

---

# Appendix 15

Livestock Grazing Management Best Management  
Practices and Design Features and  
Supplemental Information

This page intentionally left blank.

# **Appendix 15. Livestock Grazing Management Best Management Practices and Design Features and Supplemental Information**

## **15.1 LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND DESIGN FEATURES**

The following measures best management practices (BMP) provide a list of strategies, practices, or design features to be considered during implementation of the RMP. These measures are not required in every instance but are useful to aid in proper livestock grazing management in GRSG habitats. The applicability and overall effectiveness of each BMP cannot be fully assessed until the project level when the project location and design are known. Because of site-specific circumstances, some BMPs may not apply to some projects (e.g., a resource is not present on a given site) and/or may require slight variations. For example, variations could be required for the following reasons:

- A specific BMP is documented to not be applicable to the site-specific conditions of the project/activity. Economic considerations, such as increased costs, do not necessarily require that an RDF be varied or rendered inapplicable.
- An alternative BMP, a state-implemented conservation measure, or plan-level protection is determined to provide equal or better protection for GRSG or its habitat.
- A specific BMP will not avoid or minimize impacts to GRSG or its habitat.

### **15.1.1 Coordination**

- 43 CFR 4100 regulations direct BLM to consult, cooperate and coordinate with affected grazing permittees, the state having lands or responsible for managing resources within the area, and the interested public when engaging in program work such as changes in permitted use, Allotment Management Plans, Range Improvements, issuance and/or modification of a grazing authorization. The BLM coordinates with Federal, State, county, Indian tribal and local governmental entities, institutions, organizations, corporations, associations, and individuals when authorizing grazing on BLM lands. In GRSG habitat management areas, these communication efforts should include coordination on how livestock grazing practices could be managed across both BLM-administered lands and non-BLM-administered lands, in partnership with interested permittees and lessees, to improve GRSG habitat conditions.

### **15.1.2 Best Management Practices for Livestock Grazing Management**

- Set priorities for grazing management activities (e.g., monitoring, authorization renewals, field checks, etc.) following direction in agency policy, including IM 2018-024 as amended or superseded. When considering competing priorities in GRSG habitat, considerations should include level of management priority (priority vs general habitat management areas) and focusing on areas where current livestock grazing management is a significant causal factor to not meeting or making significant progress towards meeting the special status species (SSS) land health standard, and those containing riparian areas, including wet meadows. Other criteria for prioritization can include the need to respond to urgent natural resource concerns (e.g., fire) and legal obligations.

- When current livestock management practices are determined to not be meeting or making progress towards meeting the SSS land health standard (following appropriate consultation, cooperation and coordination, consistent with BLM Handbook H-4180-1), implement changes in grazing management through grazing authorization modifications, or allotment management plan implementation. Potential modifications, either within the existing terms and conditions or considered as additional alternatives in grazing authorization NEPA analysis as a threshold/response, (not presented in any priority order) could include, but are not limited to, changes in:
  - Season or timing of use;
  - Numbers of livestock;
  - Distribution of livestock use;
  - Duration and/or level of use;
  - Kind of livestock (e.g., cattle, sheep, horses, or goats) (Briske et al. 2011); and
  - Range improvements.
- Locate supplements (salt, mineral, protein, etc.) away from water sources, meadows, riparian areas, swales, and GRSg leks in locations that increase livestock distribution unless effective control of livestock to avoid detrimental impairment of any riparian area or GRSg habitats can be ensured.
- When using salt or mineral supplements, place them outside intact sagebrush stands to reduce impacts to GRSg breeding habitat. For example, place supplements in existing disturbed sites, areas with reduced sagebrush cover, to reduce impacts on GRSg breeding habitat; where feasible use salts or mineral supplements to improve management of livestock for the benefit of GRSg habitat.
- During the lekking season, encourage minimal vehicle use and maintenance activities associated with livestock management during lekking hours (before 9 am and after 6 pm) within 0.6 miles of a lek.
- To decrease attracting predators or decreasing water quality, whenever found and wherever possible, remove dead livestock from public land and dispose of in ways that do not shift the impact to non-public land. If it is not possible to entirely remove livestock carcasses, they should, at a minimum, be removed from riparian areas and water sources.
- In PHMA, IHMA (in Idaho), and GHMA, areas that have received vegetation treatments should be rested from livestock grazing until resource monitoring data verifies the treatment objectives specific to the purposes of the treatment are being met and an appropriate grazing regime has been developed. Examples of vegetation treatments include seedings, hazardous fuels reduction treatments, emergency stabilization and rehabilitation efforts.
- Avoid disturbing lekking and roosting GRSg from human, guard animal, and sheep activities by trailing, overnighing, watering, and bedding sheep on public lands at least 0.6 miles from occupied leks (dates of lek activity determined locally, approximately March 15–May 1 in lower elevations and March 25–May 15 in higher elevations).
- When trailing livestock during the lekking or nesting season, use roads or existing trails, to the extent possible.
- When available, use GRSg habitat use-pattern mapping or habitat monitoring to strategically adjust livestock distribution to benefit occupied GRSg breeding habitat, include herding, salting, and water-source management (e.g., turning troughs/pipelines on/off and extending pipelines/moving troughs) in grazing programs.
- Ensure that permittees are informed of management and movement requirements related to avoiding recent burns, habitat rehabilitation, or other restoration sites.
- Identify and, when feasible, establish strategically located forage reserves, focusing on areas where restoration to GRSg habitat is unlikely or lower priority habitat restoration areas.

### **15.1.3 Design Features for Range Developments**

- When installing new range improvement projects in PHMA/IHMA, avoid construction during the applicable seasonal use periods associated with lekking, nesting, or brood rearing seasonal habitats (March 1 – July 15, or as identified for local variability in coordination with the state wildlife agency or other appropriate agency with management expertise and authority).
- Use temporary range infrastructure, such as troughs, fences, and supplements, where feasible and appropriate, to meet management objectives.
- Install shutoff valves at spring sources and troughs. Unless needed for wildlife habitat or water, ensure shutoff valves are closed and troughs are drained when livestock are not utilizing the pasture, as consistent with the water laws of the State within which the land is located.
- Install lids on spring collection boxes.
- Limit structures taller than adjacent vegetation and existing structures that could provide perching opportunities for avian predators. Where they are necessary, place them near taller natural features or partially/entirely bury them if possible.
- Install floats in troughs to prevent overflow and keep water at spring sources, as consistent with the water laws of the State within which the land is located.
- Ensure that new and existing livestock troughs and open water storage tanks are fitted with ramps to facilitate the use of and escape from troughs by GRSG and other wildlife; do not use unsecured, unstable, or ineffective items such as floating boards or similar objects.
- Locate troughs outside meadows, swales, and riparian areas.
- Design new water developments to maintain hydrologic function of spring sources, water courses and associated riparian habitat, as consistent with the water laws of the State within which the land is located.
- Consider virtual fencing opportunities, as appropriate.
- To minimize risk of noxious or invasive plant spread, require all heavy equipment used in construction of range improvements to be thoroughly cleaned of all soil and plant material prior to entering public lands.
- To minimize livestock concentration impacts on nesting and early brood rearing sage-grouse, locate new livestock handling facilities (such as corrals) away from active leks and outside of nesting habitat at least by 1.2 miles (Manier et al., 2014).
- Identify and close roads and trails that are not needed for range development maintenance.
- Where livestock handling and/or watering facilities result in lowering the downstream water table and dewatering of wet meadows or mesic habitat, relocate or remove these facilities when doing so will halt or reverse the dewatering, consistent with applicable laws.
- Design new and maintain existing water projects to avoid standing pools of shallow water that could spread West Nile Virus.

### **15.1.4 Drought Response**

- When completing a fully processed grazing authorization in GRSG habitat, incorporate strategies for livestock management during drought conditions.
- During drought conditions use a recognized drought indicator, such as the Drought Monitor, Vegetation Drought Response Index, or Palmer Drought Severity Index, to determine when abnormally dry or drought conditions are developing, present, or easing. When such conditions are developing or present:
  - Conduct pre-season assessments prior to livestock turn out.

- Monitor vegetation conditions during authorized livestock use periods to determine need for early removal and/or other changes to meet seasonal RMP objectives.
- During drought periods, prioritize evaluating effects of drought in PHMA relative to GRSG needs for food and cover (including riparian areas); ensure that post-drought management allows for vegetation recovery, based on ecological potential, that meets GRSG needs in priority GRSG habitat areas. Where ESDs or STMs are lacking for an area, the best available information to achieve the GRSG needs should be used.
- If livestock grazing is deferred due to drought, reevaluate vegetation and GRSG habitat indicators that measure GRSG habitat prior to reauthorization of grazing.

#### **15.1.5 From the BLM National Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy of 2004**

- Use prescriptive livestock grazing, where appropriate, to reduce annual grass production and the spread of wildfire into sagebrush communities. Timing of grazing and effects on residual native plants need to be carefully evaluated.
- Use grazing practices that promote the growth and persistence of native shrubs, grasses and forbs needed by sage-grouse for seasonal food and concealment. Grazing practices include changing season of use, numbers of livestock, grazing intensity, distribution of livestock use, and type of livestock (sheep, cattle or horses). Altering season of grazing may help to favor perennial plants in areas where native perennials and cheatgrass occur together in the plant community. Vegetation structure (height) should be managed so as to provide adequate cover for sage-grouse during the nesting period.
- Coordinate with state wildlife agencies where concentrations of grazing wildlife detrimentally affects sage-grouse habitat quality.
- Maintain seeps, springs, wet meadows, and riparian vegetation in a functional and diverse condition for young sage-grouse and other species that depend on forbs and insects associated with these areas. Consider fencing if vegetation associated with these wet areas cannot be maintained with current livestock, wildlife or wild horse and burro use and the impacts of the fence are outweighed by the improved habitat quality.
- Where other grazing management options are not achieving, or cannot achieve, the desired objectives, a short-term option may be livestock exclusion. Temporary exclusion can provide the plant community the opportunity to progress toward a point where grazing can again be reintroduced once desired conditions are reached. Removing livestock may not reverse the condition of severely altered habitats and often must be combined with reseeding and other rehabilitation methods to restore appropriate sagebrush habitat.

#### **15.1.6 Nevada Specific BMPs**

If results from the GRSG Habitat Assessment Framework indicate that GRSG habitat benchmarks are found to be un-suitable, and the land health evaluation results in a finding that Standards are not met or progress made towards meeting, and the determination concludes that current livestock grazing is a causal factor, and until appropriate modifications are incorporated through the grazing authorization renewal process, the following management strategies could be considered that may include, but are not limited to, the following, with considerations to site specific seasonal date restrictions:

- Provide periods of rest or deferment during critical growth periods of key vegetation species
- Manage grazing duration and intensity to allow plant growth sufficient to meet or make progress towards meeting GRSG habitat objectives (**Table 2-2**)

- Employ herd management techniques to minimize impacts of livestock on breeding, nesting, and brood-rearing habitat during the breeding season (March 1 to June 30; Lek—March 1 to May 15, and Nesting—April 1 to June 30)
- Consider any temporary projects that can avoid, minimize, or mitigate livestock impacts (e.g., temporary fencing or temporary water hauling locations;
- To prevent impacts to nesting GRSG, work with permittees to avoid concentrated turn-out locations for livestock within 4 miles of active and pending leks from March 1 to June 30 with consideration of quality of site-specific habitat, current bird activity, probability of sage-grouse nesting within the radius area, and duration intensity of the use.
- Avoid domestic sheep use and bedding areas and herder camps within 2 miles of active and pending leks from March 1 to June 30
- Utilizing land features and roads on maps provided to the permittee to help delineate livestock use avoidance areas

## **15.2 SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: ACTION ALTERNATIVES ADDRESSING LIVESTOCK GRAZING**

The USFWS 2013 Greater Sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) Conservation Objectives: Final Report (COT Report) notes that “livestock grazing is the most widespread type of land use across the sagebrush biome and almost all sagebrush areas are managed for livestock grazing” (USFWS 2013). The COT Report also includes tables that characterize threats to GRSG by population throughout its range (see COT Report, Table 2, pages 16 through 29). One of the threats assessed included grazing, with the report noting the threats from improper livestock grazing varied by population from “present and widespread,” to “present but localized,” and “not known to be present.”

