

Greater Sage-Grouse Planning



March 29, 2023 | Update Newsletter

INTRODUCTION

Greater sage-grouse (GRSG) depend on healthy sagebrush communities. The expansive sagebrush ecosystem on which this bird depends is managed by a mix of federal, tribal, state, and local agencies, as well as private landowners. Approximately half of GRSG habitat is managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). State and Tribal-led efforts to conserve the species and its habitat date back to the 1950s. For the past three decades, state wildlife agencies, federal agencies, and many others in the range of the species have been collaborating to conserve GRSG and its habitats.

The BLM is currently considering amendments to its resource management plans (RMPs) to enhance GRSG conservation through management of sagebrush habitats on BLM-administered lands in 10 states - California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming. Public scoping for this effort concluded more than a year ago.

The BLM is not inviting public comments on this newsletter. There will an opportunity for the public to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), inclusive of all its applicable context and details, when it is published later this year.

PLANNING BACKGROUND

In 2010, the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) determined that listing the GRSG under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) was “warranted but precluded” by other priorities. The USFWS made this determination based on continued decline of GRSG habitats and on inadequacy of regulatory mechanisms guiding habitat management. In response, the BLM, in coordination with the United States Department of the Interior and the United States Department of Agriculture United State Forest Service (USFS), developed a management strategy that included updating GRSG management actions in its land use plans.

In September 2015, the BLM and USFS adopted amendments and revisions to 98 RMPs across 10 western states. The amended goals, objectives, and actions in these RMPs included management of GRSG habitat on BLM-administered surface and mineral estates, as well as on National Forest System Lands. The purpose of these amendments was to address the various threats to GSRG across the range that were within the jurisdiction of the BLM and USFS. Collectively, these plans govern the management of 67 million acres of GRSG habitat on federal lands. Subsequently, the USFWS determined that the GRSG did not warrant listing under the ESA based in part on regulatory certainty from the federal RMP amendments and revisions.

In October 2017, the BLM initiated another planning process to consider changes to GRSG management actions to align with state plans. The subsequent Records of Decisions (RODs) for these state-specific

processes were issued in March 2019. The changes to GRSG management actions through the 2019 planning process varied by state. This resulted in multiple changes from the 2015 amendments in some states, fewer in others, and none in Montana and North and South Dakota.

In October 2019, the US District Court for the District of Idaho issued an order which temporarily enjoined the BLM from implementing the 2019 RODs. However, the court did not vacate the amendments or their Records of Decision. The BLM prepared supplemental EISs to address and clarify the issues identified in the Court's injunction. RODs associated with those supplemental EISs were signed in January 2021, though those RODs did not change management identified in the 2019 RODs. Until the court makes a final ruling on the merits of the case, the BLM is enjoined from implementing the amended actions from the 2019 RODs, and the actions contained in the 2015 RODs remain in effect.

The maps and language for the 2015, 2019, and 2021 planning efforts can be accessed through links on the BLM's GRSG website: www.blm.gov/programs/fish-and-wildlife/sagegrouse/blm-sagegrouse-plans.

GREATER SAGE-GROUSE POPULATION AND HABITAT TRENDS

Quantity and quality of habitat can affect the size and trend of the populations, as can non-habitat factors such as disruptive activities, drought. Recent data suggests we continue to observe declines in sagebrush habitats and sage-grouse populations throughout the range.

Each spring State wildlife agencies conduct lek counts to track GRSG populations. GRSG populations experience natural population fluctuations and monitoring indicates the most recent nadirs (low point of population cycles) are lower than the prior nadirs in most states. The U.S. Geological Survey¹ has also analyzed state-collected lek data and reported estimated range-wide population declines of 80 percent from 1966-2019 and of 37 percent from 2002-2019. While the study identified areas in the range where populations were stable to increasing, the researchers found that over 81 percent of areas throughout the range had declining populations since 2002.

