

WYOMING BLM MANAGEMENT ACTIONS AND FOREST SERVICE PLAN COMPONENTS – A CROSSWALK

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
MA 1 - Continue to support the development of statewide sage-grouse seasonal habitat models for the State of Wyoming.	Standard operating procedure.
MA 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 best management practices (BMP) and offsite compensatory mitigation where appropriate.	Standard operating procedure.
MA 3 - Utilize the Wyoming Sage-grouse Implementation Team (SGIT) and Local Working Group plans or other state plans, analyses, and other sources of information to guide development of conservation objectives for local management of sage-grouse habitats. The BLM will collaborate with appropriate federal agencies, and the State of Wyoming as contemplated under Governor Executive Order 2013-3, to: (1) develop appropriate conservation objectives; (2) define a framework for evaluating situations where Greater Sage-Grouse conservation objectives are not being achieved on federal land, to determine if a causal relationship exists between improper grazing (by wildlife or wild horses or livestock) and Greater Sage-Grouse conservation objectives; and (3) identify appropriate site-based action to achieve Greater Sage-Grouse conservation objectives within the framework	To be included in Forest Service Implementation Guidance.
MA 4 - Include the collection of baseline data and outline post-project monitoring components into project planning, as appropriate and necessary.	Standard operating procedure.
MA 5 - The BLM will coordinate new recommendations, mitigation, and conservation measures applied for sage-grouse with the WGFD and other appropriate agencies, local government cooperators, and the	No similar management direction.

BLM Management Actions

Forest Service Plan Components

Wyoming SGIT. These measures will be analyzed in site-specific NEPA documents, as necessary.

MA 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.

GRSG-TDDD-GL-018-Guideline¹ – Within priority-connectivity habitat management areas, do not authorize new surface disturbing or disruptive activities from March 15 through June 30 within 4 miles of a lek or lek perimeter of an occupied lek within priority-connectivity areas. Activities that meet the exception, waiver, and modification criteria may be authorized. Where credible data, based upon field analysis, support different timeframes for this seasonal restriction, dates may be shifted by 14 days before or after the above dates.

GRSG-TDDD-GL-019-Guideline¹ – In general habitat management areas, do not authorize new surface disturbing or disruptive activities from March 15 to June 30 within 2 miles of the lek or lek perimeter of any occupied lek located inside general areas. Activities that meet the exception, waiver, and modification criteria may be authorized. Where credible data, based upon field analysis, support different timeframes for this restriction, dates may be shifted by 14 days before or subsequent to the above dates.

GRSG-TDDD-GL-020-Guideline¹ – Within mapped winter concentration areas in priority-core habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, do not authorize new surface disturbing or disruptive activities from December 1 through March 14 to protect priority-core and sagebrush focal area greater sage-grouse populations that use these winter concentration habitats. Activities not located in suitable habitat that meet the exception, waiver, and modification criteria may be authorized.

GRSG-TDDD-GL-021-Guideline¹ – Within mapped winter concentration areas in priority-connectivity and general habitat management areas, do not authorize new surface disturbing or

¹On a case-by-case basis, and only when it can be demonstrated that the activity will not cause declines in greater sage-grouse populations, allow exceptions, modifications, and waivers. The authorized officer may grant an exception if a review determines that the action, as proposed or conditioned, would not impair the function or utility of the site for the current or subsequent seasonal habitat, life-history, or behavioral needs of greater sage-grouse.

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
	disruptive activities from December 1 through March 14 where winter concentration areas are identified as supporting populations of greater sage-grouse that attend leks within priority-core habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas.
MA 7 - Ensure site-specific, measurable, conservation and mitigation objectives are included in project planning within sage-grouse habitats.	To be included in Forest Service Implementation Guidance.
MA 8 - Each BLM field office will develop landscape-scale restoration, conservation, and maintenance strategies, including special management of seasonal habitats and identified connectivity zones outside of PHMAs, working with voluntary partners and cooperating agencies. These strategies must be coordinated and reconciled, where possible, with adjoining management entities that share habitats or populations.	No similar management direction.
MA 9 - Design all range projects in a manner that minimizes potential for invasive species establishment. Monitor and treat invasive species associated with existing range improvements.	GRSG-GRSGH-GL-009-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, actions and authorizations should be designed to limit the spread and effect of undesirable non-native plant species.
MA 10 - Apply all appropriate required design features (Appendix B) as mandatory Stipulations/Conditions of Approval (COA) within PHMAs for fluid minerals, travel management, lands and realty, range management, wild horses, coal exploration, locatable mineral location and entry, West Nile Virus, mineral materials, non-energy solid leasable minerals, vegetation management, fire and fuels management, and noise.	<p>Required design features displayed in Appendix B of the FEIS that are not current standard operating procedure have been converted to standards or guidelines for the Forest Service draft proposed plan amendments. Those items that were not converted will be displayed in implementation guidance distributed after the project decision is finalized.</p> <p>GRSG-M-FMO-GL-088-Guideline – In priority and important habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, do not authorize employee camps.</p> <p>GRSG-M-FMO-GL-089-Guideline – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, closed-loop systems should be used for drilling operations with no reserve pits, where feasible.</p> <p>GRSG-M-FMO-GL-090-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, during drilling operations, soil compaction should be minimized and soil structure should be</p>

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

maintained using the best available techniques to improve vegetation reestablishment.

GRSG-M-FMO-GL-091-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, dams, impoundments and ponds for mineral development should be constructed to reduce potential for West Nile virus. Examples of methods to accomplish this include:

- Increase the depth of ponds to accommodate a greater volume of water than is discharged.
- Build steep shorelines (greater than 2 feet) to reduce shallow water and aquatic vegetation around the perimeter of impoundments to reduce breeding habitat for mosquitoes.
- Maintain the water level below that of rooted aquatic and upland vegetation. Avoid flooding terrestrial vegetation in flat terrain or low-lying areas.
- Construct dams or impoundments that restrict down-slope seepage or overflow by digging ponds in flat areas rather than damming natural draws for effluent water storage or lining constructed ponds in areas where seepage is anticipated.
- Line the channel where discharge water flows into the pond with crushed rock or use a horizontal pipe to discharge inflow directly into existing open water.
- Line the overflow spillway with crushed rock and construct the spillway with steep sides.
- Fence pond sites to restrict access by livestock and other wild ungulates.
- Remove or re-inject produced water.
- Treat waters with larvicides to reduce mosquito production where water occurs on the surface.

GRSG-RT-DC-068-Desired Condition - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, within the travel management system, greater sage-grouse experience minimal

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

disturbance during breeding and nesting (March 15 to June 30), and wintering (December 1 to March 15) periods.

GRSG-RT-ST-073-Standard – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, prohibit public access on temporary energy development roads, unless consistent with all other terms and conditions included in this forest plan amendment.

GRSG-RT-GL-074-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, new roads and road realignments should be designed and administered to reduce collisions with greater sage-grouse.

GRSG-RT-GL-075-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, road construction within riparian areas and mesic meadows should be restricted. If not possible to restrict construction within riparian areas and mesic meadows, roads should be designed and constructed perpendicular to ephemeral drainages and stream crossings, unless topography prevents doing so.

GRSG-RT-GL-077-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, dust abatement terms and conditions should be included in road-use permits when dust has the potential to impact greater sage-grouse.

GRSG-RT-GL-078-Guideline - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, road and road-way maintenance activities should be designed and implemented to reduce the risk of vehicle or human-caused wildfires and the spread of invasive plants. Such activities include but are not limited to the removal or mowing of vegetation a car-width off the edge of roads; use of weed-free earth-moving equipment, gravel, fill, or other materials; and blading or pulling roadsides and ditches that are infested with noxious weeds only if required for public safety or protection of the roadway.

GRSG-FM-GL-051-Guideline – Locating temporary wildfire suppression facilities (e.g., incident command posts, spike camps,

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

helibases, mobile retardant plants) in priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas should be avoided.

GRSG-FM-GL-052-Guideline - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, cross-country vehicle travel during fire operations should be restricted, whenever safe and practical to do so, as determined by fireline leadership and incident commanders.

GRSG-FM-GL-053-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, use fire management tactics and strategies that seek to minimize loss of existing sagebrush habitat. The safest and most practical means to do so will be determined by fireline leadership and incident commanders.

GRSG-FM-GL-054-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, prescribed fire prescriptions should minimize undesirable effects on vegetation and/or soils (e.g., minimize mortality of desirable perennial plant species and reduce risk of hydrophobicity).

GRSG-FM-GL-055-Guideline - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, roads and natural fuel breaks should be incorporated into fuel break design to improve effectiveness and minimize loss of existing sagebrush habitat.

GRSG-FM-GL-056-Guideline - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, all fire-associated vehicles and equipment should be inspected and cleaned using standardized protocols and procedures and approved vehicle/equipment decontamination systems before entering and exiting the area to minimize the introduction of invasive annual grasses and other invasive plant species and noxious weeds.

GRSG-FM-GL-057-Guideline - Unit-specific greater sage-grouse fire management toolboxes containing maps, lists, contact information for qualified resource advisors, local guidance, and relevant information

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

should be developed and used.

GRSG-FM-GL-058-Guideline – Localized maps of priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas should be provided to dispatch officers and extended attack incident commanders to use when prioritizing wildfire suppression resources and designing suppression tactics.

GRSG-FM-GL-059-Guideline - In or near priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, a greater sage-grouse resource advisor should be assigned to all extended attack fires.

GRSG-FM-GL-060-Guideline – On critical fire weather days, protection of greater sage-grouse habitat should receive high consideration, along with other high values, for positioning of resources.

GRSG-FM-GL-061-Guideline - Line officers should be involved in setting pre-season wildfire response priorities and, during period of multiple fires, prioritizing protection of priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas.

GRSG-FM-GL-062-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, consider using fire retardant and mechanized equipment only if it is likely to result in minimizing burned acreage.

GRSG-FM-GL-063-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, to minimize sagebrush loss, mop-up should be conducted where the burned areas adjoin unburned islands, doglegs, or other habitat features, as safety and available resources allows.

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>MA 11 - Integrated vegetation management would be used to control, suppress, and eradicate, where possible, noxious and invasive species per BLM Handbook H-1740-2. Manage weed treatments to maintain and improve Greater Sage-Grouse habitat. Apply Required Design Features and BMPs as Conditions of Approval, such as those in Appendix B.</p>	<p>The following text would be included in FS Implementation Guidance: Integrated vegetation management would be used to control, suppress, and eradicate, where possible, noxious and invasive species per Forest Service Manual 2080. Manage weed treatments to maintain and improve Greater Sage-Grouse habitat.</p>
<p>MA 12 - Existing notices and approved plans of operations under 43 CFR 3809 : For projects that overlap PHMAs, operators may be requested to submit modifications to the accepted notice or approved plan of operations so that the operations minimally impact PHMAs (core only). 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 43 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’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 PHMAs in the corporate geographic information system (GIS) database. If there is overlap, the BLM AO may notify the operator of ways that they may minimize impacts to PHMAs (core only) 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</p>	<p>GRSG-M-LM-ST-096-Standard – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, only approve Plans of Operation with mitigation to protect greater sage-grouse and their habitats, consistent with the rights of the mining claimant as granted by the Mining Law of 1872, as amended.</p> <p>GRSG-M-LM-ST-097-Standard – The disturbance cap described in GRSG-TDDD-ST-023-Standard will not be applied to foreclose development of locatable minerals on unpatented claims located under the General Mining Act of 1872, as amended; the disturbance from locatable mining will be accounted for when determining the percent disturbance and whether the cap has been exceeded.</p>

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>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>	
<p>MA 13 - As new occupied sage-grouse habitat is found or occurs either through additional inventories or expansion into previously unoccupied habitat, the BLM will incorporate, through appropriate processes and analyses, these areas into the GHMA category and manage them as such, until the earliest review occurs by the SGIT. At that time they will be considered for PHMA status or continue to be managed as GHMAs, and will be added to the statewide map at that time.</p>	<p>The following text would be included in FS Implementation Guidance. As new occupied sage-grouse habitat is found or occurs either through additional inventories or expansion into previously unoccupied habitat, the Forest Service will incorporate these areas into priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas through appropriate processes and analyses.</p>
<p>MA 14 - Contribute to actions that help to ground-truth the statewide sage-grouse seasonal habitat models for the State of Wyoming.</p>	<p>To be included in Forest Service Implementation Guidance.</p>
<p>MA 15 - Use the Sage-grouse Habitat Assessment Framework or best available assessment tool (approved by the AO) when assessing or evaluating sage-grouse habitats at multiple scales.</p>	<p>To be included in Forest Service Implementation Guidance.</p>
<p>MA 16 - 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 BLM (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>	<p>To be included in Forest Service Implementation Guidance.</p>
<p>MA 17 - Many sage-grouse seasonal habitats within and outside of PHMAs (core only) 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 plan. The BLM 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,</p>	<p>The direction in the Forest Service standards and guidelines will be applied consistent with applicable valid existing rights, laws, and regulations.</p> <p>GRSG-M-FML-GL-086-Guideline – On existing federal leases in priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, when surface occupancy cannot be restricted due to valid existing rights or development requirements, disturbance and surface occupancy should be limited to areas least harmful to greater sage-grouse, based on vegetation, topography, or other habitat features.</p>

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
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.	
MA 18 - PHMAs would be designated as OHV Limited Areas. The OHV limitation would ultimately be to “Designated Routes” as determined through a subsequent implementation/activity level Travel Management Plan. In the interim, motorized use on existing routes may occur; however, no new routes may be created without specific authorization.	Standard operating procedure.
MA 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 PHMAs with current administrative/agency purpose or need to administrative access only. Existing plans should be assessed for consistency with sage-grouse conservation objectives.	Motorized travel plans have been completed for National Forest System Lands. Existing plans will be assessed periodically for consistency with greater sage-grouse habitat needs.
MA 20 - Construct roads needed for production activities to minimum design standards within PHMAs, in compliance with the Density and Disturbance Calculation Tool (DDCT) process.	Standard operating procedure.
MA 21 - Field office staff will work with project proponents (including those within the BLM) and the WGFD to site their projects in locations that meet the purpose and need for their project, utilize the DDCT, and have been determined to contain the least sensitive habitats.	Standard operating procedure.
MA 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.	No similar management direction.
MA 23 - Management Action 23 has been moved to Management Action 137.	Management Action 23 has been moved to Management Action 137.
MA 24 - Management Action 24 has been moved to Management Action 137.	Management Action 24 has been moved to Management Action 138.

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>MA 25 - All existing LUP decisions will be retained unless vacated or modified by decisions in these LUP amendments. Where more restrictive land use allocations or decisions are made in existing RMPs, those more restrictive land use allocations or decisions will remain in effect and will not be amended by these LUP amendments.</p>	<p>To be included in Forest Service Implementation Guidance or the Record of Decision.</p>
<p>MA 26 - Fire and fuels management actions would be designed to contribute to the protection and enhancement of sagebrush habitat that support Greater Sage-Grouse populations (including large contiguous blocks of sagebrush).</p>	<p>GRSG-FM-DC-046-Desired Condition - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, the extent and spread of wildfire resulting in loss of sagebrush is minimized, considering firefighter and public safety and other high priority values.</p>
<p>MA 27 - BLM planning units (Districts), in coordination with the USFWS and relevant state agencies, would complete and continue to update Greater Sage-Grouse Landscape Wildfire & Invasive Species Habitat Assessments to prioritize at-risk habitats, and identify fuels management, preparedness, suppression and restoration priorities necessary to maintain sagebrush habitat to support interconnecting Greater Sage-Grouse populations. These assessments and subsequent assessment updates would also be a coordinated effort with an interdisciplinary team (IDT) to take into account other Greater Sage-Grouse priorities identified in this plan. Appendix J describes a minimal framework example and suggested approach for this assessment.</p> <p>Implementation actions will be tiered to the Local (District) Greater Sage-Grouse Landscape Wildfire & Invasive Species Assessment using the best available science related to the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse.</p> <p>In coordination with USFWS and relevant state agencies, the BLM planning units (Districts) will identify annual treatment needs for wildfire and invasive species management as identified in local unit level Landscape Wildfire and Invasive Species Assessments. Annual treatment needs will be coordinated across state/regional scales and across jurisdictional boundaries for long-term conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse.</p> <p>These landscape assessment implementation efforts will be reviewed annually with appropriate USFWS and state agency personnel.</p>	<p>No similar management direction.</p>

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>MA 28 - Implement a coordinated inter-agency approach to fire restrictions based upon National Fire Danger Rating System (NFDRS) thresholds (fuel conditions, drought conditions, and predicted weather patterns) for Greater Sage-Grouse habitat.</p>	<p>Standard operating procedure.</p>
<p>MA 29 - Within acceptable risk levels, utilize a full range of fire management strategies and tactics, including the management of wildfires to achieve resource objectives across the range of sage-grouse habitat consistent with land use plan direction.</p>	<p>Standard operating procedure.</p>
<p>MA 29a - In order to avoid surface-disturbing activities in PHMAs, priority will be given to development of oil and gas and other mineral resources outside of PHMAs, subject to applicable stipulations. When authorizing development of oil and gas and other mineral resources in PHMAs, subject to applicable stipulations for the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse, priority will be given to development in non-habitat areas first and then in the least suitable habitat for Greater Sage-Grouse.</p>	<p>GRSG-M-FML-ST-084-Standard – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, when authorizing development of fluid mineral resources, work with the operator to minimize impacts to greater sage-grouse and their habitat, such as locating facilities in non-habitat areas first and then in the least suitable habitat.</p>
<p>Lands and Realty Management</p>	
<p>Rights-of-Way (e.g., Power lines, Transmission, Wind Energy Projects)</p>	
<p>MA 30 - Specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>PHMAs would be managed as right-of-way (ROW) avoidance areas for new ROW or Special Use Authorization (SUA) permits (Map 2-13).</p> <p>Within PHMAs where new ROWs/SUAs are necessary, new ROWs/SUAs would be located within designated RMP corridors or adjacent to existing ROWs/SUAs where technically feasible. Subject to valid existing rights including non-federal land inholdings, required new ROWs/SUAs would be located adjacent to existing ROWs/SUAs or where it best minimizes sage-grouse impacts.</p> <p>For values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect:</p>	<p>GRSG-LR-SUA-ST-025-Standard – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, restrict issuance of new special use authorizations for infrastructure, such as high-voltage transmission lines, major pipelines hydropower, distribution lines, and cellular towers (Map 2-13). Exceptions must be limited and based on rationale (e.g., monitoring, modeling, or best available science) that explicitly demonstrates that adverse impacts to greater sage-grouse will be avoided with the exception. Existing authorized uses will continue to be recognized.</p> <p>GRSG-LR-SUA-ST-026-Standard – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, do not authorize temporary lands special use permits (i.e., facilities or activities) that result in loss of habitat or would have long-term (i.e., greater than 5 years) negative impact on greater sage-grouse or their habitats.</p>

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>Portions of PHMAs would be managed as ROW exclusion areas (Map 2-9) in accordance with existing RMP decisions for resource values other than Greater Sage-Grouse.</p>	<p>GRSG-LR-SUA-ST-030-Standard – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, locate upgrades to existing transmission lines within the existing designated corridors or rights-of-way unless an alternate route would benefit greater sage-grouse or their habitats.</p>
<p>MA 31 - Specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>Within GHMAs where new ROWs/SUAs are necessary, new ROWs/SUAs would be co-located within existing ROWs/SUAs where technically feasible.</p> <p>Appropriate sage-grouse seasonal timing constraints would be applied.</p> <p>For values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect:</p> <p>Portions of GHMAs would be managed as ROW avoidance areas (Map 2-9) in accordance with existing RMP decisions for resource values other than Greater Sage-Grouse.</p>	<p>GRSG-LR-SUA-ST-030-Standard – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, locate upgrades to existing transmission lines within the existing designated corridors or rights-of-way unless an alternate route would benefit greater sage-grouse or their habitats.</p>
<p>MA 32 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>New Transmission Lines (greater than 115 kV):</p> <p>New transmission lines greater than 115 kV in PHMA (core only) would be allowed only (1) within the 2-mile wide transmission line route through PHMA (core only) population areas in south-central and southwestern Wyoming (see Map 2-15 from Executive Order (EO) 2011-5); (2) when located within 0.5 miles or less of an existing 115 kV or greater transmission line or; or (3) in designated RMP corridors authorized for above-ground transmission lines. Transmission lines routed using one or more of the three criteria listed above will not be counted against the DDCT 5% disturbance cap.</p> <p>New transmission lines greater than 115 kV proposed outside of these areas would be considered where it can be demonstrated that declines in sage-grouse populations could be avoided through project design</p>	<p>GRSG-LR-SUA-ST-028-Standard – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, new power transmission projects must be located within the 2-mile wide transmission line route in south-central and southwestern Wyoming (see Map 2-15) or as close as technically feasible (i.e., within 0.5 mile) on either side of existing 115 kV or larger transmission lines or corridors creating a route no wider than 1 mile. These projects will not be counted against the 5% disturbance cap (Wyoming Density and Disturbance Calculation Tool Manual).</p> <p>GRSG-LR-SUA-ST-029-Standard - In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, new power distribution lines must not be located within 0.6 miles from the perimeter of occupied greater sage-grouse leks. Effective mitigation to protect greater sage-grouse is required. See Standards and Guidelines in the Timing, Distance, Density, and Disturbance section and see GRSG-INFRA-GL-024-Guideline.</p>

BLM Management Actions

and/or mitigation. These projects will be subject to the density and disturbance restrictions for PHMA.

