

Dear Reader,

The enclosed errata sheet documents minor changes to the text and figures of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Oregon Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Resource Management Plan Amendment (PRMPA) that was publicly released in May 2015. These corrections reflect edits that were discovered after the release of the Final EIS. There are no changes or significant new circumstances or information identified in this errata sheet that affect the analysis or conclusions of the Final EIS.

This errata sheet is part of the administrative record for the EIS; these corrections will be posted to the project website at <http://www.blm.gov/or/energy/opportunity/sagebrush.php>.

For additional information or clarification regarding the errata sheet, please contact Joan Suther, Project Manager, at jsuther@blm.gov or (541) 573-4445.

Thank you,

| Section or Table | Page | Edit or Clarification |
|---------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Section 1.2.1 | 1-2 | On December 9, 2011, a Notice of Availability was published in the Federal Register to initiate the BLM/US Department of Agriculture (USDA), Forest Service (Forest Service) GRSG Planning Strategy across nine ten western states, including Northeast California, Oregon, Nevada, Idaho, Utah, and Southwest Montana in the Great Basin Region and Northwest Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, South Dakota, and North Dakota in the Rocky Mountain Region. |
| Section 1.2.3 | 1-7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary Priority Habitat (PPH): Priority Habitat Management Area • Preliminary General Habitat (PGH): General Habitat Management Area |
| Section 1.4 | 1-8 | The planning area covers all or portions of 17 counties in Oregon. Eight counties contain GRSG habitat. |
| Section 1.4 | 1-8 | However, PPH PHMA and PGH GHMA are only found... |
| Tables 1-1, 1-3, 1-5, 1-6 | 1-10, 1-11, 1-12, 1-20 | PPH and PGH references should be PHMA and GHMA. |
| Section 1.6.4 | 1-21 | However, this document is specific to PPH PHMA and PGH GHMA , and not all... |
| Section 1.9.9 | 1-30 | The COT Report provides a WAFWA Management Zone and Population Risk Assessment. The report identifies localized threats from isolated/small size , sagebrush elimination, agriculture elimination , fire, conifer encroachment, weed and annual grass invasion, mining, free-roaming wild horses and burros, urbanization, and widespread threats from energy development, infrastructure, grazing, and recreation (USFWS 2013a, p. 18-16). |
| Table 2-3 | 2-25 | <p>Action LG/RM 2 replaced with the following: MD LG 2: 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 modifications include, but are not limited to, changes in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Season or timing or use; 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). <p>*Not in priority order*</p> |

| Section or Table | Page | Edit or Clarification |
|------------------|-------|--|
| Table 2-3 | 2-31 | Complete Master Development Plans in lieu of APD/GPD by APD/GPD or Operations/Utilization plans for geothermal fluid mineral lease development processing within PHMA. |
| Section 2.7.1 | 2-54 | The information collected through the Monitoring Framework Plan will be used by the BLM to determine adaptive management hard and soft triggers for habitat (discussed below) are met. |
| Section 2.8.1 | 2-60 | ...Oregon Sage-Grouse Plan for Oregon-state sage-grouse plan... |
| Section 2.8.2 | 2-63 | ...of which this Draft Final EIS is a part. |
| Section 2.8.4 | 2-65 | A noteworthy difference between Alternatives C and F...and that most of the management allocations actions would apply to both PHMA and GHMA. |
| Section 2.8.5 | 2-65 | Alternative D is was the BLM's Preferred Alternative. |
| Section 4.4.2 | 4-101 | "...and deferring use to times when soils are saturated." |
| Section 4.4.2 | 4-102 | Vegetation could be unintentionally damaged or removed occur during project construction |
| Section 4.20.3 | 4-345 | <p>Paragraph beginning "Restrictions to ROW development under Alternatives B, C, D,E, F, and the Proposed Plan..." replaced with: "Proposed management under Alternatives B, C, D, E, and F and the Proposed Plan could require investors to consider alternative power line ROW alignments or designs that could increase the costs of constructing new infrastructure.</p> <p>"A 2012 WECC study, for example, provides information on transmission line construction costs per mile, which range from \$927,000 to \$2,967,000, depending on voltage and whether lines are single or double circuit. The same study provides cost multipliers for difficult terrains, reaching up to 2.25 in the case of forested lands (WECC 2012).</p> <p>"Utilities and other infrastructure investors typically pass on these costs to ratepayers. Where the rate base is smaller, such as in rural areas, per-ratepayer impacts of constructing a 10-mile, 230kV transmission line, for example, would be greater compared to the economic impacts on ratepayers served by a larger metropolitan utility proposing the same line.</p> <p>"Under Alternatives B, C, D, and E and the Proposed Plan, ratepayers serviced by local utility providers with small rate bases would be impacted more by costs associated with added route lengths or infrastructure design requirements, compared with ratepayers serviced by larger, multi-state providers.</p> <p>"Where technically and financially feasible, Alternatives B and D and the Proposed Plan</p> |