For the 2015 GRSG planning effort the BLM worked closely with the States to identify population and habitat adaptive management triggers. If one of the triggers was met, the plans stated that management changes may be appropriate. The BLM's 2021 *Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Implementation Rangewide Monitoring Report for 2015-2020*² identified 42 population triggers that had been tripped through 2020. In almost half of the areas evaluated, a management change may help address the causal factor.

Sixteen habitat triggers were also tripped during the same period, with most the result of wildfires and the associated loss of sagebrush habitats:

¹ Coates, P.S., Prochazka, B.G., O'Donnell, M.S., Aldridge, C.L., Edmunds, D.R., Monroe, A.P., Ricca, M.A., Wann, G.T., Hanser, S.E., Wiechman, L.A., and Chenaille, M.P., 2021, Range-wide greater sage-grouse hierarchical monitoring framework—Implications for defining population boundaries, trend estimation, and a targeted annual warning system: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2020–1154, 243 p., <https://doi.org/10.3133/ofr20201154>.

² Herren, V., E. Kachergis, A. Titolo, K. Mayne, S. Glazer, K. Lambert, B. Newman, and B. Franey. 2021. Greater sage-grouse plan implementation: Rangewide monitoring report for 2015–2020. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Denver, CO.

- Analyses of west-wide satellite maps determined sagebrush availability across all land ownerships declined by approximately 3 percent (1.9 million acres) between 2012 and 2018.
- Nearly 60 percent of the sagebrush losses occurred on BLM-managed lands (approximately 1.1 million acres range wide).

The BLM also estimates the amount of disturbance from infrastructure across GRSG range. The Monitoring Report estimated that in Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA) – and Important Management Areas (IHMA) in Idaho – the percent of anthropogenic disturbance was less than one percent – below what literature has identified as the threshold where GRSG abandon leks.

Compared to PHMA and IHMA, disturbance from infrastructure in General Habitat Management Areas (GHMA) and other state-specific habitat management area designations is higher. Range-wide, disturbance estimates in these areas is approximately 1.58 percent.

NEW SCIENCE

Since 2015, hundreds of peer-reviewed scientific publications on GRSG and management of their habitats have been published. Some of these new publications are consistent with science that the BLM previously considered. A review of this new information found some of the BLM's current RMP management may be inconsistent with some of the new science. This includes the need to potentially modify habitat management areas to consider new GRSG biological information, and the effects of climate change that may affect plan durability.

PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR PLANNING

More than 70 BLM RMPs include management for GRSG habitat conservation and restoration on approximately 67 million acres of GRSG habitat that the BLM manages across 10 western states. Managing for healthy and resilient sagebrush habitat is considered essential to the long-term health of GRSG populations that continue to experience pressure from a variety of factors, including invasive grasses, wildfire, drought exacerbated by climate change, and development.

This planning process is needed to address the continued GRSG habitat losses and declines in GRSG populations, to consider the recent developments in relevant science (including providing for durable planning decisions when considering the effects of climate change), to address concerns raised by the courts, and to address the issues related to GRSG management raised through scoping.

The purpose of this action is to consider targeted amendments that respond to changed conditions, to provide the BLM with locally relevant decisions that accord with range-wide GRSG conservation goals, and to provide continuity in managing GRSG habitats based on biological information versus political boundaries. In addition, this effort will address issues identified through litigation, including range-wide cumulative effects.

The BLM has an obligation to initiate proactive conservation measures to reduce threats to species like GRSG. The goal for this BLM planning effort is to conserve and manage GRSG habitats to support persistent, healthy GRSG populations, consistent with the BLM's sensitive species policy and in cooperation with state governments and other conservation partners. It also seeks to maintain existing habitat connectivity between GRSG populations.

ISSUES IDENTIFIED THROUGH SCOPING

The BLM refined the list of issues from the Notice of Intent based on input received during the public scoping period. That list can be found in chapter 3 of the Scoping Report, available on the project's ePlanning site: <https://eplanning.blm.gov/eplanning-ui/project/2016719/570>.