To address the threat of improper livestock grazing, the COT Report recommended a conservation objective to “conduct grazing management...in a manner consistent with local ecological conditions that maintains or restores healthy sagebrush shrub and native perennial grass and forb communities and conserves the essential habitat components for sage-grouse (e.g. shrub cover, nesting cover)” (COT Report, page 45). It goes on to note that “areas which do not currently meet this standard should be managed to restore these components.” It concludes that “livestock...numbers must be managed at levels that allow native sagebrush vegetative communities to minimally achieve Proper Functioning Conditions (PFC; for riparian areas) or Rangeland Health Standards (RHS; uplands). The specific management (e.g., type of livestock, numbers, seasons, rotation, etc.) will depend on the local ecological factors and current condition of land health. The COT Report also recommends a conservation objective for range management structures (“avoid or reduce the impact of range management structures on sage-grouse”), and fences (“minimize the impact of fences on sage-grouse populations”).

As part of this planning effort livestock/range management actions were reviewed to determine which specifically address COT objectives. The prior GRSG plan amendment efforts included several management actions in the livestock grazing section that are addressed in existing agency regulations, policies, or that are duplicative of management actions in other sections of the ARMPA or the original RMPs. Since these actions would continue to be implemented whether they appear in the RMP, they are being considered for removal in Alternatives 4, 5, and 6. Further, most of these actions address management on livestock grazing in general, rather than focusing on conducting livestock grazing in a manner that reduces the potential for improper livestock grazing. Finally, some of the management actions did not contain specific direction, but provided a series of suggestions of what kind of activities or adjustments may be considered during future grazing

management decisions, with specific decisions deferred to the implementation level. Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 consolidate the livestock grazing decisions to focus on conducting livestock grazing in a manner that would reduce the potential for improper livestock grazing in GRSG habitat and relocate or remove actions that are not required to be in the RMP to implement.

The following table compares livestock grazing management actions from each of the BLM amendment efforts from 2015, with changes made in 2019 (if applicable) displayed in strike-out (for deletions) or underlines (for additions). The right-hand column identifies a summary statement for the row, with similar concepts between the states grouped. The column also identifies whether the concepts in the row are addressed by management in Alternatives 4 and 5 in Chapter 2, whether the concept was retained as a livestock grazing best management practices, or if it is proposed to not be carried forward in this planning process.



2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<b>Objective RM-1:</b> GRSG objectives and well-managed livestock operations are compatible because forage availability for livestock and hiding cover for GRSG are both dependent on healthy plant communities. Agreements with partners that promote sustainable GRSG populations concurrent with sustainable ranch operations offer long-term stability. In the context of sustainable range operations, manage the range program to: 1) maintain or enhance vigorous and productive plant communities; 2) maintain residual herbaceous cover to reduce predation during GRSG nesting and early brood-rearing; 3) avoid direct adverse impacts to GRSG-associated range project infrastructure; and 4) employ grazing management strategies that avoid concentrating animals on key GRSG habitats during key seasons.	—	<b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.3:</b> Within PHMA, incorporate GRSG habitat objectives and management considerations into all BLM grazing allotments through AMP or permit renewals. Develop standards with State of North Dakota and USFWS.	<b>Objective LG 1:</b> Manage permitted livestock grazing to maintain and/or enhance PHMAs and GHMAs to meet or make progress towards meeting all GRSG life-cycle requirements and habitat objectives ( <b>Table 2-2</b> ), based on site potential.	<b>Objective LG 1:</b> Manage livestock grazing to maintain or improve Greater Sage-grouse habitat by achieving Standards for Rangeland Health (SRH).	—	—	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Manage grazing to achieve GRSG habitat/objectives and/or land health standard</li><li>• Avoid direct adverse GRSG impacts from range infrastructure</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> <p>There is a regulatory requirement to achieve land health standards (4180), and it is a common objective/desired condition for public lands. In this effort, we want to focus on an objective specific to maintaining/improving GRSG habitat. This concept is included in chapter 2 in Objective RM-1.</p>

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
—	<b>MD LG 1:</b> Maintain existing areas designated as available or unavailable for livestock grazing. Existing active AUMs for livestock grazing within the planning area will not be changed at the broad scale, though the number of AUMs available on an allotment may be adjusted based on site-specific conditions to meet management objectives during term permit renewals, AMP development, or other appropriate implementation planning. Additionally, temporary adjustments can be made annually to livestock numbers, the number of AUMs, and season of use in accordance with applicable regulations.	<b>Dillon MD LG 1:</b> Maintain existing areas designated as available or unavailable for livestock grazing. Existing active AUMs for livestock grazing within the planning area will not be changed at the broad scale, though the number of AUMs available on an allotment may be adjusted based on site-specific conditions to meet management objectives during term permit renewals, AMP development, or other appropriate implementation planning. Additionally, temporary adjustments can be made annually to livestock numbers, the number of AUMs, and season of use in accordance with applicable regulations. <b>Lewistown Action LG-1.2:</b> The area will remain available for livestock grazing.	—	<b>Objective LG 2:</b> On BLM-managed lands, 12,083,105,622581 acres will continue to be available for livestock grazing in Greater Sage-grouse habitat. <u>Table 2-6 is no longer applicable and is therefore deleted.</u> In key RNAs, 22,765 acres will be unavailable to livestock grazing. See Table 2-6, Key ACECs and RNAs for ARMPA.  <u>MD LG 1 is deleted.</u> Livestock grazing management in the 13 key RNAs returns to being governed by applicable district RMPs as amended by the 2015 Oregon Greater Sage-Grouse ROD/ARMPA goals, objectives, and management decisions. <del>MD LG 1:</del> All or portions of key RNAs will be unavailable to grazing (Table 2-6). Determine whether to remove fences, corrals, or water storage facilities (e.g. reservoirs, catchments, ponds).	<del><b>MA LG 1:</b> PHMA and GHMA will be available for livestock grazing (Figure 2-3, Livestock Grazing [Appendix A]). Active animal unit months (AUMs) for livestock grazing will be 329,521 on BLM lands. Make adjustments to permitted AUMs consistent with regulation and the remaining grazing direction. In addition, on an annual basis livestock numbers and the season of use can be adjusted within the terms and conditions of the permit.</del>  Make adjustments to permitted use and annual adjustments to levels of livestock use consistent with regulation and the direction identified below where livestock grazing is identified as a causal factor to not meeting standards or habitat objectives.	—	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Available/unavailable allocation decision.</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> One of the primary decisions an RMP is supposed to make is whether a given area is available for livestock grazing. Included in chapter 2 as Management Action RM-1.
<b>MD RM-1:</b> (ADH) Within ADH, incorporate GRSG habitat objectives and management considerations into all BLM grazing allotments through Allotment Management Plans.	—	—	—	—	—	—	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Manage grazing to achieve GRSG habitat/objectives and/or land health standards</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> Duplicative with other decisions. Consolidate decisions that incorporate habitat objectives into one. See chapter 2 grazing decision RM-2 or Application of Habitat Objectives – Objective SSS Y and actions SSS Y1 and SSS Y2.

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<b>MD RM-2:</b> (ADH) Work cooperatively on integrated ranch planning within GRSG habitat. Develop management strategies that are seamless with respect to actions on public and private lands within BLM grazing allotments.	<b>MD LG 3:</b> Where opportunities exist, coordinate with other land managers to encourage livestock operations that utilize mixed federal, private and/or state land to be managed at the landscape scale to benefit GRSG and their habitat across land ownerships.	<b>Dillon MD LG 3:</b> Where opportunities exist, coordinate with other land managers to encourage livestock operations that utilize mixed federal, private and/or state land to be managed at the landscape scale to benefit GRSG and their habitat across land ownerships.  <b>Billings Management Direction LG-1.4:</b> In PHMA, work cooperatively on integrated ranch planning within GRSG habitat so operations with deeded/BLM allotments can be planned as single units.  <b>Lewistown Action LG-1.4:</b> In PHMA, cooperate with ranchers and other agencies on integrated ranch planning so operations with intermingled land ownerships within BLM allotments can be planned as single units.	—	—	<del><b>MA-LG-3:</b> In PHMA, consult, cooperate, and collaborate with other land owners and management agencies (e.g., private and SITLA) to develop plans which provide for landscape level approaches to habitat improvement. Manage unfenced private and SITLA lands within a grazing allotment that are under exchange of use agreements or percent public land use as a single unit that will have the same management as the public lands.</del>	<b>MD LG 2:</b> Within PHMA the BLM will 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 Greater Sage-Grouse habitat.	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Coordinate with partners/neighbors</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> <p>43 CFR 4100 regulations direct BLM to consult, cooperate and coordinate with affected grazing permittees, the state having lands or responsible for managing resources within and the interested publics when engaging in program work such as changes in permitted use, Allotment Management Plans, Range Improvements, issuance and/or modification of a grazing permit.</p> <p>Because regulations already require coordination, and conducting such coordination does not require an RMP decision to implement, it would be removed from the RMP-decision section for Alternatives 4 and 5. However, coordination language has been added specific to managing GRSG habitat across multiple ownership as a BMP in the appendix.</p>

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<p><b>MD RM-3:</b> (PHMA) The BLM will prioritize:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. the review of grazing permits/leases, in particular to determine if modification is necessary prior to renewal, and</li><li>2. the processing of grazing permits/leases in PHMA.</li></ol> <p>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.</p>	<p><b>MD LG 15:</b> <del>Generally, the BLM will prioritize</del> (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 based on land health conditions or concerns related to rangeland health standards. <u>If similar issues are found in both PHMA and IHMA, then those in PHMA should be addressed first.</u> <del>in Sagebrush Focal Areas (SFA) followed by PHMA outside of the SFA.</del></p> <p>In setting workload priorities, precedence will be given to existing permits/leases in these areas not meeting Land Health Standards and that have <u>declining Greater Sage-Grouse populations, defined by a soft or hard population adaptive management trigger being engaged. Greater Sage-Grouse populations that are stable or trending upward will be a lower priority for permit renewal and the assessment process, with focus on those containing riparian areas, including wet meadows.</u> <del>Management and conservation action prioritization will occur at the Conservation Area (CA) scale and be based on GRSG population and habitat trends: Focusing management and conservation actions first in SFA followed by areas of PHMA outside SFA.</del> The BLM may use other criteria for prioritization to respond to urgent natural resource concerns (e.g., fire) and legal obligations.</p> <p><b>MD LG 2:</b> Prioritize BLM land health assessments and processing of BLM grazing</p>	<p><b>Dillon MD LG 15:</b> 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 Sagebrush Focal Areas (SFA) followed by PHMA outside of the SFA.</p> <p>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. Management and conservation action prioritization will occur at the Conservation Area (CA) scale and be based on GRSG population and habitat trends: Focusing management and conservation actions first in SFA followed by areas of PHMA outside SFA. The BLM may use other criteria for prioritization to respond to urgent natural resource concerns (e.g., fire) and legal obligations.</p> <p><b>MD LG 2:</b> Prioritize BLM land health assessments and processing of BLM grazing permits consistent with management area prioritization (MD SSS 4), unless other higher priority considerations exist (MD LG 15) or other factors such as threatened, endangered and proposed species habitat that livestock grazing can affect. Where possible, conduct land health assessments at the watershed, or other meaningful landscape-scale.</p> <p><b>Billings MD LG-14:</b> The BLM will prioritize (1) the review of grazing permits/leases, in particular to determine if</p>	<p><b>MD LG 2:</b> 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 SFA followed by PHMA outside of the SFA. 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.</p>	<p><b>MD LG 11:</b> Sagebrush Focal Areas will be prioritized for management and conservation actions, including, but not limited to review of livestock grazing permits/leases.</p> <p><b>MD LG 12:</b> 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 Sagebrush Focal Areas (SFA) followed by PHMA outside of the SFA. 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.</p>	<p><del><b>MA-LG-2:</b> 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 SFA first followed by PHMA outside SFA.</del></p> <p><del>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 (ex., fire) and legal obligations.</del></p>	<p><b>MD LG 5 (cont.):</b> The BLM would 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 SFA followed by PHMA outside of the SFAs. In setting workload priorities, precedence would be given to existing permits/leases in these areas not meeting LHSs, 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.</p>	<p><u>Summary statement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Prioritize review/processing of grazing permits</li></ul> <p><u>Applicability for RMPs?</u></p> <p>Prioritization is not an RMP decision. It depends on staffing, budget, and the consideration of other resource issues that include, but are not limited to GRSG, other listed species, LHS, wildfire, or other resource concerns.</p> <p>Previous national level guidance for prioritization of renewals has always been to look at high resource value areas first. IM's such as WO 2009-018 and WO 2018-024 gave guidance on prioritization.</p> <p>The 2015 FWS listing determination cited the prioritization for reviewing grazing permits and conducting monitoring to determine if changes may be needed to meet GRSG habitat conditions – though it also noted that other criteria could be considered.</p> <p>Retained language related to prioritization in the livestock grazing BMP appendix. It can help inform and guide during implementation, though it is not needed as an RMP-level decision.</p>

