Chapter 2. Alternatives

2.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the six alternatives this resource management plan amendment (RMPA)/environmental impact statement (EIS) analyzes in detail. The alternatives consider changes to existing greater sage-grouse (GRSG) actions that are currently in the BLM's plans (Alternative 2 - No Action Alternative), and five action alternatives. This chapter also describes alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed analysis.

2.1.1 Components of Alternatives

This amendment process builds on planning efforts from 2015 and 2019. It considers amending GRSG goals, objectives, management actions, and allowable uses, including administrative designations. Definitions of these components can be found in Section II of the BLM's land use planning handbook (BLM-H-1601-I). In the previous BLM GRSG planning efforts, individual actions were identified in some BLM state amendments as "management actions" and in others as "management decisions." While the BLM planning handbook has a specific definition for "management decisions," in this document – including **Appendix 2** – management action and management decision are used interchangeably.

2.2 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

2.2.1 Alternative I (Applicable Decisions from the 2015 ARMPA)

Alternative I includes the applicable elements of the 2015 Approved RMPAs (ARMPA) that are being analyzed for potential amendment as part of this planning effort. It does not include all the goals, objectives, and actions from the 2015 ARMPAs, as this effort is considering targeted amendments. Under Alternative I, the BLM would re-adopt the applicable GRSG habitat management area (HMA) boundaries, goals, objectives, and actions from the 2015 Records of Decision (ROD)/ARMPAs (as updated through maintenance actions). The existing language in the plans from the 2019 ARMPAs would revert to that contained in the 2015 ARMPAs (as maintained). Due to the U.S. District Court of Idaho's preliminary injunction preventing implementation of the 2019 amendments (see explanation in Alternative 2 summary below) this alternative reflects how the BLM is currently managing GRSG habitat on public lands. This includes designation of some areas of PHMA as Sagebrush Focal Areas (SFA) with a recommendation to withdraw them from mineral location and entry under the Mining Law of 1872 and prioritization for various other activities related to vegetation treatments, livestock grazing, and wild horses and burros.

2,2.2 Alternative 2 (Applicable Decisions from the 2019 ARMPA – No-Action)

Alternative 2 is the No-Action Alternative and includes the applicable decisions from the 2019 Greater Sage-Grouse ROD/ARMPAs efforts except areas in Montana/Dakotas, which would be based on management in the 2015 amendments because they were not amended in 2019. This alternative, including the HMA boundaries and associated management in the 2019 amendments, is the No Action because it reflects the management language currently in the BLM's approved land use plans. The U.S. District Court for the District of Idaho has issued a preliminarily injunction, preventing the BLM from implementing the 2019 amendments, but not vacating them or their Records of Decision. Because the 2019 RODs were not vacated, the decisions from the 2019 amendment effort remain the GRSG management language in the BLM's RMPs. Under this alternative the BLM would apply the management from those 2019 efforts. Alternative 2 was developed through coordination with each state's applicable agencies, cooperating agencies, and public input to increase alignment with the State's GRSG conservation plan and strategies. It was further refined for alignment with

BLM policies at the time those RMPAs were developed. SFAs would be removed from the BLM RMPs in all states except Oregon and Montana; these areas would still be managed with all the protections of PHMA, but would no longer include a recommendation for withdrawal (including in the Oregon SFAs), and prioritizations would be the same as the rest of PHMA.

2.2.3 Alternative 3

Alternative 3 includes the greatest measures to protect and preserve GRSG and its habitat. Alternative 3 would update the HMA boundaries based on new information and science that has become available since the 2015 and 2019 efforts, however all HMAs would be managed as priority HMA (PHMA). The BLM would close PHMA to new fluid mineral leasing, saleable minerals/mineral materials permits, and nonenergy leasable minerals leasing (development associated with existing permits and leases would not be precluded). PHMA would be recommended for withdrawal from location and entry under the Mining Law of 1872 and unavailable for livestock grazing. PHMA would also be ROW exclusion areas. Where there are currently designated wild horse and burro herd management areas overlapping PHMA, the wild horse and burro herd management area would become a Herd Area that is not managed for wild horses and burros. Under Alternative 3, the BLM would designate 11,139,472 acres of ACECs specific to the management of GRSG; the ACECs would include portions of PHMA and would have the same allocations (i.e., allowable uses) as the rest of PHMA. No areas would be identified as SFA because Alternative 3 considers the greatest level of restrictions on resource uses in all GRSG HMAs.

2.2.4 Alternative 4

Alternative 4 would update the habitat management area boundaries and associated management based on new information and science that has become available since the 2015 and 2019 efforts. While many of the allocations would be similar to Alternatives 1 and 2, the areas to which management would be applied are updated to reflect new science. One difference in Alternative 4 is in Wyoming all PHMA would be managed with no surface occupancy stipulations for new oil and gas leases (all other states already have this stipulation in PHMA). In addition, management associated with some of the major minimization measures (e.g., disturbance cap, adaptive management) is adjusted to address cross-boundary coordination of shared populations, range-wide biological and managerial concerns based on monitoring, and experience gained from implementing management for GRSG since 2015. Alternative 4 allows compensatory mitigation to be used under specific conditions. Additional compensatory mitigation may be required where habitat and/or population adaptive management thresholds have been met. Areas previously identified as SFAs are managed as PHMA. The primary difference between management of SFAs in the 2015 Plans and PHMAs in this planning effort is that PHMA would not include a recommendation for withdrawal or prioritization strategies.

2.2.5 Alternative 5

Alternative 5 considers other potential alignments of habitat management areas and associated management to try and balance GRSG conservation with public land uses. If State governments updated the GRSG management area boundaries in their specific State plans, the BLM is considering those boundaries on public lands in Alternative 5. HMAs are similar to but refined from Alternative 4 and restrictions would generally be similar to Alternative 4, except for oil and gas in Wyoming which is similar to Alternative 2. However, reasonable differences in management would be considered while still providing GRSG conservation, Alternative 5 considered options with fewer restrictions on resource uses and provided more opportunities for considering compensatory mitigation to offset impacts on GRSG and its habitat. Areas previously identified as SFAs are managed as PHMA. The primary difference between management of SFAs in the 2015 Plans and PHMAs in this planning effort is that PHMA would not include a recommendation for withdrawal or prioritization strategies.

2.2.6 Alternative 6

Under Alternative 6, management for all habitat management areas and the topics being considered in the range of alternatives would be the same as described for Alternative 5, but with the addition of ACECs. ACEC boundaries would be the same as described for Alternative 3, but management would be less restrictive compared to Alternative 3, though generally more restrictive than the rest of Alternative 6 PHMA.

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT ANALYZED IN DETAIL

The BLM also reviewed all of the alternatives considered in the separate 2015 and 2019 planning processes, none of which was suggested for reanalysis during public scoping. The range of alternatives already considered in detail in this effort includes the most protective alternatives from the prior efforts. Alternatives from those prior efforts with broad reductions in GRSG protections compared to what is being considered in this effort would not be consistent with the current purpose and need. In addition, the rationale for dismissing alternatives from detailed analysis in the prior efforts are still applicable to this effort. Such dismissed alternatives includes a USFWS-listing alternative; managing all designated habitats as ACECs; eliminating recreational hunting; closing GRSG habitat to OHV use; adopting county-specific plans to BLM-administered lands; increased grazing alternative; and leasing GRSG habitat for oil shale and tar sands development or including stipulations for such development. The prior alternatives dismissed from detailed analysis will again be dismissed from detailed analysis for the same reasons as described previously and are incorporated by reference into this ElS. As such, none of the previously considered alternatives will be explicitly evaluated in this RMPA.

Further, the BLM, the USFWS, States and other federal agency partners prepared the NTT (2011) and the Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Objectives: Final Report (COT Report–2013) reports to identify rangewide GRSG conservation objectives and conservation measures that would: inform the USFWS 2015 decision under the Endangered Species Act and inform partners; and provide guidance for the BLM to consider through land use planning, which the BLM did in 2015, 2019, and again in 2020 planning efforts. The NTT and COT reports constituted starting points for the BLM to consider in at least one alternative to be considered through the NEPA and land use planning process. They are not compendiums that, standing alone, represent best available science. The NTT and COT reports do not address how the implementation of their GRSG conservation measures would affect other uses of the public lands—such as recreation, fluid mineral development, mining, and livestock grazing. Moreover, the NTT and COT reports do not quantify the GRSG conservation benefits of each respective conservation measure. Additional context related to the COT and NTT reports and rationale why they were not included as specific alternatives in this effort is provided in **Appendix 6**.

During the alternative development process, the States of Idaho and Wyoming each suggested a "state alternative." The BLM determined that most of the actions included in each subject alternative were already evaluated among other alternatives. In some instances, the exact language was already in the range of alternatives or was incorporated in Alternative 5. In other instances, the proposed language was substantially similar to language already being considered, or that would result in substantially similar effects. In very few instances, the BLM determined the proposed language was not consistent with the purpose and need (e.g., removing the disturbance cap), included recommendations that were not consistent with BLM policies (e.g., changing RMP allocations outside a plan amendment), or would be addressed during the implementation process (e.g., requiring and setting time-frames for removing wild horses if they contribute to an area not meeting land health standards). Because the RMP-level actions in the submissions are considered in the range of alternatives, developing a stand-alone state alternative is not necessary for consideration of effects. Proposed plan amendments of BLM RMPs at the state level will be able to draw from any of the actions

considered in the range of alternatives. Because of this, alternatives in the Draft EIS specific to each state that duplicate actions already considered in the range of alternatives are not necessary.

During scoping, the public suggested several alternatives or components of alternatives that the BLM considered but did not analyze in detail. These are summarized in **Table 2-I** below. Further details on alternatives proposed by the public during scoping and where they were considered in the EIS are provided in the public scoping report on the project's website: https://eplanning.blm.gov/eplanning-ui/project/2016719/570.

Table 2-1. Alternatives Proposed During Public Scoping but Not Analyzed in Detail

| Alternative Proposed | Rationale for Dismissal |
|---|--|
| An alternative where AUMs in GRSG habitat | Adjustments to the existing number of AUMs are completed at |
| are based on prolonged drought, warmer | the allotment scale based on site-specific conditions to meet |
| temperatures, and reduced grass production. | management objectives during grazing authorization renewals, |
| | AMP development, or other appropriate implementation-level |
| | planning. Additionally, temporary adjustments can be made |
| | annually to livestock numbers, the number of AUMs, and |
| | season of use within the range of the terms and conditions and |
| N N | in accordance with applicable regulations. The BLM is better |
| No. | suited to make adjustments that respond to drought through |
| 10,4 | activity- and implementation-level decision making at the |
| Alternatives that any direct a search like and | allotment level. |
| Alternatives that conduct a capability and suitability-type analysis of grazing conflicts | There are alternatives that specifically address GRSG habitat needs through identification of habitat objectives. In addition, |
| with GRSG needs; apply mandatory, | the BLM's grazing regulations require the BLM manage grazing |
| measurable conservative use periods; and | to meet Land Health Standards, including the standard that |
| avoid the breeding period, hot season, and | provides for special status species habitat. However, developing |
| winter use in GRSG habitats in any lands | terms and conditions for how grazing in specific areas should |
| where grazing might continue. | be conducted to meet these is associated with implementation- |
| 2110 4. 110. 40. | level decisions related to allotment management plans or term |
| is an in in is | permit renewals. |
| Alternatives for constructing exclosures to | Out of scope; not generally a planning level decision. |
| use as ungrazed reference areas: identify that | Establishing small exclosure areas for research purposes is |
| during land health evaluations, small (10 acres | better suited for decision-making at the allotment level, not at |
| or less) reference areas would be considered | the RMP level. |
| in priority sage-grouse habitat to exclude | |
| livestock use for the purposes in aiding BLM's | |
| ability to establish control areas when | |
| analyzing impacts to permitted activities such | |
| as livestock grazing and better inform | |
| management decisions. | Out of seems generally not a planning level desiries |
| Alternatives that specify acceptable livestock grazing utilization, trampling levels, and shrub | Out of scope; generally not a planning level decision. Establishing terms and conditions for grazing permits is a |
| structural protections and other mandatory | decision best made at the implementation-level decision making |
| and enforceable terms and conditions for | where those terms can be tailored to the environmental |
| both upland and riparian vegetation. | conditions present in the given allotment. The EIS considers |
| 22. Spiana and Aparian regention. | GRSG habitat objectives, and the BLM's regulations require |
| | adherence to land health standards. Terms and conditions |
| | needed to meet these conditions can be implemented at the |
| | site-scale when issuing/renewing a grazing permit. |
| | |

| Alternative Proposed | Rationale for Dismissal |
|--|--|
| An alternative relative to livestock grazing | Out of scope; not a planning level decision. The EIS considers |
| management to facilitate sagebrush | GRSG habitat objectives, and the BLM's regulations require |
| recruitment and survival. That alternative | adherence to land health standards. Development of allotment |
| should develop allotment management plans, | management plans is conducted in a manner to meet regulatory |
| cooperatively with willing permittees, with | and planning requirements in context of the local ecological |
| objective utilization levels sufficient to | circumstances and conditions. Such actions as requested can be |
| facilitate sagebrush recruitment and survival. | implemented at the site-scale. |
| An alternative that follows the same approach | Out of scope; not a planning level decision. The EIS considers |
| used by the Ely District BLM that implements | GRSG habitat objectives at multiple spatial scales. The specific |
| sagebrush habitat restoration in a systematic | restoration strategies needed to achieve the objectives are |
| fashion at a watershed scale. | developed through the implementation process. |
| An alternative that includes close | While not a planning level decision, the 2015 ARMPAs speak to |
| coordination with local and state fire | coordination across ownerships and managerial responsibilities. |
| managers for coordinated fire suppression in | In addition, while specific fire suppression efforts, identification |
| GRSG habitat and for aggressive fuels | and implementation of fuels reduction projects, and postfire |
| reduction projects and postfire rehabilitation. | rehabilitation, including coordination across multiple agencies |
| | and jurisdictions, are critical to successfully reducing wildfire |
| | risks, they are conducted at the site-specific scale. |
| An alternative that defers SFA designation to | Out of scope. The management needed for public lands, |
| states. | whether PHMA, GHMA, or other designations, needs to occur |
| 200 | in the BLM's land use plans to comply with FLPMA. However, |
| 187 | states can recommend management of certain areas through |
| 0 4 | this process. However, the EIS does include alternatives that |
| - A F & F | consider not designating SFAs. |
| A deferral alternative of federal land" and | An alternative that defers leasing in a given area would be |
| minerals in southwestern Montana from oil | substantially similar in effect to an alternative that considers |
| and gas leasing pending revision of the Dillon | closing an area to leasing. BLM has developed a range of |
| RMP. The BLM should also evaluate a deferral | alternatives related to areas available or not available for oil |
| alternative that would commit to not lease in | and gas leasing, as well as stipulations for leasing activities to |
| the Beaverhead, Big Hole, and Centennial | address the continued GRSG habitat losses and declines in |
| valleys until it revises the 2006 Dillon RMP. | GRSG populations. Alternative 3 considers closing PHMA to oil |
| 12 We ell 60, 16 | and gas leasing. A commitment to not offer lands for oil and gas leasing is not an RMP decision. |
| An alternative that focuses on increasing | Out of scope. An alternative that decreases |
| development including additional mineral | stipulations/restrictions in an effort to encourage more |
| leasing and development, wind and solar, or | development would not be consistent with the purpose and |
| rights of way | need to address the continued GRSG habitat losses and |
| rigitus-oi-way. | declines in GRSG populations. In addition, mineral leasing and |
| 20 31 1 1 de | granting rights-of-way are implementation-level decisions. The |
| The one Mice | RMP identifies areas available or not available for such uses and |
| So till Or the | any stipulations required for protection of GRSG. The RMP |
| 130 | does not directly lease areas or grant rights-of-way. |
| development, including additional mineral leasing and development, wind and solar, or rights-of-way. An alternative that considers removing the | As explained in the BLM's Purpose and Need, this planning |
| disturbance cap. | effort addresses the continuing losses of GRSG habitat and the |
| distai barree cap. | associated population declines. Research across the species' |
| | range has identified relationships between various |
| | anthropogenic developments and GRSG avoidance behavior or |
| | lek abandonment. An alternative that considers removing a tool |
| | that addresses a threat to GRSG would not be consistent with |
| | the purpose and need described in Chapter 1. |
| | and purpose and need described in enapter 1. |