Working from that list of issues, the BLM reviewed the management decisions from the 2015 and 2019 plans and determined that not all the decisions needed to be reconsidered in this effort. For example, management associated with fire and invasives was extensively addressed in prior plan amendments.

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PRELIMINARY RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES

The following table presents a high-level conceptual summary of the BLM's preliminary draft range of alternatives for this planning process. It is a high-level snap-shot of the agency's work at a specific point in time in the planning process. The specific alternative language is still being developed by the BLM in coordination with its cooperating agencies.

The BLM is not inviting public comments on the draft summary alternative language in this newsletter. This table is presented solely as part of a public update on the planning process. The entirety of the alternatives, including the specific text and all applicable context, will be provided later this year in the Draft EIS. When that document is completed, the BLM will provide it for public review and invite the public to provide comments in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

Alternative 1 (from 2015)	Alternative 2 (from 2019)	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
Resource Management Plan Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG) Goal/Objective				
All states include language to maintain and enhance sagebrush habitats with the intent of conserving sage-grouse populations. The exact language varies by state.	Same as Alt 1.	Conserve and manage greater sage-grouse habitats to support persistent, healthy populations, consistent with BLM’s sensitive species policy and in coordination with state wildlife agencies. Conservation and management should maintain existing connectivity between GRSG populations.	Same as Alt 3.	Same as Alt 3.
Key Component/Management Issue: Habitat Management Area Alignments and Associated Major Land Use Allocations				
Affirms Habitat management area (HMA) boundaries from 2015 amendments (as maintained). Maintains Sagebrush Focal Areas (SFAs) from 2015 amendments.	Affirms HMA boundaries from 2019 amendments. SFAs removed in UT, WY, NV, and ID. SFA remain in MT and OR UT removed GHMA, though there were no allocations specific to GHMA from the 2015 amendments, so there are no allocation changes from its removal.	All areas managed for GRSG would be PHMA. Some states are considering expanding HMAs to include areas of adjacent non-habitat, unoccupied historic habitat, or areas with potential to become habitat as PHMA.	The BLM is coordinating with state wildlife agencies to consider adjustments to existing HMA boundaries based on a review of how those boundaries relate to new information and science. Areas nominated as areas of critical environmental concern (ACEC) that BLM evaluated to meet the regulatory criteria would be considered for designation and management.	The BLM is coordinating with state wildlife agencies to consider adjustments to existing HMA boundaries based on a review of how those boundaries relate to new information and science. Could also consider adjustments based on balancing the various multi-use opportunities across the landscape while continuing to provide for GRSG needs. No ACEC(s) No SFAs
Summarized PHMA (and ID IHMA) allocations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fluid minerals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most states are NSO (PHMA and IHMA) and/or have seasonal restrictions. WY and MT are also subject to density and disturbance limits. CO is closed within 1 mile of lek. • Salable minerals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most states closed in PHMA and IMHA, but open for new free use permits (except ID). WY has seasonal restrictions, and WY and MT subject to 	Summarized PHMA (and ID IHMA) allocations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fluid minerals – Same as Alt 1, except CO has no closed areas. • Salable minerals – Same as Alt 1, except ID allows consideration of new free use permits and NV added exception criteria to the closure. 	Summarized PHMA allocations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fluid minerals – Closed to leasing • Salable minerals – Closed 	Work on the HMA boundaries and associated allocations is ongoing. They will largely be based on Alts 1 and 2, with adjustments based on HMA review, presence of a potential ACEC, or other state-specific considerations. Details are still being determined.	Work on the HMA boundaries and associated allocations is ongoing. They will largely be based on Alts 1 and 2, with adjustments based on HMA review, or other state-specific considerations. Details are still being determined.