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	permits consistent with management area prioritization (MD SSS 4), unless other higher priority considerations exist (MD LG 15) or other factors such as threatened, endangered and proposed species habitat that livestock grazing can affect. Where possible, conduct land health assessments at the watershed, or other meaningful landscape-scale.	<p>modification is necessary prior to renewal, and (2) the processing of grazing permits/leases in PHMA. 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 (ex., fire) and legal obligations.</p> <p><b>Lewistown (Same as Livestock Grazing MD-12):</b> 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 SFA followed by PHMA outside of the SFA. 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.</p> <p><b>Lewistown Action LG 1.5:</b> 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 in SFA, followed by PHMA. In setting will prioritize (1) the review of grazing permits/leases in particular to determine if modification is necessary prior</p>	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	(See above.)	<p>to renewal): and (2) the processing of grazing permits/leases in in SFA, followed by PHMA. 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.</p> <p><b>Miles City MD LG-3:</b> 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 PHMA. 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 (ex., fire) and legal obligations.</p> <p><b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.5:</b> 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 PHMA. 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,</p>	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	(See above.)	<p>including wet meadows. The BLM may use other criteria for prioritization to respond to urgent natural resource concerns (such as fire) and legal obligations.</p> <p><b>South Dakota MD-32</b> Land Health Standards: BLM will prioritize grazing leases in PHMA to determine if modifications are necessary prior to renewals or if the allotment does not meet Land Health Standards.</p> <p><b>Management Direction 36:</b> 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 PHMA. 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 (such as fire) and legal obligations.</p>	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<b>MD RM-4:</b> (ADH) Conduct land health assessments that include (at a minimum) indicators and measurements of vegetation structure/condition/composition specific to achieving GRSG habitat objectives (Doherty et al. 2011). If local/state seasonal habitat objectives are not available, use GRSG habitat recommendations from Connelly et al. 2000 and Hagen et al. 2007.	<b>MD LG 4:</b> PHMA & IHMA: During the land health assessment process, identify the type(s) of seasonal habitat the assessed areas are capable of supporting. Utilize the habitat assessment framework, (Stiver et al. 2015) or other BLM approved methodology, in accordance with current policy and guidance to determine whether vegetation structure, condition and composition are meeting GRSG habitat objectives including riparian and lentic areas (Objective SSS 2; Table 2-2). Use appropriate Ecological Site Descriptions, reference sheets and state and transition models to inform desired habitat conditions and expected responses to management changes for the land unit being assessed.	<b>Dillon MD LG 4:</b> PHMA & IHMA: During the land health assessment process, identify the type(s) of seasonal habitat the assessed areas are capable of supporting. Utilize the habitat assessment framework, (Stiver et al. 2015) or other BLM approved methodology, in accordance with current policy and guidance to determine whether vegetation structure, condition and composition are meeting GRSG habitat objectives including riparian and lentic areas (Objective SSS 2; Table 2-2). Use appropriate Ecological Site Descriptions, reference sheets and state and transition models to inform desired habitat conditions and expected responses to management changes for the land unit being assessed.  <b>Lewistown Action LG-1.2:</b> In PHMA and GHMA, conduct land health evaluations and determinations that include (at a minimum) indicators and/or measurements of structure/condition/ composition of vegetation specific to achieving GRSG habitat objectives. Management actions will be developed and implemented within one year if land health determinations indicate that an allotment is not meeting standards due to current livestock grazing. Appendix D addresses mid-scale monitoring.  <b>Lewistown Action LG-1.6:</b> Allotments that have the best opportunities for conserving, enhancing, or restoring habitat for GRSG will receive high priority for monitoring, evaluation, and management.	<b>MD LG 4:</b> Complete land health assessments in PHMAs and GHMAs to identify whether or not GRSG habitat objectives (Table 2-2) are being met. The priority order for completing land health assessments in GRSG habitat is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Allotments containing SFA that have never been evaluated;</li><li>•Allotments containing SFA that have not been re-evaluated in 10 or more years;</li><li>•Allotments containing PHMAs that have never been evaluated;</li><li>•Allotments containing PHMAs that have not been re-evaluated in 10 or more years;</li><li>•Allotments containing GHMAs that have never been evaluated;</li><li>•Allotments containing GHMAs that have not been re-evaluated in 10 or more years.</li></ul>	<b>Objective LG 3:</b> Complete rangeland health assessments for grazing permits/leases that have not been renewed and prioritized by Allotment Categories I, M, and C. The priority order for completing rangeland health assessments in Greater Sage-grouse habitat is: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Allotments containing SFA that have never been evaluated.</li><li>2. Allotments containing SFA that have not been re-evaluated in 10 or more years.</li><li>3. Allotments containing PHMA that have never been evaluated.</li><li>4. Allotments containing PHMA that have not been re-evaluated in 10 or more years.</li><li>5. Allotments containing GHMA that have never been evaluated.</li><li>6. Allotments containing GHMA that have not been re-evaluated in 10 or more years.</li></ol>	<del><b>MA-LG-5:</b> In PHMA and GHMA, conduct land health assessments that include indicators and measurements of structure, condition, composition, etc., of vegetation specific to achieving GRSG habitat objectives (Objective SSS-3), including within wetlands and riparian areas. Prioritize land health assessments in SFA, followed by PHMA outside of the SFA. Conduct land health assessments at the watershed scale and use the GRSG habitat objectives when assessing the applicable standard in GRSG habitats.</del>	<b>MD LG 1:</b> The BLM policy in WO-IM-2009-007 and BLM Handbook H-4180-1 will be used to evaluate land health standards achievement in PHMA (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 nonachievement and nonconformance.	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Land health assessments: include habitat indicators, ecological site descriptions, state and transition, priorities</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> <p>Prioritization is not an RMP decision. It depends on staffing, budget, and the consideration of other resource issues that include, but are not limited to GRSG, other listed species, LHS, wildfire, or other resource concerns.</p> <p>Previous national level guidance for prioritization of renewals has always been to look at high resource value areas first. IM's such as WO 2009-018 and WO 2018-024 gave guidance on prioritization.</p> <p>The 2015 FWS listing determination cited the prioritization for reviewing grazing permits and conducting monitoring to determine if changes may be needed to meet GRSG habitat conditions – though it also noted that other criteria could be considered.</p> <p>Retained language related to prioritization in the livestock grazing BMP appendix. It can help inform and guide during implementation, though it is not needed as an RMP-level decision.</p>



2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	(See above.)	<p><b>Lewistown Action LG-1.7:</b> In PHMA, conduct land health evaluations and determinations that include (at a minimum) indicators and/or measurements of structure/condition/compositio n of vegetation specific to achieving GRSG habitat objectives. Management actions will be developed if land health determinations indicate that an allotment is not meeting standards due to current livestock grazing. Appendix D addresses mid-scale monitoring.</p> <p><b>Lewistown Action LG-1.8:</b> The BLM will monitor grazing permits/leases renewed or modified in accordance with the direction contained in this guidance as follows: Allotments within SFA, followed by those in other PHMA, and focusing on those with riparian areas, will be prioritized for monitoring to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions in the permits. The BLM will collect, at a minimum, the following monitoring data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Vegetation Condition</li><li>· Actual Use</li><li>· Utilization</li><li>· Use Supervision</li></ul> <p><b>Lewistown Action LG-1.9:</b> In PHMA and GHMA, conduct land health evaluations and determinations that include (at a minimum) indicators and/or measurements of structure/condition/compositio n of vegetation specific to achieving GRSG habitat objectives. Management actions will be developed if land health determinations indicate that an allotment is not meeting standards due to livestock grazing in accordance with BLM</p>	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	(See above.)	<p>grazing regulations 43 CFR, Part 4100. Appendix D addresses mid-scale monitoring.</p> <p><b>Lewistown Action LG-1.11:</b> In PHMA, manage for vegetation composition and structure consistent with ecological site potential within the reference state to achieve GRSG seasonal habitat objectives. Natural ecological processes that impede localized site potential and that create a mosaic of habitat successional patterns will continue to occur.</p> <p><b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.6:</b> In PHMA, conduct land health assessments that include (at a minimum) indicators and measurements of structure/condition/composition of vegetation specific to achieving GRSG habitat objectives. Local objectives will be developed at the field office level in partnership with North Dakota Game and Fish Department and USFWS, and incorporated into AMPs or livestock grazing permits as appropriate incorporating best available science.</p> <p><b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.9:</b> In PHMA, manage for vegetation composition and structure consistent with GRSG seasonal habitat objectives. ESDs can help determine whether or not the GRSG seasonal habitat objectives are consistent with the ecological site potential within the reference state. GRSG seasonal habitat objectives and ecological site potential within reference</p>	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	(See above.)	states are not always going to be the same.  <b>HiLine (Same as Vegetation MD-11):</b> Rangeland health monitoring and assessments will be conducted within current staffing capabilities. The allotments within the Greater Sage-Grouse PHMA and the Grassland Bird/Greater Sage-Grouse PHMA will be high priority for reassessment of land health standards and processing grazing permits as detailed in Appendix I. Rangeland health monitoring plans will be developed and implemented at the field office level.	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)
<b>MD RM-6:</b> (ADH) Manage for vegetation composition and structure consistent with ecological site potential and within the reference state subject to habitat objectives, including successional stages.	—	—	—	—	—	—	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Manage for vegetation composition consistent with ecological site potential</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> Duplicative with habitat objective reference action. Consolidate decisions that incorporate habitat objectives into one. See chapter 2 grazing decision RM-2 or Application of Habitat Objectives – Objective SSS Y and actions SSS Y1 and SSS Y2.