| Alternative Proposed | Rationale for Dismissal |
|--|--|
| A climate action plan/multiple-use alternative | The purpose and need of this planning process is to address the |
| that considers policies that require optimizing | continued GRSG habitat losses and declines in GRSG |
| the domestic development of minerals. | populations. The alternatives considered do address whether |
| | and where various mineral development activities would align |
| | with GRSG management. Considering an alternative that |
| | focuses on increasing activities that are known to impact GRSG |
| | would not be consistent with the purpose and need. |
| An alternative that balances economic, social, | Some scoping comments recommended consideration of an |
| and conservation considerations. | alternative that balances considerations for conservation with |
| | economic and social needs. As a concept without more specific |
| | suggestions the recommendation was too general to develop a |
| | specific alternative around. However, the many of the |
| | alternatives considered in detail address differing levels of |
| | management constraints within GRSG habitat and their |
| | associated effects on public land uses. |
| A preferred alternative focused on multiple | All the BLM's alternatives comply with the direction in FLPMA |
| use: avoid public lands that are off limits to | that public lands be managed "on the basis of multiple use and |
| use; instead provide active management and | sustained yield" (FLPMA Sec. 102(a)(7)). Beyond that, an |
| appropriate mitigation measures that can be | alternative that does not avoid disturbance eliminates the |
| implemented based on site-specific | primary tool research has shown protects GRSG and their |
| information. | habitat, and therefore would not be consistent with the |
| 494 | purpose and need. In addition, all the alternatives considered in |
| , 0/ 4 | detail apply the full mitigation spectrum of avoiding impacts, |
| 13 4 6 | then minimizing effects if avoidance is not possible, and then |
| Cla M | providing compensatory mitigation for residual effects. |
| 410 21 | Alternative 3 focuses on avoidance whereas alternatives 2 and |
| 01, D. CC | 5 provide more consideration for compensatory mitigation and |
| " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " " | consideration of local circumstances. Given the general nature |
| 0. 41, 40, 4 | of the alternative proposed, the current range of alternatives |
| A I DADAY | include actions that are similar in both content and effect. |
| An alternative as part of any new RMPA that is consistent with the October 5, 2020, | The BLM must comply with its grazing regulations which |
| 1- AU -11 -1A AV | |
| Humboldt County approved Policy on | habitat for special status species, including GRSG. However, |
| Rangeland Management and Health and with | consistency with local plans and policies will be conducted as |
| other policies on livestock grazing. The BLM should also consider the references cited | part of the EIS process. In addition, as a rangewide conservation effort, a county-focused plan for a species that |
| within the county's policy as part of the | uses large landscapes that may include multiple counties is too |
| overall body of science used to inform any | narrow. As part of this planning process, we have coordinated |
| new BLM RMPA. | and sought input from counties. |
| HEN DELFILIA. | and sought input it offi counties. |

2.4 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The BLM identified Alternative 5 as the preferred alternative in this Draft ElS. This alternative was selected after review of comments submitted by other government agencies, public organizations, state and tribal entities, interested individuals (during scoping) and cooperating agencies. The preferred alternative represents goals (see **Section 2.5.1**), objectives (see **Section 2.5.4**), and management direction determined to be most effective at resolving planning issues by adjusting management options based on internal and external input and administration priorities, balancing resource uses by managing multiple use according to GRSG habitat designation, and meeting the purpose and need by ensuring management on BLM-administered lands support GRSG conservation goals and provides the BLM with locally relevant decisions that accord with range-wide GRSG conservation goals.

Identifying a preferred alternative does not indicate any decision or commitments from the BLM. In developing the Proposed RMPA/Final EIS, the next phase of the planning process, the decision maker may select various goals, objectives, allocations and management prescriptions from each of the alternatives analyzed in the Draft RMPA/EIS. The combination of goals, objectives and management prescriptions may also vary by state to address circumstances that vary between the states. The Proposed RMPA/Final EIS may also reflect adjustments based on comments on the Draft RMPA/EIS, new information, or changes in BLM policies or priorities. The BLM has the discretion to select as a Proposed RMPA, an alternative or set of state-specific alternatives that uses an alternative in its entirety or to combine aspects of the various alternatives presented in this Draft RMPA/EIS. This allows the BLM to select the best strategy that incorporates appropriate GRSG habitat management actions to meet the RMP goals and objectives, is consistent with the purpose and need, is in accordance with the agency's mandate to manage the public lands for multiple use and sustained yield and aligns with state and local plans and policies to the extent possible.

2.5 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF DRAFT ALTERNATIVES

The sections describe the draft alternatives' goals, objectives, and management decisions/actions. At the beginning of each section there is a brief description introducing the action/topic and rationale for alternatives development. These introductions are not planning decisions but are included to establish context for the alternatives. Section 2.5 includes rangewide alternatives applicable to all states, organized by the cross-cutting management topics/issues identified during scoping (see Section 1.6). Accompanying these narratives are tables showing side-by-side descriptions of the alternatives. Section 2.6 includes the alternatives associated with state-specific circumstances, organized by state. Alternatives I and 2 in Section 2.5 are presented as summaries due to variations by state or planning area. Not all decisions from the 2015 and 2019 amendment efforts are included in Alternatives I and 2. Only management actions being considered for amendment in Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 are brought forward from the 2015 and 2019 efforts. The remaining decisions from the prior planning efforts will remain in place regardless of which alternative is selected. Appendix 2, Existing GRSG Management in BLM RMPs identifies all existing GRSG management (inclusive of both 2015 and 2019 ARMPAs) for each state and identifies whether an action may be amended in the current effort. The figure on the next page is an example of how some decisions may be considered for amendment, while others will remain unchanged.

Actions applicable to all alternatives are shown in one cell across a row and would be implemented regardless of which alternative is ultimately selected. Actions applicable to more than one but not all alternatives are indicated by either combining cells for the applicable alternatives, or by denoting them as the same for another alternative (e.g., "same as Alternative A"). "No similar action" is used to indicate there is no similar goal, objective or action to the other alternatives, or that the similar goal, objective or action is reflected in another management action in the alternative.

Figure 2.1. Example Conceptual Model for the BLM GRSG Planning Amendments

All RMP Decisions

2015 GRSG ARMPs and ARMPAs to RMP to RMP to RMP Fire 2 added to RMP Fire 3 added to RMP 10 Fire I added to RMP SSS I added to RMP to RMP SSS 2 added 3 added MR I added MR 2 added SSS ē 9 9 Ω 9

The 2015 GRSG plan amendment effort added or amended several RMP actions specific to management of GRSG habitat on public lands. All other RMP management actions not related to GRSG remained unchanged. (These are examples and not reflective of changes being considered in this effort).

MD SSS 1 changed/amended MD SSS 2 no change MD MR 1 no change MD Fire 1 no change MD Fire 2 no change MD Fire 3 changed/amended MD Fire 4 added to RMP

The 2019 GRSG amendment effort changed some actions added or amended in 2015 and in some cases added additional management actions to the RMPs. All GRSG management actions not considered for change remained as described in the 2015 ARMPA. All other RMP management actions not related to GRSG remained unchanged.

| Cuả | rent GR | of Amen | or the | Hort | 105 105 | 10 |
|--|--|---|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|----|
| MD SSS 1 no change MD SSS 2 changed/amended | MD SSS 3 no change MD MR 1 changed/amended | MD MR 2 changed/amended MD Fire I no change | MD Fire 2 no change MD Fire 3 no change | MD Fire 4 no change | MD Predation I added to RMP | |

This GRSG amendment effort is considering changes to some actions added or amended in both the 2015 and 2019 efforts. In some cases, this effort is considering adding additional management actions to the RMPs. All GRSG management actions not being considered for a change will remain as described in the 2015 and 2019 ARMPAs, respectively. All other RMP management actions not related to GRSG remain unchanged.

Many management actions are informed by the location of GRSG leks (breeding areas associated with GRSG nesting habitat). Existing management actions across the species' range use different lek definitions (e.g., active, occupied, pending, or historic), as identified by state wildlife agencies where the lek occurred. In 2022, the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) published standardized definitions for leks to resolve inconsistencies between states, thereby allowing for comparable data analyses across the species' range (Cook et. al., 2022). Through these plan amendments, the BLM proposes to adopt the lek definitions published by WAFWA and use them when implementing GRSG management. **Appendix 4** compares the new WAFWA lek definitions to definitions used in each existing BLM RMP/EIS. Unless otherwise specifically noted, the term "lek" applies to the WAFWA definition for "active lek."

2.5.1 Clarifying the RMP Goal for GRSG

In 2015, BLM RMPs were amended or revised to include updated goals or objectives for GRSG management in consideration of the National Technical Team (NTT) Report (BLM 2011). The NTT comprised resource specialists and scientists from the BLM, State Fish and Wildlife Agencies, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). In the report the authors identified a management goal to: "Maintain and/or increase sage-grouse abundance and distribution by conserving, enhancing or restoring the sagebrush ecosystem upon which populations depend in cooperation with other conservation partners."

Some iteration of the NTT Report goal is in all current BLM RMPs for GRSG. Through this planning effort, the BLM proposes to clarify its goal, which is to conserve, enhance, restore, and manage GRSG habitats to support persistent, healthy populations, consistent with BLM's Special Status Species Management Policy (BLM-M-6840) and in coordination and cooperation with state wildlife agencies. Habitat conservation and management should maintain existing connectivity between GRSG populations.

Table 2-2, Comparison of Alternatives, GRSG RMP Goal, presents management by alternative for this management issue.

Table 2-2. Comparison of Alternatives, GRSG RMP Goal

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| All states have at least one goal | or objective that includes the | BLM resource management | plans (RMPs) would identify the | desired condition for GRSG |
| following language and/or conce | pt: | in the following overarching | goal: | |
| Maintain and enhance populate | tions and distribution of GRSG | Conserve, enhance, restore | and manage GRSG habitats to s | support persistent, healthy |
| by protecting and improving s | sagebrush habitats and | populations, consistent with | BLM's Special Status Species M | lanagement Policy (BLM- M- |
| ecosystems that sustain GRS0 | G populations. | 6840) and in coordination as | nd cooperation with state wildli | fe agencies. Habitat |
| Conserve, enhance, and resto | ore the sagebrush ecosystem | conservation and manageme | int should maintain existing con | nectivity between GRSG |
| upon which GRSG population | ns depend in an effort to | populations. | id dilligion | |
| cooperation with other cons | ervation partners | on the | ted allo sio | |
| Maintain and enhance quality/ | suitable habitat to support the | - 2th at 11 ac | Sat Priers | |
| expansion of GRSG population | ons on federally-administered | Mics though | 261, 14 V. | |
| lands within the planning area | | all is il be il | W. OU. OI. | |
| | ~ | er dec Mil 400 | he dul | |
| | 2/6 | extent alois | ri lieu | |
| | cicla N | Marino Ellock 12 | 16/ | |
| | Offic BL | achine iste he | 3 | |
| | inche d | 11.0001 24 | | |
| | 20 1 1 131 | EL. KE War | | |
| | is a gariante di | St. Ch. Mat | | |
| | 15 1 MB , 51 269 | MERRI | | |
| <\\ | JI CO SILY OF LOS | y en | | |
| | do stia Epicioni | IM | | |
| | 431. Mr. 131.00 | | | |
| | 102 US, W/ 5 OC | | | |
| 9 | a filo, Bry the | | | |
| | Marse | | | |
| | . His | | | |
| All states have at least one goal following language and/or conce Maintain and enhance populate by protecting and improving secosystems that sustain GRSG. Conserve, enhance, and restdupon which GRSG population maintain and/or increase their cooperation with other conse. Maintain and enhance quality/expansion of GRSG population lands within the planning area. | S populations. ore the sagebrush ecosystem as depend in an effort to rabundance and distribution, in ervation partners. Is suitable habitat to support the ons on federally-administered in the control of the control | | | |
| | | | | |

2.5.2 Habitat Management Area Alignments and Associated Major Land Use Allocations

The BLM has reviewed new scientific publications since our previous planning efforts which provide key population (e.g., Doherty et al. 2016, Coates et al., 2021), genetic (e.g., Cross et al., 2018, Oyler-McCance et al., 2022) connectivity (e.g., Row et al. 2018, Cross et al., 2023) habitat (e.g., Doherty et al., 2016, Wann et al., 2022, Doherty et al., 2022) and climate change (Palmquist et al., 2021, Rigge et al., 2021). This information was used to update GRSG habitat designations in concert with state wildlife agencies, to determine if BLM was applying appropriate management allocations consistent with the purpose and need of this amendment. While HMAs may encompass multiple land ownerships, reflecting the wide-ranging ecological needs of GRSG, management actions that follow are specific to BLM-administered lands.

Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA) have the highest value to maintaining sustainable GRSG populations and can include breeding, late brood-rearing, winter concentration areas, and migration or connectivity corridors. The BLM objective for these areas is to maintain and enhance habitat conditions that will support persistent and healthy GRSG populations through management to minimize habitat loss and degradation. See **Appendix 3** for a description of the strategies applied by each state to identify PHMA.

Important Habitat Management Areas (IHMA; ID only) are defined as lands that encompass moderate to high-quality GRSG habitat and populations necessary for providing a management buffer for PHMA, connecting patches of PHMA, and in some cases supporting important populations and habitat independent of PHMA. The objective for IHMA is to maintain habitat conditions that will support persistent and healthy GRSG populations.

General Habitat Management Areas (GHMA) are lands that are or have the potential to become occupied seasonal or year-round habitat outside of PHMA or IHMA, managed to sustain GRSG populations. These areas are defined differentially by state wildlife management agencies, but generally are of poorer GRSG habitat quality with reduced occupancy when compared to PHMA. Some state wildlife agencies have identified areas of GHMA as important for restoration, connectivity, or seasonal habitats, and most require mitigation for unavoidable impacts within this designation. The objective for GHMA is to maintain habitat conditions to support GRSG populations consistent with the state agency designations of recovery, connectivity, or seasonal habitats.

Other habitat management areas are identified by individual states for a variety of purposes, typically as subsets of GHMA (i.e., lower priority than PHMA). These are defined and described in detail in **Appendix 3**.

Table 2-3, Comparative Summary – Acres GRSG Habitat Management Areas by State by Alternative. **Appendix 3** provides a summary of each state strategy in developing their habitat management areas, as well as the definitions for the GRSG habitat management areas used in each state. **Maps 2.1** through **2.6** show the relationship of the habitat management areas across the west.

In addition to habitat management areas, this section summarizes allocations for major land uses. Additional details for alternatives I and 2 (e.g., specific avoidance criteria for rights-of-way, specific controlled surface use stipulations for fluid minerals, etc.), is presented in **Appendix 2**. If specific language from previous plans is not included in this amendment, it is not being considered for amendment in this effort.