Alternative 1 (from 2015)	Alternative 2 (from 2019)	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
<p>density and disturbance limits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Energy minerals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All states closed but can consider expansion of existing leases. WY has seasonal restrictions, and WY and MT subject to density and disturbance limits. ○ IHMA (ID) open in Known Phosphate Lease Areas. • Coal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CO, MT/DK, UT, and WY state that PHMA would be “essential habitat” for unsuitability evaluation. ID, NV/CA, and OR did not address coal due to absence of the mineral. • Locatable minerals – Recommendation to withdraw all SFAs from location and entry under the United States mining laws. • Rights-of-Way (ROW): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All states are Avoidance for major ROWs. All states avoidance for minor ROWs except WY which is open with buffers and mitigation. • Wind: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PHMA is exclusion except in WY where PHMA is avoidance or open if no impact to GRSG. IHMA is avoidance. OR is Avoidance in Lake, Harney, and Malheur Counties. • Solar: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PHMA is exclusion (utility scale only in ID, NV/CA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Energy minerals – Same as Alt 1, except NV added exception criteria to the closure. • Coal – Same as Alt 1, except in UT where essential habitat would be identified as part of future unsuitability criteria. • Locatable minerals: Recommendation for SFA withdrawal removed except in MT/DK which did not do a 2019 amendment. • ROW – Same as Alt 1 with additional exception criteria added in NV. • Wind – Same as Alt 1 with additional exception criteria added in NV. • Solar – Same as Alt 1, except NV added exception criteria to the closure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Energy minerals – Closed • Coal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CO, MT/DK, UT and WY would be same as UT Alt 2. • Locatable minerals – Recommendation to withdraw PHMA from location and entry under the United States mining laws • ROW – Exclusion (outside of designated corridors) • Wind – Exclusion • Solar – Exclusion 		

Alternative 1 (from 2015)	Alternative 2 (from 2019)	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
<p>and OR) except in WY where solar was not addressed. ID IHMA is Avoidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o OR is Avoidance in Lake, Harney, and Malheur Counties. • Livestock grazing – PHMA (and ID IHMA) are available. • Trails and Travel – Limited to existing roads and trails, with cross-country use allowed where suitable based on local conditions (e.g., sand dunes, rocky areas, etc.). <p>Summarized <u>GHMA</u> allocations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fluid minerals – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Closed within 1 mile of leks (CO, OR) o NSO within 2 (CO), 1 (OR) or 0.25 (WY) mile of leks. UT is NSO but distance varies by office. o Controlled Surface Use (seasonal restrictions and/or buffers) in ID, NV/CA OR, WY • Salable minerals – Most states have minimization measures. • Non-Energy minerals – Most states have minimization measures. • Coal: No state mentioned coal management in GHMA. • Locatable minerals – No GHMA is recommended for withdrawal. • ROWs – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o CO, NV/CA, and OR Avoidance for major ROWs. o ID and UT open to major ROWs with minimization measures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestock grazing – Same as Alt 1. • Trails and Travel – Same as Alt 1. <p>Summarized <u>GHMA</u> allocations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fluid minerals – same as Alt 1, except CO changed the closure to NSO. • Salable minerals – Same as Alt 1. • Non-Energy minerals – Same as Alt 1. • Coal – Same as Alt 1. • Locatable minerals – Same as Alt 1. • ROWs – Same as Alt 1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livestock grazing – Unavailable • Trails and Travel – Same as Alt 1. <p>Summarized <u>GHMA</u> allocations:</p> <p>Not applicable to this alternative, as there would be no other HMA types.</p>		