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<b>MD RM-5:</b> (ADH) Develop specific objectives—through NEPA analysis conducted in accordance with the permit/lease renewal process—to conserve, enhance, or restore GRSG habitat. Base benchmarks on Ecological Site/Range Site Descriptions. When existing on Ecological Site/Range Site Descriptions have not been developed, or are too general to serve adequately as benchmarks, identify and document local reference sites for areas of similar potential that exemplify achievement of GRSG habitat objectives and use these sites as the benchmark reference. Establish measurable objectives related to GRSG habitat from baseline monitoring data, ecological site descriptions, or land health assessments/evaluations, or other habitat and successional stage objectives.	—	<b>Billings:</b> <b>MD LG-12:</b> Site specific Greater Sage-Grouse habitat and management objectives will be developed for BLM land within Greater Sage-Grouse PHMA. These objectives will be incorporated into the respective allotment management plans (AMPs) or livestock grazing permits as appropriate.  <b>Lewistown Action LG-1.2:</b> Site-specific Greater Sage-Grouse habitat and management objectives will be developed for BLM land and incorporated into the respective AMPs or livestock grazing permits as appropriate. Third order (fine-scale) and fourth order (site-scale) habitat indicators and characteristics for sage-grouse habitat seasonal use areas as described in the Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework (Stiver, et al. 2015) will be used to quantify habitat objectives.  <b>HiLine MD-36:</b> Consideration will be given to incorporating fine-scale and site-specific Greater Sage-Grouse habitat and management objectives as appropriate to the area into AMPs or livestock grazing permits.	<b>MD LG 8:</b> Within PHMAs and GHMAs, incorporate terms and conditions into grazing permits to meet GRSG habitat objectives ( <a href="#">Table 2-2</a> ), specific terms and conditions will be based on rangeland health assessments (and subsequent monitoring data).	<b>MD LG 4:</b> When fine and site-scale Greater Sage-grouse habitat assessment and monitoring is needed or required, (e.g., as a component of a rangeland health assessment), measure the Greater Sage-grouse habitat suitability indicators for seasonal habitats identified in Table 2-2. Site suitability values may be adjusted regionally where there is scientific justification for doing so. When using the indicators to guide management actions or during land health assessments, consider that the indicators are sensitive to the ecological processes operating at the scale of interest and that a single habitat indicator does not necessarily define habitat suitability for an area or particular scale.	<del><b>MA-LG-4:</b> Evaluate Utah's Rangeland Health Standards and process grazing permits. Focus monitoring and management activities on allotments found not to be achieving Utah's Rangeland Health Standards where livestock grazing is identified as a causal factor and that have the best opportunities for conserving, enhancing or restoring habitat for GRSG.</del>  Use ecological site descriptions and/or other appropriate information to determine the desired plant community within proper functioning ecological processes for conducting land health assessments to evaluate the achievement or non-achievement of rangeland health standards.	<b>MD LG 4:</b> Within PHMA, 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 wildlife/special status species standard habitat objectives have <u>has</u> not been met nor progress being made toward meeting <u>them</u> that standard, there will be an evaluation and a determination made as to the cause. If it is determined that the <u>current</u> authorized livestock use is a significant <u>causal</u> factor in failing to achieve the <u>wildlife/special status species</u> standards, <u>the BLM would address the achievement or progress toward achieving the LHSs (43 CFR 4180.2) and, if needed, Greater Sage-Grouse habitat maintenance or improvement for healthy rangelands, the use will be adjusted by the response specified in the instrument that authorized the use.</u>	<u>Summary statement:</u> • Manage grazing to achieve GRSG habitat/objectives and/or land health standards  <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> Developed a consolidated action (Management Action RM-2 in chapter 2) to consider GRSG habitat benchmarks via HAF to inform LHS. The action connects GRSG habitat benchmarks for suitable habitat via HAF to inform land health special status species standard, and then the regulatory requirement to meet LHS (see Management Action RM-2 in chapter 2).
<b>MD RM-7:</b> (ADH) Include terms and conditions on grazing permits and leases that address disruptive activities that affect GRSG and assure plant growth requirements are met and residual forage remains available for GRSG hiding cover.  Specify as necessary: 1. Season or timing of use 2. Numbers of livestock (include temporary non-use or livestock removal)	<b>MD LG 6:</b> When livestock management practices are determined to not be compatible with meeting or making progress towards achievable habitat objectives following appropriate consultation, cooperation and coordination, implement changes in grazing management through grazing authorization modifications, or allotment management plan implementation. Potential	<b>Dillon MD LG 6:</b> When livestock management practices are determined to not be compatible with meeting or making progress towards achievable habitat objectives following appropriate consultation, cooperation and coordination, implement changes in grazing management through grazing authorization modifications, or allotment management plan implementation. Potential	<b>MD LG 1:</b> When livestock management practices are determined to not be compatible with meeting or making progress towards achievable habitat objectives following appropriate consultation, cooperation and coordination, implement changes in grazing management through grazing authorization modifications, or allotment management plan implementation <u>and consistent with 43 CFR 4160.1 and IM-</u>	<b>MD LG 2:</b> When livestock management practices are determined to not be compatible with meeting or making progress towards achievable habitat objectives following appropriate consultation, cooperating and coordination, implement changes in grazing management through grazing authorization modifications, or allotment management plan implementation. Potential modifications include, but are not limited to, changes in: 1. Season or timing of use;	<b>MA-LG-6:</b> In PHMA, when <u>an area is not livestock management practices are determined to not be compatible with meeting or making progress towards achievable habitat objectives and Land Health Standards, and the causal factor is livestock grazing (i.e., improper livestock grazing) following appropriate consultation, cooperating and coordination, implement</u>	<b>MD LG 1:</b> When determining appropriate actions to address nonachievement of land health standards and nonconformance with the guidelines due to existing grazing management practices or levels of grazing use, management actions including but not limited to the following will be considered singly or in combination: 1. Season or timing of use	<u>Summary statement:</u> • Include/Adjust terms and conditions to meet land health standards/GRSG objectives/needs  <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> The text in this row does not contain any decision but is a list of what the agency could consider if an area isn't meeting the habitat needs for GRSG. This is evident by language such as "...potential modifications include" or

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
3. Distributions of livestock use 4. Intensity of use (utilization or stubble height objectives) 5. Kind of livestock (e.g., cattle, sheep, horse, llama, alpaca, and goat) 6. Class of livestock (e.g., yearlings versus cow/calf pairs) 7. Locations of bed grounds, sheep camps, trail routes, and the like	modifications include, but are not limited to, changes in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Season or timing of use;</li><li>• Numbers of livestock;</li><li>• Distribution of livestock use;</li><li>• Duration and/or level of use;</li><li>• Kind of livestock (e.g., cattle, sheep, horses, or goats) (Briske et al. 2011); and</li><li>• Grazing schedules (including rest or deferment).</li></ul> *Not in Priority Order  <b>MD LG 8:</b> PHMA & IHMA - Where practical, design pasture rotations to utilize non-native perennial grass seedings and/or annual grasslands, during GRSG nesting season annually or periodically.	modifications include, but are not limited to, changes in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Season or timing of use;</li><li>• Numbers of livestock;</li><li>• Distribution of livestock use;</li><li>• Duration and/or level of use;</li><li>• Kind of livestock (e.g., cattle, sheep, horses, or goats) (Briske et al. 2011); and</li><li>• Grazing schedules (including rest or deferment).</li></ul> *Not in Priority Order  <b>Dillon MD LG 8:</b> PHMA & IHMA - Where practical, design pasture rotations to utilize non-native perennial grass seedings and/or annual grasslands, during GRSG nesting season annually or periodically.  <b>Lewistown Action LG-I.1:</b> GRSG habitat objectives will be considered when evaluating an allotment's conformance with land health standards (see Appendix F in the Lewistown Field Office Proposed RMPA/Final EIS) prior to renewing a grazing authorization.  <b>Lewistown Action LG-I.12:</b> In PHMA, implement management actions within or outside of the watershed planning/permit renewal process to modify grazing management and to meet seasonal GRSG habitat objectives. Consider singly, or in combination, for changes in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>· Season or timing of use</li><li>· Numbers of livestock (includes temporary non-use or livestock removal)</li><li>· Distribution of livestock use</li><li>· Intensity of use</li><li>· Type of livestock</li></ul>	<u>2018-023</u> . Potential modifications include, but are not limited to, changes in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Season or timing of use;</li><li>• Numbers of livestock;</li><li>• Distribution of livestock use;</li><li>• Duration and/or level of use;</li><li>• Kind of livestock (e.g., cattle, sheep, horses, or goats) (Briske et al. 2011);</li><li>• Grazing schedules (including rest or deferment);</li><li>• Class of livestock;</li><li>• Grazing schedules (including rest or deferment)</li><li>• Making allotment unavailable to grazing</li></ul> *Not in priority order  <b>MD LG 5:</b> If results from a land health assessment indicate that GRSG habitat objectives ( <a href="#">Table 2-2</a> ) are not met in SFA, PHMAs or GHMAs and grazing is a causal factor, and until appropriate modifications (MD LG 1) are incorporated through the permit renewal process, <u>then consistent with applicable laws and regulations</u> , implement management strategies that may include, but are not limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide periods of rest or deferment during critical growth periods of key vegetation species</li><li>• Limit grazing duration and intensity to allow plant growth sufficient to meet GRSG habitat objectives (<a href="#">Table 2-2</a>)</li><li>• Employ herd management techniques to minimize impacts of livestock on breeding, nesting, and brood-rearing habitat during the breeding season (March 1 to June 30; Lek—March 1 to</li></ul>	2. Numbers of livestock; 3. Distribution of livestock use; 4. Duration and/or level of use; 5. Locations of bed grounds, sheep camps, trail routes, and the like; 6. Extended rest or temporary closure from grazing through BLM administrative actions; 7. Make allotment unavailable to grazing; 8. Kind of livestock (e.g., cattle, sheep, horses, or goats) (Briske et al. 2011); and 9. Grazing schedules (including rest or deferment). *Not in Priority Order  When SRH are being met no changes in current management or activity plans or permits/leases are required, but could occur to meet other resource management objectives.	changes in grazing management through grazing authorization modifications, or allotment management plan implementation. Potential modifications include, but are not limited to, changes in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Season or timing of use;</li><li>• Numbers of livestock;</li><li>• Distribution of livestock use;</li><li>• Duration and/or level of use;</li><li>• Kind of livestock (e.g., cattle, sheep, horses, or goats); and</li><li>• Grazing schedules (including rest or deferment).</li></ul> *Not in priority order	2. Numbers of livestock (includes temporary nonuse 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.	“implement management strategies that may include” and both instances note that the list is inclusive of but not limited to a series of potential actions. It's just a list – like a toolbox of things the BLM could apply.  43 CFR 4180 directs BLM to take appropriate action if livestock are the causal factor for failing to achieve the land health standards. Handbook 4180 outlines the process and suggests available tools such as Ecological Site Descriptions to be used as a reference when assessing/evaluating the achievement of land health standards. Moved a consolidated version of this to the BMP appendix, as it's just a list of potential actions the BLM could consider during implementation.

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	(See above.)	<p><b>HiLine MD-1:</b> If monitoring data demonstrate that livestock use on an allotment in a priority Greater Sage-Grouse area is adversely affecting Greater Sage-Grouse or their habitat, the terms and conditions of grazing permits may be modified, or changes in active use could be considered in order to meet the standards for rangeland health as described in 43 CFR, Part 4180 and the Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (Appendix L) or to otherwise manage, maintain, or improve sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p><b>HiLine MD-2:</b> Appropriate indicators and measurements specific to habitat for Greater Sage-Grouse, or any other wildlife species of concern, will be evaluated as part of standards and guidelines assessment and any necessary and appropriate habitat objectives specific to meeting the wildlife health standard for the site will be identified and incorporated into allotment management plans (AMPs) or the terms and conditions of livestock grazing permits.</p> <p><b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.10:</b> In PHMA, implement management directions (grazing decisions, AMP/Conservation Plan development, or other agreements) to modify grazing management to meet State of North Dakota seasonal GRSG habitat requirements, where allotment evaluations indicate land health assessments are not being met due to livestock. Consider singly, or in combination, changes in:</p>	<p>May 15, and Nesting—April 1 to June 30)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consider any temporary projects that can mitigate livestock impacts (e.g., temporary fencing or temporary water hauling locations;</li><li>• Work with permittees to avoid concentrated turn-out locations for livestock within 4 miles of active and pending leks from March 1 to June 30</li><li>• Avoid domestic sheep use and bedding areas and herder camps within 2 miles of active and pending leks from March 1 to June 30</li><li>• Utilizing land features and roads on maps provided to the permittee to help delineate livestock use avoidance areas</li><li>• Considering no grazing from May 15 – Sept. 15 in riparian areas and wet meadows.</li><li>• Removing livestock within 3-7 days for the remainder of the grazing year once the allowable use levels are reached (BLM 1996, Burton et. al 2011, Cagney et. al, 2010, Connelly et. al 2000, France et. al 2008, Hagen et. al 2007, Holechek 1988, Platts 1990, and Tanaka et. al 2014):<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ In riparian areas and wet meadows the allowable percent utilization is 35% woody species, and a minimum stubble height of 4-6 inches (10-15 cm) for herbaceous riparian vegetation based on site.</li><li>▪ In mountain big sage habitat, the allowable percent utilization is 40 % herbaceous key species and/or 35 % shrub key species.</li></ul></li></ul>	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	(See above.)	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; and 5. Type of livestock (e.g., cattle, sheep, horses, llamas, alpacas, and goats).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ In Wyoming Basin big sage habitat, the allowable percent utilization is 35% herbaceous key species and/or 35 % shrub key species.</li><li>▪ In black sage habitat, the allowable percent utilization is 35% herbaceous key species and/or 35 % shrub key species.</li></ul> <p>To the extent that the implementation of these strategies would be in conflict with the terms and conditions of any applicable livestock grazing permit or lease, then the BLM would complete a new decision-making process before implementing the strategies.</p>	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)
—	—	—	<b>MD LG 6:</b> Appropriate allowable utilization levels will be defined through the grazing permit renewal process. At least one alternative in the NEPA process will consider the utilization levels identified in MD LG 5.	—	—	—	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Include/Adjust terms and conditions to meet land health standards/GRSG objectives/needs</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> <p>Only from NV/CA. It's not an RMP decision, but “plan to plan” type of language along with direction for what future NEPA should consider in a range of alternatives, none of which are RMP decisions or BMPs.</p>
—	—	—	<b>MD LG 7:</b> In pastures where post livestock removal use monitoring results in utilization levels that exceed allowable use levels and livestock are identified as a causal factor, reduce animal unit months (AUMs) grazed the following year accordingly in accordance with 43 CFR 4160.1 and IM 2018-023. AUMs cannot be applied to another pasture that is already being used by livestock or is being purposefully rested.	—	—	—	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Include/Adjust terms and conditions to meet land health standards/GRSG objectives/needs</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> <p>Only from NV/CA. Not an RMP decision, but direction for implementation that is not directly linked to habitat conditions. Included as a BMP specific to NV/CA.</p>