Table 2-3. Comparative Summary – Acres GRSG Habitat Management Areas by State by Alternative (BLM administered surface only)

| | Habitat Management Area | Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-----|--------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | | | 1 | agement Area A | | |
| | PHMA | 32,465,000 | 32,535,000 | 69,199,000 | 36,701,000 | 34,803,000 |
| | GHMA | 26,383,000 | 25,878,000 | N/A | 25,946,000 | 23,718,000 |
| | | | | gement Area Al | | - W |
| | PHMA | 748,000 | 921,000 | 1,538,000 | 751,000 | 7 51,000 |
| | GHMA | 788,000 | 727,000 | N/A | 786,000 | 786,000 |
| | LMA | 97,000 | 82,000 | 97,000 | 97,000 | 97,000 |
| | | | | ement Area Alig | | 11. 100 |
| | PHMA | 4,178,000 | 4,106,000 | 8,860,000 | 4,472,000 | 4,573,000 |
| | IHMA | 2,736,000 | 2,796,000 | N/A | 2,477,000 | 2,50 3,000 |
| | GHMA | 1,958,000 | 1,958,000 | N/A | 1,910,000 | 1,722,000 |
| | | Montana/D | akotas Habitat N | lanagement Are | a Alignments | 0 |
| | PHMA | 3,275,000 | 3,275,000 | 5,254,000 | 3,300,000 | 3,300,000 |
| | GHMA | 2,384,000 | 2,384,000 | N/A | 1,859,000 | 1,859,000 |
| | RHMA | 165,000 | 165,000 | N/A | 94,000 | 94,000 |
| | CHMA | N/A | N/A | 298,000 | 298,000 | 298,000 |
| | | | | 1anagement Are | | * |
| | PHMA | 9,266,000 | 9,268,000 | 21,138,000 | 9,780,000 | 9,661,000 |
| | GHMA | 5,783,000 | 5,749,000 | N/A | 7 ,551,000 | 6,183,000 |
| | OHMA | 4,862,000 | 4,870,000 | N/A | 3,806,000 | 2,977,000 |
| | | | | gement Area Ali | | |
| | PHMA | 4,589,000 | 4,557,000 | 11,022,000 | 6,283,000 | 6,281,000 |
| | GHMA 💉 | 5,634,000 | 5,662,000 | N/A | 4,739,000 | 3,539,000 |
| | ~~ | Utah | | ement Area Aligi | nments | |
| | PHMA (| 2,080,000 | 2,080,000 | 3,568,000 | 2,192,000 | 1,627,000 |
| | GHMA | 438,000 | N/A | N/A | 1,195,000 | 646,000 |
| | 6 10 | Wyomi | ing Habitat Mana | gement Area Al | ignments | |
| W) | PHMA | 8,328,000 | 8, 328,000 | 17,821,000 | 9,921,000 | 8,609,000 |
| 11. | GHMA | 9,397,000 | 9,397,000 | N/A | 7,905,000 | 8,981,000 |
| | Stewardship | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 15,000 |
| | Areas | Tr. Flo | CN. | | | |
| SU | PHMA GHMA Stewardship Areas | W Hatio | 50 | | | |
| Ì | 4110 | | | | | |

Table 2-4. Comparison of Alternatives, Habitat Management Area Alignments, Associated Major Land Use Allocations, and Non-Habitat

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|---|--|---------------------------------|---|
| Summary of Afternative I | | a Alignments and Associated M | | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
| CDSC habitat management | | | | CRSC habitat management |
| GRSG habitat management areas would be identified and | GRSG habitat management areas would be identified and | GRSG habitat management areas would be identified and | GRSG habitat management | GRSG habitat management areas would be identified and |
| | | | areas would be identified and | |
| managed using the boundaries from the 2015 amendments or | managed using the boundaries from the 2019 amendments. See | managed as shown on Map 2.3. | managed as shown on Map 2.4. | managed as shown on Map 2.5. |
| | | Acres by state and rangewide | Acres by state and rangewide | Acres by state and rangewide |
| revisions (as maintained). See | Map 2.2 for the map of the | are shown in Table 2-3 above. | are shown in Table 2-3 above. | are shown in Table 2-3 above. |
| Map 2.1 for the HMA map. | HMAs. Acres by state and | Information on state-by-state | Information on state-by-state | Information on state-by-state |
| Acres by state and rangewide | rangewide are shown in Table | GRSG HMA mapping strategies | GRSG HMA mapping strategies | GRSG HMA mapping strategies |
| are shown in Table 2-3 above. | 2-3 above. | is in Appendix 3. | is in Appendix 3. | is in Appendix 3. |
| Information on state-by-state | Information on state-by-state | 200 | 19, 47, 61 | |
| GRSG HMA mapping strategies | GRSG HMA mapping strategies | Under Alternative 3, all areas | No areas would be identified or | No areas would be identified or |
| is in Appendix 3 . | is in Appendix 3. | managed for GRSG would be | managed as SFAs. | managed as SFAs. |
| is in Experience | is in a special section. | PHMA. | 0, 00 | (HMA boundaries under |
| ID, MT, NV, OR, UT, WY: | MT/DK: Manage the same | (In addition to the PHMA there | No In | Alternative 6 are the same as |
| Manage Sagebrush Focal Areas | HMAs as Alternative I. | would be ACECs designated See | 11.00 | those under Alternative 5. Map |
| (SFAs) as described in the 2015 | ID NV LIT WY removed SEAs | the ACEC section below and | alle | 2.6 shows the HMA boundaries |
| amendments or revisions. | and associated management | Appendix E) | 10 | and the GRSG ACECs that |
| CA, CO, ND, SD: Does not | and associated management. | Appendix 5. | | would be designated. See the |
| include SFAs. | CA, CO, MT/DK are the same | 400 The dis 1 5 | | ACEC section below, and |
| include SFAS. | as Alternative I. | (, 000 78) | | Appendix 5.) |
| | | 46.0 | | Appendix 5.) |
| | OR retained the SFAs, but | 15 18 12 | | |
| | removed the recommendation | 3. 7/2. " All. | | |
| | for withdrawal from location | 1/2 1/2 | | |
| 1 | and entry under the Mining Law | (a. 00) | | |
| | of 1872. | The state of the s | | |
| | 131 1 131 | 000 | | |
| | 25 31 1 P d | | | |
| | 2-3 above. Information on state-by-state GRSG HMA mapping strategies is in Appendix 3. MT/DK: Manage the same HMAs as Alternative I. ID, NV, UT, WY removed SFAs and associated management. CA, CO, MT/DK are the same as Alternative I. OR retained the SFAs, but removed the recommendation for withdrawal from location and entry under the Mining Law of 1872. | | | |
| • | STO BY THE | | | |
| | No C | | | |
| | , the | | | |
| | • | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Summarized PHMA (and | Summarized PHMA (and | Summarized PHMA | Summarized PHMA | Summarized PHMA |
| ID IHMA) allocations: | ID IHMA) allocations: | allocations: (Wind, solar, | allocations: | allocations: |
| (Wind, solar, livestock grazing, | (Wind, solar, livestock grazing, | livestock grazing, and major | (Wind, solar, livestock grazing, | (Wind, solar, livestock grazing, |
| and major ROWs are addressed | and major ROWs are addressed | ROWs are addressed in | and major ROWs are addressed | and major ROWs are addressed |
| in separate tables below.) | in separate tables below.) | separate tables below.) | in separate tables below.) | in separate tables below.) |
| Fluid minerals: Except as noted below. | Fluid minerals: Same as Alternative I, except CO PHMA is NSO (no closed areas). | Fluid minerals: Closed to leasing | Fluid minerals: Fxcept as noted below. | - Florid main analys |
| of leks. Saleable Minerals/Mineral Materials: Except as noted below, all states are closed in PHMA (and in IHMA in ID), but open for new free use permits and expansion of existing pits. WY: Open subject to occupancy, seasonal limitations, disturbance, and density. | Saleable Minerals/Mineral Materials; Same as Alternative I, except as noted below: NW/CA: Exception criteria added to the closure. | Saleable Minerals/Mineral Materials: Closed | Saleable Minerals/Mineral Materials: Except as noted below, all states are closed in PHMA, but open for new free use permits and expansion of existing pits. ID: open for new free use permits and expansion of existing pits if screening and development criteria met ID IHMA open WY: Same as Alternative I. (See the ID and OR state specific circumstances for additional details for saleable mineral allocation decisions) | Saleable Minerals/Mineral Materials: Same as Alternative 4 except ID PHMA, which is open for new free use permits and expansion of existing pits subject to screening and development criteria. (See the ID and OR state specific circumstances for additional details for saleable mineral allocation decisions) |