Construction of new transmission lines will adhere to the restrictions associated with conducting activities within PHMAs.

Review of transmission line proposals would incorporate the Framework for Sage-grouse Impacts Analysis for Interstate Transmission Lines and other appropriate documents consistent with the three routing criteria described above.

New projects within PHMAs that may require future utility lines, including distribution and transmission lines or pipelines, would include the proposed utility lines in their DDCT as part of the proposed disturbance. Lines permitted but not located in the above mentioned routes or a designated corridor will be counted towards the 5% disturbance calculation (line disturbance is equal to the anticipated construction footprint or construction ROW width multiplied by length and includes all access roads, staging areas, and other surface disturbance associated with construction outside of the construction ROW).

New Electric Distribution Lines (less than 115 kV):

New electric distribution lines would be buried where feasible and economically feasible. If not economically feasible, distribution lines may be authorized when effectively designed/mitigated to protect Greater Sage-Grouse and the Authorized Officer determines that overhead installation is the action alternative with the fewest adverse impacts while still meeting the project need. Agricultural and residential lines will be considered to be adequately mitigated for Greater Sage-Grouse if constructed at least 0.6 mile from the lek perimeter with appropriate timing constraints and constructed to the latest APLIC standards. These ROW authorizations will be subject to approval by the State Director.

Priority Transmission Lines:

Forest Service Plan Components

GRSG-LR-SUA-GL-032-Guideline – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, outside of existing designated corridors and rights-of-way, new transmission lines and pipelines should be buried to limit disturbance to the smallest footprint unless explicit rationale is provided that the biological impacts to greater sage-grouse are being avoided. If new transmission lines and pipelines are not buried, locate them adjacent to existing transmission lines and pipelines.

PHMAs are designated as avoidance areas for high voltage transmission line and pipeline ROWs, except for the transmission projects specifically identified below. All authorizations in these areas, other than the excepted projects, must comply with the conservation measures outlined in this proposed plan, including the Required Design Features (RDF) and avoidance criteria presented in Appendix B of this document. The BLM is currently processing an application for Gateway South, Gateway West and TransWest Express and the NEPA review for these projects is well underway. The BLM is analyzing Greater Sage-Grouse mitigation measures through the project's NEPA review process.

Pipelines:

New pipelines through PHMAs would be allowed: (1) within an RMP corridor currently authorized for that use or designated through future RMP amendments; or (2) constructed in or adjacent to existing utilities (buried and above-ground) or roads. Pipelines constructed in RMP corridors or adjacent to existing utilities or roads will require completion of a DDCT analysis for baseline data collection but the project is not required to meet the threshold of 5%. However, within 6 months of the completion of construction, the project proponent will provide the AO with as-built drawings so that total disturbance within core area can be calculated annually.

The following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Casper RMP:

No new corridor designations would be made in Bates Hole. When placement of a major ROW facility within a designated corridor is not possible, and for smaller ROW and other linear facilities, placement would be adjacent to existing facilities or disturbances. Cross-country placement of ROW and other linear facilities would be allowed only when placement in a designated corridor or adjacent to an existing facility is not practical or feasible. The extent of all surface disturbances

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

would be minimized.

No new corridors would be established in the Sand Hills Management Area (MA); ROWs would be allowed when management objectives for the area can still be achieved.

All currently designated corridors would be maintained. All special restrictions that apply to types of use/facilities on the corridors would be removed, except as noted for the Oregon Trail Road ROW Corridor, Segment A. The corridors include 351,020 acres, of which 94,580 acres are federal surface. The widths/size of designated corridors would not change. Special restrictions applying to types of use/facilities on the corridors would be removed on a case-by-case basis. Existing corridors include:

1. Oregon Trail Road Corridor, Segment A
2. Oregon Trail Road Corridor, Segment B
3. Oregon Trail Road Corridor, Segment C
4. Poison Spider/Gas Hills Road Corridor
5. Highway 20-26 Corridor
6. Wyoming Highway 259/U.S. 87 Corridor
7. Wyoming Highway 387 Corridor
8. Lost Cabin-Arminto Road Corridor
9. RMP Change No. 2012-03: included the
10. West wide Energy Corridor
11. Cabin Creek Corridor
12. Existing Oregon Trail Road ROW Corridor, Segment A

Oregon Trail Road ROW Corridor, Segment A allows additional ROW facilities provided they are subsurface, surface, or low profile developments. ROW facilities that introduce visual intrusions on the skyline along the corridor would not be allowed. Special restrictions applying to types of use/facilities on the corridors would be removed on a case-by-case basis, and a new corridor, to be called the Cabin Creek Corridor, would be designated.

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

Future Corridor Adjustments and New Corridor Designations:

Future corridor adjustments and new corridor designations would be made only when facility placement within an existing designated corridor is incompatible, unfeasible, or impractical and when the environmental consequences can be adequately mitigated. Problems of technical compatibility between facilities and spacing of facilities in corridors would be solved on a case-by-case basis. Special restrictions applying to types of use/facilities on the corridors would be removed on a case-by-case basis.

South Bighorns/Red Wall Management Area:

No corridors would be designated; however, ROWs would be allowed on a case-by-case basis when management objectives for the area could still be achieved.

Kemmerer RMP:

Utility corridors would be designated, based on use (i.e., power lines, pipelines, and fiber optic lines).

Preferred utility corridors would be 2 miles wide (width would be determined based on resource values) and designated as follows, but variances would be allowed based on application where conflicts with other resources were minimal or could be mitigated through resource-specific stipulations:

High-voltage power line corridors would be established north of and parallel to I-80, and along Wyoming State Highway 89 from the junction of I-80 and the Wyoming state line.

Fiber optic and low-voltage power line corridors would be located along currently established road systems (e.g., interstate or state highways and paved county roads).

Newcastle RMP:

Utility/transportation systems would be located adjacent to existing

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

utility/transportation systems whenever practical. Areas to be avoided for new facility placement and routes would be identified on a case-by-case basis, rather than attempting to establish utility corridors.

Pinedale RMP:

Utility facilities would be restricted to existing routes and designated corridors where practicable, including environmental and socioeconomic considerations. Corridor routes include U.S. Highways 189 and 191 and State Highways 189, 191, 350, 351, 352, 353, and 354. New corridors could be established as oil and gas fields are developed.

Rawlins RMP:

All BLM-administered public lands, except wilderness study areas (WSA) and some SD/MAs (including areas of critical environmental concern (ACEC)/Special Interest Areas (SIA)), would be open to consideration for placement of utility ROW systems. Each utility ROW would be located adjacent to existing facilities, when possible. Areas with important or sensitive resource values would be avoided.

Existing major transportation and utility ROW routes would be designated corridors. However, major transportation routes within the planning area that are located east of the Carbon County-Albany County line would not be considered for ROW corridor designation because of the scattered public landownership pattern in the area. All corridors would be designated for power lines (above ground and buried), telephone lines, and fiber optic lines.

Specific proposals would require site-specific environmental analysis and compliance with established permitting processes.

Activities generally excluded from ROW corridors include mineral materials disposal, range and wildlife habitat improvements involving surface disturbance and facility construction, campgrounds, and public recreation facilities and other facilities that would attract public use.

ROW facilities would not be placed adjacent to each other if issues

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

with safety or incompatibility or resource conflicts were identified. The designated width, allowable uses, and excluded uses for each corridor may be modified during implementation of the Approved RMP.

Green River RMP:

Areas designated as utility windows would be preferred locations for future grants. Five windows have been identified: 2 east-west, 3 north-south. Other areas would be considered for rights-of-way on a case-by-case basis. Windows 0.5 mile in width have been identified for the placement of utilities. The northern east-west window would be for underground facilities only, and the southern east-west window would be for both above and below ground facilities. A 0.5 mile wide north-south window on the west side of Flaming Gorge, a window south along Highway 430, and a north-south window along the east side of Flaming Gorge have been identified for above and below ground utilities.

Jack Morrow Hills (JMH) Coordinated Activity Plan (CAP):

The planning area, with the exception of defined exclusion and avoidance areas, would be open to considering grants of rights-of-way if area objectives could be met. Exclusion areas are closed to rights-of-way. Avoidance and special management areas not identified as exclusion areas would be open to consideration only after site-specific analysis demonstrates area objectives could be met (see glossary) in Greater Sage-Grouse potential nesting habitat.

MA 34 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:

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 in flight. Power lines (distribution and transmission) will be designed to

GRSG-INFRA-GL-024-Guideline - In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, when constructing new infrastructure and during maintenance, replacement, and upgrades to existing infrastructure, impacts to greater sage-grouse and their habitats should be mitigated.

- Existing guy wires should be removed or appropriately marked with bird flight diverters to make them more visible to greater sage-grouse in flight. Authorization of new infrastructure with guy wires should be restricted.
-

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>minimize wildlife related impacts and constructed to the latest APLIC standards.</p> <p>Outside of PHMAs the following RMP decisions remain in effect:</p> <p>Kemmerer RMP:</p> <p>New utility lines would be buried or BLM-approved anti-perch devices would be installed on all new utility lines within sagebrush and/or semiarid shrub-dominated habitats, unless NEPA analysis shows little or no impact without burial or modification.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power lines (distribution and transmission) should be designed to minimize wildlife related impacts and constructed to the latest APLIC standards. • When possible, perch deterrents should be installed on existing and new overhead facilities. Tanks and other above ground facilities should be equipped with structures or devices that discourage nesting and perching of raptors and corvids. • Permanent structures should be designed or sited to minimize impacts to greater sage-grouse, with emphasis on locating and operating facilities that create movement (e.g., pump jacks) or attract frequent human use and vehicular traffic (e.g., fluid storage tanks) in a manner that will minimize disturbance of greater sage-grouse or interference with habitat use. • Liquid gathering facilities should be placed outside priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas. To reduce truck traffic and perching and nesting of ravens and raptors, tanks should not be placed at well locations.
<p>MA 35 - Within PHMA where existing authorizations, ROWs, or SUAs have had some level of development (e.g., road, fence, and well) and are expired and are no longer in use, the site would be reclaimed by removing these features and restoring the habitat. Power lines (distribution and transmission) will be designed to minimize wildlife related impacts and constructed to the latest APLIC standards.</p>	<p>GRSG-LR-SUA-ST-027-Standard - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, when a lands special use authorization is revoked or terminated and no future use is contemplated, require the authorization holder to remove overhead lines and other infrastructure in compliance with 36 CFR 251.60(i).</p>
Renewable Energy	
<p>MA 36 - Within PHMAs, all RMPs are amended as follows: Wind energy development would be avoided in PHMAs (Map 2-33), and not allowed unless it can be sufficiently demonstrated that the development activity would not result in declines of PHMA populations. Sufficient demonstration of “no declines” should be coordinated with the WGFD and USFWS.</p> <p>For values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect:</p> <p>Areas that are currently unavailable (Map 2-29) due to the need to</p>	<p>GRSG-WS-GL-036-Guideline – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, restrict authorization of wind utility-scale and/or commercial energy development except for on-site power generation associated with existing industrial infrastructure (e.g., mine site).</p>

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>protect sensitive resources would remain unavailable to wind energy development!.</p>	
<p>MA 38 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse , all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>The use of guy wires for meteorological towers (MET) tower supports would be avoided within PHMAs. All existing and any new unavoidable guy wires should be marked with recommended bird deterrent devices.</p> <p>The siting of new temporary MET towers within PHMAs would be avoided within 2 miles of occupied sage-grouse leks, unless they are out of the direct line of sight of the occupied lek.</p> <p>Outside of PHMA the following RMP decisions remain in effect:</p> <p>Kemmerer RMP:</p> <p>New MET towers would be avoided within 1 mile of occupied sagebrush obligate habitats, unless anti-perch devices are installed. MET towers relying on guy wires for support would be prohibited in these habitats. Exceptions could be made if NEPA analysis shows little or no impact to sagebrush obligate species.</p> <p>Rawlins RMP:</p> <p>MET towers would be authorized on a case-by-case basis from 0.25 mile to 1 mile of an occupied Greater Sage-Grouse and sharp-tailed grouse lek.</p>	<p>GRSG-LR-SUA-GL-031-Guideline - Authorization of new temporary MET towers should be restricted in priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas within 2 miles of occupied greater sage-grouse leks, unless they are out of direct line of sight of an occupied lek.</p>
<p>Land Tenure Adjustments (Acquisitions, Land Exchanges, Transfers and Sales)</p>	
<p>MA 40 - Within PHMAs and GHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse , all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>Lands classified as PHMAs for Greater Sage-Grouse would be retained in federal management unless: (1) the agency can demonstrate that disposal of the lands will provide a net conservation gain to the Greater Sage-Grouse or (2) the agency can demonstrate that the</p>	<p>GRSG-LR-LOA-ST-033-Standard – In priority and general management areas and sagebrush focal areas, do not approve landownership adjustments unless the action results in a net conservation gain to greater sage-grouse or it will not directly or indirectly adversely impact greater sage-grouse conservation.</p>

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

disposal of the lands will have no direct or indirect adverse impact on conservation of the Greater Sage-Grouse.

Exceptions would be considered where there is mixed ownership and land exchanges would allow for additional or more contiguous federal ownership patterns within PHMAs.

For PHMAs 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 a permanent conservation easement.

For lands in GHMAs that are identified for disposal, the BLM will only dispose of such lands consistent with the goals and objectives of this plan, including, but not limited to, the LUP goal to conserve, recover, and enhance sage-grouse habitat on a landscape scale.

For values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Casper RMP:

224,830 acres of public lands are identified as potentially suitable for disposal. At the implementation stage, site-specific analysis with public participation will be conducted. Based on the analysis and public comments received, a determination will be made on whether disposal of the parcel is in the public's best interest. If it is not in the public's best interest, the parcel will be retained in public ownership.

Restricted Disposal – dispose of 5,450 acres on a restricted basis.

Allow land-use authorizations under FLPMA Section 302(b) leases and permits to meet public demand.

Evaluate on a case-by-case basis as proposals are presented. Potential lease and permit areas may include, but are not limited to the following:

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas where there are documented or existing trespass facilities that can be resolved by an authorization under this section • Areas along major highways where developments may facilitate public needs • Areas in or adjacent to residential, agricultural, commercial, or industrial developments. <p>The BLM will pursue acquisition of lands and interest in lands in the South Bighorns/Red Wall area.</p>	
<p>MA 41 - Within PHMAs and GHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse , all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>Areas where acquisitions (including subsurface mineral rights) or conservation easements would benefit sage-grouse habitat would be identified.</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and GHMA, and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP:</p> <p>The BLM would pursue acquisition of lands and interest in lands in the Bolton Creek Drainage and Bates Creek areas.</p>	<p>GRSG-LR-LOA-GL-034-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas with minority Federal ownership, consider landownership adjustments to achieve a landownership pattern (e.g., consolidation, reducing fragmentation) that supports improved greater sage-grouse population trends and habitats.</p>
<p>MA 42 - Sage-grouse habitat requirements would be utilized to prioritize parcels for exchange or acquisition within PHMAs.</p>	<p>GRSG-LR-LOA-GL-034-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas with minority Federal ownership, consider landownership adjustments to achieve a landownership pattern (e.g., consolidation, reducing fragmentation) that supports improved greater sage-grouse population trends and habitats.</p>
<p>MA 43 - Within PHMAs, non-mineral withdrawals would be evaluated to determine if the withdrawal action is consistent with sage-grouse conservation.</p>	<p>GRSG-LR-LW-GL-035-Guideline – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, use land withdrawals as a tool, where appropriate, to prevent activities that will be detrimental to greater sage-grouse or their habitats.</p>

Livestock Grazing Management

MA 44 - The BLM policy in WO-IM-2009-007 and BLM Handbook H-4180-1 would be used to evaluate land health standards achievement in PHMAs (core only) 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 achieve the standards and conform with the guidelines, which through this process will identify appropriate actions to address non-achievement and non-conformance.

When determining appropriate actions to address non-achievement of land health standards and non-conformance with the guidelines due to existing grazing management practices or levels of grazing use, management actions including but not limited to the following would be considered singly or in combination:

1. Season or timing of use
2. Numbers of livestock (includes temporary non-use or livestock removal)
3. Distribution of livestock use
4. Intensity of use
5. Kind of livestock (e.g., cattle, sheep, horses, llamas, alpacas and goats)
6. Class of livestock (e.g., yearlings versus cow calf pairs)
7. Range improvements.

Refer to the document, "Grazing Influence, Management, and Objective Development in Wyoming's Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat" (Cagney et al. 2010) for guidance when considering appropriate management actions to achieve conformance.

GRSG-LG-DC-037-Desired Condition – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, livestock grazing is managed to ensure adequate nesting cover and does not conflict with the attainment of other vegetation attributes (Table 1).

GRSG-LG-GL-038-Guideline - Grazing guidelines in table 2 should be applied in each of the seasonal habitats in table 2. If values in table 2 cannot be achieved based upon a site-specific analysis using Ecological Site Descriptions, long-term ecological site capability analysis, or other similar analysis, adjust grazing management to move towards desired habitat conditions in table 1 consistent with the ecological site capability. Do not use drought and degraded habitat condition to adjust values. Grazing guidelines in table 2 would not apply to isolated parcels of National Forest System lands that have less than 200 acres of greater sage-grouse habitat.

See Table 2. Grazing Guidelines for Greater Sage-grouse Seasonal Habitat.

GRSG-LG-GL-039-Guideline – On the Thunder Basin National Grassland, if 90% or more of the allotment falls within nesting or brood rearing habitat, 25% of the allotment would be exempted from the breeding/nesting residual perennial grass height guidelines in table 2.

GRSG-LG-GL-045-Guideline – On the Thunder Basin National Grassland, where general habitat management areas overlap with Management Area 8.4 (Mineral Production), Management Area 3.63 (Black-footed Ferret Reintroduction Habitat), or other designated areas for short-grass species, livestock grazing should be managed to meet the objectives for that Management Area.

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>MA 45 - Within PHMAs the BLM would work cooperatively with permittees, lessees, 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.</p>	<p>Standard operating procedure.</p>
<p>Livestock Grazing Permit Monitoring</p>	
<p>MA 46 - The following RMP decisions remain in effect:</p> <p>Casper RMP:</p> <p>Grazing leases would be adjusted where an evaluation of monitoring, field observations, or other data indicate changes, and either increases or decreases, in forage allocation are needed or when necessary or required by other applicable law or regulation.</p> <p>Kemmerer RMP:</p> <p>Vegetative communities would be managed in accordance with Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.</p> <p>Appropriate livestock grazing management actions would be developed and integrated to address rangeland health standards, improve forage for livestock, and enhance rangeland health.</p> <p>Newcastle RMP:</p> <p>Any adjustments in livestock grazing use would be made as a result of monitoring and consultation with grazing permittees. Monitoring studies would be conducted using the current BLM-approved methodology.</p> <p>Pinedale RMP:</p> <p>Monitoring of the range and the vegetation resource would be conducted at a level sufficient to detect changes in grazing use, trend, and range conditions. Monitoring would be tied to land health standards and indicators that help determine change in status and progress toward meeting objectives. Data would be used to direct and support grazing management decisions consistent with national policy.</p>	<p>GRSG-LG-DC-037-Desired Condition – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, livestock grazing is managed to ensure adequate nesting cover and does not conflict with the attainment of other vegetation attributes (table I).</p>

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

Rawlins RMP:

Livestock grazing would be managed to meet the Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.