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
—	—	—	<b>MD LG 10:</b> In any allotment where land health standards were not met and livestock grazing was found to be a significant causal factor, compliance monitoring will be conducted annually until GRSG habitat objectives ( <a href="#">Table 2-2</a> ) are met. If compliance monitoring finds that the implemented management strategies identified in MD LG 5 are not achieving the desired results, a change in action will be required in compliance with <a href="#">43 CFR 4160.1 and IM 2018-023</a> .	—	—	—	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Monitoring commitment if not meeting LHS</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> <p>Monitoring is not an RMP decision but is based on available staff and budget. This is more appropriately addressed as a mix of 1) compliance with the grazing regulations and 2) implementation prioritization. Not carried forward as it's related to implementation prioritization, which is not an RMP action.</p>
<b>MD RM-8:</b> (ADH) Develop drought contingency plans at the appropriate landscape unit that provide for a consistent/appropriate BLM response. Plans shall establish policy for addressing ongoing drought and post-drought recovery for GRSG habitat objectives.	<b>MD LG 14:</b> In response to weather conditions (i.e. drought) adjust grazing management (i.e., delay turnout, adjust pasture rotations, adjust the amount and/or duration of grazing) as appropriate to provide for adequate food and cover for GRSG.	<b>Dillon MD LG 14:</b> In response to weather conditions (i.e. drought) adjust grazing management (i.e., delay turnout, adjust pasture rotations, adjust the amount and/or duration of grazing) as appropriate to provide for adequate food and cover for GRSG.  <b>Lewistown Action LG-1.13:</b> During drought periods, prioritize evaluating effects of the drought in PHMA, relative to their needs for food and cover. Drought management will continue to be in accordance with the Montana/Dakotas drought policy (see Appendix I, Drought Policy, in the Lewistown Field Office Proposed RMPA/Final EIS). Since there is a lag in vegetation recovery following drought, post-drought management will be implemented to allow for vegetation recovery that meets GRSG needs in PHMA. In accordance with BLM grazing regulation 43 CFR, Part 4130.3-3, consultation, cooperation, and coordination with owners or lessees having lands or	—	<b>MD LG 5:</b> During drought conditions use a recognized drought indicator, such as the Drought Monitor or Palmer Drought Severity Index, to determine when abnormally dry or drought conditions are developing, present, or easing. When such conditions are developing or present: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Conduct pre-season assessments prior to livestock turn out.</li><li>2. Monitor vegetation conditions during authorized livestock use periods to determine need for early removal or other changes to meet seasonal PHMA and GHMA objectives.</li></ol> If livestock grazing is deferred due to drought, reevaluate vegetation and Greater Sage-grouse habitat indicators that measure Greater Sage-grouse habitat prior to reauthorization of grazing.	<del><b>MA LG 7:</b> In PHMA, during drought periods, prioritize evaluating effects of the drought relative to GRSG needs for food and cover. Initiate emergency management measures (e.g. delaying turnout, adjusting the amount and/or duration of livestock grazing, implement other terms of the permit) during times of drought to protect GRSG habitat, in accordance with Instruction Memorandum 2013-094 (Resource Management During Drought), or other agency policies.</del>  Implement post-drought management to allow for vegetation recovery that meets GRSG needs.	<b>MD LG 7:</b> When periods of drought occur, where appropriate, the AO will evaluate strategies to address drought through coordination with grazing permittee/lessee and annual billings processes. In cooperation with livestock grazing permittees/lessees, drought contingency plans will be developed at the appropriate landscape unit that provide for a consistent/appropriate BLM response. Contingency plans shall establish strategies for addressing ongoing drought and post-drought recovery.	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Drought response</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Drought is not solely a livestock grazing issue. However, as drought directly effects vegetation that is used by both livestock grazing and GRSG, there is a connection. Consolidated grazing related management associated with drought to the BMP appendix, as the existing management to the left is more related to best practices than it is RMP-level decision-making or allocation changes.</li><li>• Additionally, 43 CFR 4110.3-3(b) provides the ability of the authorized officer to determine that when resources on public lands require protection because of drought ... that actions can be taken.</li></ul>



2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	(See above.)	managing resources within the area, the affected cooperative state grazing district, and interested public will be completed prior to adjusting post-drought livestock management if the grazing permit is being modified to make these adjustments. Implementation of adjustments will be initiated through documented agreement or by decision of the authorized officer in accordance with BLM grazing regulation 43 CFR, Part 4160.  <b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.11:</b> During drought periods, prioritize evaluating effects of the drought in PHMA relative to their needs for food and cover. Management will continue to be in accordance with the Montana-Dakotas Drought Policy (see Appendix H, Drought Policy, of the 2015 Greater Sage-Grouse Approved RMPA/ROD [BLM 2015a]).	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)
<b>MD RM-9:</b> The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within PHMA would include specific management thresholds based on Table 2.3 in the Proposed Plan, Land Health Standards (43 CFR, Part 4180.2), ecological site potential, and one or more defined responses that would allow the authorizing officer to make adjustments to livestock grazing that have already been subject to NEPA analysis.	<b>MD LG 16:</b> <u>Grazing in the PHMA and IHMA will be managed according to the process outlined in the text below, and the grazing permit renewal process will be managed according to 43 CFR 4100, Subpart 4180, and as outlined in the process below.</u>  a. <u>Incorporate the Greater Sage-Grouse desired conditions in Table 2.2 [of the 2015 Final EIS] and management considerations as desired conditions, and manage livestock grazing, recognizing that these conditions may not be achievable: (1) due to the existing ecological</u>	<b>Dillon MD LG 16:</b> The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within SFA and PHMA will include specific management thresholds, based on GRSG Habitat Objectives Table, 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.  <b>Billings MD LG-13:</b> The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within PHMA will	<b>MD LG 3:</b> The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within SFA and PHMA will include specific management thresholds based on GRSG Habitat Objectives Table ( <b>Table 2-2</b> ), Land Health Standards (43 CFR, Part 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.	<b>MD LG 13:</b> The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within SFA and PHMA will include specific management thresholds based on GRSG Habitat Objectives <b>Table 2-2</b> , Land Health Standards (43 CFR, Part 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.	<b>MA-LG-6 (cont.):</b> <u>When improper livestock grazing is the causal factor for not meeting or making progress towards achievable habitat objectives and Land Health Standards, the NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within SFA and PHMA will analyze multiple potential modifications (e.g., alternatives from the list above) that address the reasons for not meeting, allowing the include specific management thresholds based on <b>Table 2-2</b>, Land Health Standards (43 CFR, Part 4180.2), and ecological</u>	<b>MD LG 4 (cont.):</b> <u>When NEPA analysis is required for a specific implementation action, one alternative would include mechanisms to make adjustments to meet or make progress toward meeting the wildlife/special status species standard. The analysis should also identify the BLM-approved data collection methodologies used for monitoring conditions and determining when adjustments are necessary. If current grazing management meets land health standards and provides for Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, there would be no need to analyze an alternative for Greater Sage-Grouse. Authorized uses in PHMA that incorporate habitat objectives</u>	<u>Summary statement:</u> • Thresholds and Responses in permit renewals  <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> Alternatives 4 and 5 include the concept of a proactive approach associated with thresholds and responses in the alternatives above under Management Action RM-3.

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	<p><u>condition, ecological potential, or existing vegetation; or (2) due to causal events unrelated to existing livestock grazing; and 3) that they are not intended to be prescriptive at the allotment level.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Conduct habitat assessments using appropriate monitoring methods. Where appropriate, make a determination of factors causing any failure to achieve the desired conditions in Table 2.2 [of the 2015 Final EIS]. The assessment will be conducted at a resolution and scale sufficient to document the habitat condition and will include local, spatial, and interannual variability. Any determination relative to the habitat characteristics (Table 2.2 [of the 2015 Final EIS]) will be based on existing ecological condition, ecological potential, and existing vegetation information. This is to ensure the assessment recognizes whether these habitat characteristics are achievable.</u></p> <p>c. <u>The assessment will rely on published characteristics of Greater Sage-Grouse habitat and the ecological site descriptions, on Table 2.2 [of the 2015 Final EIS as amended], and where available and applicable, rangeland health determinations made in accordance with 43 CFR 4180.2(c).</u></p> <p>d. <u>After conducting the assessment in (b), above, if</u></p>	<p>include specific management thresholds based on GRSG Habitat Objectives Table (Table 2-6) and Land Health Standards (43 CFR, Part4180.2) 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.</p> <p><b>MD LG-15:</b> The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within PHMA will include specific management thresholds based on GRSG Habitat Objectives Table (Table 2-6) and Land Health Standards (43 CFR, Part4180.2) 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.</p> <p><b>Miles City MD LG-4:</b> The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within PHMA will include specific management thresholds based on GRSG Habitat Objectives Table and Land Health Standards (43 CFR, Part4180.2) 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.</p> <p><b>South Dakota MD 34:</b> The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within PHMA will include specific management</p>	(See above.)	(See above.)	<p><del>site potential, and one or more defined responses that will allow the</del> authorizing officer to make adjustments to livestock grazing that have already been subjected to NEPA analysis. Adjustments to meet seasonal GRSG habitat requirements could include those items identified in the list above.</p>	<p><del>for Greater Sage-Grouse must develop desired conditions based on Greater Sage-Grouse habitats present in the allotment and the ecological potential of sites that supports these habitats. Metrics used to monitor for objectives must be developed and inform the wildlife/SSS portion of the Standards for Healthy Rangelands.</del></p> <p><del>Within PHMA, seasonal habitat objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse apply only to those habitats delineated within an allotment during the specific season (e.g., breeding season objectives during breeding season). Data needed to inform the relationship between the authorized use and habitat condition would come from sample locations that appropriately reflect the impact of the authorized use on habitat conditions. Data points should fall within Greater Sage-Grouse seasonal habitat areas and be collected on ecological sites that have the potential to produce Greater Sage-Grouse habitat.</del></p> <p><del>The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that includes lands within SFAs and PHMA will include specific management thresholds based on GRSG habitat objectives (Tables 2-2 and 2-3) and Land Health Standards (43 CFR 4180.2), 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.</del></p>	(See above.)

