	Within sage-grouse core habitat, the BLM/Forest Service would review and consider amending BLM Herd Management Area Plans (HMAP) to incorporate sage-grouse habitat objectives and management considerations for all BLM herd management areas (HMA).	There are no wild horses on National Forest System Lands in the planning area studied in this analysis.
#106	Sage-grouse core habitat management objectives would be considered when evaluating appropriate management levels (AML).	There are no wild horses on National Forest System Lands in the planning area studied in this analysis.

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
#107	Sage-grouse core habitat management objectives would be considered when conducting land health assessments in BLM HMAs.	There are no wild horses on National Forest System Lands in the planning area studied in this analysis.
#108	When conducting NEPA analysis for wild horse and burro management activities, water developments or other rangeland improvements for wild horses in sage-grouse core habitat, the direct and indirect effects to sage-grouse populations and habitat would be addressed. Water developments or rangeland improvements would be implemented using the criteria identified for domestic livestock identified above in core habitats.	There are no wild horses on National Forest System Lands in the planning area studied in this analysis.
#109	Coordinate with other resources (Range, Wildlife, and Riparian) to conduct land health assessments within all BLM HMAs.	There are no wild horses on National Forest System Lands in the planning area studied in this analysis.
#110	<p>In sage-grouse core habitat, fuel treatments would be designed and implemented with an emphasis on protecting existing sagebrush ecosystems and enhancing and protecting future sagebrush ecosystems (refer to WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-grouse [WGFD 2011, as updated]) and Appendix A.</p> <p>These recommended protocols would be used in determining whether proposed treatment constitutes a “disturbance” that will contribute toward the 5% threshold for habitat maintenance.</p>	RDF
#111	<p>In addition to Alternative A: Burned areas that are within core sage-grouse habitats would be restored. Following 2011 wildfires (and following 1994 wildfires in Northeast Wyoming), areas containing less than 5% canopy cover would be treated as disturbed pending an implementation management plan with trend data showing the area returning to functional sage-grouse habitat. This would be specific only to wildfire situations. This direction would not be intended for other incentive/mitigation situations.</p> <p>The BLM/Forest Service could bring in BAER and BAR teams who would work collaboratively with partners at the federal, state, and local level to maintain and enhance sage-grouse habitats in a manner consistent with the priority habitat population area strategy for conservation. DDCT reviews would be conducted in coordination with the WGFD Habitat Protection Program located in Cheyenne at the WGFD headquarters. Areas within sage-grouse priority habitat would be high priority for restoration of sage-grouse habitat beyond immediate response.</p>	<p>RDF</p> <p>Restore burned areas that are within core sage-grouse habitats.</p> <p>Also, see the Disturbance Standard for direction concerning areas with less than 5% canopy cover.</p> <p>Continue current management concerning fire restoration teams.</p>
#112	In addition to Alternative A: For fuels management, the agencies would consider multiple tools for fuels reduction and would analyze in NEPA compliance documentation before electing to implement prescribed fire in sage-grouse core habitat areas. The use of prescribed fire would be avoided in areas of Wyoming big sagebrush, other xeric	RDF

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	<p>sagebrush species, where cheatgrass or other fire-invasive species occur, and/or within areas of less than 12-inch precipitation zones.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix A, WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-grouse (WGFD 2011, as updated) and the BLM's Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2011-138 (Sage-grouse Conservation Related to Wildland Fire and Fuels Management). If prescribed fire activities are not in compliance with these protocols, the treatment would be considered a sage-grouse core habitat disturbance.</p>	
#113	<p>Within sage-grouse core habitat, post fuels management projects would be designed to ensure long-term persistence of seeded or pre-treatment native plants (while controlling for erosion and treating infestation of invasive plant species), to return to suitable sage-grouse habitat.</p>	RDF
#114	Same as Alternative A.	Continue Current Management.
#115	Same as Alternative A.	Continue Current Management.
#116	No similar action.	No similar action.