Green River RMP/JMH CAP:

The kinds and seasons of livestock grazing use would continue to be licensed until monitoring, negotiation, consultation, or a change in resources conditions indicate that a modification is needed. Monitoring would be continued or initiated following adjustments in grazing use to assure that grazing and other management objectives are being met.

Permit Renewals

MA 48 - Within PHMAs, all BLM use authorizations will contain terms and conditions regarding the actions needed to meet or progress toward meeting the habitat objectives. If monitoring data show the habitat objectives have not been met nor progress being made towards meeting them, there will be an evaluation and a determination made as to the cause. If it is determined that the authorized use is a cause, the use will be adjusted by the response specified in the instrument that authorized the use.

Direction concerning modifying AMPs to include GRSG requirements is expected to be included in the Record of Decision.

The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that includes lands within SFAs and PHMAs will include specific management thresholds based on Greater Sage-Grouse habitat objectives (Tables 2-2 and 2-3), Land Health Standards (43 CFR 4180.2) and ecological site potential, and one or more defined responses that will allow the authorizing officer to make adjustments to livestock grazing that have already been subjected to NEPA analysis.

MA 49 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:

Standard operating procedure.

BLM monitoring would be used to evaluate progress toward achieving land health standards within PHMAs 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.

Allotments within SFAs, followed by those within PHMAs, and focusing on those containing riparian areas, including wet meadows, will be prioritized for field checks to help ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the grazing permits. Field checks could include monitoring for actual use, utilization, and use supervision.

The BLM will prioritize (1) the review of grazing permits/leases, in particular to determine if modification is necessary prior to renewal, and (2) the processing of grazing permits/leases in SFAs followed by PHMAs outside of the SFAs. In setting workload priorities, precedence will be given to existing permits/leases in these areas not meeting Land Health Standards, with focus on those containing riparian areas, including wet meadows. The BLM may use other criteria for prioritization to respond to urgent natural resource concerns (e.g., fire) and legal obligations.

Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Casper RMP:

Conversions in kinds of livestock and changes in season of use would be considered on a case-by-case basis through an environmental analysis. Such changes will be consistent with rangeland health objectives. Grazing leases will be adjusted to accurately reflect the kind of livestock use on public land in all allotments.

Kemmerer RMP:

Current amounts, kinds, and seasons of livestock grazing uses would be authorized until rangeland health standards assessment results and (or) monitoring indicates a grazing use adjustment is necessary, or that a kind and (or) class of livestock or season of use modification can be

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

accommodated.

Newcastle RMP:

Any adjustments in livestock grazing use would be made as a result of monitoring and consultation with grazing permittees. Monitoring studies would be conducted using the current BLM-approved methodology.

Pinedale RMP:

Conversions from one type of livestock to another would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, including an environmental analysis, and would be authorized in conformance with the goals and objectives of the RMP.

Rawlins RMP:

The current amounts, kinds, and seasons of livestock grazing use would be authorized until monitoring, field observations, ecological site inventory, or other data acceptable to BLM indicates a grazing use adjustment is needed, as appropriate. Requests for changes in season-of use or kind-of-livestock would be considered on a case-by-case basis. Any decision regarding changes in grazing use would include cooperation, consultation, and coordination with the grazing permittees and the interested public.

Green River RMP:

The Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (BLM 1997a) would apply to all resource uses on BLM-administered lands. These standards are the minimal acceptable conditions that address the health, productivity, and sustainability of the rangeland. The standards describe healthy rangelands rather than rangeland by-products.

Achievement of a standard is determined through observing, measuring, and monitoring appropriate indicators. An indicator is a component of a system whose characteristics (e.g., presence, absence, quantity, and distribution) can be observed, measured, or monitored

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>based on sound scientific principles. The standards will direct the management of public lands and focus the implementation of this activity plan toward the maintenance or attainment of healthy rangelands.</p>	
<p>MA 50 - Within PHMAs, at the time a permittee or lessee voluntarily relinquishes a permit or lease (see Grazing Relinquishment in the Glossary), the BLM will consider whether the public lands where that permitted use was authorized should remain available for livestock grazing or be used for other resource management objectives, such as reserve common allotments or fire breaks.</p>	<p>GRSG-LG-GL-040-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, when livestock grazing permits and/or grazing preference are voluntarily relinquished, consider closure of grazing allotments, pastures, or portions of pastures, or managing the allotment as a forage reserve where removal of livestock grazing would enhance the ability to achieve desired habitat conditions (Table I).</p>
<p>MA 52 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>When periods of drought occur, where appropriate, the AO would evaluate strategies to address drought through coordination with grazing permittee/lessee and annual billings processes.</p> <p>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 response. Contingency plans should establish strategies for addressing ongoing drought and post-drought recovery.</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP:</p> <p>Other management considerations for use of stock driveway withdrawals (SDW) would include providing emergency use for relief from fire, drought, or other natural causes or to meet management objectives in adjoining allotments that require rest. These other uses would be addressed on a case-by-case basis and may occur any time during the year provided the AO has determined adequate forage is available and it does not interfere with regular trail use. The decision</p>	<p>Standard operating procedure.</p>

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

determining there is adequate forage would be documented and filed in the appropriate SDW file. Consultation and coordination with livestock owners who regularly use the respective SDW would be made prior to authorizing this type of use. This use would be authorized in accordance with federal grazing regulations.(also see Management Action 54)

A drought contingency plan would be developed to maintain adequate habitat components for viable fish, wildlife, and Special Status Species populations.

Range Development Projects**MA 53 - Specific to management for all Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat, all RMPs are amended as follows:**

In GHMAs and PHMAs, existing range improvements (e.g., fences, livestock/wildlife 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.

Outside of PHMA and GHMA, and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Casper RMP:

Identified hazard fences would be modified and new fences would be constructed in accordance with the BLM Fencing Handbook 1741-1. Decision 4010.

Placement of salt, mineral, or forage supplements for livestock would not be allowed within 0.25 mile of water, wetlands, and riparian areas,

GRSG-LG-043-Guideline - Collision risk associated with existing fences within 1.2 miles of leks should be minimized through removal or modification (e.g. marking, laydown fences, or other design features).

GRSG-LG-GL-044-Guideline – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, new permanent livestock facilities, except fences, should not be constructed within 0.6 miles from the perimeter of occupied leks. In general habitat management areas, new permanent livestock facilities should not be constructed within 0.25 miles of occupied leks.

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

unless written analysis shows that watershed, riparian, wetland, wildlife, and vegetative values would not be adversely impacted. Forage supplements would be required to be “certified weed-free.”

Kemmerer RMP:

BLM fencing standards would be applied to newly constructed fences on BLM-administered lands within the planning area.

Existing fences would be eliminated or modified to reduce conflicts on a case-by-case basis.

Livestock salt or mineral supplements would be located a minimum of 0.25 mile away from water sources, riparian areas, and aspen stands. Buffers would be based on resource concerns on a case-by-case basis.

Newcastle RMP:

Fence construction would be required to meet current BLM fence standards.

Fences on BLM-administered public land surface that cause documented wildlife conflicts would be removed, reconstructed, or modified, as appropriate or necessary, to eliminate or reduce the conflict.

Construction of fences that interfere with movements of big game species in crucial big game winter range would not be allowed on BLM-administered public land surface.

Pinedale RMP:

Mineral supplement blocks would be placed in locations that promote proper grazing distribution and prevent inappropriate livestock use on riparian habitat; for example, by locating supplements on ridgetops and/or approximately 0.25 mile from riparian habitat. Placement of supplements near water sources, such as wells and reservoirs, would consider rangeland objectives, such as grazing distribution, wildlife habitat requirements, and reclamation success. Mineral supplement

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

blocks would not be placed within 0.25 mile of an occupied sage-grouse lek. Mineral supplement blocks would not be placed within 0.25 mile of known Special Status Plant Species locations.

Rawlins RMP:

New fence construction would be authorized according to BLM standards unless modified following consultation with affected parties. Existing fences would be modified according to current BLM standards and according to wildlife and livestock management needs.

Green River RMP/JMH CAP:

Where documented wildlife conflicts with fencing on public lands occur, fences would be modified, reconstructed, or, if necessary, removed. Herding control of livestock would be encouraged as an alternative to fencing. Fence construction would be in accordance with BLM design standards and located so as not to overly impede wildlife movement. Consideration would also be given to Special Status Species and wild horse movement.

Green River RMP:

Livestock water developments and range improvements would be considered to maintain or improve resource conditions, enhance livestock distribution, or both. Compatibility with special status plant species would be required. Water developments and/or range improvements proposed in sensitive areas would be considered only if wildlife habitat and resource conditions are maintained or improved and no significant or irreversible adverse effects would occur.

Salt or nutritional supplements would be prohibited within 500 feet of riparian habitat and National Historic and Scenic Trails unless analysis shows that these resources would not be adversely affected. These supplements also would be prohibited on areas inhabited by special status plant species. Placement of supplements at least 500 feet away from wells, troughs, and other human-made water sources would be

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

encouraged to better distribute livestock.

JMH CAP:

Livestock water developments and range improvements would be considered to maintain or improve resource conditions, enhance livestock distribution, or both. Compatibility with special status plant species would be required. Water developments and/or range improvements proposed in sensitive areas would be considered only if wildlife habitat and resource conditions were maintained or improved and no significant or irreversible adverse effects would occur.

Salt or nutritional supplements would be prohibited within 500 feet of riparian habitat and National Historic and Scenic Trails unless analysis shows that these resources would not be adversely affected. These supplements also would be prohibited on areas inhabited by special status plant species. Placement of supplements at least 500 feet away from wells, troughs, and other human-made water sources would be encouraged to better distribute livestock.

Livestock Trailing

MA 54 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse , all RMPs are amended as follows:

Livestock trailing that is authorized would include a trailing plan to utilize non-habitat to the extent possible, include specific routes and timeframes for trailing, utilize existing trails, and avoid stopovers on occupied leks, as appropriate.

The following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Casper RMP:

The revocation of withdrawals for those trails that are no longer active would be reviewed and recommended and these lands would be incorporated into adjacent allotments (46,050 acres). Grazing leases would be offered to the respective grazing lessees. All remaining SDW

GRSG-LG-GL-041-Guideline – Bedding sheep and locating camps within 0.6 mi from the perimeter of a lek during lekking (March 1 to May 15) should be restricted.

GRSG-LG-GL-042-Guideline – Trailing livestock should be routed through non-habitat or in areas that will minimize impacts to greater sage-grouse and their habitats. Specific routes and timeframes should be identified, existing trails should be used, and stopovers on occupied leks should be avoided

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

lands for trail use (55,680 acres) would be retained.

Kemmerer RMP:

Current livestock trails would be retained. Livestock trailing use would occur within 0.5 mile of the mapped centerline.

Pinedale RMP:

Adequate stock trails would be maintained to support livestock trailing needs.

Riparian Area Management

MA 55 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:

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 also would be balanced to promote the production and availability of beneficial grasses and forbs for use during late brood-rearing within PHMAs, while maintaining upland conditions and functions.

Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Casper RMP:

Lotic and lentic wetland/riparian areas would be managed toward Proper Functioning Condition (PFC).

The BLM would manage toward PFC and identified Desired Plant Community (DPC) on 350 miles of lotic and adjacent riparian habitat and 10,000 acres of lentic habitat to meet fish, wildlife, and Special Status Species habitat requirements.

Kemmerer RMP:

GRSG-GRSGH-DC-002-Desired Condition – In greater sage-grouse habitat management areas, including all seasonal habitats, 70% of lands capable of producing sagebrush have 10 to 30% sagebrush canopy cover and less than 10% conifer canopy cover. In addition, within breeding and nesting habitat, sufficient herbaceous vegetation structure and height provides overhead and lateral concealment for nesting and early brood rearing life stages. Within brood rearing habitat, wet meadows and riparian areas sustain a rich diversity of perennial forb species relative to site potential. Within winter habitat, sufficient sagebrush height and density provides food and cover for greater sage-grouse during this seasonal period. Specific desired conditions for greater sage-grouse based on seasonal habitat requirements are in table I..

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

Livestock conversions would be allowed in allotments with riparian concerns only when a plan is approved to address riparian issues. Management actions and range improvements proposed to address riparian issues would have to be implemented prior to authorizing the conversion. Livestock conversions may be approved only after completion of a suitability study for the conversion. The conversion may be authorized if it is determined that riparian habitats will be maintained or improved by the conversion.

Pinedale RMP:

Meet the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health and maintain or enhance wetland and riparian vegetation to achieve Proper Functioning Condition.

Grazing systems will be designed to maintain or improve watershed and range condition; for example, through changing seasons of use, implementing rotational or other grazing management systems, or developing infrastructure for livestock management.

In allotments with riparian habitat, grazing management actions will be designed to maintain or achieve proper functioning condition.

Green River RMP:

Range improvements will be directed at resolving or reducing resource concerns, improvement of wetland/riparian areas, and overall improvement of vegetation/ground cover. New range improvements may be implemented in "I" and "M" category allotments. Maintenance of range improvements will be required in accordance with the BLM Rangeland Improvement Policy.

JMH CAP:

Implementation of grazing management systems will assist in improving or maintaining the desired range condition. Approved AMPs, or other activity plans intended to serve as the functional equivalent to an AMP, for each of the designated grazing allotments will provide the necessary

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

guidance for achieving grazing management objectives.

Appropriate actions for improving degraded rangeland and riparian habitat (i.e., meeting Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands (BLM 1997a)) could include, but will not be limited to, reduction of permitted animal unit months (AUM), modified turnout dates, livestock water developments, range improvements, modified grazing periods, growing season rest, riparian pastures, exclosures, implementation of forage utilization levels, and livestock conversions. These improvements will be considered individually using the method outlined in Appendix 2 of the JMH CAP ROD to ensure conformance with management objectives for the planning area and other resource values.

MA 56 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:

Range improvement projects would be planned and authorized in a way that contributes to rangeland health and maintains and/or improves Greater Sage-Grouse and its habitat.

Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Green River RMP:

Water sources may be developed in crucial wildlife winter ranges only when consistent with wildlife habitat needs. Such sources will be designed to benefit livestock, wild horses, and wildlife. Alternative water supplies or facilities for livestock may be provided to relieve livestock grazing pressure along stream bottoms and improve livestock distribution.

JMH CAP:

Livestock water developments and range improvements will be considered to maintain or improve resource conditions, enhance livestock distribution, or both. Compatibility with special status plant

GRSG-LG-043-Guideline - Collision risk associated with existing fences within 1.2 miles of leks should be minimized through removal or modification (e.g. marking, laydown fences, or other design features).**GRSG-LG-GL-044-Guideline** – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, new permanent livestock facilities, except fences, should not be constructed within 0.6 miles from the perimeter of occupied leks. In general habitat management areas, new permanent livestock facilities should not be constructed within 0.25 miles of occupied leks.

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>species will be required. Water developments and/or range improvements proposed in sensitive areas (Map 4) will be considered only if wildlife habitat and resource conditions are maintained or improved and no significant or irreversible adverse effects will occur.</p>	
<p>MA 57 - Existing water developments associated with springs and seeps would be evaluated and associated pipelines/structures to those developments having a negative effect on PHMAs would be modified.</p>	<p>To be included in the Record of Decision.</p>
<p>Minerals Management</p>	
<p>Exceptions to lease stipulations, Conditions of Approval, and terms and conditions</p>	
<p>MA 58 - Exceptions waivers, and modifications to lease stipulations, COAs, and terms and conditions (T&C), etc. for sage-grouse would continue to be considered on a case-by-case basis consistent with approved LUPs and other BLM policy and regulations as they relate to exceptions within PHMAs and GHMAs.</p>	<p>Footnote 3: ³On a case-by-case basis, and only when it can be demonstrated that the activity will not cause declines in greater sage-grouse populations, allow exceptions, modifications, and waivers. The authorized officer may grant an exception if a review determines that the action, as proposed or conditioned, would not impair the function or utility of the site for the current or subsequent seasonal habitat, life-history, or behavioral needs of greater sage-grouse.</p>
<p>Fluid Minerals Unleased Estate</p>	
<p>MA 60 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse , all RMPs are amended as follows: The BLM 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 Appendix E – Fluid Mineral Stipulations).</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Fluid mineral leasing would be allowed in PHMAs (core only), except in areas that are closed to leasing due to the need to protect other sensitive resources (Map 2-4).</p>	<p>GRSG-M-FMUL-ST-079-Standard – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, new oil and gas leases may be offered consistent and subject to the leasing stipulations in the timing, distance, density, and disturbance direction in section GRSG-TDDD.</p>

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>MA 61 - A minimum lease size of 640 contiguous acres of federal mineral estate would be applied within PHMAs.</p> <p>Preliminary parcels reviewed for possible offering in a lease sale should comply with this minimum lease size. Expressions of interest that are less than this minimum lease size would be evaluated and modified by the BLM to meet the minimum lease size, where possible, prior to review for possible offering in a lease sale.</p>	<p>To be included in the Record of Decision.</p>
<p>MA 62 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse , all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>Geophysical exploration projects that are designed to minimize habitat fragmentation within PHMAs would be allowed, except where prohibited or restricted by existing LUP decisions, and in conformance with timing and distances stipulations (see actions 129 through 134).</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP:</p> <p>The blocks of public land identified as mapped in the Casper Field Office GIS database will be managed to retain intact blocks of native vegetation (192,550 acres, of which 131,880 acres are BLM-administered surface). In these areas, the following restrictions apply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These blocks are (1) unavailable for oil and gas leasing and (2) a geophysical operation on public surface for the life of the plan. Activities for existing oil and gas leases are managed intensively (see Appendix U of the Casper RMP). Existing leases will be allowed to expire and not be renewed. 2. Within these blocks, a withdrawal from the operation of the public land laws, including the mining laws will be pursued. 3. These blocks are closed to mineral material disposal. Existing permits will be allowed to expire without renewal or expansion. 4. These blocks are not open to wind/renewable energy 	<p>GRSG-M-FMUL-ST-080-Standard – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, require geophysical exploration projects to be designed to minimize greater sage-grouse habitat fragmentation.</p>

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

development.

5. These blocks remain open to livestock grazing.
6. All allowed surface-disturbing activities within the designated blocks are subject to a Controlled Surface Use (CSU) restriction, minimizing surface disturbance to meet management objectives.
Decision 4024

The North Platte River Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) will continue to be open to oil and gas leasing and geophysical operations. Decision 7039

The area is unavailable for oil and gas leasing and geophysical exploration is not allowed. Decision 7047

The MA is unavailable for new oil and gas leasing. No geophysical operations will be allowed on public surface.

Activities on existing leases will be managed intensively to meet the objectives of the MA (see Appendix U of the Casper RMP– Intensive Management). To minimize surface-disturbing activities, oil and gas exploration and development will use directional drilling techniques and well twinning whenever practicable. Decision 7059

The Red Wall/Gray Wall complex is located entirely within the South Bighorns/Red Wall MA and is unavailable for new oil and gas leasing. No geophysical operations will be allowed on public surface. Activities on existing leases will be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the MA (see Appendix U of the Casper RMP– Intensive Management). To minimize surface-disturbing activities, oil and gas exploration and development will use directional drilling techniques and well twinning whenever practicable. Decision 7063

Those lands currently open to oil and gas leasing will continue to be open to geophysical operations. Those lands open to oil and gas leasing, but subject to a No Surface Occupancy (NSO) restriction, may be open to geophysical operations should site specific NEPA analysis disclose a finding of no significant impact. No geophysical operations

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

are allowed in areas closed for oil and gas leasing. Decision 2019

Kemmerer RMP:

Allow for geophysical exploration on lands throughout the planning area subject to identified conditions of approval.

Newcastle RMP:

Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities associated with all types of minerals exploration and development and with geophysical exploration will be subject to appropriate mitigation measures determined through, but not limited to, use of the Wyoming BLM Mitigation Guidelines.

Pinedale RMP:

Vehicle-based geophysical activities will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.

The use of surface and/or above-ground (Poulter shot) explosive charges for geophysical exploration will be assessed case by case.