Alternative 1 (from 2015)	Alternative 2 (from 2019)	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ WY is open to major ROWs. ○ All states are open to minor ROWs with mitigation (WY does not require mitigation). • Wind - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CO, MT/DK, NV/CA, and OR are Avoidance ○ ID, UT and WY are open. • Solar - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CO, MT/DK and OR are Avoidance ○ NV/CA and UT are Exclusion ○ ID and WY are open. • Livestock grazing – available for livestock grazing. • Trails and Travel – Limited to existing roads and trails, with cross-country use allowed where suitable based on local conditions (e.g., sand dunes, rocky areas, etc.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wind – Same as Alt 1, NV/CA added exception criteria to the avoidance. • Solar – Same as Alt 1. • Livestock grazing – Same as Alt 1. • Trails and Travel – Same as Alt 1. 			
Key Component/Management Issue: Mitigation				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, UT: Require and ensure mitigation that achieves a net conservation gain in all HMA types. • In WY: Same as others in PHMA. No mitigation requirements in GHMA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MT/DK, NV/CA and OR same as Alt 1. • BLM does not require compensatory mitigation but will enforce state mitigation policies and programs • CO and ID provide mitigation resulting in no net loss. • UT and WY removed the net conservation gain requirement. • CO, ID, NV/CA, OR, UT and WY specify that compensatory mitigation would be voluntary unless required by laws other than FLMPA or by the State. 	<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as Alt 1 with avoidance emphasized. <p>Compensatory mitigation would need to fully offset any residual effects on habitat function and value. Compensatory mitigation efforts must be sufficient to fully offset both direct and indirect residual impacts at the scale necessary to meet the RMP GRSG goals and objectives.</p>	<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation will maintain habitat values (i.e., no net loss; all habitat designations), unless the state applies a higher standard. • If long-term trends (two nadirs) indicate a decreasing population, or if an adaptive management trigger is tripped, compensatory mitigation would be required to demonstrate an improvement in habitat services beyond merely replacing what was lost. Additional compensatory mitigation may be required where triggers have been tripped. 	<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigation will maintain habitat values (i.e., no net loss; all habitat designations), unless the state applies a higher standard. <p>If activities are not avoided or addressed through minimization, any remaining impacts will be addressed through compensation.</p> <p>Compensatory mitigation would need to fully offset any residual effects on habitat function and value and must be sufficient to fully offset both direct and indirect residual impacts at the scale necessary to meet the</p>

Alternative 1 (from 2015)	Alternative 2 (from 2019)	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
			Compensatory mitigation would need to fully offset any residual effects on habitat function and value and must be sufficient to fully offset both direct and indirect residual impacts at the scale necessary to meet the RMP GRSG goals and objectives.	RMP GRSG goals and objectives.
Key Component/Management Issue: Application of Habitat Objectives				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, UT, includes general narrative associated with the habitat objective tables that notes the indicators and values from table would be considered when authorizing activities in GRSG habitat. With WY and OR these states note the values would be used during the land health evaluation process to help determine if the standard applicable to GRSG habitat is being met. MT/DK and UT includes language that the values may be adjusted based on local factors, data, or updated science. UT includes a qualitative desired condition separate from the quantitative values in the table. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, UT, includes general narrative associated with the habitat objective tables that notes the indicators and values from table would be considered when authorizing activities in GRSG habitat. With WY and OR these states note the values would be used during the land health evaluation process to help determine if the standard applicable to GRSG habitat is being met. ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, and UT includes language that the values may be adjusted based on local factors, data, or updated science. ID and UT include a qualitative desired condition separate from the quantitative values in the table. 	<p>All States: The habitat objectives would identify the desired outcome for habitat on BLM-administered lands in all GRSG HMAs: management of activities to support suitable GRSG habitat at multiple scales, supporting connected mosaics of sagebrush to provide seasonal habitats and dispersal. The specific tables identifying indicators and benchmarks that various scientific publications throughout the range have identified as guidelines for habitat managers would be retained in the monitoring appendix as a tool through which suitability is informed.</p>	Same as Alt 3.	Same as Alt 3.
Key Component/Management Issue: Disturbance Cap				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO, ID, NV/CA, OR, UT, Dakotas: 3% cap does not include fire or agriculture. In ID the cap can be exceeded in utility corridors if benefit to GRSG. Cap applies at both biologically significant unit (BSU)-scale and at proposed project analysis area within PHMA. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO, ID, NV/CA, OR, UT, Dakotas: 3% cap does not include fire or agriculture. In ID the cap can be exceeded in utility corridors if benefit to GRSG. In UT the cap can be exceeded if will benefit GRSG. The cap is applied at the BSU and project scale except in ID which just applies it at the BSU scale. 	<p>All states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3% cap for new and pre-existing authorizations (subject to valid existing rights) in the project analysis area and within Habitat Assessment Framework (HAF) Fine-Scale boundaries while honoring valid existing rights. Cap would include </p>	<p>All states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3% cap in the project analysis area in PHMA, applicable only to infrastructure. 3% cap in PHMA in the HAF Fine-Scale boundaries, applicable only to infrastructure. <p>Loss of habitat from wildfire and agriculture would be addressed</p> </p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All states: 3% cap in PHMA in the HAF Fine-Scale boundaries. Applicable only to infrastructure. WY and MT: 5% cap at the project analysis area in PHMA. Includes fire and agriculture. All other states: 3% cap at project analysis area in