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	<p>the current grazing system achieves applicable Idaho rangeland health standards, absent substantial and compelling information, no further grazing management changes are necessary to achieve desired conditions for Greater Sage-Grouse habitat.</p> <p>e. If the process and conditions outlined in (b), above demonstrate that livestock grazing is limiting achievement of the desired conditions (Table 2.2 [of the 2015 Final EIS]), renewed permits will include measures, including but not limited to the actions outlined in <b>Appendix C</b> to achieve desired habitat conditions. These measures must be tailored to address the specific management issues.</p> <p>f. Adaptive management changes related to existing grazing permits should be undertaken only where improper grazing is determined to be the causal factor in not meeting habitat characteristics, specific to site capability, based on monitoring, with appropriate spatial variability. See <b>Appendix C</b>.</p> <p>g. Where management changes are needed and necessary pursuant to (f), above, implement management actions that are narrowly tailored to address the specific habitat objective applied at the allotment or activity plan level, including the actions outlined in <b>Appendix C</b>.</p>	<p>thresholds based on GRSG Habitat Objectives Table and Land Health Standards (43 CFR, Part4180.2) 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.</p> <p><b>South Dakota MD 36:</b> The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within PHMA will include specific management thresholds, based on GRSG Habitat Objectives (Table 2-3), Habitat Objectives for GRSG 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.</p> <p><b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.8:</b> Develop specific objectives to conserve, enhance or restore PHMA based on ecological site descriptions and assessments (including within wetlands and riparian areas). If an effective grazing system that meets GRSG habitat requirements is not already in place, analyze at least one alternative that conserves, restores or enhances GRSG habitat in the NEPA document prepared for the permit renewal.</p> <p><b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.5:</b> The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within PHMA will include specific</p>	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	<p><u>Grazing Section of BMPs.</u> (The Governor's plan is attached as <b>Appendix I</b> for references to this section.)The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within SFA and PHMA will include specific management thresholds, based on <u>GRSG Habitat Objectives Table, Land Health Standards (43 CFR 4180.2)</u> 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.</p>	<p>management thresholds, based on GRSG Habitat Objectives (Table 2-3), Habitat Objectives for GRSG 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.</p> <p><b>Lewistown Action LG 1.5</b> The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within PHMA will include specific management thresholds, based on GRSG Habitat Objectives (Table 2-2), Land Health Standards (43 CFR, Part 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.</p> <p><b>Lewistown Action LG-1.10:</b> Conserve, enhance, or restore PHMA based on ecological site descriptions (including wetlands and riparian areas). If an effective grazing system that meets GRSG habitat objectives is not already in place, analyze at least one allotment-specific alternative within the planning unit/permit renewal process that conserves, restores, or enhances PHMA.</p>	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<b>MD RM-10:</b> Allotments within PHMA, focusing on those containing riparian areas, including wet meadows, would 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.	<b>MD LG 17:</b> Allotments within SFA, followed by those within PHMA with declining Greater Sage-Grouse populations, defined by a soft or hard adaptive management trigger being engaged and/or with land health concerns, 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 can include monitoring for actual use, utilization, and use supervision. Management and conservation action prioritization will occur at the Conservation Area (CA) scale and be based on GRSG population and habitat trends: Focusing management and conservation actions first in SFA followed by areas of PHMA outside SFA.	<b>Dillon MD LG 17:</b> Allotments within SFA, followed by those within PHMA, 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 can include monitoring for actual use, utilization, and use supervision. Management and conservation action prioritization will occur at the Conservation Area (CA) scale and be based on GRSG population and habitat trends: Focusing management and conservation actions first in SFA followed by areas of PHMA outside SFA.  <b>Billings LG-16, Lewistown LG 1.5, HiLine Grazing MD-17, Miles City MD-5, North Dakota Part of Management Direction LG 1.5, and South Dakota MD-35:</b> Allotments within PHMA, 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 can include monitoring for actual use, utilization, and use supervision	<b>MD LG 11:</b> Allotments within SFA, 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.	<b>MD LG 14:</b> Allotments within SFA, followed by those within PHMA, 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.	<b>MA-LG-9:</b> In PHMA, assess livestock grazing in riparian and meadow complexes and ensure recovery or maintenance of appropriate vegetation and water quality. Where recovery or maintenance is not occurring and the causal factor is livestock grazing, reduce pressure on riparian or wet meadow vegetation used by GRSG in the summer by adjusting grazing management practices (e.g., use fencing/herding techniques, or changes in seasonal use or livestock distribution).  Allotments within SFA, followed by those within PHMA, 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.	<b>MD LG 5:</b> BLM monitoring would be used to evaluate progress toward achieving land health standards within PHMA 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 toward achieving the standards and conform with the guidelines, which through this process will identify appropriate actions to address nonachievement and nonconformance.  Allotments within SFAs, followed by those within PHMA, 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 include monitoring for actual use, utilization, and use supervision.	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Monitoring to LHS/habitat objectives, including riparian monitoring and prioritizing “field checks”</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> <p>Prioritization of monitoring and “field checks” is not an RMP decision. It depends on staffing, budget, and the consideration of other resource issues that include, but are not limited to GRSG, other listed species, LHS, wildfire, or other resource concerns.</p> <p>The 2015 FWS listing determination cited the prioritization for reviewing grazing permits and conducting monitoring to determine if changes may be needed to meet GRSG habitat conditions – though it also noted that other criteria could be considered.</p> <p>43 CFR 4180 directs BLM to take appropriate action if livestock are the causal factor for failing to achieve the land health standards. Handbook 4180 also provided guidance on assessing/evaluating Standard 2 which is the Riparian standard.</p>

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<p><b>MD RM-11:</b> (ADH) Manage riparian areas and wet meadows for proper functioning condition within ADH.</p> <p><b>MD RM-12:</b> (ADH) Within ADH, manage wet meadows to maintain diverse species richness, including a component of perennial forbs, relative to site potential (i.e., reference state).</p> <p><b>MD RM-13:</b> (ADH) Establish permit/lease terms and conditions in conjunction with grazing strategies to ensure that the timing and level of utilization results in wet meadows with diverse species richness, including a component of perennial forbs, relative to site potential (i.e., reference state).</p>	—	<p><b>Lewistown Action LG-1.18:</b> Within PHMA, reduce hot season grazing on riparian and meadow complexes to promote recovery or maintenance of appropriate vegetation and water quality. Use fencing/herding techniques or seasonal use or livestock distribution changes to reduce pressure on riparian or wet meadow vegetation used by GRSG in summer. Hot season use of riparian and wet meadow complexes may be authorized where consistent with overall GRSG habitat objectives and where use is currently resulting in vegetative conditions that are in conformance with land health standards.</p> <p><b>HiLine (Same as Riparian MD-10):</b> Grazing techniques and practices detailed in Appendix I will be implemented to reduce hot season (summer) grazing on riparian and meadow complexes within the PHMA. Alternative water facilities will be installed to relieve grazing impacts on riparian areas inside of priority sage-grouse habitat.</p>	<p><b>MD LG 12:</b> Grazing management strategies for riparian areas and wet meadows will, at a minimum, maintain or achieve proper functioning condition (PFC) and promote GRSG brood-rearing habitat objectives (<a href="#">Table 2-2</a>) within PHMAs and GHMAs.</p>	—	<p><del><b>MA-LG-8:</b> In PHMA, manage riparian areas and wet meadows for proper functioning condition.</del></p>	<p><del><b>MD LG 10:</b> Grazing between In PHMA, for riparian habitats and/or wet meadow communities utilized by Greater Sage-Grouse, livestock grazing would be managed and upland habitats will be balanced to promote the production and availability of beneficial forbs to GRSG for use during nesting and brood-rearing, while maintaining upland conditions and functions. Grazing in meadows, mesic habitats, and riparian pastures also will be balanced to promote the production and availability of beneficial grasses and forbs for use during late brood-rearing within PHMA, while maintaining upland conditions and functions.</del></p>	<p><u>Summary statement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Management of riparian areas/wet meadows</li></ul> <p><u>Applicability for RMPs?</u></p> <p>Riparian management is not a solely livestock grazing issue. Managing for PFC is related to land health standards and vegetation management in an RMP. Including it in the livestock grazing section implies that grazing is the only affected or responsible resource use, which it is not.</p> <p>Desired conditions and associated management for riparian areas are a component of the “suitable habitat” action when it comes to GRSG, and/or are addressed in vegetation sections of the original RMP decisions. As this is a duplicative concept with language and concepts in the GRSG habitat objectives and land health standards it is being considered for removal from specific reference in the livestock grazing section under Alternatives 4 and 5.</p>
<p><b>MD RM-14:</b> (ADH) Authorize new water development only after determining that the project will not adversely impact GRSG from habitat loss. Ensure that adequate long-term grazing management is in effect before authorizing water developments that may increase levels of use or change season of use. Give specific consideration to adjacent or downstream wetland habitat when a project entails a diversion from a spring or seep.</p>	—	—	<p><b>MD LG 16:</b> Authorize new water developments for diversion from spring or seep source, in accordance with state water law and subject to valid existing rights when PHMAs and GHMAs will benefit from or not be negatively impacted by the new development. This includes developing new water sources for livestock as part of a grazing management plan to improve GRSG habitat.</p>	—	<p><del><b>MA-LG-10:</b> In PHMA, manage existing and limit authorization of new water developments to projects that have a neutral effect or are beneficial effect to GRSG habitat (such as by shifting livestock use away from critical areas). New developments that divert surface water must be designed to maintain riparian or wet meadow vegetation and hydrology to meet GRSG needs.</del></p>	—	<p><u>Summary statement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Guidance/Management for new water developments</li></ul> <p><u>Applicability for RMPs?</u></p> <p>Developed consolidated management in the alternative table above that combines management for any new grazing improvement project. See chapter 2 Livestock Grazing decisions RM-4 and RM-5.</p>

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<b>MD RM-15:</b> (ADH) Analyze springs, seeps and associated pipelines to determine if modifications are necessary to maintain the continuity of the predevelopment riparian area. If necessary to maintain GRSG populations or reverse a downward population trend caused by habitat loss, modify the project as necessary to restore the applicable wetland habitat.	—	—	<b>MD LG 15:</b> In accordance with state water law and subject to valid existing rights, remove or modify water developments that are negatively impacting GRSG habitats.  <b>MD LG 17:</b> Modify water development projects to ensure riparian habitats in PHMAs and GHMAs are being maintained or improved in compliance with valid existing rights and in accordance with state water law.  <b>MD LG 19:</b> In PHMAs and GHMAs, remove livestock ponds built in perennial channels that are negatively impacting riparian habitats, either directly or indirectly, unless riparian access is able to be controlled and negative impacts effectively mitigated (e.g.; water gap fence to pond), and do not permit new ones to be built in these areas subject to valid existing rights. Prior to pond removal, offsite watering options will be examined and considered.	<b>MD LG 6:</b> Authorize new, relocate, or modify existing range improvements that use seeps or springs as a water source to enhance their year round functionality. Install or retrofit wildlife escape ramps in all livestock water troughs or water storage facilities (e.g., catchments, storage tanks).  Maintain, enhance, or reestablish riparian areas in PHMA and GHMA  <b>MD LG 7:</b> Identify playas, wetlands, and springs that have been modified for livestock watering within PHMA and GHMA. Identify those water improvements that have Greater Sage-grouse population limiting implications, and develop projects for rehabilitation. Further actions should be instigated for development of water off site; new water should be available before existing water is eliminated.	<del><b>MA-LG-11:</b> In PHMA, evaluate existing water developments (springs, seeps, etc., and their associated pipelines) to determine if modifications are necessary to maintain or improve riparian areas and GRSG habitat. Make modifications where necessary, considering impacts on other water uses when such considerations are neutral or beneficial to GRSG.</del>	<b>MD LG 12:</b> Existing water developments associated with springs and seeps will be evaluated and associated pipelines/structures to those developments having a negative effect on PHMA will be modified.	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Guidance/Management of existing water developments (monitor, evaluate, maintain, adjust, and/or remove)</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> Developed consolidated management in the alternative table above that combines management for any existing grazing improvement project. See chapter 2 Livestock Grazing decisions RM-4 and RM-5.