Geophysical projects, including projects proposed in areas with an NSO restriction, will be analyzed and mitigation developed on a case-by-case basis.

Geophysical activities that are considered casual use actions are allowed within 0.25 mile of active sage-grouse leks provided that:

- Operations are conducted on designated roads and trails.
- Operations during the breeding season (March 1 through May 15) are conducted between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m.
- A 150-foot wide strip of undisturbed sagebrush is maintained around the perimeter of the lek for hiding and escape cover.

Rawlins RMP:

All lands open to oil and gas leasing consideration will also be open to geophysical exploration, subject to appropriate resource surveys,

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

surface protection measures, adequate bonding, and adherence to State of Wyoming standards for geophysical operations.

Vehicular use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the glossary), such as geophysical exploration including project survey and layout, will be permitted except where specifically prohibited (e.g., some SD/MAs).

Green River RMP:

Geophysical exploration (vehicles and detonation) activities will be prohibited within 0.5 mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature. Areas of sensitive heritage resources and geologic features, such as Boars Tusk, White Mountain Petroglyphs, special status plant species, WSAs, and historic trails, will remain closed. Receiver lines may be laid using foot traffic within these areas. Exceptions to these restrictions may be granted on a case-by-case basis subject to appropriate site-specific analysis and mitigation requirements.

The remainder of the planning area will be open to geophysical exploration, with application of appropriate mitigation. Rights-of-way limitations in the planning area apply to on- and off-road vehicle traffic used for geophysical activities. Exploration activities will be allowed in sensitive resource areas only if they can be performed with acceptable mitigation of impacts.

JMH CAP:

Geophysical exploration (vehicles and detonation) activities will be prohibited within 0.5 mile of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature. Areas of sensitive heritage resources and geologic features, such as Boars Tusk, White Mountain Petroglyphs, special status plant species, WSAs, and historic trails, will remain closed. Receiver lines may be laid using foot traffic within these areas. Exceptions to these restrictions may be granted on a case-by-case basis subject to appropriate site-specific analysis and mitigation requirements.

The remainder of the planning area will be open to geophysical exploration, with application of appropriate mitigation. Rights-of-way

BLM Management Actions

Forest Service Plan Components

limitations in the planning area apply to on- and off-road vehicle traffic used for geophysical activities. Exploration activities will be allowed in sensitive resource areas only if they can be performed with acceptable mitigation of impacts.

Fluid Minerals Leased Estate**MA 63 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:**

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, as provided in the applicable LUP decision, as revised or amended, their inclusion as APD COAs would be considered when approving exploration and development activities through completion of the environmental record of review (43 CFR 3162.5 and 36 CFR 228.108), including appropriate documentation of compliance with 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 PHMAs or use and includes applicable and technical COAs. 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 proposed operations in PHMAs, the Surface Use Plan of Operations (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 Surface Use Plan of Operations based on site-specific or project-specific considerations shall be noted in the project file, along with a rationale for not including them.

GRSG-M-FML-ST-081-Standard – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas when approving the Surface Use Plan of Operation portion of the Application for Permit to Drill on existing leases that are not yet developed, require that leaseholders avoid and minimize surface disturbances and disruptive activities consistent with the rights granted in the lease.

GRSG-M-FML-ST-083-Standard – Locate compressor stations on portions of a lease that are non-habitat and are not used by greater sage-grouse, and if there would be no direct, indirect, or cumulative effects on greater sage-grouse or their habitat. If this is not possible, work with the operator to use mufflers, sound insulation, or other features to reduce noise consistent with GRSG-TDDD-ST-015-Standard.

GRSG-M-FML-GL-085-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas on existing leases, operators should be encouraged to reduce disturbance to greater sage-grouse habitat. At the time of approval of the Surface Use Plan of Operation portion of the Application for Permit to Drill, terms and conditions should be included to reduce disturbance to greater sage-grouse habitat, where appropriate and feasible and consistent with the rights granted to the lessee.

GRSG-M-FML-GL-086-Guideline – On existing federal leases in priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, when surface occupancy cannot be restricted due to valid existing rights or development requirements, disturbance and surface occupancy should be limited to areas least harmful to greater sage-grouse, based on vegetation, topography, or other habitat features.

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

In this process the BLM would evaluate, among other things:

1. Whether the conservation measure is “reasonable” (43 CFR 3101.1-2) and consistent with valid existing rights
2. Whether the action is in conformance with the approved LUP; and the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.

The BLM 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 conservation of seasonal habitats and PHMAs (connectivity only) that support population management objectives set by the state.

The BLM would continue to work with project proponents 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 (based on vegetation, topography, or other habitat features) and resources whether inside or outside of PHMAs (utilizing DDCT analysis process). Valid existing rights would be recognized and respected.

Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Kemmerer RMP:

Choose and implement appropriate mitigation in a timely manner to minimize decreases in habitat function.

Utilize appropriate voluntary offsite compensatory mitigation to reduce impacts. This would be necessary if (1) all onsite mitigation has been accomplished and adverse effects have not been mitigated; or (2) if onsite mitigation is not feasible.

Pinedale RMP:

Offsite mitigation proposed by oil and gas or other operators could be

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

considered and analyzed in future environmental documents as mitigation for proposed activities within the planning area. Proposed offsite mitigation will be described and analyzed for effectiveness in detail on a project-specific basis. Offsite mitigation would conform to requirements in the Pinedale RMP regarding the order of use of mitigation methods, stipulations applied to offsite mitigation measures, and priority order for mitigating resource impacts onsite or offsite.

Green River RMP:

Development actions will be analyzed on a case-by-case basis to identify mitigation needs to meet RMP objectives, provide for resource protection, and provide for logical development. Limitations on the amount, sequence, timing, or level of development may occur. This may result in transportation planning and in limitations in the number of roads and drill pads, or deferring development in some areas until other areas have been restored to previous uses.

JMH CAP:

COAs attached to an APD will be based on site-specific NEPA or other analysis and will establish specific, necessary mitigation measures not covered by stipulations for resource and environmental protection. Some areas will need more intensive mitigation measures to protect sensitive resources and provide for public health and safety. These intensive mitigation measures or COAs will mostly apply to areas with overlapping sensitive resources (e.g., Areas 2 and 3). Examples of intensive mitigation that can apply to all activities based on site-specific analysis include offsite placement of facilities, remote control monitoring, restricted or prohibited surface use including road construction, multiple wells from a single pad, central tank batteries/facilities, and pipelines and power lines concentrated in specific areas. In addition, refer to Section 3.12.3 for additional mitigation measures that may apply as part of the transportation plan.

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>MA 64 - Within PHMAs, field offices would work with project proponents (including those within BLM) to site their projects in locations that minimize impacts to sensitive resources.</p>	<p>GRSG-M-FML-ST-081-Standard – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas when approving the Surface Use Plan of Operation portion of the Application for Permit to Drill on existing leases that are not yet developed, require that leaseholders avoid and minimize surface disturbances and disruptive activities consistent with the rights granted in the lease.</p>
<p>MA 66 - Master Development Plans would be considered and encouraged for projects involving multiple proposed disturbances within PHMAs.</p>	<p>The Forest Service will work with the BLM to complete Master Development Plans.</p>
<p>MA 67 - Within PHMAs, unitization would be encouraged as a means of minimizing adverse impacts to sage-grouse to reduce fragmentation and surface disturbing and disruptive activities. Require unitization when deemed necessary for proper development and operation of an area or to facilitate more orderly (e.g., phased and/or clustered) development as a means of minimizing adverse impacts to resources, including Greater Sage-Grouse, so long as the unitization plan adequately protects the rights of all parties, including the United States.</p>	<p>GRSG-M-FMO-GL-092-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, to keep habitat disturbance at a minimum, a phased development approach should be applied to fluid mineral operations, wherever possible, consistent with the rights granted under the lease. Disturbed areas should be reclaimed as soon as they are no longer needed for mineral operations.</p>
<p>MA 68 - The BLM should closely examine the applicability of categorical exclusions in PHMAs and GHMAs. If extraordinary circumstances review is applicable, the BLM should determine whether those circumstances exist. For proposed actions in PHMAs, determine whether a categorical exclusion is applicable and if so, closely examine the extraordinary circumstances, if applicable, to determine whether one or more exists that would require preparation of a NEPA analysis. If a categorical exclusion applies, and no extraordinary circumstances exist, determine whether preparing a NEPA analysis would help inform decisionmaking.</p>	<p>The Forest Service NEPA guidance for categorical exclusions is found in the Forest Service handbook at 1909.15 Chapter 30.</p>
<p>MA 69 - Federal Regulations, 43 CFR 3104.1 requires that a bond be furnished before any drilling or surface disturbance activities begin. The lessee, sublessee or the operator must furnish a surety or personal bond in the amount of at least \$10,000 to ensure compliance with all the lease terms, including protection of the environment. With the consent of the surety and principal, the operator may use the bond of another party, such as the lessee. Each time there is a new operator,</p>	<p>GRSG-M-FML-ST-082-Standard – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, when facilities are no longer needed or leases are relinquished, require reclamation plans to include terms and conditions to restore habitat to desired conditions as described in table I.</p>

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

that operator must notify the BLM that he/she is the responsible operator, giving the particulars of the bond under which he/she will operate. The BLM can require an increase in a bond amount any time conditions warrant such an increase.

Per 36 CFR 228.109, as part of the review of a proposed surface use plan of operations, the authorized forest officer shall consider the estimated cost to the Forest Service to reclaim those areas that would be disturbed by operations and to restore any lands or surface waters adversely affected by the lease operations after the abandonment or cessation of operations on the lease. If at any time prior to or during the conduct of operations, the authorized forest officer determines the financial instrument held by the Bureau of Land Management is not adequate to ensure complete and timely reclamation and restoration, the authorized forest officer shall give the operator the option of either increasing the financial instrument held by the Bureau of Land Management or filing a separate instrument with the Forest Service in the amount deemed adequate by the authorized forest officer to ensure reclamation and restoration. The authorized forest officer shall consider the costs of the operator's proposed reclamation program and the need for additional measures to be taken when estimating the cost to the Forest Service to reclaim the disturbed area.

A reclamation bond would be required on all projects that is commensurate with the scope, scale, size of the project within PHMAs. Partial bonding may be appropriate depending on these factors.

MA 70 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:

No similar management direction.

Produced water from coalbed natural gas (CBNG) wells will be treated and disposed of in collaboration and consistent with the requirements of the state, and required design features specified in Management Action 10 (see Appendix B).

Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the

BLM Management Actions

Forest Service Plan Components

modification described above:

Pinedale RMP:

Produced water from CBNG wells will be treated and disposed of in collaboration and consistent with the requirements of the state.

MA 71 - Specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse , within PHMA (core only), all RMPs are amended as follows:

Where the federal government owns the mineral estate, and the surface is in non-federal ownership, apply the same stipulations, COAs, and/or conservation measures and RDFs applied if the mineral estate is developed on BLM-administered lands in that management area, to the maximum extent permissible under existing authorities, and in coordination with the landowner.

Within PHMAs (non-core only) and outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Pinedale RMP:

BLM-permitted actions on split estate lands are subject to the same stipulations as leased federal mineral estate on federal surface lands, provided the stipulations do not adversely affect the surface owner's land use or actions. Exceptions to surface development restrictions could be granted if requested or agreed to by the surface owner.

MA 72 - Within PHMAs where the federal government owns the surface and the mineral estate is in non-federal ownership, apply appropriate surface use COAs, stipulations, and mineral RDFs through ROW grants or other surface management instruments, to the maximum extent permissible under existing authorities, in coordination with the mineral estate owner/lessee.

The Forest Service has no jurisdiction over mineral estate when they are not the surface owner. The BLM is solely responsible for mineral estate under non-federal surface ownership.

GRSG-M-FML-GL-087-Guideline - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, where the Federal government owns the surface and the mineral estate is in non-Federal ownership coordinate with the mineral estate owner/lessee to apply appropriate stipulations, conditions of approval, conservation measures and required design features to the appropriate surface management instruments to the maximum extent permissible under existing authorities.

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

See MA 10. Similar actions are found in Appendix B – Required Design Features.

GRSG-M-FMO-GL-088-Guideline – In priority and important habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, do not authorize employee camps.

GRSG-M-FMO-GL-089-Guideline – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, closed-loop systems should be used for drilling operations with no reserve pits, where feasible.

GRSG-M-FMO-GL-090-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, during drilling operations, soil compaction should be minimized and soil structure should be maintained using the best available techniques to improve vegetation reestablishment.

GRSG-M-FMO-GL-091-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, dams, impoundments and ponds for mineral development should be constructed to reduce potential for West Nile virus. Examples of methods to accomplish this include:

- Increase the depth of ponds to accommodate a greater volume of water than is discharged.
 - Build steep shorelines (greater than 2 feet) to reduce shallow water and aquatic vegetation around the perimeter of impoundments to reduce breeding habitat for mosquitoes.
 - Maintain the water level below that of rooted aquatic and upland vegetation. Avoid flooding terrestrial vegetation in flat terrain or low-lying areas.
 - Construct dams or impoundments that restrict down-slope seepage or overflow by digging ponds in flat areas rather than damming natural draws for effluent water storage or lining constructed ponds in areas where seepage is anticipated.
 - Line the channel where discharge water flows into the pond with crushed rock or use a horizontal pipe to discharge inflow directly into existing open water.
 - Line the overflow spillway with crushed rock and construct the
-

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
	<p>spillway with steep sides.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fence pond sites to restrict access by livestock and other wild ungulates. • Remove or re-inject produced water. • Treat waters with larvicides to reduce mosquito production where water occurs on the surface.
<p>Solid Leasable Minerals</p>	
<p>MA 75 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>At the time an application for a new coal lease or lease modification is submitted to the BLM, the BLM will determine whether the lease application area is "unsuitable" for all or certain coal mining methods pursuant to 43 CFR 3461.5. PHMA is essential habitat for maintaining Greater Sage-Grouse for purposes of the suitability criteria set forth at 43 CFR 3461.5(o)(1).</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP:</p> <p>If coal development potential is shown to exist, all BLM-administered lands outside the Coal Development Potential Area (CDPA) will be considered for coal leasing, unless specifically closed to mineral leasing. The coal-screening process will be completed on all newly identified lands having coal development potential.</p> <p>All BLM-administered lands within the CDPA identified in the 2001 Buffalo RMP maintenance action are acceptable for further consideration for coal leasing. The only exceptions are those lands determined unacceptable within the area. The coal unsuitability criteria are re-evaluated whenever new coal lease applications are received.</p> <p>Kemmerer RMP:</p>	<p>GRSG-M-CM-ST-093-Standard – Apply all restrictions listed in the Timing, Distance, Density and Disturbance section to coal exploration and new coal lease projects.</p> <p>GRSG-M-CM-ST-094-Standard – Priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas are essential habitat for maintaining greater sage-grouse for purposes of the suitability criteria set forth at 43 CFR 3461.5(o)(1).</p> <p>GRSG-M-CM-GL-095-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, when coal leases are subject to readjustment, additional requirements should be included in the readjusted lease to protect and reduce threats to conserve, enhance, and restore greater sage-grouse and their habitat for long-term viability.</p>

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

Process new coal lease applications by using the coal screening process. The coal screening process results will determine which lands may be available for further consideration for coal leasing and development. Appropriate NEPA analysis would be required prior to leasing. Federal land within the proposed Haystack project area is determined acceptable for further consideration for coal leasing and development. No coal LBAs will be considered for Rock Creek/Tunp and Bear River Divide management areas.

Pinedale RMP:

Decisions on lands acceptable for leasing consideration for coal development will be made after an application is received and the coal screening process is conducted.

Rawlins RMP:

Federal coal lease applications will be accepted only on those federal coal lands with development potential identified as suitable for further leasing consideration after application of the coal unsuitability criteria (the above-mentioned approximately 51,250 acres and 2,318.7 million tons of surface minable federal coal).

Green River RMP/JMH CAP:

Federal coal lands within the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential area (about 422,000 acres) are open to further consideration for coal leasing and development (i.e., new competitive leasing, emergency leasing, lease modifications, and exchange proposals, under the Federal Coal Management Program) with appropriate and necessary conditions and requirements for protection of other land and resource values and uses.

MA 76 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:

No similar management direction.

Upon receipt of a coal lease application proposing underground mining methods that include surface operations and impacts within PHMAs, Criterion 15 would be applied and the area would be identified as

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

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 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 Instruction Memorandum (IM) WY WY-2012-019 says that the BLM will assess potential impacts to sage-grouse through the NEPA process, and that the state regulatory agency would apply this mitigation, as well as protective measures consistent with the state policy for solid leasable mining action at the permitting stage.

Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Casper RMP:

If coal development potential is shown to exist, all BLM-administered lands outside the CDPA will be considered for coal leasing, unless specifically closed to mineral leasing. The coal-screening process will be completed on all newly identified lands having coal development potential.

All BLM-administered lands within the CDPA identified in the 2001 Buffalo RMP maintenance action are acceptable for further consideration for coal leasing. The only exceptions are those lands determined unacceptable within the area. The coal unsuitability criteria are re-evaluated whenever new coal lease applications are received.

Kemmerer RMP:

Process new coal lease applications by using the coal screening process. The coal screening process results will determine which lands may be available for further consideration for coal leasing and

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

development. Appropriate NEPA analysis would be required prior to leasing. Federal land within the proposed Haystack project area is determined acceptable for further consideration for coal leasing and development. No coal LBAs will be considered for Rock Creek/Tunp and Bear River Divide management areas.

Pinedale RMP:

Decisions on lands acceptable for leasing consideration for coal development will be made after an application is received and the coal screening process is conducted.

Rawlins RMP:

Federal coal lease applications will be accepted only on those federal coal lands with development potential identified as suitable for further leasing consideration after application of the coal unsuitability criteria (the above-mentioned approximately 51,250 acres and 2,318.7 million tons of surface minable federal coal).

Green River RMP/JMH CAP:

Federal coal lands within the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential area (about 422,000 acres) are open to further consideration for coal leasing and development (i.e., new competitive leasing, emergency leasing, lease modifications, and exchange proposals, under the Federal Coal Management Program) with appropriate and necessary conditions and requirements for protection of other land and resource values and uses.

MA 77 - Coal exploration activities could be allowed in PHMAs if they can be completed in compliance to surface occupancy and disturbance and density stipulations analyzed through the DDCT process.

GRSG-M-CM-ST-093-Standard – Apply all restrictions listed in the Timing, Distance, Density and Disturbance section to coal exploration and new coal lease projects.

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

Solid Leasable Minerals (Other than Coal and Oil Shale)**MA 78 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:**

All non-energy leasable mineral activities would be considered in PHMAs, provided that the activities can be completed in compliance to surface occupancy and disturbance and density stipulations (Map 2-28) analyzed through the DDCT process.

Exploration licenses and prospecting permits would be considered with appropriate mitigating measures.

Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Portions of PHMAs would be unavailable for leasing (Map 2-24) in accordance with existing RMP decisions for resource values other than Greater Sage-Grouse.

Kemmerer RMP:

Sodium: All public lands (outside of the Raymond Mountain WSA and exceptions identified below) within the planning area are available for sodium leasing consideration. Exploration for sodium will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Limited surface occupancy criteria contained in the Sodium Mineral Development Environmental Assessment will be applied on a case-by-case basis. No new sodium leases or exploration licenses may be issued on lands within the Raymond Mountain WSA. No new sodium exploration and leasing will be considered for Rock Creek/Tunp and Bear River Divide management areas.

Phosphate: All public lands (outside of the Raymond Mountain WSA and exceptions identified below) within the planning area are available for phosphate leasing consideration. Exploration for phosphate will be considered on a case-by-case basis. No new phosphate exploration and

GRSG-M-NEL-GL-098-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, at the time of issuance of prospecting permits, exploration licenses and leases, or readjustment of leases for non-energy leasable minerals, the Forest Service should provide recommendations to the Bureau of Land Management for the protection of greater sage-grouse and their habitats.

GRSG-M-NEL-GL-099-Guideline - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, the Forest Service should recommend to the Bureau of Land Management that expansion or readjustment of existing leases avoid, minimize, or mitigate the effects to greater sage-grouse and their habitat.

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

leasing will be considered for Rock Creek/Tunp and Bear River Divide management areas.