Alternative 1 (from 2015)	Alternative 2 (from 2019)	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MT, WY: 5% cap at the project area scale in PHMA. Includes wildfire and agriculture. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MT, WY: Same as Alt 1. 	<p>infrastructure, fire, and agriculture.</p>	<p>through the sagebrush availability objective already included by all states, as well as the habitat objectives.</p>	<p>PHMA. Does not include fire or agriculture.</p> <p>Loss of habitat from wildfire and agriculture would be addressed through the sagebrush availability objective already included by all states, as well as the habitat objectives.</p>
<p>Key Component/Management Issue: Fluid Mineral Development and Leasing Objective</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO, ID, ND, NV/CA, OR, UT, WY, parts of MT/DK (Dillon, Billings, HiLine, Miles City, ND, SD): Priority will be given to leasing and development of fluid mineral resources, including geothermal, outside of PHMAs and GHMAs, or within the least impactful areas within PHMA and GHMA if avoidance is not possible. No similar objective in Lewistown or Butte. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO, ID, OR, and MT/DK offices: Same as Alt 1. UT, NV/CA: Removed the objective. WY: Leasing allowed in PHMA, and if the BLM has a backlog of Expressions of Interest for leasing, the BLM will prioritize work first in non-habitat followed by lower habitat management areas (e.g., GHMA). Clarified for fluid mineral development on existing leases that could adversely affect GRSG populations or habitat, the BLM would work with the lessees, operators, or other project proponents to avoid, reduce, and mitigate adverse impacts consistent with lessees' rights. 	<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The leasing prioritization objective would not be applicable since all PHMA would be closed to new leasing, and all HMAs would be PHMA. 	<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify the objective associated with fluid mineral leasing on what should be considered when determining whether to offer a parcel of GRSG HMA for leasing. Adjust the objective to focus on how fluid mineral development associated with existing leases could be prioritized in a manner that minimizes adverse impacts to GRSG and its habitat to the extent compatible with the lessees' surface use rights (43 CFR 3101.1-2). 	<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove the leasing objective. Determining whether to offer a parcel for lease would consider the goals, objectives, and allocations in the RMP. Any offered lease would include the GRSG stipulations included in the RMP.
<p>Key Component/Management Issue: Fluid Mineral Leasing Waivers, Exceptions, and Modifications</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, UT: No waivers or modifications. An exception can be considered if action is alternative to action on nearby parcels that would be more harmful to GRSG (with partner agency approval). WY: Waivers, exceptions, and modifications available at the discretion of the authorized officer, in coordination with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MT/DK, OR, and WY are same as Alt 1. ID is similar to Alt 1 but removed the requirement for concurrent approval from other agencies. CO, NV/CA and UT developed state-specific exceptions, modifications, and waivers. 	<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All PHMA would be closed to leasing, so no waiver, exception, or modification would be needed. 	<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include exceptions, modifications, and waivers for fluid mineral stipulations, but clarify that they can be excepted, modified or waived if the authorized officer determines the factors leading to the inclusion of the stipulation have changed sufficiently to make the protection longer justified, or if the proposed operations 	<p>Same as Alt 4.</p>