| Section or Table | Page | Edit or Clarification |
|------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| | | <p>identify buried power lines as a design option to mitigate impacts on GRSG. New construction costs of underground transmission lines can be between 4 and 14 times higher compared to new overhead construction (PSC 2011), depending on terrain. In rural areas, the cost of burying new distribution lines would be more than double the cost of new overhead construction. Burying existing distribution lines would likely cost between \$400,000 and \$500,000 per mile in rural areas (EIA 2012). Under all alternatives, where burying new lines would be technically unfeasible or would result in costs that could not be absorbed by the ratepayers, infrastructure investors would explore other route or design options that avoid impacts on GRSG habitat.”</p> |
| Chapter 7 | Citation added to References | <p>Hemstrom, Miles A., Janine Salwasser, Joshua Halofsky, Jimmy Kagan, and Cyndi Comfort. 2012. The integrated landscape assessment project. <i>In: Proceedings of the first landscape state-and-transition simulation modeling conference, June 14-16, 2011</i> (Becky K. Kerns, Ayn J. Shlisky, and Colin J. Daniel, editors). Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-869. Portland, Oregon: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. Pp. 57-71.</p> |
| Chapter 8 | Definitions added to Glossary | <p>Grazing Relinquishment: the voluntary and permanent surrender by an existing permittee or lessee (with concurrence of any base property lien holder[s]), of their priority (preference) to use a livestock forage allocation on public land as well as their permission to use this forage. Relinquishments do not require the consent or approval of the BLM. The BLM’s receipt of a relinquishment is not a decision to close areas to livestock grazing.</p> <p>Interstate Highways: Freeways and highways with multiple lanes.</p> <p>Maintenance Level: Operation guidance to field personnel on the appropriate intensity, frequency, and type of maintenance activities that should be undertaken to keep the route in acceptable condition and provide guidance for the minimum standards of care for the annual maintenance of a route.</p> <p>Major Roads: Federal and state highways that are not interstate highways.</p> <p>Minor Roads: All transportation routes with maintenance level 3, 4, or 5 on BLM-administered lands or its equivalent on lands not administered by the BLM.</p> <p>Transfer of Grazing Preference: The BLM’s approval of an application to transfer grazing preference from one party to another or from one base property to another or both.</p> |

| Section or Table | Page | Edit or Clarification |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| | | Grazing preference means a superior or priority position against others for the purposes of receiving a grazing permit or lease. This priority is attached to base property owned or controlled by the permittee or lessee. |
| Appendix C | C-1 | Language added in response to Governor's Consistency Review Response: In addition, state-implemented conservation measures or protections may be considered as an alternative in the application of RDFs, as appropriate, on a site-specific basis. |
| Appendix D | D-3 | ...or when the area within an individual Oregon PAC or when the area supporting at least 5 percent sagebrush canopy cover and less than 5 percent tree cover... |
| Appendix D | D-3 | Potential vegetation types developed from state and transitions state-and-transition models includes burned areas, juniper encroachment, crested wheat grass wheatgrass plantings... |
| Appendix D | D-6 | BLM intends to use the remotely sensed data collected from the effectiveness monitoring at the mid-scale (Oregon PAC), supplemented with local data where needed and available at the lek-scale to identify when a soft or hard trigger for habitat has been reached. |
| Appendix D | D-13 | ...hard trigger responses can occur once both the habitat and population criteria above were are met. |
| Appendix D | Table on page D-22 | Table has been deleted. |
| Appendix I | Footnote to Table I-2 on page I-3 | Minor roads include transportation routes with maintenance intensity level 3, 4, or 5 on BLM lands or its equivalent on non-BLM lands. |

This page intentionally left blank.