Pinedale RMP:

Should interest in other leasable minerals materialize in the future, leasing will be considered on a case-by-case basis, and the RMP will be amended as appropriate and necessary. The same surface disturbance restrictions will be used in analyzing leasing proposals and determining the issuance of any leases (for example, geothermal steam, coal, sodium, oil shale, and phosphate).

Green River RMP/JMH CAP:

The known sodium leasing area is open to exploration and consideration for leasing and developments, but is closed to prospecting permits.

The remainder of the planning area is open to sodium prospecting except for areas that are closed to mineral leasing, surface mining, or mechanical prospecting type activities (areas closed to drilling, off road vehicle use, and explosive charges).

Sodium (trona) leasing will be considered on a case-by-case basis, and is subject to the same conditional requirements as oil and gas and coal, and the general management direction applied in this RMP.

Locatable Mineral Activities

MA 79 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:

252,160 acres within SFAs (see management action 139 for identification of SFAs) would be recommended for withdrawal from the General Mining Act of 1872, subject to valid existing rights.

894,060 acres would be considered for recommendation for withdrawal from mineral entry, based on risk to sage-grouse and its habitat from conflicting locatable mineral location and entry. A total of approximately 20,357,630 acres are open to locatable mineral location

GRSG-M-LM-ST-096-Standard – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, only approve Plans of Operation with mitigation to protect greater sage-grouse and their habitats, consistent with the rights of the mining claimant as granted by the Mining Law of 1872, as amended.

GRSG-M-LM-ST-097-Standard – The disturbance cap described in GRSG-TDDD-ST-023-Standard will not be applied to foreclose development of locatable minerals on unpatented claims located under the General Mining Act of 1872, as amended; the disturbance from

BLM Management Actions

and entry (Map 2-23). Operators may be requested to submit modifications to the accepted notice or approved plan of operations so that the operations minimally impact PHMAs. 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 43 CFR 3809.5 and 36 CFR 228.3.

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's determination of whether the proposed operations will cause unnecessary or undue degradation under 43 CFR 3809.5 and 36 CFR 228.3. The request containing the suggested conservation measures must make clear that the operator's compliance is not mandatory.

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 PHMAs in the corporate GIS database. If there is overlap, the BLM AO may notify the operator of ways that they may minimize impacts to PHMAs 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.

For values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect:

Forest Service Plan Components

locatable mining will be accounted for when determining the percent disturbance and whether the cap has been exceeded.

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>1,785,230 acres are withdrawn from mineral entry for the protection of sensitive resources (see Map 2-19).</p>	
<p>Salable Minerals</p>	
<p>MA 80 - PHMAs would be open to mineral material exploration, sales, and free use permits, except in areas that are unavailable due to the need to protect other resource values (Map 2-14). All salable mineral activities within PHMAs would be considered, provided they can be completed in compliance within surface occupancy, seasonal restrictions, and disturbance and density stipulations (Map 2-18 and Management Actions 126,127,129 through134) analyzed through the DDCT process.</p>	<p>GRSG-M-MM-ST-100-Standard – Apply all restrictions listed in the Timing, Distance, Density and Disturbance section to authorizations for mineral material sales and free use.</p>
<p>MA 81 - Within PHMAs closure and restoration of salable mineral pits no longer in use would be considered to meet sage-grouse habitat conservation objectives. Emphasis would be given to reclamation/restoration of PHMAs as a viable long term goal to improve sage-grouse habitat.</p>	<p>GRSG-M-MM-ST-101-Standard - Permits for mineral material operations in priority, sagebrush focal, or general sage-grouse habitat management areas, must include appropriate requirements for reclamation of the site to restore, enhance, or maintain desired habitat conditions (table 1).</p>
<p>Recreation and Visitor Services</p>	
<p>Outdoor Recreation Management</p>	
<p>MA 82 - Specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse or PHMA, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>BLM Special Recreation Permits (SRP) would be allowed in PHMAs, unless negative impacts to sage-grouse cannot be adequately mitigated.</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP:</p> <p>The entire planning area will remain open to dispersed recreation. The camping limit on public lands is set by BLM policy and is currently limited to 14 days. Emphasis will be placed on providing interpretive and information signs and materials for public land visitors, maintaining</p>	<p>GRSG-R-DC-064-Desired Condition – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, recreation activities are balanced with the ability of the land to support them, while meeting greater sage-grouse seasonal habitat desired conditions (table 1) and creating minimal user conflicts.</p> <p>GRSG-R-ST-065-Standard – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, do not authorize temporary recreation uses (i.e., facilities or activities) that result in loss of habitat or would have long-term (i.e., greater than 5 years) negative impact on greater sage-grouse or their habitats.</p> <p>GRSG-R-GL-066-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas habitat management areas, terms and conditions that protect and restore greater sage-</p>

BLM Management Actions

existing facilities to a high standard consistent with the recreational setting, and limiting development of additional facilities to those areas where public recreational use of surrounding public lands requires. Work with state, local groups, and adjacent landowners will be conducted to identify and develop recreational trails, both motorized and non-motorized, when the opportunities presents themselves. SRPs will be allowed for commercial, noncommercial, and competitive events on a case-by-case basis. Cooperation will be maintained with a variety of user groups, especially in the local area, to provide diverse recreational opportunities for enjoyment of public lands. BLM will pursue acquisition of lands and interest in lands in the Rattlesnake Range and Pine Ridge areas, as well as promote and support recreation-based tourism.

Kemmerer RMP:

Allow dispersed recreation and permit special recreational activities (e.g., outfitting and guiding permits and off-highway vehicle (OHV) events permitted on an annual basis after evaluation).

Green River RMP:

Special recreation permits will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Appropriate mitigation will be included in special recreation permits, commercial recreation uses, and major competitive recreation events to provide resource protection and public safety.

JMH CAP:

Special recreation use permits for managed activities that occur in the JMH CAP planning area will be reviewed and subject to recommendations made by the Rock Springs Field Office. This will allow the Rock Springs Field Office to track the amount, location, and timing of organized activity occurring within the planning area to monitor resource pressure. The permit evaluation process will consider the nature of the event, potential impacts to resources, conflicts with other events, and impacts to the quality of other visitors'

Forest Service Plan Components

grouse habitats within the permit area should be included in new recreation special use authorizations. During renewal, amendment, or reauthorization, terms and conditions in existing permits and operating plans should be modified to protect and/or restore greater sage-grouse habitat.

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>experiences. Mitigation measures necessary to protect the resources will be included in any permit issued. A plan of operation will be required for all commercial recreational operators and outfitters. The plan will describe the type, extent, and location of the recreation use and the mechanisms by which the operator/outfitter will prevent impacts to environmental resources. Any requests in special recreation use permit applications to remove natural resources will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis after an environmental analysis process.</p>	
<p>MA 82a - In PHMAs, do not construct new recreation facilities (e.g., campgrounds, trails, trailheads, staging areas) unless the development would have a net conservation gain to Greater Sage-Grouse habitat (such as concentrating recreation, diverting use away from critical areas, etc.), or unless the development is required for visitor health and safety or resource protection.</p>	<p>GRSG-R-GL-067-Guideline – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, new recreational facilities or expansion of existing recreational facilities (e.g., roads, trails, campgrounds), including special use authorizations for facilities and activities, should not be approved unless the development results in a net conservation gain to greater sage-grouse and/or their habitats or the development is required for visitor safety.</p>
<p>Special Designations and Other Management Areas</p>	
<p>MA 84 - New sage-grouse conservation ACECs would not be designated.</p>	<p>No similar management direction. ACECs are not a land designation on National Forest System lands.</p>
<p>Travel Management</p>	
<p>MA 86 - Specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Within PHMAs, designate the non-sand dune portions of the following OHV Open Areas as OHV Limited Area. The OHV limitation would ultimately be to “Designated Routes” as determined through a subsequent implementation/activity level Travel Management Plan. In the interim, motorized use on existing routes may occur; however, no new routes may be created without specific authorization: Rawlins Field Office: Dune Pond Cooperative Management Area. 2. Rock Springs Field Office: Portion of the Greater Sand Dunes Recreation Area. 	<p>There are no “open” OHV areas on National Forest System Lands included in this LUP amendment.</p>

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

The following RMP decisions remain in effect:

The Casper Field Office Poison Spider OHV Park (290 acres) would remain as an “open” OHV area.

MA 87 - Within PHMAs and GHMAs, all motorized use (of which OHVs are a subset) would be limited to designated routes. Route designations will occur in subsequent implementation/activity level Travel Management Plans. In the interim motorized use on existing routes may occur; however, no new routes may be created without specific authorization. In PHMAs and GHMAs, temporary closures will be considered in accordance with 43 CFR subpart 8364 (Closures and Restrictions); 43 CFR subpart 8351 (Designated National Area); 43 CFR subpart 6302 (Use of Wilderness Areas, Prohibited Acts, and Penalties); 43 CFR subpart 8341 (Conditions of Use).

Standard operating procedure.

Temporary closure or restriction orders under these authorities are enacted at the discretion of the Authorized Officer to resolve management conflicts and protect persons, property, and public lands and resources. Where an Authorized Officer determines that off-highway vehicles are causing or will cause considerable adverse effects upon soil, vegetation, wildlife, wildlife habitat, cultural resources, historical resources, threatened or endangered species, wilderness suitability, other authorized uses, or other resources, the affected areas shall be immediately closed to the type(s) of vehicle causing the adverse effect until the adverse effects are eliminated and measures implemented to prevent recurrence. (43 CFR 8341.2) A closure or restriction order should be considered only after other management strategies and alternatives have been explored. The duration of temporary closure or restriction orders should be limited to 24 months or less; however, certain situations may require longer closures and/or iterative temporary closures. This may include closure of routes or areas.

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>MA 88 - New primary and secondary roads would be avoided within 1.9 miles of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks within PHMAs. All new roads would be prohibited within 0.6 miles of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks within PHMAs.</p>	<p>GRSG-RT-ST-069-Standard - Restrict construction of new category level 4 and 5 roads within 1.9 miles of the perimeter of occupied greater sage-grouse leks within priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas unless construction allows decommissioning of an existing route that negatively affects greater sage-grouse.</p> <p>GRSG-RT-ST-070-Standard – Do not allow any category of road construction within 0.6 miles from the perimeter of occupied leks in priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas or 0.25 miles from the perimeter of occupied leks in general habitat management areas as described in GRSG-TDDD-ST-013 and 014-Standards.</p>
<p>MA 89 - Within PHMAs, no upgrading of existing routes that would change route category or capacity would be allowed unless the upgrading would have minimal impact on sage-grouse in PHMAs, was necessary for motorist safety, or eliminated the need to construct a new road.</p>	<p>GRSG-RT-ST-071-Standard - In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, do not allow upgrades to existing routes that would change route category (level 1 through 5) or capacity unless the upgrading would have minimal impact on greater sage-grouse, is necessary for motorist safety, or eliminates the need to construct a new road.</p>
<p>MA 90 - In PHMAs, existing roads or realignments would be used to access valid existing rights that are not yet developed. If valid existing rights could not 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 PHMA.</p>	<p>GRSG-RT-ST-072-Standard - If necessary to construct new roads and trails in priority or sagebrush focal areas for one of the reasons listed in GRSG-RT-ST-071-Standard or to access valid existing rights, limit construction to the minimum standard, length, and number and avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts. See the Density Disturbance Calculation information referenced in Appendix I.</p>
<p>MA 91 - Specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse or PHMA, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>For roads, primitive roads and trails not designated in travel management plans within PHMAs, natural reclamation of roads and trails would be allowed in appropriate situations where additional resource damage is not foreseeable.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>No similar management direction.</p>

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

for protection.

In PHMAs, locate new roads that will have relatively high levels of activity (accessing multiple wells, housing development) greater than 1.9 miles from the perimeter of occupied Greater Sage-Grouse leks. Locate new other roads used to provide facility site access and maintenance >0.6 miles from the perimeter of occupied Greater Sage-Grouse leks.

Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Kemmerer RMP:

Roads and two-track routes determined to be unauthorized or redundant and unnecessary for resource management purposes will be reclaimed to achieve surrounding native conditions.

Rawlins RMP:

Roads or trails that are eroding beyond a reasonable level will be fixed or closed.

JMH CAP:

Transportation planning will provide for access to achieve multiple-use goals while providing maximum protection for crucial habitats and sensitive resources and will consider:

Closing and rehabilitating unused roads and trails and those causing resource damage. This will be subject to county review of existing rights-of-way needs.

MA 92 - Within PHMAs, when reseeding roads and trails, appropriate seed mixtures would be used and the use of transplanted sagebrush would be considered.

GRSG-RT-GL-076-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, when decommissioning roads and unauthorized routes, restoration activity should be designed to move habitat towards desired conditions (table 1).

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

See MA 10. Similar actions are found in Appendix B – Required Design Features.

GRSG-RT-DC-068-Desired Condition - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, within the travel management system, greater sage-grouse experience minimal disturbance during breeding and nesting (March 15 to June 30), and wintering (December 1 to March 15) periods.

GRSG-RT-ST-073-Standard – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, prohibit public access on temporary energy development roads, unless consistent with all other terms and conditions included in this forest plan amendment.

GRSG-RT-GL-074-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, new roads and road realignments should be designed and administered to reduce collisions with greater sage-grouse.

GRSG-RT-GL-075-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, road construction within riparian areas and mesic meadows should be restricted. If not possible to restrict construction within riparian areas and mesic meadows, roads should be designed and constructed perpendicular to ephemeral drainages and stream crossings, unless topography prevents doing so.

GRSG-RT-GL-077-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, dust abatement terms and conditions should be included in road-use permits when dust has the potential to impact greater sage-grouse.

GRSG-RT-GL-078-Guideline - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, road and road-way maintenance activities should be designed and implemented to reduce the risk of vehicle or human-caused wildfires and the spread of invasive plants. Such activities include but are not limited to the removal or mowing of vegetation a car-width off the edge of roads; use of weed-free earth-moving equipment, gravel, fill, or other materials; and blading or pulling roadsides and ditches that are infested with noxious

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
Vegetation Management	weeds only if required for public safety or protection of the roadway.
<p>MA 93 - Within PHMAs and GHMAs, the BLM would manage for vegetation composition and structure that reflects ESD or other methods that reference site potential or comparable standard to achieve sage-grouse and other resource objectives.</p>	<p>GRSG-GRSGH-DC-001-Desired Condition – The landscape for greater sage-grouse encompasses large contiguous areas of native vegetation, approximately 6 to 62 square miles in area, to provide for multiple aspects of species life requirements. Within these landscapes, a variety of sagebrush-community compositions exist without invasive species, which have variations in subspecies composition, co-dominant vegetation, shrub cover, herbaceous cover, and stand structure, to meet seasonal requirements for food, cover, and nesting for greater sage-grouse.</p> <p>GRSG-GRSGH-GL-012-Guideline - When breeding and nesting habitat overlaps with other seasonal habitats, habitat should be managed for breeding and nesting desired conditions (table 1).</p> <p>GRSG-LG-GL-038-Guideline - Grazing guidelines in table 2 should be applied in each of the seasonal habitats in table 2. If values in table 2 cannot be achieved based upon a site-specific analysis using Ecological Site Descriptions, long-term ecological site capability analysis, or other similar analysis, adjust grazing management to move towards desired habitat conditions in table 1 consistent with the ecological site capability. Do not use drought and degraded habitat condition to adjust values. Grazing guidelines in table 2 would not apply to isolated parcels of National Forest System lands that have less than 200 acres of greater sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p>See Table 2. Grazing Guidelines for Greater Sage-grouse Seasonal Habitat.</p> <p>GRSG-LG-GL-039-Guideline – On the Thunder Basin National Grassland, if 90% or more of the allotment falls within nesting or brood rearing habitat, 25% of the allotment would be exempted from the breeding/nesting residual perennial grass height guidelines in table 2.</p>

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
	<p>GRSG-LG-GL-045-Guideline – On the Thunder Basin National Grassland, where general habitat management areas overlap with Management Area 8.4 (Mineral Production), Management Area 3.63 (Black-footed Ferret Reintroduction Habitat), or other designated areas for short-grass species, livestock grazing should be managed to meet the objectives for that Management Area.</p>
<p>MA 94 - Within PHMAs in northeast Wyoming (as mapped in WY EO 2011-5), vegetation treatments in nesting and wintering habitat that would reduce sagebrush canopy to less than 15% would not be conducted.</p>	<p>GRSG-GRSGH-GL-007-Guideline – Within priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas in northeast Wyoming, vegetation treatments in nesting and wintering habitat that would reduce sagebrush canopy to less than 15% should be restricted.</p>
<p>MA 95 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>For vegetation treatments in sagebrush within PHMAs, refer to Appendix A, WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-Grouse (WGFD 2011, as updated) and BLM Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2013-128 (Sage-grouse Conservation Related to Wildland Fire and Fuels Management).</p> <p>These recommended protocols would be used in determining whether proposed treatment constitutes a “disturbance” that would contribute toward the 5% threshold within PHMA maintenance. Additionally, these protocols would be used to determine whether the proposed treatment configuration would be expected to have neutral or beneficial impacts for PHMA (core only) 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 would work collaboratively with partners at the state and local level to maintain and enhance sage-grouse habitats.</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the</p>	<p>GRSG-GRSGH-GL-006-Guideline – Sagebrush removal in priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas and in wintering habitat should be avoided unless necessary to support attainment of desired habitat conditions (table I).</p>

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

modification described above:

Green River RMP:

Prescribed burns generally will be conducted in areas having greater than 35% sagebrush composition, 20% desirable grass composition, and greater than 10 inches of precipitation. Other vegetation manipulation methods will be considered on a case-by-case basis depending on objectives and cost benefits.

Casper RMP:

Decision 4053: The areas (Bates Hole and Fish Creek/Willow Creek) will have priority for vegetative treatments to improve sage-grouse habitats and for vegetation monitoring to ensure residual herbaceous vegetation is maintained for nesting cover on public lands.

MA 96 - For vegetation treatments in sagebrush within PHMAs, refer to Appendix A, 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.

Additionally, these protocols would be used to determine whether the proposed treatment configuration would be expected to have neutral or beneficial impacts for PHMA (core only) 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.

The BLM would work collaboratively with partners at the state and local level to maintain and enhance sage-grouse habitats.

Seasonal restriction would be applied, as needed, for implementing fuels management treatments according to the type of seasonal habitat

GRSG-GRSGH-GL-006-Guideline – Sagebrush removal in priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas and in wintering habitat should be avoided unless necessary to support attainment of desired habitat conditions (table I).

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
present.	
MA 97 - Within PHMA 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.	To be included in Forest Service Implementation Guidance.
MA 98 - For vegetation treatments in sagebrush within PHMAs, refer to Appendix A, WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-Grouse (WGFD 2011, as updated).	To be included in Forest Service Implementation Guidance.
Vegetation Reclamation	
MA 99 - Reclamation of surface disturbances in PHMAs would be consistent with the Wyoming Reclamation Policy (BLM 2009a), vegetation objectives (Table 2-2 and 2-3) and Appendix C. A monitoring plan would be developed for each restoration or reclamation project and reporting progress and changes in resource condition.	GRSG-GRSGH-ST-003-Standard – Design habitat restoration projects to move towards the desired conditions in table I and incorporate the concepts outlined in Appendix C - Reclamation Plan and Appendix D - Monitoring Framework.
MA 100 - 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. Reestablishment of sagebrush cover and desirable understory plants would be the highest priority for restoration efforts. Landscape patterns that most benefit sage-grouse would be restored and created, considering potential changes in climate.	GRSG-GRSGH-GL-011-Guideline - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, native plant species should be used, when possible, to restore, enhance, or maintain desired conditions (table I).
MA 101 - Within PHMAs, 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. Restoration would be prioritized in seasonal habitats that are thought to be limiting sage-grouse distribution and/or abundance	To be included in Forest Service Implementation Guidance.