| Except as noted below, all states are closed, but can consider expansion of existing leases. WY: Open subject to occupancy, seasonal limitations, disturbance, and density. IHMA in ID is open in Known Phosphate Leasing Areas (KPLAs), IHMA Outside KPLAs is open subject to disturbance thresholds. Coal: Co O, MT/DK, UT, and WY include the following language: At the time an application for a new coal lease or lease modification is submitted to the BLM, the BLM will determine whether the lease application area is "unsuitable" for all or "unsuitable" for all or Except as noted below, all states are closed. NV/CA: Closed with exceptions. Coal: Figure of the states and tensitive 4. NV/CA: Closed with exceptions. Coal: Figure of the NV/CA: State specific speci | Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| certain coal mining methods pursuant to 43 CFR Part 3461.5. PHMA is essential habitat for maintaining GRSG for purposes of the suitability criteria as per 43 CFR Part 3461.5(o)(1). ID, NV/CA, and OR: Did of essential habitat for maintaining GRSG as per the suitability criteria at 43 CFR Part 3461.5(o)(1). information associated with lease nomination areas as | Non-Energy minerals: Except as noted below, all states are closed, but can consider expansion of existing leases. WY: Open subject to occupancy, seasonal limitations, disturbance, and density. IHMA in ID is open in Known Phosphate Leasing Areas (KPLAs). IHMA Outside KPLAs is open subject to disturbance thresholds. Coal: Co, MT/DK, UT, and WY include the following language: At the time an application for a new coal lease or lease modification is submitted to the BLM, the BLM will determine whether the lease application area is "unsuitable" for all or certain coal mining methods pursuant to 43 CFR Part 3461.5. PHMA is essential habitat for maintaining GRSG for purposes of the suitability criteria as per 43 CFR Part 3461.5(o)(1). | Non-Energy minerals: Same as Alternative I, except NV/CA added exception criteria to the closure. Coal – All States same as Alt I, except UT: At time an application for a new coal lease or lease modification is submitted to the BLM, the BLM will determine whether the lease application area is "unsuitable" for all or certain coal mining methods pursuant to 43 CFR Part 3461.5. Coordination with the appropriate State of Utah agency and the determination of essential habitat for maintaining GRSG as per the suitability criteria at 43 CFR Part 3461.5(o)(1) will consider site-specific information associated with | Non-Energy minerals: Closed Coal: Co, MT/DK, UT and WY would include the same language as UT Alt unless a suitability process has already been conducted that considered GRSG HMAs. ID, NV/CA, and OR would not address coal | Non-Energy minerals: Except as noted below, all states are closed. NV/CA: Closed with exceptions. ID IHMA: Open WY: Same as Alternative I. (See the NV/CA state specific circumstances for additional details for non-energy mineral | Non-Energy minerals: Same as Alternative 4. |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Locatable minerals: | Locatable minerals: | Locatable minerals. The BLM | Locatable minerals: | Locatable Minerals: Same as |
| ID, MT, NV, OR, UT, WY: | MT/DK: Same as | recommends PHMA for | MT: UMRBNM is already | Alternative 4. |
| SFAs were recommended for | Alternative I. | withdrawal from location and | withdrawn | Acciliative 1. |
| withdrawal from location and | o ID, NV/CA, OR, UT, and | entry under the Mining Law | | |
| under the Mining Law of | WY: Same as alternative | of 1872. The portion of the | 115 | |
| 1872. The BLM applied for a | | PHMA that is within the SFA | 110 | |
| withdrawal pursuant to | recommendation for | boundaries from 2015 were | of this BLM | |
| 204(a) of FLPMA and the | withdrawal from location | recommended for | 11, de 10 0 | |
| Secretary initiated the | and entry under the | withdrawal from location and | o we di | |
| withdrawal process for those | Mining Law of 1872 | under the Mining Law of | olly of the Of | |
| lands. That process is | associated with SFAs. | 1872. The BLM applied for a | of this and of the BLM of sted in the bublished in the BLM of the | |
| currently underway. | | withdrawal pursuant to | 100 10, 10, | |
| MT: UMRBNM is already | | 204(a) of FLPMA and the | Sto Ou are. | |
| withdrawn. | | Secretary initiated the | 2 4 16. | |
| | | withdrawal process for those | ve, 11 v. | |
| | | lands. That process is | 4, 4, 01, | |
| | | currently underway. | 60,116 | |
| Minor Rights-of-Way | Minor ROW: Same as Alternative I, except NV/CA added exception criteria to the Avoidance. | PHMA that is within the SFA boundaries from 2015 were recommended for withdrawal from location and under the Mining Law of 1872. The BLM applied for a withdrawal pursuant to 204(a) of FLPMA and the Secretary initiated the withdrawal process for those lands. That process is currently underway. Minor ROW: Exclusion (outside of designated corridors) | Minor ROW: | Minor ROW: |
| (ROW): | Alternative I, except NV/CA | (outside of designated | Same as Alternative | Same as Alternative I |
| Except as noted below, | added exception criteria to | corridors) | I (including IHMA), | (including IHMA), except |
| PHMA in all states is | the Avoidance. | and the state of | except as noted below: | as noted below: |
| avoidance for minor | 20, 6 | Oc The dis b | For minor ROWs, | |
| ROWs (<100 kV | M. The | 0 1000 27 | MT/DK exclusion within | MT/DK exclusion within |
| transmission lines and < | 181: 12 | 161. VF 1410 | 1.2 miles of active leks | 0.6 miles of active leks |
| 24" pipelines) | ie a Wir Wille | 15 OK 21 | and crucial winter range. | and crucial winter range. |
| IHMA in ID is avoidance | is de ellis | PILL ALLO | Avoidance in designated | Avoidance in designated |
| when consistent with | vis Milling Be | 14 76 | corridors in those areas, | corridors in those areas, |
| screening criteria and | 1, 00, 3/13 VV. V | 3, 61, | and in the remainder of | and in the remainder of |
| subject to RDFs and | 90 410 EV. 101 | 'IU' | PHMA and RHMA. | PHMA. RHMA Avoidance |
| buffers. | 131, Mr. 311 | CO | (See the CO state specific | within 1.2 miles of active |
| o WY: Open to smaller | 128 31 1 No 9 | 3 | circumstances for additional | leks and in crucial winter |
| ROWs, subject to buffers | ID OUS MI SE | | details for ROW allocation | range. Remainder of |
| and mitigation. | Still BL All | | decisions) | RHMA open. |
| | 40 | corridors) | | (See the CO state specific circumstances for additional |
| | Minor ROW: Same as Alternative I, except NV/CA added exception criteria to the Avoidance. | • Minor ROW; Exclusion (outside of designated corridors) | | details for ROW allocation |
| | | | | |
| | | | | decisions) |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Travel and Transportation | Travel and Transportation | Travel and Transportation | Travel and Transportation | Travel and Transportation |
| Management: | Management: Same as | Management: Same as | Management – Same as | Management – Same as |
| All states: Manage PHMA | Alternative I. | Alternative I | Alternative I | Alternative I. |
| and IHMA as limited to | | | | |
| existing roads and trails, | | | vie | |
| with isolated areas open | | | 10 1133 | |
| to cross-country use | | | 01 3 2/11 | |
| where suitable based on | | | U 01 0 111 | |
| local conditions (e.g., | | is | se the co | |
| sand dunes, rocky areas, | | ars. | The of | |
| etc) | | 100 | Summarized GHMA | |
| Summarized GHMA | Summarized GHMA | Summarized GHMA allocations: Not applicable to this alterative, as GHMA, IHMA, OHMA, and RHMA under Alternative 3 would be managed as PHMA. | Summarized GHMA | Summarized GHMA |
| allocations: | allocations: | allocations: | allocations: | allocations: |
| Fluid minerals: | Fluid minerals: Same as | Not applicable to this alterative, | Fluid minerals: | Fluid minerals: |
| o CO: closed within I mile | Alternative I, except CO | as GHMA, IHMA, OHMA, and | 6 CO: NSO w/in 2 miles of | Same as Alternative 4 for |
| of leks, NSO within 2 | changed the closure within | RHMA under Alternative 3 | leks, TL elsewhere. | all states except CO: |
| miles of leks, and | one mile of leks to be an | would be managed as PHMA. | o ID: CSU | CSU w/in 2 miles of leks, |
| seasonal limitations | NSO. | 16 16 4 10 90 | o MT/DK: NSO w/in 0.6 | TL w/in rest of GHMA |
| elsewhere. | : 2 | 6 Ch 21 19 | mile of leks and in crucial | CO Alternative 6: CSU |
| ID: CSU (lek buffers) | ci Gla | My We sills of | winter range; CSU | w/in I mile of PHMA, TL |
| MT/DK – varies by local | Elle Bl | cult of story | elsewhere and in CHMA. | w/in rest of GHMA. |
| office (see Table 2-28). | 70° 6. V | 100 The dis 16 | NV/CA, OR: open with | (See the CO and WY state |
| NV/CA: CSU (lek buffers | M. The | 0 1 200 33 | minor stipulations (CSU | specific circumstances for |
| and seasonal limitations) | 181: 18 | 46, V 4 W | – seasonal limitations) | additional details for fluid |
| o OR: NSO within I mile | is a all will | 19 8 1 | UT: NSO near leks and | mineral allocation decisions) |
| of leks, and CSU | . 6 13 MG 611 201 | 9. TE. 411. | seasonal limitations | |
| (seasonal limitations) | nis will Re | 1/2 1/2 | (varies by office) | |
| o UT: NSO near leks | 100 31130 | (a. 00) | o WY: NSO w/in 0.25 mile | |
| (varies by office) and | 00 7510 EX 1101 | III. | of leks; seasonal | |
| CSU (seasonal | *31. M. 31. | 200 | limitations within 2 miles | |
| limitations) based on | 25 31 1 M d | | of leks; open with | |
| allocations in plans that | Jo My MI VE | | standard terms and conditions outside of 2- | |
| predated the 2015 amendment. | STO BY THE | | mile lek buffer. | |
| amendment. | Ma C | | mile lek buπer. | |
| WY: NSO within 0.25 miles of leks, and | ille | as GHMA, IHMA, OHMA, and RHMA under Alternative 3 would be managed as PHMA. | (See the CO and WY state specific circumstances for | |
| seasonal limitations | • | | additional details for fluid | |
| within 2 miles of leks. | | | mineral allocation decisions) | |
| open with standard terms | | | inineral anocation decisions) | |
| and conditions outside of | | | | |
| 2-mile lek buffer. | | | | |
| Z-IIIIIe IEK DUIIEI. | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Saleable minerals/Mineral | Saleable minerals/Mineral | _ | Saleable minerals/Mineral | Saleable minerals/Mineral |
| Materials: | Materials: Same as | | Materials: Same as | Materials: Same as |
| All states: no allocations | Alternative I, except ID | | Alternative 2. | Alternative 2. |
| for GHMA (meaning open), though most have minimization measures such as RDFss/BMPs and mitigation. | changed applying "RDFs and buffers" in GHMA to applying "BMPs." | | n of this BLM | |
| Non-energy minerals: All states: no specific allocations for GHMA(meaning open) though most have minimization measures such as RDFs/BMPs and mitigation | Non-energy minerals: Same as Alternative I, except ID changed applying "RDFs and buffers" in GHMA to applying "BMPs." | - ublication version be pro- | Non-Energy minerals – Same as Alternative I. Coal – Unsuitability evaluation approach same as applied in PHMA. Locatable minerals – Same as | Non-Energy minerals – Same as Alternative I. |
| Coal: No states mentioned coal management in GHMA. | Coal: Same as Alternative I. | Lebrech will doci | Coal – Unsuitability evaluation approach same as applied in PHMA. | Coal – Same as Alternative 4. |
| • Locatable minerals: SFAs were recommended for withdrawal from location and under the Mining Law of 1872. The BLM applied for a withdrawal pursuant to 204(a) of FLPMA and the Secretary initiated the withdrawal process for those lands. That process is currently underway. | Locatable minerals: Same as Alternative 1. | Are Publication Version of the property of the property will be property of the property of th | Locatable minerals – Same as Alternative I. | Locatable minerals – Same as Alternative I. |
| Minor Rights-of-Way: Substantial variation by state: All states: open to minor ROWs with mitigation, except in WY. | Minor Rights-of-Way: Same as Alternative I, except ID changed applying "RDFs and buffers" in GHMA to applying "BMPs." | D <u> </u> | Minor Rights-of-Way: CO, MT/DK: Avoidance OR: Avoidance within breeding, nesting, and/or seasonal habitats, otherwise open ID, NV/CA, UT, WY: Open | Minor Rights-of-Way: CO: Avoidance ID, UT, WY: Open MT/DK: Avoidance w/in I.2 miles of active leks and w/in crucial winter range, open elsewhere. CHMA: Avoidance NV/CA, OR: Open with minimization measures |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| Travel and Transportation | Travel and Transportation | _ | Travel and Transportation | Travel and Transportation |
| Management: Limited to | Management: Same as | | Management: Same as | Management Same as |
| existing roads and trails, with | Alternative I. | | Alternative I. | Alternative I. |
| isolated areas open to cross- | | | | |
| country use where suitable | | | Nis | |
| based on local conditions | | | 1119 | |
| (e.g., sand dunes, rocky | | | of this SLM | |
| areas, etc.). | | | 11 0 0 P 111 | |
| | Criteria-Based Management | No similar action. | | |
| All states include language | All states include language | No similar action. | The GRSG habitat management ar | |
| encouraging location of | encouraging location of | 10 | objectives, and management for co | |
| potential projects in areas of | potential projects in areas of | on he | The habitat management area bou | indaries are not intended to |
| non-habitat before considering | non-habitat before considering | 410 4 411 | represent a survey-grade habitat b | ooundary, may include result s of |
| them in areas with habitat in | them in areas with habitat in | : C3 1/31 0 | large-scale modeling, and are not | to be used exclusively for habitat |
| GRSG habitat management | GRSG habitat management | Alle thing t | determinations at a project or site | e-level scale. However, habitat use |
| areas. | areas. | republication vinathe of the property of the property will be property will be property will be property by the property of th | and occupancy, and vegetation co | |
| UT included management (MA- | UT adjusted MA-SSS-1 to apply | ele ec villi oci | therefore careful consideration of | areas within habitat management |
| | to PLIMA allowing management | 16 16 14 90 | areas and field investigations are n | |
| SSS-1) allowing managers to | to PHMA – allowing managers to identify areas of PHMA that | 6 0 2 2 3 16 | management in a manner that mee | |
| identify areas of GHMA that lack principal habitat | lack principal habitat | M We sille of 1 | objectives. In accordance with exi | |
| components necessary for | components necessary for | CALL CALL | inventories will continue to be co | |
| GRSG, including but not limited | GRSG, including but not limited | 100 The dis 10 | on GRSG habitat and distribution | |
| to rock outcrops, alkaline flats, | to rock outcrops, alkaline flats, | 0 1 000 00 | (a), BLM Manual 6840 .04 D 3; BL | M-M-6840 .04 E 2). |
| and pinyon-juniper ecological | pinyon-juniper ecological sites, | 161. VF 141 | If during consideration of a propo | sed action (project level |
| sites. This non-habitat in GHMA | and areas that have crossed an | 15 OK 21 | authorization) within GRSG PHM | |
| could be identified when | ecological threshold to a | DILE AND | (in MT), SHMA (in WY) and OHN | |
| considering a project proposal | different stable non-GRSG | 14 76 | habitat is identified, a field investig | |
| and application of GHMA | habitat vegetation community, | ar ver | BLM biologist (or reviewed and ac | |
| objectives and management | such as cheatgrass | Mexpent wildows document that may be all MEPA Register in all procured that may be all ment that ment all ment all ment that ment all men | investigation should use published | |
| actions could be excepted if: | monocultures or pinyon/juniper | C | more than I) for identifying GRSC | |
| the non-habitat does not | woodlands (phase 3, absent | 0 | [as revised], NRCS ecological site | |
| provide important | sagebrush understory) . This | | | odels) and be coordinated with the |
| connectivity between areas | non-habitat in PHMA could be | | interdisciplinary team. Any discre | |
| with existing or potential | identified when considering a | | GRSG habitat management areas | |
| habitat; | project proposal and application | | will be disclosed, with supporting | |
| all direct and indirect impacts | of PHMA objectives and | | state and transition models, ecolo | |
| that impair the function of | management actions could be | | analyzed as a component of the N | |
| adjacent seasonal habitats or | excepted if: | | · ' | · |
| the life-history or behavioral | the non-habitat does not | | In the mapped GRSG habitat man | |
| needs of the GRSG | provide important | | of non-habitat – areas that lack th | |
| population are eliminated | connectivity between | | principal habitat components nece | |
| through project design (e.g., | seasonal habitats; and | | where conformance with the RMF | |
| —————————————————————————————————————— | Josephia Habitato, and | | conservation (see definitions for e | existing habitat, potential habitat, |

| | | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|---|---|--|
| direct and indirect impacts on | (See above.) | and non-habitat in glossary). How | |
| adjacent seasonal habitats | | to adjacent GRSG populations and | |
| (disturbance to or disruption | | | |
| | | projects in these non-habitat areas | S. |
| (disturbance to or disruption of) that would impair their biological function of providing the life-history or behavioral needs of the GRSG population are eliminated through project design (e.g., minimize sound, preclude tall structures, require perch deterrents), as | The Publication Version of the Arest will be poor the final document that may be all the property by the final poor the final | habitat) still need to be considered projects in these non-habitat areas. All management objectives and de management area type will apply a documented: The project is proposed in verifice in addition to indirect impacts a established above), indirect impacts (considered in pacts of indirect or indirect impacts (considered in pacts). | d when planning and authorizing s. cisions associated with each unless all the following criteria are fied non-habitat. associated with distance (as fact consideration also includes: onsidering impacts within the research) to adjacent habitat fall or populations of GRSG due to project design and finimize noise, preclude tall frents, etc.), as demonstrated in lindirect impact consideration for etween seasonal habitats (e.g., g., winter, etc.), or (3) within or etween seasonal habitats (e.g., g., winter, etc.), or (3) within or etween seasonal habitats (as confield checks) only occurs on exposed action would not include foods that would change the foods that would change the foods that would change the foods that would existing the foods of the proposed project. For the proposed project, for the proposed project, for the state and federal agencies, for the proposed project. The reasons will be documented. If the reasons will be documented as the proposed project from the criteria are met prior to come a same area would need to firm the criteria are met prior to come a site-specific project from the criteria are met prior to come a site-specific project from the criteria are met prior to come a site-specific project from the criteria are met prior to come a site-specific project from the criteria are met prior to come and the graph that the criteria are met prior to come and the graph that the criteria are met prior to come and the graph that the criteria are met prior to come and the graph that the criteria are met prior to come and the graph that the criteria are met prior to come and the graph that the criteria are met prior to come and the graph that the criteria are met prior to come and the graph that the criteria are met prior to come and the graph that the criteria are met prior to come and the graph that the criteria are met prior to come and the graph that the graph th |
| t v n 2 e n v c a | (disturbance to or disruption of) that would impair their biological function of providing the life-history or behavioral needs of the GRSG population are eliminated through project design (e.g., minimize sound, preclude tall structures, require perch deterrents), as demonstrated in the project's NEPA document. Any exception granted by the Authorized Officer based on the above criteria would only apply to the specific project-evel authorization. Excepting a site-specific project from compliance with GRSG management in an area of non-nabitat would not change the boundaries of PHMA. NV/CA added management (MD SSS 5) that allowed the state Director to grant exceptions to allocations and stipulations in PHMA, GHMA, and OHMA if location of the proposed activity is determined to be unsuitable" (by a biologist with GRSG experience using methods such as Stiver et. al. 2015, as revised) and lacks the ecological potential to become marginal or suitable habitat; and will not result in direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts on GRSG | (disturbance to or disruption of) that would impair their biological function of providing the life-history or behavioral needs of the GRSG population are eliminated through project design (e.g., minimize sound, preclude tall structures, require perch deterrents), as demonstrated in the project's NEPA document. Any exception granted by the Authorized Officer based on the above criteria would only upply to the specific project-evel authorization. Excepting a site-specific project from compliance with GRSG management in an area of non-nabitat would not change the coundaries of PHMA. NV/CA added management MD SSS 5) that allowed the state Director to grant exceptions to allocations and stipulations in PHMA, GHMA, and OHMA if location of the proposed activity is determined to be unsuitable" (by a biologist with GRSG experience using methods such as Stiver et. al. 2015, as revised) and lacks the ecological potential to become marginal or suitable habitat; and will not result in direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts on GRSG and its habitat. Management allocation decisions will not | (disturbance to or disruption of of that would impair their biological function of providing the life-history or behavioral needs of the GRSG population are eliminated through project design (e.g., minimize sound, preclude tall structures, require perch deterrents), as demonstrated in the project's NEPA document. Any exception granted by the Authorized Officer based on the above criteria would only piply to the specific project-evel authorization. Excepting a bite-specific project from compliance with GRSG management in an area of non-nabitat would not change the boundaries of PHMA. NV/CA added management MD SSS 5) that allowed the scate Director to grant exceptions to affocations and tipulations in PHMA, GHMA in OHMA if location of the proposed activity is determined to be dissuitable "(by a biologist with GRSG experience using methods such as Stiver et al. 2015, as revised) and lacks the ecological potential to become marginal or suitable habitat, management in minutes in the proposed activity in determined to be dissuitable as a still proposed activity in the proposed activity in the proposed activity in the proposed activity is determined to be dissuitable as a still proposed activity in the proposed activity is determined to be dissuitable as a still proposed activity in the proposed activity is determined to be dissuitable as a still proposed activity in the proposed activity is determined to be dissuitable as a still proposed activity in the proposed projects in the undergo individual analysis to consultable management and an activity in the proposed projects in the undergo individual analysis to consultable management and actions and tripilations. Exceptions with the appropriate proposed activity in the proposed projects in the undergo individual analysis to consultable abitat; and will not result in direct, indirect, procumulative impacts on GRSG and its habitat. Management individual analysis to consultable abitations. Exceptions with GRSG management and activity in the proposed projects in the unde |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| (See above.) | to be unsuitable if the area has passed a threshold and lacks the ecological potential to become marginal or suitable habitat. | (See above.) | will be at the discretion of the BL not meet the above criteria are not Authorized Officer, but they must habitat management area management area management area. | ia may only be made by the here is not concurrence between ate biologists, then the conclusion |
| | this is an unofficial of the distantial NEPARES AND Stantial NEPARES OF THE BLIM WATER OF THE BLIM THE DESTRUCTION OF THE BLIM WATER OF THE BLIM TH | Prepublication version of the property of the property will be property will be property by the property by th | osted publision. The only version The only version The relied upon. | |

2.5.3 Mitigation

FLPMA provides the Secretary and the BLM broad authority to conserve and enhance public land values, including requiring mitigation. In all GRSG habitat management areas and consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law, BLM will apply the mitigation hierarchy (avoidance first, then minimization, compensation last) when authorizing actions resulting in GRSG habitat loss and degradation. For alternatives 3 through 6 the proposal is to achieve the at a minimum no net habitat loss (full restoration of functional habitats or enhancement of habitats such that it offsets the loss of capacity in impacted areas). The principles of HAF can be used to measure habitat sufficiency in implementing mitigation. The BLM is focusing on habitat mitigation, as sagebrush habitat fragmentation, loss and disturbance have been identified as the primary influences on GRSG population trends (Knick and Hanser, 2011). Compensatory mitigation should be durable, ensuring it will be resilient and persist as GRSG habitat (barring any natural disaster), and should be , ensa, same HAF. a where practice.