#117	No similar action.	No similar action.
#118	No similar action.	No similar action.
#119	No similar action.	No similar action.
#120	<p>In Addition to Alternative A: In sage-grouse core habitat areas, suppression would be prioritized immediately after firefighter and public safety to conserve the habitat.</p> <p>General sage-grouse habitat would be assigned a priority commensurate with its importance in the local fire plan.</p>	RDF
#121	<p>The BLM/Forest Service, in coordination with the State of Wyoming and its agencies, other local partners and stakeholders, would establish monitoring protocols for sage-grouse populations and habitat that would be incorporated into individual project approvals, including small and in-house projects, as appropriate and necessary.</p>	MA #121 will be converted to an Objective.
#122	<p>Inside sage-grouse core habitat areas, the BLM/Forest Service would limit the density of oil and gas or mining activities to no more than an average of 1 location per 640 acres, subject to valid existing rights; and would limit all surface disturbance (any program area) to no more than 5% of the core landscape using the DDCT process described in Appendix I.</p>	<p>Oil and Gas or Mining Activity Density Guideline.</p> <p>Limit or reduce the density of oil and gas or mining activities to no more than an average of 1 location per 640 acres in Greater Sage-Grouse core habitat areas.</p> <p>Surface Disturbance Guideline.</p> <p>Limit all surface disturbances (any program area) to no more than 5% of the Greater Sage-Grouse core landscape and connectivity areas using the DDCT process described in Appendix I.</p> <p>For vegetation treatments in sagebrush within core habitat areas, refer to Appendix A WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-grouse (WGFD 2011, as updated). Consider these</p>

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
		<p>protocols in determining whether or not the proposed treatment constitutes a “disturbance” that would contribute toward the 5% threshold.</p> <p>Utility Transmission projects in the 2-mile wide corridor in south-central and southwestern Wyoming will not be counted against the 5% disturbance cap (Reference Manual). (See Attachment D, Map 1 and 2 from WY EO 2011-5) (note – remove this if the corridor does not pass through National Forest System Lands). New projects within sage-grouse core habitats that may require future distribution and transmission lines would include the proposed distribution and transmission lines in their DDCT as part of the proposed disturbance. Lines permitted but not located in a transmission corridor will be considered towards the 5% disturbance calculation (line disturbance is equal to ROW width multiplied by length and includes all access roads, staging areas, and other surface disturbance associated with construction outside of the ROW).</p> <p>Easement and SUA within existing corridors would not be counted against the 5% disturbance cap.</p> <p>For fuels treatments, use Appendix A WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-grouse (WGFD 2011, as updated) and Appendix A to determine whether or not proposed treatment constitutes a “disturbance” that will contribute toward the 5% threshold for habitat maintenance.</p> <p>Following 2011 wildfires (and following 1994 wildfires in Northeast Wyoming) burned areas containing less than 5% canopy cover, shall be treated as disturbed pending an implementation management plan with trend data showing the area returning to functional sage-grouse habitat. This is specific only to wildfire situations and is not intended for other incentive/mitigation situations.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix A WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-grouse (WGFD 2011, as updated) and the BLM’s Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2011-138 (Sage-grouse Conservation Related to Wildland Fire and Fuels Management). If prescribed fire activities are not in compliance with these protocols, the treatment is considered a sage-grouse core habitat disturbance.</p>
#123	<p>Inside sage-grouse connectivity areas, all surface disturbances (any program area) would be limited to no more than 5% per 640 acres using the DDCT process described in Appendix I.</p>	<p>Combined with MA #122.</p>
#124	<p>In addition to Alternative A: Within sage-grouse core habitat when mitigation is required, the agencies in coordination with the State of Wyoming and its agencies and partners, would use the following mitigation hierarchy: In-kind and onsite (on lease) mitigation would be</p>	<p>RDF</p>