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>MA 102 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>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 and vegetation (see Tables 2-2 and 2-3) objectives.</p> <p>The use of native seeds for fuels management treatment would be prioritized based on availability, adaptation (site potential), and probability of success. Where probability of success or native seed availability is low, non-native seeds may be used to meet Greater Sage-Grouse habitat objectives to trend toward restoring the fire regime. When reseeding, use fire resistant native and non-native species, as appropriate, to provide for fuel breaks.</p> <p>Native seed allocation would be prioritized for use in sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Kemmerer RMP:</p> <p>Require the use of certified weed-free seed and mulch for rehabilitation projects.</p> <p>Pinedale RMP:</p> <p>Disturbed areas will be reclaimed to native site plant composition. If reclamation of original plant composition is impossible or not desirable, reclamation will achieve a native plant community that meets the Wyoming Standards for Rangeland Health.</p>	<p>GRSG-FM-GL-050-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, when reseeding in fuel breaks, fire resistant native plant species should be used if available, or consider using fire resistance non-native species, if analysis demonstrates that non-native plants will not damage greater sage-grouse habitat in the long-term.</p>
<p>MA 103 - Post emergency stabilization and rehabilitation (ES&R) and burn area emergency rehabilitation BAER management would be designed to ensure long-term persistence of seeded or pre-burn native</p>	<p>Standard operating procedure.</p>

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>plants. This may require temporary or long-term changes in livestock grazing, wild horse, 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>	
<p>MA 104 - The role of existing seedings that are currently composed of primarily introduced perennial grasses in and adjacent to PHMAs 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 or if they provide value in conserving or enhancing the rest of the PHMAs (core only), 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 (Davies et al. 2011).</p>	<p>To be included in Forest Service Implementation Guidance.</p>
<p>MA 105 - 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 PHMAs. Areas invaded by annual grasses would be second priority for restoration when the sites are not adjacent to PHMAs, but are within 2 miles of PHMAs. The third priority for areas invaded by annual grasses habitat restoration projects would be sites beyond 2 miles of PHMAs. The intent would be to focus restoration outward from existing, intact habitat.</p>	<p>To be included in FS Implementation Guidance.</p>
<p>MA 106 - In fire prone areas where sagebrush seed is required for sage-grouse habitat restoration, the BLM would consider establishing seed harvest areas that are managed for seed production and are a priority for protection from outside disturbances.</p>	<p>No similar management direction.</p>
<p>MA 107 - Vegetation treatment proposals must include evaluation of soils, precipitation, invasive/exotic plants, as well as the current condition of PHMAs. Avoid aerial pesticide/herbicide spraying in favor of ground applications to minimize drift into non-target areas in Greater Sage-Grouse habitat unless benefits of treatments are likely to outweigh impacts.</p>	<p>No similar management direction.</p>

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

Grasshopper/Mormon Cricket Control and Management**MA 108 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:**

No similar management direction.

The BLM could implement treatments within PHMAs 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 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 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.

Avoid aerial pesticide/herbicide spraying in favor of ground applications to minimize drift into non-target areas in Greater Sage-Grouse habitat unless benefits of treatments are likely to outweigh impacts.

Outside of PHMA/or and for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Casper RMP:

Work with Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) to control outbreaks of grasshoppers and Mormon crickets on public lands in the planning area in accordance with the MOU between U.S. Department of the Interior and APHIS.

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
Wild Horse Management	
<p>MA 109 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>Within PHMAs, the BLM 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).</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Green River RMP/JMH CAP:</p> <p>Specific habitat objectives for herd management areas would be developed. Consideration will be given to desired plant communities, wildlife, watershed, livestock grazing, and other resource needs.</p>	<p>No similar management direction – no wild horse herd management areas on National Forest System Lands in the planning area.</p>
<p>MA 110 - PHMA (core only) management objectives would be considered when evaluating appropriate management levels (AML).</p>	<p>No similar management direction – no wild horse herd management areas on National Forest System Lands in the planning area.</p>
<p>MA 111 - PHMA (core only) management objectives would be considered when conducting land health assessments in BLM HMAs.</p>	<p>No similar management direction – no wild horse herd management areas on National Forest System Lands in the planning area.</p>
<p>MA 112 - When conducting NEPA analysis for wild horse management activities, water developments or other rangeland improvements for wild horses in PHMAs, 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 PHMAs.</p>	<p>No similar management direction – no wild horse herd management areas on National Forest System Lands in the planning area.</p>
<p>MA 113 - Coordinate with other resources (Range, Wildlife, and Riparian) to conduct land health assessments within all BLM HMAs.</p>	<p>No similar management direction – no wild horse herd management areas on National Forest System Lands in the planning area.</p>

Wildland Fire and Fuels Management

MA 114 - In PHMAs, fuels 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.

These recommended protocols would be used in determining whether proposed treatment constitutes a “disturbance” that will contribute toward the 5% threshold for habitat maintenance.

Fuel treatments would be designed through an interdisciplinary process to expand, enhance, maintain, and protect Greater Sage-Grouse habitat. Green strips (using native fire resistant/resilient species) and/or fuel breaks would be used, where appropriate, to protect seeding efforts from subsequent fire events.

In coordination with the USFWS and relevant state agencies, BLM planning units (Districts) with large blocks of Greater Sage-Grouse habitat would develop, using the assessment process described in Appendix J, a fuels management strategy which considers an up-to-date fuels profile, land use plan direction, current and potential habitat fragmentation, sagebrush and sage-grouse ecological factors, and active vegetation management steps to provide critical breaks in fuel continuity, where appropriate. When developing this strategy, planning units would consider the risk of increased habitat fragmentation from a proposed action versus the risk of large scale fragmentation posed by wildfires if the action is not taken.

Utilizing an interdisciplinary approach, a full range of fuel reduction techniques would be available. Fuel reduction techniques such as grazing, prescribed fire, chemical, biological, and mechanical treatments would be acceptable.

Upon project completion, fuels projects would be monitored and managed to ensure long-term success, including persistence of seeded

GRSG-FM-ST-047-Standard – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, when prescribed fire is used for fuels management or vegetation treatments, design the burn to move towards desired habitat conditions (table 1). Restrict prescribed fire in areas of Wyoming big sagebrush, other xeric sagebrush species, where cheatgrass or other fire-invasive species occur, and/or within areas of less than 12-inch precipitation zones unless necessary to facilitate site preparation for restoration of greater sage-grouse habitat consistent with desired conditions in table 1.

GRSG-GRSGH-GL-010-Guideline - To facilitate safe and effective fire management actions, in priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, fuel treatments in high-risk areas (i.e., areas likely to experience wildfire at an intensity level that might result in movement away from the greater sage-grouse desired conditions in table 1) should be designed to reduce the spread and/or intensity of wildfire or the susceptibility of greater sage-grouse values to move away from desired conditions (table 1).

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>species and/or other treatment components. Invasive vegetation post-treatment would be controlled.</p> <p>Wildfire prevention plans would be developed that explain the resource value of sage-grouse habitat and include fire prevention messages and actions to reduce human-caused ignitions.</p>	
<p>MA 115 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>Burned areas that are within PHMAs would be restored.</p> <p>Wildfire burns will be treated as disturbed if sagebrush is reduced below 5% unless there is an implementation plan outlining restoration efforts and 3 years of data showing a trend back to suitable habitat. The BLM could bring in burned area rehabilitation (BAR) and BAER teams who would work collaboratively with partners at the federal, state, and local level to rehabilitate and restore sage-grouse habitats in a manner consistent with the core habitat population area strategy for conservation. DDCT reviews would be conducted in coordination with the WGFD Habitat Protection Program located in Cheyenne, Wyoming at the WGFD headquarters. Areas within PHMAs would be high priority for restoration of sage-grouse habitat beyond immediate response.</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Kemmerer RMP:</p> <p>Implement BLM Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation standards located in the Department of the Interior (DOI) Interagency Burned Area Emergency Response Guidebook and BLM Burned Area Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Handbook on wildland fires to protect and sustain healthy ecosystems and protect life and property.</p>	<p>Similar management direction to be included in Forest Service Implementation Guidance.</p>

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

Newcastle RMP:

All wildfires will be evaluated to determine the need for rehabilitation or restoration measures. Restoration of burned areas will be by natural succession unless a special need is identified to prevent further resource damage.

Rawlins RMP:

Rehabilitation and restoration efforts specific to a fire event will be undertaken to protect and sustain ecosystems, public health and safety, and to help communities protect infrastructure.

MA 116 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:

For fuels management, the BLM would consider multiple tools for fuels reduction and would analyze in NEPA compliance documentation before electing to implement prescribed fire in PHMAs.

If prescribed fire is used in Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, the NEPA analysis for the Burn Plan will address:

- Why alternative techniques were not selected as a viable options
- How Greater Sage-Grouse goals and objectives would be met by its use
- How the COT Report objectives would be addressed and met
- A risk assessment to address how potential threats to Greater Sage-Grouse habitat would be minimized.

Prescribed fire as a vegetation or fuels treatment shall only be considered after the NEPA analysis for the Burn Plan has addressed the four bullets outlined above. Prescribed fire could be used to meet specific fuels objectives that would protect Greater Sage-Grouse habitat in PHMAs (e.g., creation of fuel breaks that would disrupt the fuel continuity across the landscape in stands where annual invasive grasses are a minor component in the understory, burning slash piles from conifer reduction treatments, used as a component with other

GRSG-FM-ST-048-Standard – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, if it is necessary to use prescribed fire to facilitate site preparation for restoration of greater sage-grouse habitat consistent with desired conditions in table I, the associated NEPA analysis must identify how the project would move towards greater sage-grouse desired conditions, why alternative techniques were not selected, and how potential threats to greater sage-grouse habitat would be minimized.

GRSG-FM-ST-049-Standard – On the Thunder Basin National Grassland, where general habitat management areas overlap with Management Area 3.63 (Black-footed Ferret Reintroduction Habitat), or other designated areas for short-grass species, allow prescribed fire to meet objectives for that Management Area.

treatment methods to combat annual grasses and restore native plant communities).

Prescribed fire in known winter range shall only be considered after the NEPA analysis for the Burn Plan has addressed the four bullets outlined above. Any prescribed fire in winter habitat would need to be designed to strategically reduce wildfire risk around and/or in the winter range and designed to protect winter range habitat quality. Refer to Appendix A, WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-grouse (WGFD 2011, as updated) and BLM Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2013-128. If prescribed fire activities are not in compliance with these protocols, the treatment would be considered a PHMA disturbance.

Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Casper RMP:

Use prescribed burning to achieve measurable 5th-order watershed objectives from (1) other resources, including, but not limited to, forestry, wildlife, range, vegetation, and watershed; (2) the reduction of hazardous fuels; and (3) the introduction of fire into fire-adapted ecosystems.

Green River RMP/JMH CAP:

Prescribed fire will generally be the preferred method of vegetation manipulation to convert decadent stands of brushland to grasslands and to stimulate sprouting of old, decadent aspen stands and/or shrub species. Prescribed burns are preferred in areas having greater than 35% sagebrush composition, 20% desirable grass composition, and greater than 10 inches of precipitation.

Rawlins RMP:

Fuel treatments, including prescribed fire, mechanical, chemical, and

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>biological treatments will be used for fuels reduction and to meet other multiple-use resource objectives, including returning fire to its natural role in the ecosystem. Wildland urban interfaces (WUI) and communities at risk will receive priority for fuels reduction.</p>	
<p>MA 117 - Within PHMAs, 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>	<p>GRSG-FM-ST-048-Standard – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, if it is necessary to use prescribed fire to facilitate site preparation for restoration of greater sage-grouse habitat consistent with desired conditions in table 1, the associated NEPA analysis must identify how the project would move towards greater sage-grouse desired conditions, why alternative techniques were not selected, and how potential threats to greater sage-grouse habitat would be minimized.</p>
<p>MA 118 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>Remove conifers encroaching into sagebrush habitats. Prioritize treatments closest to occupied sage-grouse habitats and near occupied leks, and where juniper encroachment is phase 1 or phase 2. Use of site-specific analysis and principles like those included in the FIAT report (Chambers et. al., 2014) and other ongoing modeling efforts to address conifer encroachment will help refine the location for specific priority areas to be treated.</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP:</p> <p>Treat woodland encroachment in grassland, sagebrush, aspen, and other vegetative communities where it is determined to be detrimental to other resource values or uses.</p> <p>Manage 630,180 acres of sagebrush communities toward DPC.</p>	<p>GRSG-GRSGH-GL-008- Guideline – When removing conifers that are encroaching into greater sage-grouse habitat, avoid persistent woodlands (i.e., old growth relative to the site or more than 100 years old).</p>

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

MA 119 - The following RMP decisions remain in effect for both PHMAs and GHMAs:

No similar management direction.

Pinedale RMP:

In the WUI or industrial interface, fuels reduction methods best suited to the area will be used to reduce the risk of catastrophic fire to these areas.

Casper RMP:

Use prescribed burning to achieve measurable 5th-order watershed objectives from (1) other resources, including, but not limited to, forestry, wildlife, range, vegetation, and watershed; (2) the reduction of hazardous fuels; and (3) the introduction of fire into fire-adapted ecosystems.

Utilize an integrated management technique approach (defined as prescribed fire, mechanical, chemical, or biological, followed by desired reseeding) to reduce fuels to protect high priority areas or resource values defined as, but not limited to the following:

- Urban and industrial interface areas
- Developed recreation areas
- Commercial timber areas
- Wildlife habitats
- Range-improvement facilities
- Communication sites
- Municipal watersheds. Decision 3008 Fuels Management.

Rawlins RMP:

A high priority for fire management activities will be given to areas identified as communities at risk, industrial interface areas, and areas containing resource values considered high priority within the RMP planning area.

JMH CAP:

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

Appropriate management response to protect the basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea plant communities will be applied.

Wildland and prescribed fires will be managed in all vegetation types to maintain or improve biological diversity and the overall health of the public lands. In particular, plant species and age class diversity will be a priority; thus, appropriate management response (AMR) for all wildland fires will be identified and implemented depending on the resources and management objectives for the area.

Suppression techniques and hazardous fuels reduction activities will be identified to reduce wildland fire severity and occurrence on portions of the landscape where fire could cause undesirable changes in plant community composition and structure. A site-specific analysis will be prepared for sensitive resource areas, such as special status plant species sites, heritage sites, historic trails, and ACECs, to determine the type of fire suppression activity that will be acceptable. Fire equipment and fire suppression techniques, such as vegetation clearing, will be limited to existing roads and trails in special status plant species habitat. As appropriate, the Fire Management Plan will be updated to reflect the appropriate suppression activity in sensitive resource areas.

MA 124 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:

No similar management direction.

Fire fighter and public safety would be the highest priority. Greater Sage-Grouse habitat (PHMA) would be prioritized commensurate with property values and other important habitat to be protected, with the goal to restore, enhance, and maintain areas suitable for Greater Sage-Grouse. Greater Sage-Grouse habitat. (GHMA) would be prioritized commensurate with local fire plans, property values and other important habitat to be protected, with the goal to restore, enhance, and maintain areas suitable for Greater Sage-Grouse.

Within PHMAs (and Priority Areas for Conservation (PAC), if so determined by individual LUP efforts) would be the highest priority for conservation and protection during fire operations and fuels

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

management decisionmaking. The PHMAs (and PACs, if so determined by individual LUP efforts) would be viewed as more valuable than GHMAs when priorities are established. When suppression resources are widely available, maximum efforts would be placed on limiting fire growth in GHMA polygons as well. These priority areas will be further refined following completion of the Greater Sage-Grouse Landscape Wildfire and Invasive Species Habitat Assessments described in Appendix J.

Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Casper RMP:

Appropriate management response will be used on all wildfires in the planning area.

Full protection strategies and tactics will be used in the following areas:

1. WUI
2. Wildland industrial interface
3. Developed recreation sites
4. Developed electronics sites of all types.

In all other areas AMR strategies and tactics will be determined by (but not limited to) the following:

1. Firefighter and public safety
2. Resource values at risk
3. Proximity to private land
4. Firefighting resource availability.

Tactical constraints follow:

1. The use of retardant within 300 feet of surface water (standing or running) is prohibited.
 2. No trees are to be cut during suppression activities within 200
-

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

yards of an identified bald eagle roost.

No heavy equipment will be used within the following areas, except when human safety is at risk:

1. Areas of cultural resource sensitivity
2. Riparian/wetland habitats
3. Big game crucial winter range habitats
4. Greater Sage-Grouse leks
5. Areas of highly erosive soils.

In areas not identified as full protection, heavy equipment usage will be limited to existing roads and trails or immediately adjacent to them.

Kemmerer RMP:

In areas of high-density urban and (or) industrial interface with intermingled BLM-administered lands, suppression objectives will follow the AMR in an approved fire management plan for the planning area to provide first for human health and safety, while minimizing loss of property and threats to other surface owners. Generally, wildland fires are suppressed in these areas. In areas of low-density urban and (or) industrial interface where BLM-administered lands occur in large contiguous blocks, fire suppression objectives will follow the AMR in an approved fire management plan for the planning area to provide first for human health and safety, while allowing for achievement of resource objectives.

Newcastle RMP:

Full suppression will be used on fires endangering human life or that spread to within 0.25 mile of state or private lands, structures and facilities, oil and gas fields, important riparian habitat, or other sensitive resources.

All wildfires will be evaluated to determine the need for rehabilitation or restoration measures. Restoration of burned areas will be by natural succession unless a special need is identified to prevent further

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

resource damage.

Pinedale RMP:

Wildland fire mitigation and fuels activities will be managed to provide for firefighter and public safety as a first priority. Public lands within intermixed landownership areas will be managed in association with the adjoining and nearby private and state lands.

Areas of mixed landownership, communities at risk as identified in the Federal Register, Volume 66, Number 160, 2001 (Antelope Run, Beaver Creek area, Boulder, Cottonwood Creek, Daniel, Forty Rod, Hoback Ranches, New Fork, Pinedale, Pocket Creek, and Upper Green); urban and industrial interface areas; and areas containing high-priority resource values have high priority for response to wildland fires and/or for fuels reduction and mitigation. Wildland fire suppression activities will be based on the AMR.

Rawlins RMP:

A high priority for fire management activities will be given to areas identified as communities at risk, industrial interface areas, and areas containing resource values considered high priority within the RMP planning area.

Green River RMP:

Wildfire suppression will emphasize AMR. Immediate control actions will be used only in cases of arson, direct threat to public safety, or a strong potential threaten structural property.

Fire suppression actions will be based on achieving the most efficient control and allowing historical acres burned to increase. Activity plans will be developed for designated fire management areas defining specific parameters for all fire occurrences.

JMH CAP:

Appropriate management response to protect the basin big

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

sagebrush/lemon scurfpea plant communities will be applied.

Wildland and prescribed fires will be managed in all vegetation types to maintain or improve biological diversity and the overall health of the public lands. In particular, plant species and age class diversity will be a priority; thus, AMR for all wildland fires will be identified and implemented depending on the resources and management objectives for the area.

Suppression techniques and hazardous fuels reduction activities will be identified to reduce wildland fire severity and occurrence on portions of the landscape where fire could cause undesirable changes in plant community composition and structure. A site-specific analysis will be prepared for sensitive resource areas, such as special status plant species sites, heritage sites, historic trails, and ACECs, to determine the type of fire suppression activity that will be acceptable. Fire equipment and fire suppression techniques, such as vegetation clearing, will be limited to existing roads and trails in special status plant species habitat. As appropriate, the Fire Management Plan will be updated to reflect the appropriate suppression activity in sensitive resource areas.

See MA 10. Similar actions are found in Appendix B – Required Design Features.

GRSG-FM-GL-051-Guideline – Locating temporary wildfire suppression facilities (e.g., incident command posts, spike camps, helibases, mobile retardant plants) in priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas should be avoided.

GRSG-FM-GL-052-Guideline - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, cross-country vehicle travel during fire operations should be restricted, whenever safe and practical to do so, as determined by fireline leadership and incident commanders.

GRSG-FM-GL-053-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, use fire management tactics and strategies that seek to minimize loss of existing sagebrush habitat. The safest and most practical means to do so will be

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

determined by fireline leadership and incident commanders.

GRSG-FM-GL-054-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, prescribed fire prescriptions should minimize undesirable effects on vegetation and/or soils (e.g., minimize mortality of desirable perennial plant species and reduce risk of hydrophobicity).

GRSG-FM-GL-055-Guideline - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, roads and natural fuel breaks should be incorporated into fuel break design to improve effectiveness and minimize loss of existing sagebrush habitat.

GRSG-FM-GL-056-Guideline - In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, all fire-associated vehicles and equipment should be inspected and cleaned using standardized protocols and procedures and approved vehicle/equipment decontamination systems before entering and exiting the area to minimize the introduction of invasive annual grasses and other invasive plant species and noxious weeds.