.s, Mitigation, presents manage. completed prior to associated actions occurring. Compensatory mitigation should also be prioritized to as habita

alternative for this mai occur within the same area of the impact (within the same HAF fine scale area, or if not possible, within the same neighborhood cluster or HAF mid-scale area where practicable) so that it provides habitat for GRSG

inent by alt Table 2-5, Comparison of Alternatives, Mitigation, presents management by alternative for this management

Table 2-5. Comparison of Alternatives, Mitigation

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| CO, ID, MT/DK (most plans), | CO, ID, NV/CA, OR, UT and | In all GRSG habitat management ar | reas and consistent with valid existir | ng rights and applicable law, |
| NV/CA, OR, and UT: Requires | WY: Specify compensatory | | rchy when authorizing third-party a | |
| and ensures mitigation provides | mitigation would be voluntary | | irect impacts) to achieve the minimu | |
| a net conservation gain to | unless required by laws other | | Framework for table of activities re | |
| GRSG. Mitigation will follow the | than FLPMA or by the State. | | ation in accordance with the BLM m | |
| regulations from the White | Other differences are described | | ell as CEQ regulations (40 CFR Par | |
| House Council on Environmental | below. | durable and resilient ensuring GRS | G habitat will persist (barring any n | atural disaster). Mitigation |
| Quality (CEQ) (40 CFR Part | | shall be prioritized to occur within | n the same area of the impact (withi | n the same HAF fine scale area |
| 1508.20), referred to as the | | | if not possible, within the same neigl | |
| mitigation hierarchy. Any | | | nearest equivalent HMA designated | |
| compensatory mitigation will be | | | ted by the project. Compensatory r | |
| durable, timely, and in addition | | | erve species listed as threatened or | endangered under the |
| to that which would have | | Endangered Species Act. | ne, 11 v. | |
| resulted without the | | Application of Mitigation Hierarchy | i. 011, 01, | |
| compensatory mitigation. The | | Avoidance: Avoiding impacts is define | ned by not taking certain action or p | parts of an action (CEO |
| BLM will develop a WAFWA | | regulations: 40 CFR Part 1508 20) | Impact avoidance in GRSG habitats | |
| Management Zone Regional | · al P | restoration of most sagebrush syst | ems can take decades. While the a | |
| Mitigation Strategy to guide the | cio 1 | many PHMA allocations. BI M may | also determine on a case-by-case ba | |
| application of the mitigation | 8910 QL | issuing an authorization in areas of | | asis to avoid impacts by not |
| hierarchy. | his is an unofficial particular of the particula | isseming and actino in East of | • | |
| The Regional Mitigation Strategy | M. The | Minimization: Where avoidance is | | |
| should include mitigation | 181: 12 | severity of a project impact at a sp | ecific location. If impacts to GRSG h | |
| guidance on avoidance, | . G & Mr. Mile | minimization measures will be appl | ied (e.g., minimizing the disturbance | |
| minimization, and compensation, | is we elling | and RDFs). BLM can consider site- | specific minimization measures beyo | |
| as follows: | als will Ro | through site-specific environmenta | I review to meet the no net habitat | |
| Avoidance | 1,000,311,300,00 | does not eliminate project impacts | and remaining residual impacts may | require compensatory |
| o Include avoidance areas; | 90 410 EV. 101 | mitigation for habitat loss or degra | dation. | |
| and, o Include any potential, | *31, Mr 311 | Compensation: Any impacts that car | nnot be avoided or minimized to no | net habitat loss would be |
| Include any potential, additional avoidance | nis is an uno the indicate of the document. The document of th | compensated at a level and in a ma | nner to fully offset both direct and i | |
| actions with regard to | M. W. W. | noise, changes in water availability) | impacts to habitat function. Mitigat | |
| GRSG conservation. | THE BLANK | with State agency or regulatory re- | quirements and consistent with BLM | |
| Minimization | Ma C | without a mitigation requirement, | mitigation should minimally meet no | net habitat loss. Establishing |
| Include minimization | 1 HV2 | no net loss will require full restora | tion of functional habitats or enhance | |
| actions already included in | • | support the number of GRSG pres | ent prior to disturbance at the apex | c of the population cycle. The |
| laws, regulations, policies, | | | ld be used to determine if restoration | on actions provide GRSG |
| land use plans, and/or | | | possible, preservation (e.g., conservation) | |
| land-use authorizations; | | | npacts and should be designed to pr | |
| and. | | | ts, connectivity corridors) or areas | |
| Include any potential, | | | tory mitigation should be completed | |
| additional minimization | | causing the need for compensation | and monitored for retention and e | fficacy. Compensatory |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| actions with regard to GRSG conservation. | (See above.) | mitigation is not required by the BLM for operations conducted under the Mining Law of 1872, but operators may always voluntarily engage in compensatory mitigation. Minimization actions and | | | |
| Compensation Include discussion of impact/project valuation, compensatory mitigation | | alternatives when appropriate Co. | with project proponents/operators mpensation may also be required by | | |
| options, siting, compensatory project types and costs, | | The BLM will apply the | of or a BLININ | | |
| monitoring, reporting, and program administration. | | on version | ane in the hed of | | |
| No similar language for WY. | | 10. 111 | in on its. | | |
| CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, UT: When authorizing actions | MT/DK and OR: Same as Alternative I. | illidgation metal thy to address | Thingacion file at City. There | The BLM will apply the mitigation hierarchy. Where | |
| that result in habitat loss and | CO: Would work with the | changes in existing development | avoidance or minimization will | avoidance or minimization | |
| degradation, require and | state to provide mitigation | or new development as the | not fully offset a project's | will not fully offset a project's | |
| ensure mitigation achieves a | with outcomes that are "at | result of valid existing rights. | impacts compensatory mitigation | impacts compensatory | |
| net conservation gain in all | least equal to the lost or 🔪 🦞 | Where avoidance or | is required and will at minimum | mitigation is required and | |
| HMA types. | degraded values." | minimization will not fully offset | meet the requirements of the | will at minimum meet the | |
| In WY: Same as other states | ID: Similar to Alternative I, | a project's impacts | state wildlife agency or other | requirements of the state | |
| in PHMA. No mitigation | except would manage for a no | compensatory mitigation is | appropriate state authority, and | wildlife agency or other | |
| required in GHMA. | net loss standard. | required and will at minimum | BLM/DOI mitigation policy. If the | appropriate state authority, | |
| UT: Includes exception for | NV/CA: Maintains net | meet the requirements of the | state agency does not require | and BLM/DOI mitigation | |
| vegetation treatments to | conservation gain standard, in | state wildlife agency or other | mitigation, or state-sponsored | policy. If the state agency | |
| benefit Utah prairie dog. | coordination with State goals | appropriate state authority, and | mitigation is determined by BLM | does not require mitigation, | |
| ID and NV (not CA): Includes | for GRSG. | BLM/DOI mitigation policy. If the | to be inconsistent with | or state-sponsored | |
| specific language regarding 🦯 | UT and WY: Removed the | state agency does not require | BLM/DOI policy, BLM will | mitigation is determined by | |
| coordination with local GRSG | net conservation gain | mitigation, BLM will require | require compensatory mitigation | BLM to be inconsistent with | |
| teams to develop or | requirement. | compensatory mitigation to | to achieve no net habitat loss. | BLM/DOI policy, BLM will | |
| implement compensatory | ID, NV/CA, UT, and WY: | achieve no net habitat loss. | Where habitat and/or population | require compensatory | |
| mitigation programs. | Reference mitigating to meet | | adaptive management thresholds | mitigation to achieve no net | |
| CO, ID, MT/DK (most plans), | the BLM's overarching | | have been met, compensatory | habitat loss. | |
| NV/CA, OR, and UT: Includes | planning goals and objectives, | | mitigation beyond what is | | |
| an appendix with further | as well as the BLM Manual | | required by the States may be | | |
| details on how mitigation | 6840 to "minimize or | | considered. BLM shall | | |
| would be applied. | eliminate threats affecting the | | coordinate closely with the state | | |
| WY: Mitigation applied | status of [GRSG] or to | | wildlife management or other | | |
| according to the Wyoming | improve the condition of | | appropriate state agency in | | |
| Strategy (EO2015-4). | [GRSG] habitat" | | determining the amount and | | |
| | | | form of additional mitigation on | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| ID: Full reclamation bond | CO, ID, NV/CA, UT, and | (See above.) | a case-by-case basis, considering | (See above.) |
| required, consistent with | WY: Describe various | | project activity, direct and | |
| regulations for minerals | processes for coordinating | | indirect impacts to GRSG | |
| activities, in all HMA types. | mitigation efforts with the | | habitats, and restoration success | |
| | state. | | rates. | |
| | mitigation efforts with the state. | Republication version of the post of the p | ane or a BLM in are in the BLM in the area published in the BLM in the area published in | |

2.5.4 Application of Habitat Objectives

Habitat objectives identify the desired habitat outcome on BLM-administered lands in GRSG HMAs at multiple scales including seasonal habitats and connectivity within and between populations. Tables identifying indicators and benchmarks for use as guidelines at the site-scale will be retained in the Habitat Indicators appendix (**Appendix 8**) as a tool through which habitat suitability is informed based on location and ecological conditions.

The Habitat Assessment Framework (HAF/ BLM TR 6710-1; Stiver et al., 2015, as revised) provides a standardized, scientifically based methodology to assess GRSG habitat suitability at multiple scales (mid, fine, and site-scale, see Map 3.7 and 3.8). Using multi-scale evaluations considers the entire suite of conditions contributing to high quality habitat, the success of past conservation actions, and prioritizing future land uses and conservation actions. Descriptions of habitat scales (broad-, mid-, fine-, and site-) and associated indicators for assessment at each scale are available in the HAF (BLM TR 6710-1). The Habitat Indicators Tables (Appendix 8, Tables 8-1.A-G) provide a list of indicators and benchmarks, derived from local and regional research on GRSG habitat selection, that collectively are used to inform habitat suitability. BLM offices will use Appendix 8, Greater Sage-grouse Habitat Indicators and Benchmarks, notably Tables 8-1.A-G to assess each monitoring location within seasonal habitats for site-scale suitability, with data collected during the appropriate corresponding seasonal use period, as applicable to address phenological changes.

The BLM will use terrestrial AIM methods (Herrick et al., 2017), additional monitoring approaches for wetland & riparian habitats, partner data as available, and supplemental guidelines (e.g., training, monitoring guidelines, sampling protocols, etc.) to collect data on site-scale habitat condition (Appendix 8). As research advances, new data could refine, or clarify GRSG selection for vegetation structure and composition in seasonal habitats. The Habitat Indicators Table(s) (Appendix 8, Table 8-1.A-G) will be periodically reviewed to consider, and as needed, incorporate the best available science in coordination with applicable federal, state, and tribal agencies. The addition or adjustment to indicators or benchmarks in the Habitat Indicators Table must include the reference or basis for which the changes are made. Revisions will only be made if warranted by scientific evidence. Use and inclusion of the HAF, including the relationship to Land Health Standards and monitoring is covered in more detail in the appendices (e.g., Appendix 8, Table 8-2).

Table 2-6, Comparison of Alternatives, Application of Habitat Objectives, presents management by alternative for this management issue.

Table 2-6. Comparison of Alternatives, Application of Habitat Objectives

Summary of Alternative I

Summary of Alternative 2

Alternative 3 Alternative 4

Alternatives 5 and 6

- CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, UT: Include language noting indicators and values from habitat objectives table would be considered when authorizing activities in GRSG habitat.
- CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, UT, and WY: Note the values in the table would be used during the land health evaluation process to help determine if the standard applicable to GRSG habitat is being met.
- ID, MT/DK, UT and WY: The values may not be obtainable on every acre, and/or should consider local ecological ability.
- MT/DK and UT: The values may be adjusted based on local factors, data, or updated science.
- NV/CA and OR: Land uses will be managed to meet the desired conditions identified in the tables.
- UT: Identifies a qualitative desired condition, with a note that the table is a summary of what science indicates may be needed to meet the qualitative objective.

- CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, UT: Same language regarding considering indicators and values as Alternative I.
- All States: Same language regarding using the habitat objectives table during the land health evaluation process as Alternative 1.
- ID, MT/DK, OR, UT and WY: Same language regarding values not being obtainable on every acre as Alternative I.
- ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, and UT: Same language regarding values being adjusted as Alternative I.
- ocal d science.

 es will desired

 1 D and UT: Identify a qualitative desired condition separate from the quantitative values in the table.

 1 D and UT: Identify a qualitative desired condition separate from the quantitative values in the table.

The tables with the attributes, indicators, and values with associated text would be replaced in the action alternatives with the following new objectives and management actions:

Objective SSS [X]: Within GRSG habitat management areas provide suitable habitat by managing for connected mosaics of sagebrush and associated communities that provide for seasonal habitats, dispersal, and migration, while limiting widespread anthropogenic disturbances and fragmentation. This objective will be accomplished by applying RMP land use allocations and management actions among HMAs, proactive habitat treatments, and project level application of mitigation (avoiding, minimizing, and compensating, per MS-1794 and H-1794) for internal and external project proposals.

Management Action SSS [XI]: Assess the suitability of GRSG habitat at HAF mid- and finescales (HAF Levels 2 and 3, respectively) based on the methods in the Sage-grouse Habitat Assessment Framework (HAF, Stiver et al. 2015, BLM TR 6710-1, as revised; see Appendix 8).

Management Action SSS [X2]: Design and implement projects that will maintain or improve habitat suitability, availability, and connectivity, based on site location, existing seasonal values, and habitat needs using the results of mid- and fine-scale habitat assessments and other complementary research, tools, or information and in coordination with partners across land management jurisdictions.

Objective SSS [Y]: Manage GRSG habitat management areas to provide seasonal habitats at the HAF Site Scale (Level 4) by providing for habitat characteristics that support seasonal habitat needs, including adequate protective cover and food needed to survive and reproduce. Seasonal habitats may include areas where sagebrush is the current dominant vegetation type, sagebrush is a primary shrub species within the various states of the ecological site, or dominated by other vegetation types but still provides GRSG habitats, such as mesic areas. This objective will be accomplished through the combination of RMP land use allocations and management actions and restoration – based on ecological potential, current vegetative condition, and existing seasonal values – and the project-level application of mitigation (avoiding, minimizing, and compensating, per MS-1794 and H-1794) for internal and external project proposals.

Management Action SSS [YI]: Assess suitability of GRSG habitat at the HAF site-scale (Level 4) based on the methods in Sage-grouse HAF (Stiver et al. 2015, BLM TR 6710-1, as revised; Appendix 8) utilizing current geographically applicable research on seasonal habitat requisites of GRSG (see Appendix 8). Updates to seasonal habitat indicators and ESDs will be developed locally and coordinated with partners (see Appendix 8).

Management Action SSS [Y2]: Maintain, improve, or restore the suitability of GRSG seasonal habitats using the Habitat Indicators Table (see Appendix 8) to inform measurable project objectives during implementation-level planning for BLM-permitted and BLM-initiated site-specific actions in HMAs, in coordination with applicable partners. Use the results of site-scale habitat assessments and other best available information to inform management decisions and the design and implementation of habitat projects.

2.5.5 Disturbance Cap

Anthropogenic disturbance negatively impacts GRSG abundance and persistence (Knick et al., 2011, 2013). When authorizing disturbing activities within important GRSG habitats (PHMA and IHMA in Idaho) the BLM applies disturbance caps to limit habitat losses associated with discrete anthropogenic disturbances and their associated human activity. Other management tools consider effects from diffuse or non-anthropogenic disturbances such as wildfire, such as sagebrush availability objectives, GRSG habitat objectives, and adaptive management thresholds. Disturbance caps identify an upper limit (maximum disturbance permitted) above which no new development is generally permitted (subject to applicable laws and regulations and valid existing rights). A disturbance cap acts as a "backstop" to ensure that total disturbance does not exceed the level of GRSG tolerance for anthropogenic activities. Disturbance caps only address direct impacts and indirect impacts associated with anthropogenic disturbances may not be fully captured by use of this tool; other management tools consider indirect impacts, such as noise required design features/actions and mitigation requirements. Additional minimization measures may be necessary to reduce the full impact of a project on GRSG.

To conserve seasonal habitat requirements associated with a local GRSG populations disturbance caps will be applied to PHMA within the Habitat Assessment Framework (HAF) fine scale (Stiver et al. 2015, as revised)., as well as at the project scale. Previous application of a disturbance cap at a larger scale (e.g., biologically significant unit) did not limit the consideration to local populations and were often "diluted" by large amounts of non-habitat. Calculation of disturbance caps must consider all disturbances (existing and new) since GRSG are negatively impacted by the total disturbance. Within designated spatial analysis areas, disturbance on all surface ownerships should be considered to accurately capture potential impacts of new authorizations on GRSG.