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	<p>first priority.</p> <p>In-kind mitigation offsite within the projects DDCT would be second priority.</p> <p>In-kind mitigation offsite within the core area boundary would be third priority.</p> <p>In-kind mitigation adjacent to the affected core area within general sage-grouse habitat would be fourth priority.</p> <p>When additional offsite mitigation is necessary, it would be conducted within the same population area where the impact occurs; and if that is not possible, mitigation would be conducted within the same Management Zone per the 2006 Western Association of Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) Strategy as the impact.</p>	
#125	<p>Sage-grouse leks inside core and connectivity habitat areas:</p> <p>Surface occupancy and surface disturbing activities would be prohibited on or within a six tenths (0.6) mile radius of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks (Map 2-3).</p>	<p>Surface Occupancy and Surface Disturbance Standard.</p> <p>Prohibit surface occupancy and surface disturbing activities within a six tenths (0.6) mile radius of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks inside Greater Sage-Grouse core and connectivity habitat areas and within a one-quarter (0.25) mile radius of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks in Greater Sage-Grouse general habitat areas. (Map 2-3).</p>
#126	<p>Sage-grouse leks outside core habitat and connectivity habitat areas:</p> <p>Surface occupancy and surface disturbing activities would be prohibited or restricted on or within a one quarter (0.25) mile radius of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks (Map 2-3).</p>	<p>Combined with #125.</p>
#127	<p>Sage-grouse nesting/early brood-rearing habitat inside core habitat areas:</p> <p>Surface disturbing and/or disruptive activities would be prohibited from March 1–June 30 to protect sage-grouse breeding, nesting and early brood rearing habitat. This timing limitation would be applied throughout the sage-grouse core area habitats. Activities in unsuitable habitats would be evaluated under the exception, waiver, and modification criteria and could be allowed on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Where credible data support different timeframes for this seasonal restriction, dates could be expanded by up to 14 days prior to or subsequent to the above dates.</p>	<p>Surface Disturbing and/or Disruptive Activity Standard.</p> <p>To protect Greater Sage-Grouse breeding, nesting, and early brood-rearing habitat, prohibit surface disturbing and/or disruptive activity from March 1 – June 30 in the following locations: in all Greater Sage-Grouse core habitat areas, within 4 miles of an occupied lek or lek perimeter within Greater Sage-Grouse connectivity areas, and within two miles of an occupied lek or lek perimeter in Greater Sage-Grouse general habitat.</p> <p>Activities in unsuitable habitats may be authorized under the exception, waiver, and modification criteria. Where credible data support different timeframes for this restriction, dates may be expanded by up to 14 days prior to or subsequent to the listed restricted timeframe.</p> <p>Prohibit utility transmission project construction between March 15 and June 30 (or December 1 and June 30 in winter concentration areas).</p>
#128	<p>Sage-grouse nesting/early brood-rearing habitat inside connectivity areas:</p> <p>Surface disturbing and/or disruptive activities would be prohibited within connectivity habitat from March</p>	<p>Combined with #127.</p>

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
	<p>1–June 30 to protect breeding, nesting and early brood-rearing habitats within 4 miles of the lek or lek perimeter of any occupied sage-grouse lek within identified connectivity areas. This timing limitation would be applied throughout the sage-grouse core area habitats. Activities in unsuitable habitats would be evaluated under the exception, waiver, and modification criteria and may be allowed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Where credible data support different timeframes for this seasonal restriction, dates could be expanded by 14 days prior or subsequent to the above dates.</p>	
#129	<p>Sage-grouse nesting/early brood-rearing habitat outside sage-grouse core and connectivity habitat areas:</p> <p>Surface disturbing and/or disruptive activities would be prohibited from March 15–June 30 to protect sage-grouse nesting and early brood rearing habitats within 2 miles of the lek or lek perimeter of any occupied lek located outside core or connectivity areas.</p> <p>Where credible data support different timeframes for this restriction, dates could be expanded by 14 days prior or subsequent to the above dates.</p>	<p>Combined with #127.</p>