GRSG-FM-GL-057-Guideline - Unit-specific greater sage-grouse fire management toolboxes containing maps, lists, contact information for qualified resource advisors, local guidance, and relevant information should be developed and used.

GRSG-FM-GL-058-Guideline – Localized maps of priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas should be provided to dispatch officers and extended attack incident commanders to use when prioritizing wildfire suppression resources and designing suppression tactics.

GRSG-FM-GL-059-Guideline - In or near priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, a greater sage-grouse resource advisor should be assigned to all extended attack fires.

GRSG-FM-GL-060-Guideline – On critical fire weather days,

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
	<p>protection of greater sage-grouse habitat should receive high consideration, along with other high values, for positioning of resources.</p> <p>GRSG-FM-GL-061-Guideline - Line officers should be involved in setting pre-season wildfire response priorities and, during period of multiple fires, prioritizing protection of priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas.</p> <p>GRSG-FM-GL-062-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, consider using fire retardant and mechanized equipment only if it is likely to result in minimizing burned acreage.</p> <p>GRSG-FM-GL-063-Guideline – In priority and general habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, to minimize sagebrush loss, mop-up should be conducted where the burned areas adjoin unburned islands, doglegs, or other habitat features, as safety and available resources allows.</p>
Wildlife and Fisheries Habitat Management	
Monitoring Effectiveness	
<p>MA 125 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>The BLM, in coordination with the State of Wyoming and its agencies, other local partners and stakeholders, would establish monitoring framework (Appendix D) 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> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP:</p>	<p>GRSG-GRSGH-ST-003-Standard – Design habitat restoration projects to move towards the desired conditions in table I and incorporate the concepts outlined in Appendix C - Reclamation Plan and Appendix D - Monitoring Framework.</p>

BLM Management Actions

Forest Service Plan Components

Bates Hole and Fish Creek/Willow Creek: The areas will have priority for vegetative treatments to improve sage-grouse habitats and for vegetation monitoring to ensure residual herbaceous vegetation is maintained for nesting cover on public lands.

Density and Disturbance

MA 126 - In PHMAs (core only), the density of disturbance of an energy or mining facility (Appendix D) would be limited to an average of one site per square mile (640 acres) within the DDCT, subject to valid existing rights. The one location and cumulative value of existing disturbances will not exceed 5 percent of suitable habitat of the DDCT area. Utilize the Greater Sage-Grouse density disturbance calculation tool as described in Appendix D.

MA 127 - Inside PHMAs (connectivity only), all suitable habitat disturbed (any program area) will not exceed 5% of suitable habitat within the DDCT area using the DDCT process described in Appendix D

GRSG-TDDD-GL-022-Guideline – In priority-core habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, limit the density of activities related to oil and gas development or mining activities to no more than an average of one pad or mining location per 640 acres, using the current Density Disturbance Calculation Tool process described in Appendix I or its replacement.

GRSG-TDDD-GL-023-Guideline – In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, do not authorize surface disturbance and disruptive activities unless all existing discrete anthropogenic disturbances cover less than 5% of the suitable habitat in the surrounding area using the current Density Disturbance Calculation Tool process or its replacement, as described in Appendix I, and the new use will not cause exceedance of the 5% cap. An exception is described in GRSG-M-LM-ST-097-Standard.

Onsite and Offsite Mitigation

MA 128 - Within PHMAs, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:

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

When compensatory mitigation is required, the BLM, in coordination

GRSG-TDDD-ST-016-Standard – In-kind mitigation is preferred to out-of-kind mitigation. Where in-kind mitigation provides a net conservation gain to greater sage-grouse, or where other habitat types are most limiting to populations, focus mitigation on habitats that provide the greatest benefit to the species. When approving mitigation requests, use the following hierarchy:

1. Onsite (on lease).
 2. Offsite within the project's DDCT analysis area.
 3. Offsite within the same priority or sagebrush focal area boundary.
 4. Adjacent to the affected priority management areas or sagebrush
-

BLM Management Actions

with the State of Wyoming and its agencies and partners, will ensure an essential nexus and rough proportionality exists between the residual impacts that warrant compensatory mitigation and the compensatory mitigation actions, as determined by the best available science. This essential nexus and rough proportionality will be clearly described in the NEPA analysis, decision document, and land use authorization for a land-use authorization application.

In-kind mitigation is generally preferred to out-of-kind mitigation, although there may be exceptions, including where out-of-kind mitigation would be more effective for achieving BLM's resource, value, and function goals and objectives, as long as an essential nexus is maintained with the land use's impacts. Where in-kind mitigation provides no net benefit to sage-grouse, or where other habitat types are most limiting to populations, mitigation should focus on habitats that provide the greatest benefit to the species.

Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:

Pinedale RMP:

Offsite mitigation proposed by oil and gas or other operators could be considered and analyzed in future environmental documents as possible mitigation for proposed activities within the planning area. Proposed offsite mitigation will be described and analyzed for effectiveness in detail on a project-specific basis. Planning for offsite mitigation will be performed in coordination with local government agencies. The need for offsite mitigation will be determined in conformance with current BLM policy, as updated.

The order of use of mitigation methods from most to least preferred is as follows:

- I. Onsite mitigation directly resolving impacts created by the action.

Forest Service Plan Components

- focal area within the general habitat management area boundary.
5. Offsite within the same 2006 WAFWA Strategy determined Management Zone as the impact.
 6. Other areas as identified by the local unit.

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

2. Offsite mitigation to the resources affected by the action that cannot be resolved onsite.
3. Offsite mitigation to similar or related resources affected by the action that cannot be resolved onsite.

The following stipulations apply to offsite mitigation measures:

1. Offsite mitigation will be used as a last choice when developing mitigation measures.
2. Offsite mitigation proposals will describe the replacement or substitution activities or methods that are used to address potential impacts on specific resources or environments or both.
3. Offsite mitigation must be as close to “in-kind” in replacement or substitution of resources, habitat function, or environments as practicable (e.g., elk habitat for elk habitat, historical properties for historical properties).
4. Offsite mitigation practices must last as long as the impacts are expected to occur.
5. Offsite mitigation practices are to be developed, conducted or performed, and funded by the project proponent.
6. Offsite mitigation activities must be conducted subject to BLM review and approval that the mitigation will actually address the impacts occurring on the public lands.

The priority order for mitigating resource impacts onsite or offsite is as follows:

1. Onsite Mitigation – Onsite (avoid, minimize, rectify, or reduce in time).
 2. Offsite Mitigation – Local (unless greater resource benefits can be achieved through regional or interstate mitigation).
 3. Offsite Mitigation – Regional (unless greater resource benefits can be achieved through interstate mitigation).
 4. Offsite Mitigation – Interstate: The preferred area for conducting offsite mitigation is as near (local offsite mitigation) to the project or impacted area as possible or as scientific information and
-

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>impact analysis suggests.</p> <p>5. Offsite Mitigation – Interstate: The preferred area for conducting offsite mitigation is as near (local offsite mitigation) to the project or impacted area as possible or as scientific information and impact analysis suggests.</p>	
<p>Timing and Distance Restrictions</p>	
<p>MA 129 - Sage-grouse leks inside PHMAs:</p> <p>Surface occupancy and surface disturbing activities would be prohibited on or within a 0.6 mile radius of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks (Map 2-3).</p> <p>The Authorized Officer may grant an exception if an environmental record of review determines that the action, as proposed or conditioned, would not impair the function or utility of the site for the current or subsequent seasonal habitat, life-history, or behavioral needs of Greater Sage-Grouse.</p>	<p>GRSG-TDDD-ST-013-Standard - In priority habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, do not authorize new surface occupancy or surface disturbing activities on or within a 0.6 mile radius of the perimeter of occupied leks that are located in priority and sagebrush habitat management areas.</p>
<p>MA 130 - Sage-grouse leks outside PHMAs:</p> <p>Surface occupancy and surface disturbing activities would be prohibited on or within a 0.25 mile radius of the perimeter of occupied sage-grouse leks (Map 2-3).</p> <p>The Authorized Officer may grant an exception if an environmental record of review determines that the action, as proposed or conditioned, would not impair the function or utility of the site for the current or subsequent seasonal habitat, life-history, or behavioral needs of Greater Sage-Grouse.</p>	<p>GRSG-TDDD-ST-014-Standard – In general habitat management areas do not authorize new surface occupancy or surface disturbing activities on or within a 0.25 mile radius of the perimeter of occupied leks.</p>
<p>MA 131 - Sage-grouse breeding, nesting, and early brood-rearing habitat inside PHMAs (core only):</p> <p>Surface disturbing and/or disruptive activities would be prohibited from March 15–June 30 to protect sage-grouse breeding, nesting, and early brood rearing habitat. This timing limitation would be applied throughout the PHMAs (core only). Activities in unsuitable habitats would be evaluated under the exception, waiver, and modification</p>	<p>GRSG-TDDD-GL-017-Guideline – In priority-core habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, do not authorize new surface disturbing or disruptive activities from March 15 through June 30. Activities that meet the exception, waiver, and modification criteria may be authorized. Where credible data, based upon field analysis, support different timeframes for the seasonal restriction, dates may be shifted by 14 days before or subsequent to the above dates.</p>

BLM Management Actions

Forest Service Plan Components

criteria and could be allowed on a case by case basis.

Where credible data support different timeframes for this seasonal restriction, dates could be shifted by up to 14 days prior to or subsequent to the above dates.

MA 132 - Sage-grouse breeding, nesting, and early brood-rearing habitat inside PHMAs (connectivity only):

Surface disturbing and/or disruptive activities would be prohibited within PHMAs (connectivity only) from March 15–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 PHMAs (connectivity only). This timing limitation would be applied throughout the PHMAs (connectivity only). Activities in unsuitable habitats would be evaluated under the exception, waiver, and modification criteria and may be allowed on a case-by-case basis.

Where credible data support different timeframes for this seasonal restriction, dates could be shifted by 14 days prior or subsequent to the above dates.

MA 133 - Sage-grouse breeding, nesting, and early brood-rearing habitat outside PHMAs:

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 PHMAs.

Where credible data support different timeframes for this restriction, dates could be shifted by 14 days prior or subsequent to the above dates.

GRSG-TDDD-GL-018-Guideline² – Within priority-connectivity habitat management areas, do not authorize new surface disturbing or disruptive activities from March 15 through June 30 within 4 miles of a lek or lek perimeter of an occupied lek within priority-connectivity areas. Activities that meet the exception, waiver, and modification criteria may be authorized. Where credible data, based upon field analysis, support different timeframes for this seasonal restriction, dates may be shifted by 14 days before or after the above dates.

GRSG-TDDD-GL-019-Guideline² – In general habitat management areas, do not authorize new surface disturbing or disruptive activities from March 15 to June 30 within 2 miles of the lek or lek perimeter of any occupied lek located inside general areas. Activities that meet the exception, waiver, and modification criteria may be authorized. Where credible data, based upon field analysis, support different timeframes for this restriction, dates may be shifted by 14 days before or subsequent to the above dates.

²On a case-by-case basis, and only when it can be demonstrated that the activity will not cause declines in greater sage-grouse populations, allow exceptions, modifications, and waivers. The authorized officer may grant an exception if a review determines that the action, as proposed or conditioned, would not impair the function or utility of the site for the current or subsequent seasonal habitat, life-history, or behavioral needs of greater sage-grouse.

BLM Management Actions	Forest Service Plan Components
<p>MA 134 - Sage-grouse winter concentration areas:</p> <p>Surface disturbing and/or disruptive activities in mapped sage-grouse winter concentration areas, to be mapped by the WGFD, would be prohibited from December 1–March 14 to protect PHMA (core only) populations of sage-grouse that use these winter concentration habitats. This timing limitation would be applied to all winter concentration areas within PHMAs.</p> <p>Activities in unsuitable habitats within PHMAs 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 mapped winter concentration areas in GHMAs would be implemented where winter concentration areas are identified as supporting populations of sage-grouse that attend leks within PHMAs (core only). Appropriate seasonal timing restrictions and habitat protection measures would be considered and evaluated in all identified winter concentration areas.</p>	<p>GRSG-TDDD-GL-020-Guideline³ – Within mapped winter concentration areas in priority-core habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas, do not authorize new surface disturbing or disruptive activities from December 1 through March 14 to protect priority-core and sagebrush focal area greater sage-grouse populations that use these winter concentration habitats. Activities not located in suitable habitat that meet the exception, waiver, and modification criteria may be authorized.</p> <p>GRSG-TDDD-GL-021-Guideline³ – Within mapped winter concentration areas in priority-connectivity and general habitat management areas, do not authorize new surface disturbing or disruptive activities from December 1 through March 14 where winter concentration areas are identified as supporting populations of greater sage-grouse that attend leks within priority-core habitat management areas and sagebrush focal areas.</p>
<hr/>	
<p>Predation</p> <p>MA 135 - The BLM would support other agencies in their efforts to minimize impacts from predators.</p> <p>The BLM 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 would support and encourage other agencies in their efforts to minimize impacts from predators on sage-grouse where needs have been documented.</p>	<p>GRSG-PR-GL-102-Guideline – Efforts by other agencies to minimize impacts from predators on greater sage-grouse should be supported and encouraged where needs have been documented.</p>

³On a case-by-case basis, and only when it can be demonstrated that the activity will not cause declines in greater sage-grouse populations, allow exceptions, modifications, and waivers. The authorized officer may grant an exception if a review determines that the action, as proposed or conditioned, would not impair the function or utility of the site for the current or subsequent seasonal habitat, life-history, or behavioral needs of greater sage-grouse.

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

Noise

MA 136 - The BLM would work with proponents to limit project related noise where it would be expected to reduce functionality of habitats that support PHMA populations.

The BLM would evaluate the potential for limitation of new noise sources on a case-by-case basis as appropriate.

BLM's near-term goal would be to limit noise sources that would be expected to negatively impact PHMA populations and to continue to support the establishment of ambient baseline noise levels for occupied PHMA leks.

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 PHMA population behavioral cycles.

As new research is completed, new specific limitations would be coordinated with the WGFD and partners.

Noise levels at the perimeter of the lek should not exceed 10 A-weighted Decibels (dBA) above ambient noise.

GRSG-TDDD-ST-015-Standard – During lekking (March 1 to May 15), restrict noise to 10dB above ambient (not to exceed 20-24 dB) measured at the perimeter of an occupied lek to lekking birds from 6 pm to 9 am within a buffer distance of 3.1 miles⁴.

Adaptive Management

MA 137 - The Greater Sage-Grouse adaptive management plan (Appendix D) provides a means of addressing and responding to unintended negative impacts to Greater Sage-Grouse and its habitat will be addressed before consequences become severe or irreversible. The Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse LUP Amendments will include the requirement for projects requiring an EIS to develop adaptive management strategies in support of the population management

GRSG-GRSGH-ST-004-Standard - When 1) annual lek counts, wing counts, aerial surveys, habitat monitoring or Density Disturbance Calculation Tool evaluations show deviation from normal annual fluctuations in greater sage-grouse habitat or populations for two consecutive years that may indicate a long-term downward trend or 2) monitoring identifies other negative population or habitat anomalies for greater sage-grouse, conduct an evaluation to determine causal

⁴Plan buffer distances reflect lower-interpreted range from Manier, D.J., Bowen, Z.H., Brooks, M.L., Casazza, M.L., Coates, P.S., Deibert, P.A., Hanser, S.E., and Johnson, D.H., 2014, Conservation buffer distance estimates for Greater Sage-Grouse—A review: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2014–1239, 14 p., <http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/ofr20141239>.

BLM Management Actions

objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse set by the State of Wyoming. Wyoming ADPPs will include an adaptive management plan, as reviewed by the BLM WO, SOL, and USFWS, which includes: Upon determination that a hard trigger is tripped, the BLM and/or the Forest Service will immediately defer issuance of discretionary authorizations for new actions for a period of 90 days. In addition, within 14 days of a determination, the Adaptive Management Working Group will convene to develop an interim response strategy and initiate an assessment to determine the causal factors.

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

In making amendments to this plan, the BLM will coordinate with the USFWS as BLM continues to meet its objective of conserving, enhancing and restoring Greater Sage-Grouse habitat by reducing, minimizing or eliminating threats to that habitat.

Soft Triggers:

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

Forest Service Plan Components

factors and develop an appropriate response strategy. This strategy may include curtailment of activities that may adversely affect greater sage-grouse populations or habitat.

GRSG-GRSGH-ST-005-Standard - Variability in 1) number of active leks, 2) acres of available greater sage-grouse habitat, or 3) greater sage-grouse population trends based on lek counts can provide catastrophic indicators that greater sage-grouse are not responding to conservation measures set forth in the plan or that large scale negative impacts to greater sage-grouse populations or habitat are occurring. If two of the preceding three indicators exceed 60% of normal variability in a year or one of the preceding three indicators exceeds 40% of normal variability for 3 out of any 5 years, desired conservation results are not being attained and within 14 days the Adaptive Management Working Group (i.e., representatives from the Bureau of Land, Forest Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and State of Wyoming) will convene to develop an interim response strategy and initiate an assessment to determine the causal factors.

BLM Management Actions**Forest Service Plan Components**

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

Hard Triggers:

Hard triggers are indicators that management is not achieving desired conservation results. Hard triggers would be considered a catastrophic indicator that the species is not responding to conservation actions, or that a larger-scale impact or set of impacts is having a negative effect. Within the range of normal population variables, hard triggers shall be determined to take effect when two of the three metrics exceeds 60 percent of normal variability for the area under management in a single year, or when any of the three metrics exceeds 40% of normal variability for a three year time period within a five-year range of analysis. A minimum of three consecutive years in a five-year period is used to determine trends (i.e., Y1-2-3, Y2-3-4, Y3-4-5).

Sagebrush Focal Areas

MA 138 - Designate SFAs as shown on Map 2-36 (1,915,990 acres). SFAs will be managed as PHMA, with the following additional management:

Will be identified in the Record of Decision and on maps.

1) Recommended for withdrawal from the General Mining Act of 1872, subject to valid existing rights, the lands shown in Map 2-23 (252,160 acres). 2) Prioritized for management and conservation actions in these areas, including, but not limited to review of livestock grazing permits/leases (see livestock grazing section for additional actions).

¹Wind energy development is a specialized aspect of ROW authorizations. Exclusion and avoidance areas described here for wind energy development are in addition to the ROW actions described in actions 30 through 35.