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<b>MD RM-16:</b> (ADH) Manage for a habitat objective that is primarily sagebrush with a mosaic of seral stages and sagebrush in all age classes. On a site-by-site basis, do not allow treatments that would adversely affect GRSG populations. See Appendix H, Guidelines for Implementation and Adaptive Management.	—	<b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.16:</b> In PHMA, allow treatments that conserve, enhance or restore GRSG habitat as well as other priority species habitat (this includes treatments that benefit livestock as part of an AMP/Conservation Plan to improve GRSG habitat).	—	—	<del><b>MA-LG-12:</b> In PHMA, ensure that vegetation treatments conserve, enhance or restore GRSG habitat (this includes treatments that benefit livestock).</del>	—	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Direction for “treatment” that help GRSG</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> Not a grazing specific action. Management actions for vegetation treatments are addressed in management actions in the vegetation section, which are not being changed by this amendment effort. As this is a duplicative concept with language and concepts in the GRSG habitat objectives and land health standards it is being considered for removal from specific reference in the livestock grazing section under Alternatives 4 and 5.
—	<b>MD LG 5:</b> When modifying grazing management, analyze indirect impacts on habitat, including changes in fuel loading and wildfire behavior.	<b>Dillon MD LG 5:</b> When modifying grazing management, analyze indirect impacts on habitat, including changes in fuel loading and wildfire behavior.	—	—	—	—	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Future NEPA guidance</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> Identification of what to analyze in future NEPA actions is not an RMP decision. That’s a NEPA policy implementation issue.



2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<p><b>MD RM-17:</b> (PHMA) Evaluate the role of existing seedings that are currently composed of primarily introduced perennial grasses in and adjacent to GRSG PHMA to determine if they should be restored to sagebrush or habitat of higher quality for GRSG. If these seedings are part of an Allotment Management Plan/Conservation Plan or if they provide value in conserving or enhancing the rest of PHMA, then no restoration would be necessary. Assess the compatibility of these seedings for GRSG habitat or as a component of a grazing system during the land health assessments (Davies et al. 2011).</p> <p>For example: Some introduced grass seedings are an integral part of a livestock management plan and reduce grazing pressure in important sagebrush habitats or serve as a strategic fuels management area.</p>	—	<p><b>Lewistown Action LG-1.21:</b> Evaluate the role of existing seedings that are currently composed of primarily introduced perennial grasses in and adjacent to PHMA to determine if they should be restored to sagebrush or habitat of higher quality for GRSG. If these seedings are part of a grazing management plan that is providing value in conserving or enhancing native rangelands in PHMA and other priority wildlife habitats, then no restoration will be necessary. Assess the compatibility of these seedings for GRSG habitat or as a component of a grazing system during the land health evaluation and determination process.</p> <p><b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.17:</b> Evaluate the role of existing seedings that are currently composed of primarily introduced perennial grasses in and adjacent to PHMA to determine if they should be restored to sagebrush or habitat of higher quality for GRSG. If these seedings are part of an AMP/Conservation Plan or if they provide value in conserving or enhancing the rest of the PHMA, then no restoration will be necessary. Assess the compatibility of these seedings for GRSG habitat or as a component of a grazing system during the land health assessments.</p>	—	—	<p><del><b>MA-LG-13:</b> In PHMA, evaluate the role of existing seedings that are currently composed of primarily introduced perennial grasses to determine if they should be restored to sagebrush or habitat of higher quality for GRSG. If existing seedings provide value in conserving or enhancing GRSG habitats, then no restoration will be necessary. Assess the compatibility of these seedings for GRSG habitat during the land health assessments.</del></p>	—	<p><u>Summary statement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Seedings (evaluate, restore, management)</li></ul> <p><u>Applicability for RMPs?</u></p> <p>Not a grazing specific action. Management objectives for vegetation treatments are encapsulated by the GRSG habitat objective and are captured in management by the connection between LHS and habitat objectives. As this is a duplicative concept with language and concepts in the GRSG habitat objectives and land health standards it is being considered for removal from specific reference in the livestock grazing section under Alternatives 4 and 5.</p>

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<p><b>MD RM-18:</b> (ADH) Design new range improvement projects to enhance livestock distribution and to control the timing and intensity of utilization. Examples of structural range improvement projects are cattle guards, fences, corrals, pipelines, troughs, storage tanks, windmills, ponds/reservoirs, solar panels, and spring developments.</p> <p>Include a plan to monitor and control invasive plant species following any related ground disturbance. Place mineral or salt supplements away from water sources and leks in locations that enhance livestock distribution.</p>	<p><b>MD LG 11:</b> Design any new structural range improvements, following appropriate cooperation, consultation and coordination, to minimize and/or mitigate impacts on GRSG habitat. Any new structural range improvements should be placed along existing disturbance corridors or in unsuitable habitat, to the extent practical, and are subject to RDFs (<b>Appendix C</b>). Structural range improvement in this context, include, but are not limited to: fences, exclosures, corrals or other livestock handling structures; pipelines, troughs, storage tanks (including moveable tanks used in livestock water hauling), windmills, ponds/reservoirs, solar panels and spring developments.</p>	<p><b>Dillon MD LG 11:</b> Design any new structural range improvements, following appropriate cooperation, consultation and coordination, to minimize and/or mitigate impacts on GRSG habitat. Any new structural range improvements should be placed along existing disturbance corridors or in unsuitable habitat, to the extent practical, and are subject to RDFs (<b>Appendix C</b>). Structural range improvement in this context, include, but are not limited to: fences, exclosures, corrals or other livestock handling structures; pipelines, troughs, storage tanks (including moveable tanks used in livestock water hauling), windmills, ponds/reservoirs, solar panels and spring developments.</p> <p><b>Lewistown Action LG-1.24:</b> In PHMA, site and design new structural range improvements and location of supplements (salt or protein blocks) to conserve, enhance, or restore said habitat through an improved grazing management system relative to GRSG habitat objectives. Structural range improvements, in this context, include cattle guards, fences, exclosures, corrals, or other livestock handling structures; pipelines, troughs, storage tanks (including movable tanks used in livestock water hauling), windmills, ponds/reservoirs, solar panels, and spring developments).</p> <p><b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.18:</b> In PHMA, design any new structural range improvements and location of supplements (salt or protein blocks) to</p>	<p><b>MD LG 13:</b> For range improvement projects, review Objective SSS 4 and apply MDs SSS 1 through SSS 4 when reviewing and analyzing projects and activities proposed in GRSG habitat.</p>	—	<p><del><b>MA-LG-14:</b> In PHMA, design new structural range improvements to have a neutral effect or conserve, enhance, or restore GRSG habitat through an improved grazing management system relative to GRSG objectives. Structural range improvements, in this context, include but are not limited to: cattle guards, fences, exclosures, corrals or other livestock handling structures; pipelines, troughs, storage tanks (including moveable tanks used in livestock water hauling), windmills, ponds/reservoirs, solar panels and spring developments. Potential for invasive species establishment or increase following construction must be considered in the project planning process and monitored and treated post-construction.</del></p>	<p><b>MD LG 11:</b> Range improvement projects will be planned and authorized in a way that contributes to rangeland health and maintains and/or improves Greater Sage-Grouse and its habitat.</p>	<p><u>Summary statement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Guidance/Management for new range improvement projects</li></ul> <p><u>Applicability for RMPs?</u></p> <p>Developed consolidated management in the alternative table above that combines management for any new grazing improvement projects. See chapter 2 Livestock Grazing decisions RM-4 and RM-5.</p>

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	(See above.)	conserve, enhance, or restore GRSG habitat through an improved grazing management system relative to GRSG objectives. Structural range improvements, in this context, include but are not limited to: cattle guards, fences, exclosures, corrals or other livestock handling structures; pipelines, troughs, storage tanks (including moveable tanks used in livestock water hauling), windmills, ponds/reservoirs, solar panels and spring developments. Potential for invasive species establishment or increase following construction must be considered in the project planning process and monitored and treated post-construction.  <b>South Dakota MD-37: Range Improvements:</b> Range improvements in PHMA would be allowed if the improvements would not impact GRSG, improvements would provide a conservation benefit to GRSG such as fences for protecting important seasonal habitats, or if improvements would meet the lek buffer requirement. Refer to Appendix B for a discussion about GRSG lek buffers.	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<b>MD RM-19:</b> (PHMA) Where conditions create the potential for impacts from West Nile virus from developments or modification of water developments, use preferred design features (PDFs)/RDFs to mitigate the potential impacts. See <b>Appendix C</b> (Required Design Features, Preferred Design Features, and Suggested Design Features).	—	<b>Lewistown Action LG-1.26:</b> When developing or modifying water developments in PHMA and GHMA, use applicable RDFs (Appendix C) to reduce potential impacts from West Nile virus.  <b>HiLine (Same as Vegetation MD-9):</b> Water developments will be installed and/or maintained to facilitate control of livestock use of vegetation, support other uses, and protect resource values. In order to minimize surface disturbance, have reliable water of better quality and not alter normal surface flow of water, alternative water developments will be emphasized before constructing new pits and reservoirs. The BLM will manage water developments within Greater Sage-Grouse habitat to reduce the spread of West Nile virus (Appendix I).  <b>Miles City MD 1:</b> Where deemed effective, water developments will be managed to reduce the spread of West Nile virus (see Appendix C, GRSG Required Design Features).  <b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.19:</b> When developing or modifying water developments in PHMA, use applicable RDFs (Appendix C of the 2015 Greater Sage-Grouse Approved RMPA/ROD2 [BLM 2015a]) to mitigate potential impacts from West Nile virus.	—	<b>MD LG 8:</b> Design new and maintain existing water projects to avoid standing pools of shallow water that would spread West Nile Virus.	—	—	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• West Nile virus guidance</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> These are worded like a BMP and were added to the livestock grazing BMP appendix.

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<p><b>MD RM-20:</b> (PHMA) Evaluate existing structural range improvements to determine if modifications are necessary to maintain GRSG populations or reverse a downward population trend caused by habitat loss. Modify, relocate, or remove projects as necessary.</p> <p>Place mineral and salt supplements away from water sources and leks in locations that enhance livestock distribution.</p>	<p><b>MD LG 12:</b> During the land health assessment and grazing permit renewal process, evaluate existing livestock management range improvements with respect to their effect on GRSG habitat. Consider removal of projects that are not needed for effective livestock management, are no longer in working condition, and/or negatively affect GRSG habitat, with the exception of functional projects needed for management of habitat for other threatened, endangered or proposed species or other sensitive resources.</p>	<p><b>Dillon MD LG 12:</b> During the land health assessment and grazing permit renewal process, evaluate existing livestock management range improvements with respect to their effect on GRSG habitat. Consider removal of projects that are not needed for effective livestock management, are no longer in working condition, and/or negatively affect GRSG habitat, with the exception of functional projects needed for management of habitat for other threatened, endangered or proposed species or other sensitive resources.</p>		<p><b>MD LG 10:</b> Avoid construction of livestock facilities and supplemental feeding of livestock within 1.2 mile of occupied or pending leks in Greater Sage-grouse habitat unless it is part of an approved habitat improvement project or approved by the authorized officer to improve ecological health or to create mosaics in dense sagebrush stands that are needed for optimum Greater Sage-grouse habitat.</p>	<p><del><b>MA-LG-15:</b> In PHMA, evaluate existing structural range improvements to make sure they have a neutral effect or conserve, enhance or restore GRSG habitat.</del></p>	<p><b>MD LG 8:</b> In GHMA and PHMA, existing range improvements (e.g., fences, livestock/wildlife watering facilities) would continue to be evaluated and modified when necessary. <del>The potential risk to Greater Sage-Grouse and its habitats from existing structural range improvements will be evaluated. The potential for modification of those structural range improvements identified as posing a risk will be addressed.</del></p>	<p><u>Summary statement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Guidance/Management of existing structural range improvements (evaluate, maintain, adjust, and/or remove), as well as mineral/salt supplements</li></ul>
	<p><b>MD LG 9:</b> Evaluate the locations where salt/supplements are placed, coordinate salt/supplements placement to reduce impacts on GRSG habitat (e.g., existing disturbed areas).</p>	<p><b>Dillon MD LG 9:</b> Evaluate the locations where salt/supplements are placed, coordinate salt/supplements placement to reduce impacts on GRSG habitat (e.g., existing disturbed areas).</p> <p><b>Lewistown Action LG-1.27:</b> During the land health evaluation and determination and grazing authorization renewal process (typically every 10 years), examine existing structural range improvements and location of supplements (salt or protein blocks) to ensure they conserve, enhance or restore PHMA.</p> <p>During the allotment evaluation and determination and grazing authorization renewal process, examine existing structural range improvements to ensure they conserve, enhance, or restore PHMA.</p> <p><b>HiLine Same as Wildlife MD-43g):</b> Existing range improvements, including the location of supplements, will be</p>	<p><b>MD LG 18:</b> Locate salting and supplemental feeding locations, temporary or mobile watering, and new handling facilities (e.g., corrals and chutes) at least 1 mile from riparian areas, springs, and meadows. The distance can be greater based on site-specific conditions.</p>	<p>Supplemental feeding in Greater Sage-grouse habitat must be part of an approved habitat improvement plan or approved by the authorized officer.</p>		<p>Supplements and supplemental feeding would continue to be authorized where appropriate.</p>	<p><u>Applicability for RMPs?</u></p> <p>Developed a consolidated management action specific to management of existing grazing projects in GRSG HMAs. See chapter 2 Livestock Grazing decisions RM-4 and RM-5.</p> <p>As for the supplement guidance, supplemental feeding has to be approved by the AO, whether it is in this RMP or not. And terms and conditions can include (and usually do include) specifications on where/where not to place supplements. As such, it is not an RMP decision, but fits better as grazing BMPs, where these concepts are considered to be moved under Alternatives 4 and 5.</p>