With the exception of Wyoming and Montana, disturbance caps are currently set at 3% of the project and "biologically significant units" identified by the BLM at the state level, but do not include habitat loss from wildfire or agricultural conversion. The latter two factors will be quantified by separate calculations of sagebrush availability via the vegetation objectives, habitat objectives, and adaptive management thresholds, as tracked by approaches described in the Monitoring Framework (Appendix 7). Ninety-nine percent of active leks occurred within landscapes that were less than 3% developed in a landscape analysis of GRSG (Knick et al. 2013) and a follow-up study on disturbance from existing energy infrastructure and human activity supported those findings (Kirol et al. 2020). Similar results were observed for other species that use sagebrush for all or part of their life cycle, including mule deer (Sawyer et al. 2020, Lambert et al. 2022), pronghorn (Lambert et al. 2022) pygmy rabbits (Germaine et al. 2017), elk (Gigliotti et al. 2023), and sagebrush songbirds (Kirol and Fedy 2021). Wyoming and Montana use a 5% disturbance cap but include wildfire and agricultural conversion (the latter is not applicable on BLM lands) to their calculations. North Dakota and South Dakota apply a mix of the two approaches – with a 5% cap that includes wildfire and agriculture, but also limiting anthropogenic disturbances to 3%.

Table 2-7, Comparison of Alternatives, Disturbance Cap, presents management by alternative for this management issue.

Table 2-7. Comparison of Alternatives, Disturbance Cap

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | Disturbance Cap Overview | | |
| CO, ID, NV/CA, OR, UT, ND, SD: 3% disturbance cap in PHMA (and IHMA in ID) on specific anthropogenic activities such as development of minerals and renewable energy, as well as ROWs. CO, ID, NV/CA, OR, UT, ND, SD: disturbance cap applies at both BSU-scale and at proposed project analysis area | CO, ID, NV/CA, OR, UT, ND, SD: 3% disturbance cap in PHMA (and IHMA in ID) on specific anthropogenic activities such as development of minerals and renewable energy, as well as ROWs. CO, NV/CA, OR, UT, ND, SD: disturbance cap applies at both BSU-scale and at proposed project DDCT analysis area within PHMA. ID cap applies at just the BSU | Disturbance Cap Overview Same as Alternative 4. However, the disturbance cap would not be applicable to new authorizations since all PHMA would be closed to new infrastructure projects. The disturbance cap would be applied to existing authorizations within the agencies' capacity to do so to the extent allowable under applicable law and while | In PHMA (and IHMA in ID), if direct habitat disturbance from existing and proposed infrastructure developments exceeds either 3% at the I) project scale (see description below) or 2) Habitat Assessment Framework (HAF) Fine Scale habitat selection area (or CO management zones and populations – see Section 2.7.1), new infrastructure projects would be deferred to | In PHMA (and IHMA in ID), if direct habitat disturbance from existing and proposed infrastructure developments exceeds either I) 3% at the project scale (see description below) in all states except MT and WY, where it is 5% at the project scale, or 2) 3% at the Habitat Assessment Framework (HAF) Fine Scale habitat selection area for all states (or CO management zones and populations – see Section 2.7.1), new infrastructure projects would be deferred to the extent allowable under applicable laws (such as the Mining Law of 1872), or valid existing rights: • until such time as the percentage of habitat disturbance in the areas has been reduced below the cap threshold through restoration of existing disturbance to meeting habitat objectives or increasing the amount of suitable habitat through restoration, or • redesigned to not result in additional surface disturbance (co-location), redesigned to |
| | Mar. He P. T. | | redesigned to move it outside PHMA (and IHMA in Idaho). | additional surface disturbance |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| , | | Disturbance Cap Numerator | | |
| CO, ID, NV/CA, OR, UT, ND, SD: infrastructure only - cap does not include wildfire or agriculture. MT, WY, ND, SD: 5% cap includes infrastructure, wildfire and agriculture. | CO, ID, NV/CA, OR, UT, ND, SD: same as Alt I. MT, WY: Same as Alt I. | Same as Alternative 4, except wildfire is also included in the numerator as disturbance. | For all states, the disturbance cap calculation is limited to the following specific activities, whether existing projects or new proposals (see Appendix 7 for additional details on how these items would be monitored): Oil and gas wells and development facilities Coal mines Wind developments (e.g., towers, sub-stations, etc.) Solar fields Geothermal development facilities Mining (active locatable, nonenergy leasable and saleable/mineral material developments) Roads (transportation features with a maintenance intensity of level 3 or 5 – see BLM Technical Note 422 – Roads and Trails Terminology, 2006 or as updated (does not include two-tracks) Railroads Power lines Communication towers Other vertical infrastructure, as well as developed rights-of-way with habitat loss (e.g., pipelines) Coal bed methane ponds (at the project scale) Meteorological towers (e.g., wind energy testing) (at the project scale) | Same as Alternative 4 at the project scale for all states except for WY and MT which would include disturbances associated with their respective DDCT approaches (e.g., wildfire and agricultural, with Montana also including subdivisions and urban development) in the numerator (agriculture and subdivision disturbance data would be provided by the state, since no such activities are permitted on public lands). None of the states would include wildfire and agriculture (or Montana subdivisions and urban development) in the numerator at the HAF Fine Scale. |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|----------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | Airport facilities and | (See above.) |
| | | | infrastructure (at the project | |
| | | | scale) | |
| | | | Military range facilities and | |
| | | | infrastructure (at the project | |
| | | | scale) | |
| | | | Hydroelectric plants/facilities | |
| | | | (at the project scale) | |
| | | GI | Recreation areas facilities and | |
| | | ers | infrastructure larger than 0.25 | |
| | | 10 | acres (e.g., parking lots, | |
| | | on he | campgrounds, trail heads, etc.) | |
| | | THE RELL | (at the project scale) | |
| | | 10 NO 10 | 105.10 | |
| | | My file | Where such data are available, | |
| | | 2016 A 11 6 -1 | this disturbance is measured by | |
| | | eb ec Million | the footprint of direct | |
| | | 1 1 1 1 1 de | disturbance of the PHMA (and | |
| | : 2 | 16, 61, 91, 18 | IHMA in ID) area where habitat is | |
| | ci Clo | M. We Ellis Cl. | removed (including staging areas, | |
| | Sell B | CUI SE SEE W | dispersed structures, parking lots, | |
| | 70.06 | 700 The dis 1 p | equipment storage areas, etc.), or | |
| | M. The | 0 (. 000 70) | by the distance between the | |
| | 20 4. 13 | 46, V . W. | outermost lines for transmission | |
| | is a che in | 15 18 131 | lines. When considering new | |
| | .6 me 61 26 | 2 7/2 File | project proposals, any project | |
| | WIS CALLAND | 1/10-11/2 | associated with the above list that | |
| | 1,00 :31.05 | ia. de. | has been approved/authorized | |
| | 0, 40, 18, 10, | - Ull | but not yet constructed should | |
| | 431 / W. 131. | 200 | be treated as though it were | |
| | 12 23 16 9 | | already constructed when | |
| | Mr. M. Me | | calculating the disturbance cap to | |
| | Str. Br fil. | | account for authorized but not | |
| | Chis is an unofficial of the Brands of the Brands of the BLM National Mational Matio | Mexpedt will dock the final heat may be at the final may be at the | yet constructed disturbance. No | |
| | . 4. Lea | | other activities or actions beyond those listed in the above list are | |
| | | | included when calculating the cap | |
| | | | (e.g., wildfire, agriculture, | |
| | | | vegetation treatments, | |
| | | | residences, barns, fencing or | |
| | | | | |
| | | | range improvements, etc.). | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | A disturbed area is included in | (See above.) |
| | | | the numerator until it has been | |
| | | | restored to provide equal or | |
| | | | improved habitat function as was | |
| | | | provided by the area before the | |
| | | | disturbance. | |
| | | | 0, 10 01.0 | |
| | | | Consistent with the BLM's | |
| | | Sil | responsibility to consider | |
| | | .0.15 | cumulative impacts when making | |
| | | 100 | decisions for activities on public | |
| | | in the | lands, the disturbance percentage | |
| | | The of the | includes acres from the above | |
| | | 11.CO NO. O. | disturbances regardless of land | |
| | | Plistine, | ownership, where such data are | |
| | | 711 cts 11 6 -11 | available. This will only inform | |
| | | 16h 260 MIL 100 | decision-making on public lands | |
| | . < | 1 46 46 10 | and cannot impact private | |
| | | Disturbance Cap Denominator | property rights. | |
| . CO ID ANYICA OD LIT AID | | | At the project scale, the | Same as Alternative 4, except as |
| • CO, ID, NV/CA, OR, UT, ND, | • CO, NV/CA, OR, ND, SD | Same as Alternative 4. | assessment area (denominator) is | noted below: |
| SD 3% cap applies at both | same as Alt I. | 400 The dis 1 5 | determined by identifying the | noted below. |
| BSU-scale and at proposed project DDCT analysis area | UT similar to Alternative 1, | C. 200 (3) | extent of the GRSG PHMA (and | At either scale, all areas in PHMA |
| within PHMA. | but allows project boundaries to be identified based on what | TE AL TIL | IHMA in ID) that supports the | (and IHMA in ID) would be |
| • MT, ND, SD, WY: 5% cap | areas of PHMA are used by | 12 Ch. Mar | GRSG population potentially | included in the denominator |
| applies at the project DDCT | the birds affected by the | Same as Alternative 4. | affected by the proposed project | unless specific information |
| area scale in PHMA. Includes | project. | al, all | that is also located in PHMA (and | documents otherwise (i.e., |
| wildfire and agriculture. | ID removed the disturbance | ia Me | IHMA); it is not to be limited to | seasonal habitat maps for the |
| Wilding and agriculture. | cap at the project scale, | -Ull. | the area where indirect impacts | HAF Fine Scale assessment area). |
| Using the DDCT approach to | applying it only at the BSU | | are anticipated. The project scale | Any potential areas that are |
| identify project level boundaries | scale. | | denominator should include the | unsuitable at the HAF site scale |
| developed by the State of | MT, ND, SD, WY: Same as | | PHMA (and IHMA) used by the | are treated neither as habitat nor |
| Wyoming is, in summary, as | Alternative 1. | | potentially affected local GRSG | disturbance, which results in the |
| follows: | Anternative 1. | | population, including the | area being removed from the |
| Determine potentially affected | 11. | | associated seasonal habitats and | denominator piece of the |
| active leks by placing a 4-mile | | | the transition zones between | formula. |
| buffer around the proposed area | | | those habitats (only within | |
| of physical disturbance related to | | | PHMA) associated with where | |
| the proposed project. All active | | | the project is proposed. | |
| leks located within the 4-mile | | | | |
| project buffer and within PHMA | | | If sufficient monitoring | |
| | | | information is not available to | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| (and IHMA) will be considered | (See above.) | (See above.) | identify the portions of the | (See above.) |
| affected by the project. | | | PHMA used by the potentially | |
| 2) Next, place a 4-mile buffer | | | affected local GRSG population, | |
| around each of the affected active | | | identify project level boundaries | |
| leks. | | | using an approach similar to the | |
| 3) All PHMA (and IHMA) within | | | DDCT approach developed by | |
| the 4-mile project buffer, | | | the State of Wyoming: 1) | |
| combined with the 4-mile lek | | | Determine potentially affected | |
| buffer(s), creates the project | his is an unofficial of documents in the Blubstantial NEPA Recording to the BLM Nation of the BLM the documents in the BLM the documents in the BLM th | i. | active leks by placing a 4-mile | |
| analysis area for each individual | | ar's | buffer around the proposed area | |
| project, absent other monitoring | | 100 | of physical disturbance related to | |
| data. If there are no active leks | | 30 M | the proposed project. All active | |
| within the 4-mile project buffer, | | *10. 411 | leks located within the 4-mile | |
| the project scale analysis area will | | 200 31 00 | project buffer and within PHMA | |
| be that portion of the 4-mile | | Ho the of | (and IHMA) will be considered | |
| project buffer within PHMA. | | 10. 10. | affected by the project. 2) Next, | |
| ' ' | | 200 CC ; ill . Cl | place a 4-mile buffer around each | |
| | | 16, 00 M, 40 | of the affected active leks. 3) All | |
| | 1 | S. St. W. M. | PHMA (and IHMA) within the 4- | |
| | 181 | We ve, War 12 | mile project buffer, combined | |
| | ceic, al | 14, 14, 41, 16, | with the 4-mile lek buffer(s), | |
| | Off. B | active ist b | creates the project analysis area | |
| | in he | 40 11.00, 4 | for each individual project, absent | |
| | 20. 11. 21 | of. 50 No. | other monitoring data. If there | |
| | 31, 4. 110 | TO DO A | are no active leks within the 4- | |
| | 19 cl : M | 12 Sh. Mar | mile project buffer, the project | |
| | :6 M 51 761 | 2 7 L . 11. | scale analysis area will be that | |
| 1 | WIS CALLIN K | al land | portion of the 4-mile project | |
| | 100 331.01 | ia. We. | buffer within PHMA. "Pending | |
| | 0, 41, 18, 10, | 1111 | leks" and other similarly defined | |
| | *31. W. 131. | 200 | state-based lek categories can be | |
| | 125 - 21 1 M 9 | | considered as active leks based | |
| | his is an unofficial of documents in the distantial NEPA Record NEPA Record NEPA Record NEPA Record Nepa distantial Nepa dista | | on inclusion from the state | |
| | 2610 BY 41/2 | | on inclusion from the state | |
| | Mar of | | wildlife agency. In CO, BLM | |
| | 1 "We | | would use the state management | |
| | 7. | | zones (see Section 2.7.1). | |
| | | Mexpect will dock the start of | | |
| | | | At the <u>HAF Fine Scale</u> , the | |
| | | | assessment area (denominator) is | |
| | | | the acres of PHMA (and IHMA in | |
| | | | Idaho) within the boundaries of | |
| | | | the HAF Fine Scale habitat | |
| | | | delineation area. Calculation of | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) Disturbance Cap Exceptions Unless required by law, regulation, policy, or presence of | the 3 percent cap would include all acres of PHMA (and IHMA in Idaho) in the Fine Scale area as the denominator. In CO, BLM would use the state identified populations (see Section 2.7.1). | (See above.) |
| | is chimin | Disturbance Cao Exceptions | iairds. | |
| ID: 3% cap can be exceeded within existing designated utility corridors at the project scale only if there would be a net benefit to GRSG (multiple states have this in the Lands section, ID just has it specifically in the disturbance cap section) NV: Disturbance can exceed 3% at the project or BSU scale except where a biological analysis indicates a net conservation to GRSG. Exceedance may be approved only with concurrence of the State Director, and unless | utility corridors at the project scale only if there would be a net benefit to GRSG (multiple states have this in the Lands section, ID just has it specifically in the disturbance cap section). UT: 3% can be exceeded if will | valid existing rights, the BLM would not consider allowances | All states: The Authorized Officer may consider projects on public lands that could result in exceeding the 3 percent disturbance cap across all ownerships at the project scale only if the following three criteria are met: 1) with concurrence from the State Director, 2) if the environmental review document(s) explains how the GRSG RMP goals and objectives will be met, including compliance with the RMP's GRSG mitigation strategy, documenting efforts to: | Same as Alternative 4, except in WY and MT where the project scale disturbance cap is 5%. All states would also replace bullet #4 under criteria #3 with the following: Compensatory mitigation would not have to be completed and functioning prior to being able to grant the exception. To grant the activity based on compensatory mitigation, prior to construction, surface occupancy, or surface disturbing activities the compensation project must be |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| NDOW, USFWS, and BLM | requirement for unanimous | (See above.) | First avoid impacts by locating | planned, funded, and approved |
| unanimously find the proposed | concurrence was removed. | | the proposed project in areas | by the operator, BLM, surface |
| action achieves a net | NV/CA: includes exception | | outside of PHMA, collocated | owner, and in coordination |
| conservation gain. | options if: | | within the footprint of existing | with the appropriate Sta te |
| MT: Any proposals for | The area is non-habitat | | disturbance, or in areas of | agency. However, due to the |
| deviations must demonstrate | including through ground- | | non-habitat shall be | uncertainty associated with |
| that the proposed activities | truthing of areas mapped | | documented. | whether the planned |
| will not cause declines in | as habitat, and will not | | Second to minimize impacts by | compensatory mitigation |
| GRSG populations in core | have direct, indirect, or | GI | applying project design | project would successfu lly |
| areas, with input from MT | cumulative effects, or | 0.13 | features shall be documented | become habitat in order to |
| FWP and USFWS (see | Compensatory mitigation | 100 | (e.g., use of RDFs, buffer | offset the impacts, one of the |
| Appendix 2 for specific text). | is provided, or | Som no. | distances, seasonal limitations, | following would need to apply: |
| WY: 5% cap can be exceeded | The proposed activity | The training | Setc.). | The area of habitat |
| if the project, as proposed or | addresses public health and | "CO NO 0 | Third, only then to consider | improvement associated |
| conditioned, would not impair | safety concerns, or | 10/12 - 11. 100 1 | using compensatory mitigation. | with compensatory |
| the function or utility of the | The proposed activity is a | republication version of the property of the property will be property of the | It is important to note | mitigation would need to |
| site for the current or | renewal or re- | ep ec dill oc | compensatory mitigation may | increase to account for a |
| subsequent seasonal habitat, | authorization of existing | 16 16 1 4 GO | not be appropriate in some | level of risk that the |
| life-history, or behavioral | infrastructure in previously | 6. 64 31 18 | GRSG habitats/populations. | compensatory mitigation |
| needs of GRSG. | disturbed sites and would | M We silve of | Before using compensatory | action may fail or not |
| All states: Apply the disturbance | not result in direct, | CUIT GIERO | mitigation as an approach for | persist for the full duration |
| cap to the extent consistent with | indirect, or cumulative | 100 THE 413 1 P | this exception, the | of the impact based on the |
| applicable law (such as the Mining | impacts, or | 0 1 200 00 | effectiveness of whether | type of specific |
| Law of 1872) and valid existing | The proposed activity is | 16, VE " U. | compensatory mitigation can | compensatory project(s) |
| rights. | determined to be a routine | 19 Ph 21 | offset impacts to the affected | and ecological conditions, |
| | administrative | Mexpent Wildows Mexpent Wildows Sterner the Final door the final d | habitat and associated | or |
| | functionand will have no | 1/4 2/ | population without risking | The operator provides |
| 1 | adverse impacts on GRSG | 3, 76, | impacts to those GRSG | long-term assurances that |
| | and its habitat | , Ill. | habitats and populations shall | the compensatory project |
| | MT: Same as Alternative 1. | CO | consider local biological | would become functional |
| | WY: Same as Alternative 1. | 5 | considerations, including, but | (e.g. project maintenance |
| | 110 OLO MI CO | | not limited to population size, | or retreatment, easements, |
| • | All states: Apply the disturbance | | connectivity to other | mitigation bonding – BLM |
| | cap to the extent consistent with | | populations, availability of | H-1794-1, section 7. 3 , |
| | applicable law (such as the Mining | | existing functional habitat, and | etc.). |
| | Law of 1872) and valid existing | | the availability of mitigation | Compensatory mitigation rate |
| | rights. | | projects that could benefit the | would need to consider |
| | | | impacted population. and | number of acres necessary to |
| | | | 3) if one of the following | offset acres affected by direct |
| | | | circumstances can be | and indirect effects (see |
| | | | documented: | Mitigation section), as well as |
| | | | The exceedance at the project | likelihood that the mitigation |
| | | | scale is the result of | project may not provide the |