Alternative 1 (from 2015)	Alternative 2 (from 2019)	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
WGFD, if no adverse impact to GRSG.			would not cause unacceptable impacts to GRSG or its habitat.	
Key Component/Management Issue: Minimizing Threats from Predation				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All states include some language related to reducing opportunities for avian predators (e.g., references in an objective, a management action, Required Design Feature or Best Management Practice). NV/CA, UT, and WY include language to minimize predator subsidies, and encouraging coordination with other partners on predator management. CO, NV/CA, and UT discuss habitat management to provide GRSG concealment from predators. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alt 1, except UT added language addressing corvid nests. 	<p>All states: Desired condition on public lands is to manage habitat so predation is at natural levels. Measures could include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managing for suitable habitat (objectives) by managing for sufficient hiding cover. Reducing or eliminating anthropogenic subsidies. Managing public lands to stop, slow, and/or discourage the incursion of novel predators. Requiring predator management plans for new developments to minimize and monitor/report predation issues. Working with partners on direct reduction of predator numbers where conditions warrant. 	Same as Alt 3.	Same as Alt 3.
Key Component/Management Issue: Improper Livestock Grazing				
<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GRSG management areas are available for livestock grazing, except OR, where all or portions Research Natural Areas would be unavailable. Prioritize monitoring and renewal of grazing in SFAs and PHMAs outside of SFAs. Include/adjust permit terms and conditions needed to meet land health standards and GRSG habitat objectives. Require thresholds and responses to address and respond to future conditions in new fully processed permits. 	<p>All States: Same as Alt 1, except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UT: all actions addressing were addressed outside the RMP so removed prioritization. WY: clarifications on grazing in riparian areas, management of range improvements, application of land health standards to GRSG, and prioritization (removed SFAs). ID: Clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NV: Clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land 	PHMA would be unavailable for livestock grazing.	<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GRSG management areas are available for livestock grazing, except in OR, where all or portions of 13 key RNAs would be unavailable. <p>Within HMAs, management will focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managing livestock grazing to meet the land health standards, as informed by the site-scale HAF suitability. New grazing permits in portions of PHMA, GHMA, and IHMA where site-scale habitat is unsuitable would 	Same as Alt 4, potentially focusing thresholds and responses on the areas with the greatest potential to impact GRSG.

Alternative 1 (from 2015)	Alternative 2 (from 2019)	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language related agency considerations if a permittee voluntarily relinquishes a permit or lease. 	<p>health standards were made. Prioritization in SFAs was removed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the 2015 amendments. 		<p>incorporate terms and conditions, as well as thresholds and responses, to move towards providing suitable habitat.</p>	
<p>Key Component/Management Issue: Wild Horse and Burro Management</p>				
<p>All states (where wild horses and burros overlap with GRSG):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage wild horse and burro populations within established appropriate management levels (AML). Incorporate GRSG habitat objectives into wild horse and burro management (e.g., herd management area plans, AML, etc.) monitoring, and gather prioritization (SFA, then PHMA, then GHMA). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as Alt 1, except removal of references to SFAs and removal of the reference to GHMA in UT. 	<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In those PHMAs with existing herd management areas, wild horses and burros would be removed. 	<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as 1, with references to SFAs removed. Considering whether potential ACEC(s) management would include removing wild horse and burro herd management areas in the Herd Areas that overlap the potential ACEC(s). 	<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as 1, with references to SFAs removed.
<p>Key Component/Management Issue: Adaptive Management</p>				
<p>All states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a hard trigger is tripped, more restrictive management would be required. The BLM will also undertake any appropriate plan amendments or revision if necessary. <p>There is no consistency in how triggers are calculated across the range. Metrics, thresholds, and timeframes and spatial scales vary state by state. Similarly, the responses associated with adaptive management triggers varies by state.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative 1, though some states applied strategies to improve the process based on lessons learned during implementation between 2015 and 2019, including the addition of “un-triggers”.</p>	<p>None. There is no additional management space within which to adjust to at the RMP level other than more proactive measures, which are dependent on budget and staffing.</p>	<p>The BLM is working with federal (habitat) and state (population) biologists across the GRSG range to develop consistent calculation for adaptive management triggers.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative 4.</p>