Table I
BLM Seasonal Habitat Objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse Wyoming Basin Ecoregion

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition ⁷	Reference
Breeding and Nesting (Seasonal Use Period March 1-June 15)			<p>Doherty. 2008. Sage-grouse and Energy Development: Integrating Science with Conservation Planning to Reduce Impacts.</p> <p>Holloran and Anderson. 2005. Spatial Distribution of Greater Sage-grouse nests in relatively contiguous sagebrush habitats.</p>
Lek Security	Proximity of trees	Trees absent or uncommon on shrub/grassland ecological sites within 1.8 miles (approx. 3 km) of occupied leks.	<p>Baruch-Mordo, S., J. S. Evans, J. P. Severson, D. E. Naugle, J. D. Maestas, J. M. Kiesecker, M. J. Falkowski, C. A. Hagen, and K. P. Reese. 2013. Saving sage-grouse from trees.</p> <p>Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i>. Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.</p>
	Proximity of sagebrush to leks	Adjacent protective sagebrush cover within 330 ft. (approx. 100 m) of an occupied lek	<p>Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i>. Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.</p>
Cover	% of seasonal habitat meeting desired conditions	>80% of the nesting habitat meets the recommended vegetation characteristics, where appropriate (relative to ecological site potential, etc.).	<p>Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.</p>

Table I
BLM Seasonal Habitat Objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse Wyoming Basin Ecoregion

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition ⁷	Reference
	Sagebrush cover ²	5 to 25%	<p>Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.</p> <p>Connelly, J. W., K. P. Reese, and M. A. Schroeder. 2003. Monitoring of Greater sage-grouse habitats and populations. University of Idaho College of Natural Resources Experiment Station Bulletin 80. University of Idaho, Moscow, ID.</p> <p>Hagen, C. A., J. W. Connelly, and M. A. Schroeder. 2007. A meta-analysis of Greater Sage-Grouse <i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i> nesting and brood-rearing habitats. <i>Wildlife Biology</i> 13 (Supplement 1):42-50.</p>
	Sagebrush height		Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Arid sites ³	4-31 inches (20.3-80cm)	
	Mesic sites ⁴	12-31 inches (40-80cm)	
	Predominant sagebrush shape	Predominantly spreading shape ⁵	Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i> . Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.
	Perennial grass cover ²		Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Arid sites ³	≥10%	
	Mesic sites ⁴	≥15%	
		Cool-season bunchgrasses preferred	<p>Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i>. Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.</p> <p>Cagney J., E. Bainter, B. Budd, T. Christiansen, V. Herren, M. Holloran, B.</p>

Table I
BLM Seasonal Habitat Objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse Wyoming Basin Ecoregion

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition ⁷	Reference
			Rashford, M. Smith and J. Williams. 2010. Grazing influence, objective development, and management in Wyoming's Greater Sage-Grouse habitat. University of Wyoming College of Agriculture Extension Bulletin B-1203. Laramie.
	Perennial grass and forb height	Adequate nesting cover of $\geq 6''$ or as determined by ESD site potential and local variability	<p>Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.</p> <p>Connelly, J. W., K. P. Reese, and M. A. Schroeder. 2003. Monitoring of Greater sage-grouse habitats and populations. University of Idaho College of Natural Resources Experiment Station Bulletin 80. University of Idaho, Moscow, ID.</p> <p>Doherty, K.E., D.E. Naugle, J.D. Tack, B.L Walker, J.M. Graham and J.L. Beck. 2014. Linking Conservation Actions to Demography: Grass Height Explains Variation in Greater Sage-Grouse Nest Survival. <i>Wildlife Biology</i>, 20(6): 320-325.</p> <p>Hagen, C. A., J. W. Connelly, and M. A. Schroeder. 2007. A meta-analysis of Greater Sage-Grouse <i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i> nesting and brood-rearing habitats. <i>Wildlife Biology</i> 13 (Supplement 1):42-50.</p> <p>Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i>. Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.</p>
	Perennial forb cover ²		Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Arid sites ³	$\geq 5\%$	
	Mesic sites ⁴	$\geq 10\%$	

Table I
BLM Seasonal Habitat Objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse Wyoming Basin Ecoregion

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition ⁷	Reference
Brood-Rearing/Summer¹ (Seasonal Use Period June 16-October 31)			
Cover	% of Seasonal habitat meeting desired condition	>40% of the summer/brood habitat meets recommended brood habitat characteristics where appropriate (relative to ecological site potential, etc.)	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Sagebrush cover ²	5-25%	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Sagebrush height	4 to 32 inches (20.3-80cm)	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Perennial grass cover and forbs ²	>5% arid sites >10% mesic sites	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Riparian areas/mesic meadows ²	Proper Functioning Condition	Preferred forbs are listed in Stiver et al. <i>In press</i> . Overall total forb cover may be greater than that of preferred forb cover since not all forb species are listed as preferred.
	Upland and riparian perennial forb availability	Preferred forbs are common with several preferred species present	Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i> . Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.

Table I
BLM Seasonal Habitat Objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse Wyoming Basin Ecoregion

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition ⁷	Reference
Winter¹ (Seasonal Use Period November 1-February 28)			
Cover and Food	% of seasonal habitat meeting desired conditions	>80% of the wintering habitat meets winter habitat characteristics where appropriate (relative to ecological site, etc.).	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. Wildlife Society Bulletin 28:967-985.
	Sagebrush cover above snow ²	>5%	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. Wildlife Society Bulletin 28:967-985. Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i> . Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.
	Sagebrush height above snow	>10 inches (>25cm)	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. Wildlife Society Bulletin 28:967-985.

¹Seasonal dates can be adjusted by local unit according to geographic region.

²Absolute cover is the actual recorded cover and can exceed 100% when recorded across all species and all layers. It is not relative cover, which is the proportions of each species, and equals 100%. Note that cover is reported for only those species (e.g., sagebrush, preferred forbs) that are sampled to determine suitability of habitat for sage-grouse. Overall cover at the site will be greater than that sampled for sage-grouse habitat, due to other species present.

³Arid corresponds to the 10 – 12 inch precipitation zone; *Artemisia tridentata wyomingensis* is a common big sagebrush sub-species for this type site (Stiver et al. *In Press*).

⁴Mesic corresponds to the ≥12 inch precipitation zone; *Artemisia tridentata vaseyana* is a common big sagebrush sub-species for this type site (Stiver et al. *In Press*).

⁵Collectively the indicators for sagebrush (cover, height, and shape), perennial grass and perennial forb (cover, height and/or availability) represent the desired condition range for nesting/early brood rearing habitat characteristics, consistent with the breeding habitat suitability matrix identified in Stiver et al. *In Press*. Sagebrush plants that are more tree or columnar-shaped provide less protective cover near the ground than sagebrush plants with a spreading shape (Stiver et

Table 1
BLM Seasonal Habitat Objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse Wyoming Basin Ecoregion

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition ⁷	Reference
<p>al. <i>In Press</i>). Some sagebrush plants are naturally columnar (e.g., Great Basin big sagebrush), and a natural part of the plant community. However, a predominance of columnar shape arising from animal impacts may warrant management investigation or adjustments at site specific scales.</p> <p>⁶Preferred forbs are listed in Stiver et al. <i>In Press</i>. Overall total forb cover may be greater than that of preferred forb cover since not all forb species are listed as preferred.</p> <p>⁷All Desired Conditions will be dependent upon site capability and local variation (e.g., weather patterns, localized drought, ESD state, etc.).</p>			

Table 2
BLM Seasonal Habitat Objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse NE Wyoming

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition ⁷	References
Breeding Habitat (Lek and Nesting/Early Brood-Rearing)			
			<p>Doherty. 2008. Sage-grouse and Energy Development: Integrating Science with Conservation Planning to Reduce Impacts.</p> <p>Holloran and Anderson. 2005. Spatial Distribution of Greater Sage-Grouse nests in relatively contiguous sagebrush habitats.</p>
Lek Security	Proximity of trees	Trees absent or uncommon on shrub/grassland ecological sites within 1.86 miles (3 km) of occupied leks.	<p>Baruch-Mordo, S., J. S. Evans, J. P. Severson, D. E. Naugle, J. D. Maestas, J. M. Kiesecker, M. J. Falkowski, C. A. Hagen, and K. P. Reese. 2013. Saving sage-grouse from trees.</p> <p>Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i>. Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.</p>
	Proximity of sagebrush to leks	Adjacent protective sagebrush cover within 328 ft. (100 m) of an occupied lek	<p>Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i>. Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.</p>

Table 2
BLM Seasonal Habitat Objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse NE Wyoming

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition ⁷	References
Nesting/Early Brood-Rearing^{5,10,12,13,14}			
Cover and Food	Seasonal habitat extent	>80% of the nesting habitat meets the recommended vegetation characteristics, where appropriate (relative to ecological site potential, etc.).	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Sagebrush cover ²	5-25%	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985. Connelly, J. W., K. P. Reese, and M. A. Schroeder. 2003. Monitoring of Greater sage-grouse habitats and populations. University of Idaho College of Natural Resources Experiment Station Bulletin 80. University of Idaho, Moscow, ID. Hagen, C. A., J. W. Connelly, and M. A. Schroeder. 2007. A meta-analysis of Greater Sage-Grouse <i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i> nesting and brood-rearing habitats. <i>Wildlife Biology</i> 13 (Supplement 1):42-50.
	Sagebrush height		Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Arid sites ³	4-31 inches (20.3-80cm)	
Mesic sites ⁴	12-31 inches (40-80cm)		
Predominant sagebrush shape		Predominantly spreading shape ⁵	Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i> . Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.

Table 2
BLM Seasonal Habitat Objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse NE Wyoming

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition⁷	References
	Perennial grass cover ²		Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Arid sites ³	≥10%	
	Mesic sites ⁴	≥15%	Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i> . Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.
		Cool-season bunchgrasses preferred	Cagney J., E. Bainter, B. Budd, T. Christiansen, V. Herren, M. Holloran, B. Rashford, M. Smith and J. Williams. 2010. Grazing influence, objective development, and management in Wyoming's Greater Sage-Grouse habitat. University of Wyoming College of Agriculture Extension Bulletin B-1203. Laramie.
	Perennial grass height	<u>Adequate nesting cover of >6" or as determined by ESD site potential and local variability</u>	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985. Connelly, J. W., K. P. Reese, and M. A. Schroeder. 2003. Monitoring of Greater sage-grouse habitats and populations. University of Idaho College of Natural Resources Experiment Station Bulletin 80. University of Idaho, Moscow, ID. Doherty, K.E., D.E. Naugle, J.D. Tack, B.L Walker, J.M. Graham and J.L. Beck. 2014. Linking Conservation Actions to Demography: Grass Height Explains Variation in Greater Sage-Grouse Nest Survival. <i>Wildlife Biology</i> , 20(6): 320-325. Hagen, C. A., J. W. Connelly, and M. A. Schroeder. 2007. A meta-analysis of Greater Sage-Grouse <i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i> nesting and brood-rearing habitats. <i>Wildlife Biology</i> 13 (Supplement 1):42-50. Herman-Brunson, K.M., K.C. Jensen, N.W. Kaczor, C.C. Swanson, M.A. Rumble and R.W. Klaver 2009. Nesting Ecology of Greater Sage-Grouse

Table 2
BLM Seasonal Habitat Objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse NE Wyoming

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition⁷	References
			<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i> at the Eastern Edge of their Historic Distribution. <i>Wildlife Biology</i> 15: 237-246.
			Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i> . Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.
	Perennial forb cover ²		Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Arid sites ³	≥5%	
	Mesic sites ⁴	≥10%	
	Perennial forb availability	Preferred forbs are common with several species present	Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i> . Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.
Late Brood-Rearing/Summer¹ (July-October)¹ (Apply to all habitat outside of nesting/breeding and winter)			
Cover and Food	Seasonal habitat extent	>40% of the summer/brood habitat meets recommended brood habitat characteristics where appropriate (relative to ecological site potential, etc.)	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Sagebrush cover ²	5-25%	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.

Table 2
BLM Seasonal Habitat Objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse NE Wyoming

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition⁷	References
	Sagebrush height	4 to 32 inches (20.3-80cm)	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Perennial grass cover ²	>15%	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Upland and riparian perennial forb availability ²	Preferred forbs are common with several preferred species present ⁶ .	Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i> . Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.
	Riparian meadow habitat condition	Proper Functioning Condition	Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i> . Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.
Winter¹ November-March¹ (Apply to areas of known or likely winter-use)			
Cover and Food	Seasonal habitat extent	>80% of the wintering habitat meets winter habitat characteristics where appropriate (relative to ecological site, etc.).	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985.
	Sagebrush cover above snow ²	>5%	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. <i>Wildlife Society Bulletin</i> 28:967-985. Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. <i>In Press</i> . Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: Multi-

Table 2
BLM Seasonal Habitat Objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse NE Wyoming

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition ⁷	References
			scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.
	Sagebrush height above snow	>10 inches (>25cm)	Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. Wildlife Society Bulletin 28:967-985.

¹ Seasonal dates can be adjusted by local unit according to geographic region.

² Absolute cover is the actual recorded cover and can exceed 100% when recorded across all species and all layers. It is not relative cover, which is the proportions of each species, and equals 100%. Note that cover is reported for only those species (e.g., sagebrush, preferred forbs) that are sampled to determine suitability of habitat for sage-grouse. Overall cover at the site will be greater than that sampled for sage-grouse habitat, due to other species present.

³ Arid corresponds to the 10 – 12 inch precipitation zone; *Artemisia tridentata wyomingensis* is a common big sagebrush sub-species for this type site (Stiver et al. *In Press*).

⁴ Mesic corresponds to the ≥ 12 inch precipitation zone; *Artemisia tridentata vaseyana* is a common big sagebrush sub-species for this type site (Stiver et al. *In Press*).

⁵ Collectively the indicators for sagebrush (cover, height, and shape), perennial grass and perennial forb (cover, height and/or availability) represent the desired condition range for nesting/early brood rearing habitat characteristics, consistent with the breeding habitat suitability matrix identified in Stiver et al. *In Press*. Sagebrush plants that are more tree or columnar-shaped provide less protective cover near the ground than sagebrush plants with a spreading shape (Stiver et al. *In Press*). Some sagebrush plants are naturally columnar (e.g., Great Basin big sagebrush), and a natural part of the plant community. However, a predominance of columnar shape arising from animal impacts may warrant management investigation or adjustments at site specific scales.

⁶ Preferred forbs are listed in Stiver et al. *In Press*. Overall total forb cover may be greater than that of preferred forb cover since not all forb species are listed as preferred.

⁷ All Desired Conditions will be dependent upon site capability and local variation (e.g., weather patterns, localized drought, ESD state, etc.).

Table I
Forest Service Seasonal Habitat Desired Conditions for Greater Sage- grouse

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition
AREAS MANAGED FOR BREEDING AND NESTING ^{1,2,3} (Seasonal Use Period March 15-June 30) Apply 5.3 miles from occupied leks. ⁴		
Lek Security	Proximity of trees ⁵	Trees or other tall structures are absent to uncommon within 1.86 miles of leks ^{6,7}
	Proximity of sagebrush to leks ⁶	Adjacent protective sagebrush cover within 328 feet of lek ⁶
Cover	Seasonal habitat extent ⁷ (Percent of seasonal habitat meeting desired conditions.)	>80% of the breeding and nesting habitat
	Sagebrush canopy cover ^{6,7,8}	15 to 25%
	Sagebrush height ⁷ Arid sites ^{7,9} Mesic sites ^{7,10}	4 to 32 inches in black sage and 12 to 32 inches in all other areas All Wyoming NFs and NGs: 16 to 32 inches
	Predominant sagebrush shape ⁶	>50% in spreading ¹¹
	Perennial grass canopy cover ^{6,7} Arid sites ^{6,7,9} Mesic sites ^{6,7,10}	$\geq 10\%$ $\geq 15\%$
	Perennial grass height ^{6,7,8}	Provide overhead and lateral concealment from predators ^{6, 15}
	Perennial forb canopy cover ^{6,7,8} Arid sites ⁹ Mesic sites ¹⁰	$\geq 5\%$ ^{6,7} $\geq 10\%$ ^{6,7}
	AREAS MANAGED FOR BROOD-REARING/SUMMER ¹ (Seasonal Use Period July 1-November 30)	
Cover	Seasonal habitat extent ⁷ (Percent of seasonal habitat meeting desired conditions.)	>40% of the brood-rearing/summer habitat
	Sagebrush canopy cover ^{6,7,8}	10 to 25%
	Sagebrush height ^{7,8}	4 to 32 inches in black sage and 12 to 32 inches in all other areas
	Perennial grass canopy cover and forbs ^{7,8}	>15%
	Riparian areas/mesic meadows	Proper Functioning Condition ¹²
	Upland and riparian perennial forb availability ^{6,7}	Preferred forbs are common with several preferred species present ¹³

Table I
Forest Service Seasonal Habitat Desired Conditions for Greater Sage- grouse

Attribute	Indicators	Desired Condition
WINTER¹ (Seasonal Use Period December 1-March 14)		
Cover and Food	Seasonal habitat extent ^{6,7,8} (Percent of seasonal habitat meeting desired conditions.)	>80% of the winter habitat
	Sagebrush canopy cover above snow ^{6,7,8}	>10%
	Sagebrush height above snow ^{6,7,8}	>10 inches ¹⁴

¹Seasonal dates can be adjusted; that is, start and end dates may be shifted either earlier or later, but the amount of days cannot be shortened or lengthened by the local unit.

²Doherty, K. 2008. *Sage-grouse and Energy Development: Integrating Science with Conservation Planning to Reduce Impacts*. University of Montana. Missoula, MT.

³Holloran and Anderson. 2005. *Spatial Distribution of Greater Sage-grouse nests in relatively contiguous sagebrush habitats*. *Condor* 107:742-752.

⁴Buffer distance may be changed only if 3 out of 5 years of telemetry studies indicate the 5.3 miles is not appropriate.

⁵Baruch-Mordo, S. J.S. Evans, J.P Severson, D.E. Naugle, J. D. Maestas, J.M. Kiesecker, M.J. Falkowski. C.A. Hagen, and K.P. Reese. . 2013. *Saving sage-grouse from trees: A proactive solution to reducing a key threat to a candidate species*. *Biological Conservation* 167: 233-241.

⁶Stiver, S.J., E.T. Rinkes, D.E. Naugle, P.D. Makela, D.A. Nance, and J.W. Karl, eds. [In press]. *Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: A Multiscale Assessment Tool*. Technical Reference 6710-1. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Denver, Colorado.

⁷Connelly, J. M. A. Schroweder, A.R. Sands, and C.E. Braun.2000. Guidelines to manage sage-grouse populations and their habitats. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 28 (4): 967-985.

⁸Connelly, J. K. Reese, and M. Schroder. 2003. *Monitoring of Greater sage-grouse habitats and populations*. Station Bulletin 80, Contribution 979. University of Idaho, College of Natural Resources Experiment Station. Moscow, ID.

⁹10–12 inch precipitation zone; *Artemisia tridentata wyomingensis* is a common big sagebrush sub-species for this type site (Stiver et al, 2015).

¹⁰≥12 inch precipitation zone; *Artemisia tridentata vaseyana* is a common big sagebrush sub-species for this type site (Stiver et al, 2015).

¹¹ Sagebrush plants with a spreading shape provide more protective cover than sagebrush plants that are more tree- or columnar shaped (Stiver et al. 2015).

¹³ Existing land management plan desired conditions for riparian areas/wet meadows (spring seeps) may be used in place of properly functioning conditions, if appropriate for meeting greater sage-grouse habitat requirements.

¹³ Preferred forbs are listed in Table III-2 (Stiver et al. 2015). Overall total forb cover may be greater than that of preferred forb cover since not all forb species are listed as preferred in Table III-2.

¹⁴ The height of sagebrush remaining above the snow depends upon snow depth in a particular year. Intent is to manage for tall, healthy, sagebrush stands.

¹⁵Projects will be designed to provide overhead and lateral concealment of nests on a site specific basis.

Table 2
Forest Service Grazing Guidelines for Greater Sage-grouse Seasonal Habitat

Seasonal Habitat	Grazing Guidelines
Areas managed for breeding and nesting ¹ within 5.3 miles of occupied leks	Perennial grass height: ² When grazing occurs during breeding and nesting season (March 15 to June 30) manage for upland perennial grass height of 7 inches ^{3,4,5,6} When grazing occurs post breeding and nesting season (July 1 to November 30) manage for 4 inches ^{4,5,8} of perennial grass height.
Areas managed for brood rearing and summer habitat ¹	Retain an average stubble height of 4 inches for herbaceous riparian/mesic meadow vegetation ^{7,9}
Winter ¹	≤35% utilization of sagebrush

¹ For descriptions of Seasonal Habitat and Seasonal Periods of greater sage-grouse see table 1.

² Grass heights only apply in breeding and nesting habitat with ≥10% sagebrush cover to support nesting.

³ Holloran et al. 2005. *Greater sage-grouse nesting habitat selection and success in Wyoming*.

⁴ Average droop height, assuming current vegetation composition has the capability to achieve these heights. Heights will be measured at the end of the nesting period (Connelly et al., 2000).

⁵ Hagen C., J.W. Connelly, and M.A. Schroeder. 2007. *A meta-analysis of greater sage-grouse *Centrocercus urophasianus* nesting and brood-rearing habitats*. *Wildlife Biology* 13(1): 42-50.

⁶ Due to variability of annual precipitation and forage production 7" stubble height may not be possible every year, even in the absence of livestock grazing.

⁷ In riparian brood-rearing habitat, sage-grouse prefer the lower vegetation (5–15 cm vs. 30–50 cm; Oakleaf 1971, Neel 1980, Klebenow 1982, Evans 1986) and succulent forb growth stimulated by moderate livestock grazing (Neel 1980, Evans 1986); moderate use equates to a 10-cm residual stubble height for most grasses and sedges and 5-cm for Kentucky bluegrass (Mosley et al. 1997, Clary and Leininger 2000) (Crawford et al. 2004. *Ecology and Management of sage-grouse habitat*).⁸ Stubble height to be measured at the end of the growing season.

⁹ Stubble height to be measured in the meadow areas used by greater sage-grouse for brood-rearing (not on the hydric greenline).