#130	<p>Sage-grouse winter concentration areas:</p> <p>Surface disturbing and/or disruptive activities in sage-grouse winter concentration areas would be prohibited from December 1–March 14 to protect core area populations of sage-grouse that use these winter concentration habitats. This timing limitation would be applied throughout the sage-grouse core area habitats.</p> <p>Activities in unsuitable habitats within core habitat areas would be evaluated under the exception, waiver, and modification criteria and could be allowed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Protection of additional areas of winter concentration that are not located within the current core area boundaries would be implemented where WCAs are identified as supporting populations of sage-grouse that attend leks within core habitat. Appropriate seasonal timing restrictions and habitat protection measures would be considered and evaluated in all identified winter concentration areas.</p>	<p>Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Concentration Area Protection Standard</p> <p>Prohibit surface disturbing and/or disruptive activities in Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Concentration Areas from December 1–March 14 to protect core area populations of sage-grouse that use these winter concentration habitats. This timing limitation will be applied throughout the sage-grouse core area habitats and in other locations where WCAs are identified as supporting populations of Greater Sage-Grouse that attend leks within Greater Sage-Grouse core area habitat.</p> <p>Activities in unsuitable habitats within core habitat areas may be evaluated under the exception, waiver, and modification criteria and may be allowed on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The following text from MA #130 will be converted to an Objective. Appropriate seasonal timing restrictions and habitat protection measures must be considered and evaluated in all WCA habitats identified (independent of habitat suitability).</p>
#131	<p>In addition to Alternative A: The BLM/Forest Service would implement strategies and techniques in land management decisions that address predators shown to pose a threat to sage-grouse (Appendix F).</p> <p>The BLM/Forest Service would support and encourage other agencies in their efforts to minimize impacts from predators on sage-grouse where needs have been documented.</p>	<p>RDF</p> <p>Implement strategies and techniques (Appendix F) in land management decisions that address predators shown to pose a threat to sage-grouse.</p> <p>Support and encourage other agencies in their efforts to minimize impacts from predators on sage-grouse where needs have been documented.</p>

MA #	BLM RMP	Forest Service LRMP
#132	<p>The BLM/Forest Service would work with proponents to limit project related noise where it would be expected to reduce functionality of habitats that support core habitat area populations.</p> <p>The BLM/Forest Service would evaluate the potential for limitation of new noise sources on a case-by-case basis as appropriate.</p> <p>The BLM/Forest Service’s near-term goal would be to limit noise sources that would be expected to negatively impact core habitat area sage-grouse populations and to continue to support the establishment of ambient baseline noise levels for occupied core habitat area leks.</p> <p>As additional research and information emerges, specific new limitations appropriate to the type of projects being considered would be evaluated and appropriate limitations would be implemented where necessary to minimize potential for noise impacts on sage-grouse core population behavioral cycles.</p> <p>As new research is completed, new specific limitations would be coordinated with the WGFD and partners.</p> <p>Noise levels at the 0.6 mile perimeter of the lek should not exceed 10 dBA above ambient noise from March 1 through May 15.</p>	<p>Noise Limit Guideline.</p> <p>To minimize the potential for noise impacts on Greater Sage-Grouse core population behavioral cycles, noise levels at the 0.6 mile perimeter of the lek should not exceed 10 dBA above ambient noise from March 1 through May 15.</p> <p>RDF</p> <p>Work with proponents to limit project related noise where it would be expected to reduce functionality of habitats that support core habitat area populations.</p> <p>Evaluate the potential for limitation of new noise sources on a case-by-case basis as appropriate.</p> <p>Limit noise sources that would be expected to negatively impact core habitat area sage-grouse populations and to continue to support the establishment of ambient baseline noise levels for occupied core habitat area leks.</p> <p>As additional research and information emerges, evaluate specific new limitations appropriate to the type of projects being considered and implement appropriate limitations where necessary to minimize potential for noise impacts on sage-grouse core population behavioral cycles. As new research is completed, coordinate new specific limitations with the WGFD and partners.</p>