| (See above.) (Above.) (See above.) (See above.) (Above.) (Above | Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | consolidating disturbance associated with the proposed project as a strategy to leave other undisturbed portions of the PHMA (and IHMA) undisturbed from new authorizations, and the third bullet below, addressing compensatory mitigation, is applied to any residual impacts. • Within RMP designated utility corridors, the 3 percent disturbance cap may be exceeded at the project scale if the site specific NEPA analysis indicates that doing so will decrease the impacts to GRSG habitat in comparison to siting a project outside the designated corridor in areas under the disturbance cap and requiring mitigation. This exception is limited to projects that fulfill the use for which the corridors were designated (ex., transmission lines, pipelines) and the designated width of a corridor will not be exceeded as a result of any project colocation. • If a technical team evaluates and recommends that sitespecific GRSG habitat and population information, combined with project design elements — including compensatory mitigation, indicates the proposed project is expected to improve the | anticipated compensation for the duration of the impact. In addition, the compensation necessary to grant this exception must provide the offsetting benefit in the same HAF Fine Scale unit being impacted by the potential |

| Summary of Alternative I |
|--------------------------|
| See above.) |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------|---|----------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | potential development. | (See above.) |
| | | | Consideration may be given to | |
| | | | providing compensatory | |
| | | | mitigation in adjacent fine-scale | |
| | | | HAF areas if doing so will | |
| | | | more effectively provide the | |
| | | | offsetting benefit. | |
| | | | Disturbance associated with | |
| | | i i | the renewal or re- | |
| | | 219. | authorization of existing | |
| | | 70. | infrastructure in previously | |
| | | 901 170 | disturbed sites or expansions | |
| | | 10, 4/1 | of existing infrastructure that | |
| | | - 3t - 2t 0 | do not result in new direct, | |
| | | lic the b | indirect, or cumulative impacts | |
| | | 10. 60, 00 | on GRSG and its habitat. | |
| | | 200 CC ; ill CC | 0.10 | |
| | | 16, 06 " W. 40 | There would be no exceptions to | |
| | 1 | P att of all a | the 3 percent PHMA (and IHMA) | |
| | ig. | 110 26, :: 40, 13 | disturbance cap at the HAF Fine | |
| | cric al | 1, 11, 41, 46, | Scale unless the disturbance is | |
| | 01, 6 | acone is b | needed for the protection of | |
| | inche | 90 1,000,01 | human life and safety, as | |
| | 20 71 21 | of. Boylor | concurred by the State Director. | |
| | 31, 21. 11/0 | CLO OF TIL | , | |
| | is el in | Is The Wa | If proposed disturbance cap | |
| | 18 M 8 20 | S Mr " LI | exception is requested in an area | |
| | WI. Ch. 119 VE | al, all | (neighborhood cluster) that has | |
| | 100 1131 101 1 | ia ne | met one of the adaptive | |
| | 0 45, 18, 40 | -UII. | management thresholds (hard or | |
| | 43, 14 130 | 00 | soft), no exceptions to the 3 | |
| | 12 v3, 16 0 | | percent disturbance cap at the | |
| | Mr. W. We | | project scale would be | |
| | S. The Br. III. | | considered until the causal factor | |
| | This is an unofficial of the Brand of the Brand of the BLM National MERA Red of the BLM the design of the BLM the BL | | analysis is completed unless the | |
| | Chis is an unofficial of the Brands of the Brands of the Blumph Agriculture of the Brands of the Bra | Mexpect will dock | disturbance is needed for the | |
| | | | protection of human life and | |
| | | | safety, as concurred by the State | |
| | | | Director. | |
| | | | Director. | |
| | | | To approve this exception, the | |
| | | | Authorized Officer must | |
| | | | document, in coordination with | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|----------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | the appropriate State agency, that | (See above.) |
| | | | the proposed action satisfies the three criteria listed above. | |
| | | | three criteria fisted above. | |
| | | | All states: Apply the disturbance | |
| | | | cap to the extent consistent with applicable law (such as the Mining | |
| | | | Law of 1872) and valid existing | |
| | | cic cic | rights. | |
| | This is an unofficial of the Bland of the Bland of the Bland NEPA Reconstitutional NEPA Reconstitution of the Bland of the | Prepublication Version | san in Lishen of other property of the only version of the relied upon. | |

2.5.6 Fluid Mineral Development and Leasing Objective

Research indicates fluid mineral development can negatively affect GRSG at multiple scales through direct impacts (habitat loss and fragmentation; Connelly et al. 2004, Lyon and Anderson 2003, Walker et al. 2007, Holloran et al. 2010, Knick et al. 2011, Green et al. 2017) and indirect impacts (increased noise and behavioral avoidance of human activity and infrastructure, including roads; Aldridge and Boyce 2007, Holloran et al. 2010, Kirol et al. 2015, Rice et al. 2016, Coates et al. 2023). Development can also contribute to cumulative impacts if it results in an increased distribution of invasive annual grasses or predator abundance.

This section addresses the RMP objective for GRSG habitat in relation to fluid minerals, RMP management actions providing guidance when considering leasing GRSG habitat management areas, and development associated with existing fluid mineral leases. Other aspects of fluid mineral leasing and development are angua, avers, exc. that are not a ces, Fluid Mineral Development issue. addressed elsewhere in this amendment or existing RMP language, including specific fluid mineral allocations and associated stipulations (see Section 2.5.2), and waivers, exceptions, modifications (see Section 2.5.7). and application of RDFs (existing RMP decisions that are not being considered for amendment in this

Table 2-8, Comparison of Alternatives, Fluid Mineral Development and Leasing Objective, presents management by alternative for this management issue. ATTORAL MERALING PARTIES AND THE PARTIES OF THE PAR

Table 2-8. Comparison of Alternatives, Fluid Mineral Development and Leasing Objective Alternative 3

Summary of Alternative I • CO, ID, ND, NV/CA, OR, UT, WY, parts of MT/DK (Dillon, Billings, HiLine, Miles City, ND, SD): Priority will be given to leasing and development of fluid mineral resources. including geothermal, outside of PHMAs and GHMAs, or within the least impactful areas within PHMA and GHMA if avoidance is not possible.

• No similar objective in Lewistown or Butte.

Summary of Alternative 2

- CO, ID, OR, and MT/DK offices: Same as Alternative I.
- UT. NV/CA: No similar objective (removed the objective).
- WY: Clarified the objective to acknowledge that leasing is allowed in PHMA, and that if the BLM has a backlog of Expressions of Interest for leasing, the BLM would prioritize its work first in nonhabitat management areas, followed by lower priority habitat management areas (e.g., GHMA) and then higher priority habitat management areas (i.e., PHMA). Clarified that for fluid mineral development on existing leases that could adversely affect GRSG populations or habitat, the BLM would work with the lessees, operators, or other project proponents to avoid. reduce, and mitigate adverse impacts on the extent compatible with lessees' rights to drill and produce fluid mineral resources.

All States:

- No leasing strategy/objective is needed since PHMA would be closed to leasing. Leasing objective language would be removed.
- New Management Action to address development in areas already leased: In PHMA (and IHMA), the BLM will work with lessees, operators, or other project proponents to avoid, minimize and compensatorily mitigate for impacts to GRSG and their habitat (e.g., habitat loss, fragmentation, indirect impacts, etc.) from new oil and gas development on existing leases to the extent consistent with surface use rights as part of the environmental review process (e.g., 43 CFR Part 3101.1-2). If possible, place development outside of PHMA (and IHMA); if determined that such placement renders the recovery of fluid minerals on the lease infeasible, or where development of existing leases exceeds a disturbance density of I per 640, and/or 3 percent disturbance cap, seek to apply other measures to site the proposed lease activities to meet GRSG habitat objectives and require compensatory mitigation to replace direct and indirect habitat impacts.

Alternative 4 Revised Fluid Mineral Objective for all states:

• Manage fluid mineral leasing and development (including geothermal) in GRSG habitat management areas to avoid, minimize, and compensate for adverse impacts to GRSG habitat to the extent practical under the law and BLM jurisdiction.

New management action: Leasing is allowed in GRSG habitat management areas open to fluid mineral leasing (including geothermal), subject to the stipulations and RDFs included in the RMP. The BLM will evaluate parcels or those portions of parcels available for leasing associated with nominations (e.g., expressions of interest) and determine areas to continue analyzing for inclusion in a lease sale as part of the lease sale NEPA review or analysis. Where there is an existing evaluation process that considers at a minimum GRSG habitat and development proximity, the BLM will use that evaluation process. However, in the absence of an existing evaluation process or where informative to an existing process, the BLM will evaluate parcels with GRSG habitat management areas as part of the lease sale NEPA review or

Alternatives 5 and 6 Revised Fluid Mineral Objective for all states:

• Objective is the same as Alternative 4.

No specific objective or management action would specify a fluid mineral leasing strategy. However, not including specific leasing prioritization language or a leasing strategy does not remove the desired condition to manage public lands to provide suitable GRSG habitat at the HAF mid-, fine- and site-scales.

Fluid mineral leasing would be considered in GRSG habitat management areas consistent with the Secretary's discretion under the Mineral Leasing Act (as amended), as well as applicable BLM regulations and policies, and in conformance with RMP goals, objectives, stipulations, and required design features to avoid, minimize, and compensate impacts to GRSG.

• Management Action to address development in areas already leased: Same as Alternative 4.