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
(See above.)	(See above.)	evaluated and if necessary modified to conserve, enhance or restore sage-grouse habitat.  <b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.20:</b> In PHMA, evaluate existing structural range improvements and location of supplements (salt or protein blocks) during grazing lease renewal process to make sure they conserve, enhance or restore GRSG habitat.	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)	(See above.)
<b>MD RM-21:</b> (ADH) Mark fences in high risk areas (Christiansen 2009; Stevens 2011).  (PHMA) Where marking fences does not reduce fence-related GRSG mortality, modify fences. Where modification does not reduce GRSG mortality and the fence-related mortality is sufficient to adversely affect GRSG populations, remove fences.	<b>MD LG 13:</b> Prioritize removal, modification or marking of fences or other structures in areas of high collision risk following appropriate cooperation, consultation and coordination to reduce the incidence of GRSG mortality due to fence strikes (Stevens et al. 2012).	<b>Dillon MD LG 13:</b> Prioritize removal, modification or marking of fences or other structures in areas of high collision risk following appropriate cooperation, consultation and coordination to reduce the incidence of GRSG mortality due to fence strikes (Stevens et al. 2012).  <b>Lewistown Action LG-1.27</b> Identify and mark fences in high and moderate risk areas, as identified by the use of “The Fence Collision Risk Tool” ( <a href="http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/">http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/</a> ) within PHMA, based on proximity to lek, lek size, and topography (Stevens 2011, Stevens et al. 2013).  <b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.20:</b> To reduce outright GRSG strikes and mortality, remove, modify or mark fences in high risk areas within PHMA based on proximity to lek, lek size, and topography.	<b>MD LG 14:</b> Build or modify livestock exclosures so that they are large enough to provide hiding cover to GRSG and other wildlife and to reduce the possibility of wildlife collisions with fences (Christiansen 2009; Stevens 2011; NRCS 2012).  <b>MD LG 23:</b> Fences shall not be constructed or reconstructed within 1.2 miles from the perimeter of occupied leks, unless the collision risk can be mitigated through design features or markings (e.g., mark, laydown fences, and design).	<b>MD LG 9:</b> Remove, modify, or mark fences identified as high risk for collisions, generally within 1.2 miles of occupied or pending leks.	<b>MA-LG-16:</b> To reduce outright GRSG strikes and mortality, remove, modify or mark fences in high risk areas (Stevens et al. 2012) based on proximity to lek (e.g., within 1.2 miles of a lek), lek size, and topography, or as latest science indicates. <del>Prioritize actions in SFA first, then PHMA.</del>  Employ NRCS fence collision risk tool (NRCS/CEAP Conservation Insight Publication “Applying the Sage Grouse Fence Collision Risk Tool to Reduce Bird Strikes”).	—	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Fences – construction, reconstructions, marking, removal, modification, etc.</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> Developed a consolidated management action specific to management of fences in GRSG HMAs. See chapter 2 Livestock Grazing decision RM-6.

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
<b>MD RM-22:</b> (ADH) Monitor for and treat invasive species associated with existing range improvements (Gelbard and Belnap 2003; Bergquist et al. 2007).	—	<b>Lewistown Action LG-1.27:</b> In PHMA and GHMA, monitor for and treat invasive and noxious weed species associated with existing range improvement projects.  <b>North Dakota Management Direction LG-1.20:</b> Monitor for, and treat invasive species associated with existing range improvements.	—	—	<del><b>MA-LG-17:</b> In PHMA, monitor for and treat noxious weeds and treat invasive species where needed, associated with existing range improvements.</del>	—	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Invasive species associated with range improvements</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> Don't need a specific management action related to weeds in livestock grazing. The GRSG habitat objectives encapsulates the weed issue. The language in the management actions are not required to be an RMP decision to implement given language that is already captured in the habitat objective to manage for suitable GRSG habitat.
<b>MD RM-23:</b> (ADH) At the time a permittee or lessee voluntarily relinquishes a permit or lease, the BLM will consider whether the public lands where that permitted use was authorized shall remain available for livestock grazing or be used for other resource management objectives, such as reserve common allotments or fire breaks. This does not apply to or impact grazing preference transfers, which are addressed in 43 CFR, Part 4110.2-3.  When a permittee or lessee voluntarily relinquishes grazing preference, consider conversion of the allotment to a reserve common allotment that will remain available for use on a temporary, nonrenewable basis for the benefit of GRSG habitat. Authorize temporary nonrenewal permits in Reserve Common Allotments to meet resource objectives elsewhere such as rest or deferment due to fire or vegetation treatments. Temporary use of reserve common allotments would not be allowed due to drought or overuse of customary allotments.	<b>MD LG 18:</b> At the time a permittee or lessee voluntarily relinquishes a permit or lease, 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. This does not apply to or impact grazing preference transfers, which are addressed in 43 CFR 4110.2-3.	<b>Dillon MD LG 18, Billings Management Direction LG-17, Lewistown Action LG 1.5, HiLine LG-16, Miles City Management Decision 6, North Dakota Management Decision LG-1.7, South Dakota MD-23:</b> At the time a permittee or lessee voluntarily relinquishes a permit or lease, 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. This does not apply to or impact grazing preference transfers, which are addressed in 43 CFR 4110.2-3.  <b>Billings MD-LG-11:</b> All allotments wholly located in Greater Sage-Grouse PHMA will be considered for retirement, where the base property owner relinquishes their preference	<b>MD LG 21:</b> At the time a permittee or lessee voluntarily relinquishes a permit or lease, the BLM will consider whether the public lands where that permitted use was authorized shall remain available for livestock grazing or be used for other resource management objectives, such as reserve common allotments and fire breaks. This does not apply to or impact grazing preference transfers, which are addressed in 43 CFR, Part 4110.2-3.	<b>MD LG 15:</b> At the time a permittee or lessee voluntarily relinquishes a permit or lease, 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. This does not apply to or impact grazing preference transfers, which are addressed in 43 CFR, Part 4110.2-3.	<del><b>MA-LG-18:</b> At the time a permittee or lessee voluntarily relinquishes a permit or lease, 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. This does not apply to or impact grazing preference transfers, which are addressed in 43 CFR, Part 4110.2-3.</del>	<b>MD LG 6:</b> At the time a permittee or lessee voluntarily relinquishes a permit or lease, 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. This does not apply to or impact grazing preference transfers, which are addressed in 43 CFR 4110.2-3.	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Relinquishment</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> Retained this specific grazing management action in chapter 2 as Management Action RM-7.

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
—	<b>MD LG 10:</b> Incorporate RDFs into Terms and Conditions for crossing permits to limit disturbance of occupied leks when trailing livestock across BLM administered lands in the spring. Work with permittees in locating over-nighting, watering and bedding locations to minimize impacts on seasonal habitats.	<b>Dillon MD LG 10:</b> Incorporate RDFs into Terms and Conditions for crossing permits to limit disturbance of occupied leks when trailing livestock across BLM administered lands in the spring. Work with permittees in locating over-nighting, watering and bedding locations to minimize impacts on seasonal habitats.	—	<b>MD LG 3:</b> The timing and location of livestock turnout and trailing shall not contribute to livestock congregation on occupied or pending leks during the Greater Sage-grouse breeding season of March 1 through June 30.	—	<b>MD LG 9:</b> Livestock trailing that is authorized will 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.	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Management of trailing activities</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> <p>The existing language fits better as BMPs, not as RMP decisions. Included in the BMP appendix under Alternatives 4 and 5.</p>
—	<b>MD LG 7:</b> Where opportunities exist, establish forage reserves to facilitate restoration and rehabilitation efforts in GRSG habitat areas. A forage reserve is an area that is set aside for use as needed by various permittees who might be displaced by wildfire, ESR, restoration efforts, etc. rather than having a term permit issued for grazing like a regular allotment.	<b>Dillon MD LG 7:</b> Where opportunities exist, establish forage reserves to facilitate restoration and rehabilitation efforts in GRSG habitat areas. A forage reserve is an area that is set aside for use as needed by various permittees who might be displaced by wildfire, ESR, restoration efforts, etc. rather than having a term permit issued for grazing like a regular allotment.	—	—	—	—	<u>Summary statement:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Forage reserves</li></ul> <u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> <p>Reserve Common Allotments are already included in Management Action RM-7. As such, a separate action is not needed as an RMP action. The area would still be available for livestock grazing, but authorizations would be applied to fill in for areas where authorized uses could not occur due to fire or vegetation treatments. Additional language is included in the BMP appendix for Alternatives 4 and 5.</p>



2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
—	—	—	<p><b>MD LG 9:</b> When a transfer application is received for preference on an allotment within GRSG habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Transfer of Preference: A transfer of preference will be approved unless the applicant does not meet qualifications (43 CFR, Part 4110.1 and 4110.2). A transfer will be approved to an unqualified applicant if 4110.2-3(e) applies.</li><li>• Issuing the permit: In accordance with Section 402(c)(2) of FLPMA, a new permit will be issued to the new preference holder with the same terms and conditions as the terminated permit unless:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– A NEPA analysis of alternative terms and conditions has been completed. If changes in terms and conditions are needed to meet sage-grouse habitat needs or otherwise make progress toward meeting land health standards, issue a decision offering a permit with the new terms and conditions</li><li>– If a new permit is issued as required by Section 402(c)(2) of FLPMA, then determine priority for completing land health evaluations, habitat assessments and NEPA analysis as described in MD LG 1.</li></ul></li></ul>	—	—	—	<p><u>Summary statement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Transfers</li></ul> <p><u>Applicability for RMPs?</u> Not needed as an RMP action; can consider this type of action without an RMP. Most of this action just cites to regulations or refers to policy. Considered for removal under Alternatives 4 and 5.</p>

2019 Amendments/Revisions							
Colorado	Idaho	Montana/Dakotas	Nevada/California	Oregon	Utah	Wyoming	NOTES
—	—	—	<p><b>MD LG 20:</b> In PHMA and GHMA, rest areas that have received vegetative treatments from livestock grazing until resource monitoring data verifies the treatment objectives are being met and an appropriate grazing regime has been developed. Any livestock grazing temporary suspended use or other management changes per 43 CFR, Part 4110.3-2a for the purpose of a vegetation treatment will be done through the grazing decision, prior to treatment.</p> <p><b>MD LG 22:</b> After grazing rest associated with vegetation treatments in PHMAs and GHMAs, monitor annually for a minimum of 5 years to ensure project objectives are being maintained.</p>	—	—	—	<p><u>Summary statement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Resting after vegetation treatments</li></ul> <p><u>Applicability for RMPs?</u></p> <p>Don't need a specific RMP management action related to resting treated areas from livestock grazing. The GRSG habitat objectives encapsulates the need to adjust any of the land uses to meet GRSG habitat objectives. The action itself refers to regulations under which such changes would be considered. Beyond that, monitoring is not an RMP decision but is based on available staff and budget. Considered for removal under Alternatives 4 and 5.</p>