Locate infrastructure in areas

that avoids or minimizes

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|----------------------|
| See above.) | (See above.) | habitat loss and impacts to | analysis by considering, at a | (See above.) |
| | | breeding and nesting habitats. | minimum, the following: | |
| | | Work with lessees, operators, | Proximity to existing oil | |
| | | or other project proponents | and gas developments, | |
| | | to place development at the | giving preference to lands | |
| | | most distal part of the lease | upon which a prudent | |
| | | from the lek or in areas least | operator would seek to | |
| | | harmful to GRSG populations | expand existing operations | |
| | | and habitat (e.g., where local | (e.g., existing leases, leases | |
| | | terrain features such as ridges | held by production, | |
| | | and ravines may shield nearby | designated units, etc.). | |
| | | habitat from disruptive factors, | Such existing | |
| | | or co-location with existing | developments would not | |
| | | disturbance). | usually include areas with | |
| | | For developments that cannot | minimal existing | |
| | | avoid impacts to GRSG, apply | infrastructure such as | |
| | | conservation measures that reduce impacts to GRSG | wildcat well locations. | |
| | | through implementation | Areas with development in | |
| | :21 | desisions (e.g. proposal of an | PHMA (and IHMA) that is | |
| | CiCl 1 | decisions (e.g., approval of an application for permit to drill, | at or approaching the | |
| | 281, B) | geothermal drilling permit, | density or disturbance caps | |
| | 100.00 | Sundry Notice, Master | at the project scale would indicate areas that would | |
| | n. The | Development Plans, etc.) and | meet this criteria. Any | |
| | 211 4. 113. | upon completion of the | nominated parcel subject | |
| | is all in | environmental record of | to immediate drainage or | |
| | :6 Me 61 78 | review (43 CFR Part 3162.5). | within five miles of existing | |
| | WIS CALLAND | In this process, evaluate | development would have a | |
| | 1,700 :31,01 | whether the conservation | higher preference value for | |
| | 0 41, 18, 10, | measures are "reasonable" (43 | analysis in lease | |
| | 431 W 135 | CFR Part 3101.1-2) and | documents. | |
| | 12 23 1 1 1 9 | consistent with the valid | Potential impacts to | |
| | Mr. Oll W. WE | existing rights | important GRSG habitats | |
| | S. The Br fil. | If an existing lease terminates | or areas that provide | |
| | 40.00 | by operation of law, the | important connectivity, | |
| | · Alle | reinstatement will not be | giving preference to lands | |
| | | authorized within PHMA (and | that would not result in | |
| | Chis is an unofficial of the Block of the Block of the Bl. M. National MEPA Records to the Bl. M. National Mational Mati | IHMA). | impairing habitat suitability | |
| | | | and proper function (see | |
| | | | GRSG habitat objectives). | |
| | | | This evaluation should | |
| | | | consider impacts to GRSG | |
| | | | habitat suitability at the | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|----------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | HAF mid-, fine- and site- | (See above.) |
| | | | scales, considering | |
| | | | information including, but | |
| | | | not limited to the presence | |
| | | | and distance from leks; | |
| | | | presence of nesting and | |
| | | | brood rearing habitats, | |
| | | | important winter habitat, | |
| | | .61 | or other limiting habitat | |
| | | 10/2 | types; the relationship | |
| | | 2100 | between leks, nesting | |
| | | ion the | habitat and other seasonal | |
| | | 2610 06 71 | habitats with topography; | |
| | Chis is an unofficial of the distantial NEPARES IN A RECOMMENTAL MARION AND A RECOMMENTAL PROPERTY OF THE DESTRUCTION AND A RECOMMENTAL PROPERTY OF THE | 11C0 "NO D | migration/movement | |
| | | 101, et, he, | corridors; adaptive management thresholds | |
| | | OUI CAS :11 P CI | (hard and soft); amount | |
| | | 164 VEC 111, 100 | and distribution of existing | |
| | | D, 44 46 10 | disturbances; the presence | |
| | 18: | We, el, va, ie | of degraded or non- | |
| | Cicial | W. 'W. Ell. " 61 | habitat, and impacts to | |
| | offir. B. | chive ist h | adjacent habitat that may | |
| | 100.00 | 40 11, cd, A | affect the biological | |
| | 20, 11, 21 | of. 50 Va. | importance of the | |
| | 31, 2. 110 | Cto CA' at I | remaining intact habitat. | |
| | is all im | IS THE WAY | Coordinate with the | |
| | 19 M 9100 | S Mr * LI | applicable State agencies to | |
| | W1. Cn. 11A VE | al, all | ensure the most current | |
| | 100 1131 181 01 | io ne | and applicable biological | |
| | o Wr. Th. Ho | -Ull | information is considered. | |
| | 10,14 | | Parcels where | |
| | 102 43, 11/20 | | development would not | |
| | COLUNION IN WE | | decrease habitat suitability | |
| | 134 8 4 | | would have higher | |
| | H No | | preference value for | |
| | 21. | | analysis in lease | |
| | Chis is an unofficial of the Brain of the Brain of the Blum Parish Recommendation of the Blum the design of the Blum the Blum the design of the Blum t | Republic te thin be che will b | documents. | |
| | | | If a parcel receives a low | |
| | | | preference value for impacts | |
| | | | to important GRSG habitats, it | |
| | | | will receive an overall low | |
| | | | preference value. An office | |
| | | | may offer low preference | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | parcels in a lease sale if the Field Office resources (e.g., staff time) allow after all high preference parcels have been evaluated for inclusion in the sale. In such a scenario, the office will select one or more low preference parcels that present the least conflicts based on the evaluation criteria to analyze for inclusion in the sale. • Management Action to address development in areas already leased: When considering exploration and development on areas leased for fluid mineral resources in PHMAs (and IHMA in ID), including geothermal, application of measures to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce and/or mitigate potential impacts will be considered through completion of the environmental record of review (43 CFR Part 3162.5 and 36 CFR Part 228.108), including appropriate documentation of compliance with NEPA. Such measures may include existing lease stipulations, project design, operator-committed measures, RMP required design features (RDFs), and local conditions of approval (COAs). The BLM will work with | Alternatives 5 and 6 (See above.) |
| | | | project proponents to promote measurable GRSG | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|----------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | conservation objectives such | (See above.) |
| | | | as, but not limited to, | |
| | | | consolidation of project | |
| | | | related infrastructure to reduce habitat fragmentation | |
| | | | | |
| | | | and loss and to promote | |
| | | | effective conservation and connectivity of seasonal | |
| | | | habitats and PHMAs (and | |
| | | 451 | IHMAs). The BLM will | |
| | | 181 | Initias). The built will | |
| | | 200 | continue to work with project proponents and the state | |
| | | :01, *He | wildlife agency to site their | |
| | | 200 25 1 | projects in a manner that | |
| | | 1,00 W. b. | honors their lease rights but | |
| | | 101, e 1, No. | have been determined to | |
| | | On Cha : 11 P CI | contain the least sensitive | |
| | | 164 VEC 111, 100 | habitats (based on vegetation, | |
| | | D' +12 16 10 | topography, or other habitat | |
| | :31 | 10, 61, 13, 18 | features) and resources | |
| | CiCICI | W. We Ell. Cl. | whether inside or outside of | |
| | This is an unofficial to the property of the p | chine ist no | PHMAs (and IHMA). Surface | |
| | 170 100 | 400 111 001 7 | use rights associated with | |
| | n. The | C. (200 78) | existing leases will be | |
| | 31, 4. 113. | Te. D. A. | recognized and respected. For | |
| | 19 ch : M | 12 561 NS | proposed operations in | |
| | :6 Me 61 78 | 2 Mr. 41. | PHMAs (and IHMAs), the | |
| | WI CALLA | al land | Surface Use Plan of | |
| | 1,700 1131,01 | ia Me. | Operations (see 43CFR Part | |
| | O VILLE, "10, | -UII | 3162.3-1(f)) shall address, at a | |
| | This is an unofficial to do the property of th | 000 | minimum, the applicable RDFs | |
| | 12 23, W 12 9 | | in the RMP. Seasonal habitats | |
| | This is an unofficial of the Block of the Block of the Blumber of | | or project features related to | |
| | S. The Br. fl. | | potential GRSG impacts that | |
| | 40.00 | | are not addressed in the | |
| | 4/11 | | Surface Use Plan of | |
| | Chis is an unofficial of the Bland of the Bl | Mexpect will dock the final dock the final dock the final dock the final dock that may be all the final may be all the final that may be all the fin | Operations based on site- | |
| | | | specific or project-specific | |
| | | | considerations shall be noted | |
| | | | in the project file, along with a | |
| | | | rationale for not including | |
| | | | them. | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | In this process the BLM will | (See above.) |
| | | | evaluate whether each | |
| | | | conservation measure is | |
| | | | reasonable and consistent with | |
| | | | surface use rights as part of | |
| | | | the environmental review | |
| | | | process (e.g., 43 CFR Part | |
| | | | 3101.1-2). | |
| | This is an unofficial of the Brands of the Blument. The Brands of the Blument of the Brands of th | Prepublication version of the property of the | Same in the second of or one only version of | |
| | official s | Mexpent wildog | the lied L. | |
| | In The The | do Ti Reginay | | |
| | This is a ment simile | Jish REPA that | | |
| | Substant NE Watio | ocur | | |
| | | | | |

2.5.7 Fluid Mineral Lease Stipulation Waivers, Exceptions, and Modifications

Federal regulations at 43 CFR Part 3171.24 provide the BLM direction for conditions under which variance from specific stipulations can be considered. This document presents the draft range of alternatives for waivers, exceptions, and modifications (WEMs) associated with the described stipulations on new fluid mineral leasing (e.g., oil, gas, and geothermal) in GRSG habitat management areas. Consideration of amending the WEM language in this planning effort is limited to future leases that have stipulations associated with no surface occupancy (NSO), disturbance cap – generally applied as a controlled surface use (CSU) stipulation, and seasonal timing limitations. This planning effort is not considering amendment of WEMs associated with other stipulations.

This section is limited to consideration of WEMs during the development phase. Other aspects of fluid mineral leasing and development are addressed elsewhere in this amendment or existing RMP language, including specific fluid mineral allocations and associated stipulations (see **Section 2.5.2**), the RMP objective for GRSG habitat in relation to fluid minerals (see **Section 2.5.6**), RMP management actions providing guidance when considering leasing GRSG habitat management areas (see **Section 2.5.6**), development associated with existing fluid mineral leases (see **Section 2.5.6**), and application of RDFs (existing RMP decisions that are not being considered for amendment in this process).

The WEMs in this document would apply to new fluid mineral leases and lease reinstatements on public lands, as well as existing leases if they do not specifically include WEMs associated with lease stipulations, and are limited to the stipulations described below. GRSG fluid mineral stipulations not mentioned in this document, as well as those program areas/stipulations not considered in this planning effort would continue where they apply. If there is a conflict between such stipulations and those presented in this document, the more restrictive would take precedence during implementation.

Description of Surface Stipulations

This planning process is considering an amendment to the language for WEMs associated with three general types of GRSG surface stipulations that would be applied to new fluid mineral leases.

No Surface Occupancy (NSO)

Use or occupancy of the land surface for fluid mineral exploration or development is prohibited to protect GRSG and GRSG habitat. Generally considered a major constraint, in areas open to fluid mineral leasing with NSO stipulations, fluid mineral leasing activities are permitted, but activities with surface occupancy cannot be conducted unless an exception, modification, or waiver is granted. Absent the approval of a waiver, exception, or modification, access to fluid mineral deposits would require drilling from outside the boundaries of the NSO stipulation. In the 2015 not warranted determination for GRSG the USFWS cited application of regulatory tools, such as NSO stipulations, as an effective conservation tool in minimizing exposure of the species to fluid mineral development.

Controlled Surface Use (CSU) - Disturbance Cap

This planning effort is considering amendments to the GRSG disturbance cap, including clarifying that it will be applied to new fluid mineral leases as a CSU stipulation. A CSU stipulation is a category of moderate constraint that allows some use and occupancy of public land while protecting identified resources or values. A CSU stipulation allows the BLM to require additional conditions be met to protect a specified resource or value in addition to standard lease terms and conditions. A new lease with the disturbance cap CSU stipulation would not guarantee the lessee the right to occupy the surface of the lease for the purpose of producing fluid minerals within GRSG designated PHMAs

(and IHMA in Idaho). The surface occupancy restriction criteria identified in this stipulation may preclude surface occupancy and may be beyond the ability of the lessee to meet due to existing surface disturbance on federal, state, or private lands within designated PHMAs/IHMAs or surface disturbance created by other land users.

Seasonal Timing Limitations (TL)

Areas identified for TLs, a moderate constraint, are closed to fluid mineral exploration and development during identified time frames to eliminate, to the degree possible, activities disruptive to GRSG during the associated seasons of use. Ground disturbing activities, drilling, stimulation, and plug and abandonment work should not be allowed during the identified periods. Production and maintenance activities on wells and well work required by another program to protect the environment (e.g. Underground Injection Control) and administrative activities may be exempt from the timing limitations at the discretion of the BLM Authorized Officer. GRSG seasonal timing limitations from prior planning efforts will not change, but waivers, exceptions, and modifications for seasonal timing limitations are being updated.

Project-specific Flexibility

For fluid minerals, surface stipulations could be excepted, modified, or waived by the Authorized Officer. An exception exempts the holder of the lease from the stipulation on a one-time basis. A modification changes the language or provisions of a stipulation due to changed conditions or new information either temporarily or for the term of the lease. A modification may or may not apply to all other sites within the leasehold. A waiver permanently exempts the surface stipulation for a specific lease, planning area, or resource based on absence of need.

An exception, modification, or waiver may be granted at the discretion of the BLM Authorized Officer if the specific criteria described below are met. WEMs specific to each stipulation are included in the leasing documents and are considered based on site-level conditions during implementation of the lease terms. The proponent must submit a written request for an exception, modification, or waiver and provide the data necessary to demonstrate that specific criteria have been met. The BLM would consider that information, in combination with all other information provided by State, County, and other local agencies; tribal governments; other federal agencies; or interested stakeholders as applicable, though decision to grant the WEM remains with the Authorized Officer.

In the event there are overlapping stipulations (e.g., NSO area overlapping a disturbance cap CSU overlapping a seasonal timing limitation), WEMs would need to be considered for each stipulation separately based on the processes identified below.

Table 2-9, Comparison of Alternatives, Fluid Mineral Leasing Waivers, Exceptions, and Modifications, presents management by alternative for this management issue.

Table 2-9. Comparison of Alternatives, Fluid Mineral Leasing Waivers, Exceptions, and Modifications

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Altamative 2 | Alternative 3 | Altomotive 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|--|---|----------------------------------|
| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | | Alternative 4 | |
| • ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, UT: | MT/DK, OR, and WY: Same as | ` | in Idaho and West Decker RHI Exception #J - applicable to | Same as Alternative 4, except in |
| | | necessary, since all GRSG habitat | the NSO stipulation within | CO where the exception would |
| In SFA, there will be no waivers, | Alternative I. | , | 0.6 miles of active leks | apply in PHMA within I mile of |
| exceptions, or modifications. | • CO: | management areas would be closed to new fluid mineral | (WAFWA definition) in | active leks. |
| • CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, | NSO-I – Within One mile of | leasing so there would be no | PHMA (and IHMA in Idaho): | active leks. |
| UT: | Active Leks: | new leases with associated | The Authorized Officer may | |
| The Authorized Officer may | **Exceptions or | stipulations | consider and grant an exception | |
| grant an exception to a fluid | modifications may be | supulations. | to the NSO stipulation within 0.6 | |
| mineral lease no-surface- | considered if, in consultation | 27.0 | miles of active leks in PHMA (and | |
| occupancy stipulation only where | with the State of Colorado, it | iol' "he | IHMA in Idaho) if it can be | |
| the proposed action: | can be demonstrated that there | after of the | demonstrated that development | |
| i. Would not have direct, | is no impact on Greater Sage- | 1100 Was 6 | and surface accurance would have | |
| indirect, or cumulative | Grouse based on one of the | 101, e 1, he, | and surface occupancy would have no direct impacts to or disruption | |
| effects on GRSG or its | following: | OUI CIE :11 P CI | of GRSG or its habitat based on at | |
| habitat; or, | o Topography/areas of non- | 164 Les 111, 100 | least one of the following – after | |
| ii. Is proposed to be | habitat create an effective | new leases with associated stipulations. | documenting the review of | |
| undertaken as an | barrier to impacts. | 10 61 731 19 | available information associated | |
| alternative to a similar | No additional impacts | M. We Elli OL | with the site proposed for the | |
| action occurring on a | would be realized above | Chine ist w | exception – both internally | |
| nearby parcel, and would | those created by existing | 400 The dis 1 p | compiled and as provided by | |
| provide a clear | major infrastructure (for | republicatinate por may be document will document will document will document will document with the posterior of the posteri | State, County and other local | |
| conservation gain to GRSG. | example, State Highway | Prepublicate will be coment with at may be coment that may be coment to be comentative. | agencies, tribal governments, | |
| | 13).21 2011 | is is wat | project proponents, other federal | |
| Exceptions based on | The exception or | 3. Tr. 411 | agencies, or interested | |
| conservation gain (ii) may only be | modification precludes or | 1/2 1/2 | stakeholders: | |
| considered in (a) PHMA of mixed | offsets greater potential | a de | The location of the proposed | |
| ownership where federal | impacts if the action were proposed on adjacent | THE STATE OF THE S | authorization is determined to | |
| minerals underlie less than fifty percent of the total surface, or | proposed on adjacent | 200 | be non-habitat (see Glossary; | |
| (b) areas of the public lands | parcels (for example, due | | as determined by a biologist | |
| where the proposed exception is | to landownership patterns). | | with GRSG experience using | |
| an alternative to an action | **In order to approve exceptions or | | methods such as the Habitat | |
| occurring on a nearby parcel | modifications to this lease | | Assessment Framework), does | |
| | stipulation, the Authorized Officer | | not provide important | |
| subject to a valid federal fluid | | | connectivity between habitat | |
| mineral lease existing as of the date of this ARMPA. Exceptions | must obtain: agreement, including written justification, between the | | areas, and the project includes | |
| based on conservation gain must | BLM District Managers and CPW | | design features to prevent | |
| also include measures, such as | that the proposed action satisfies at | | indirect disturbance to or | |
| enforceable institutional controls | least one of the criteria listed above. | | disruption of adjacent seasonal | |
| and buffers, sufficient to allow | reast one of the criteria listed above. | | habitats (whether adjacent | |
| the BLM to conclude that such | | | seasonal habitat are within 0.6 | |
| ule DLIT to conclude that such | | | seasonal nabital are within 0.6 | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| benefits will endure for the | • ID: | (See above.) | miles of an active lek or | (See above.) |
| duration of the proposed action's | | | greater than 0.6 miles from | |
| impacts. | grant an exception to a fluid | | active leks) that would impair | |
| | mineral lease NSO stipulation | | their biological function. | |
| Any exceptions to this lease | only where the proposed action: | | Topography/areas of non- | |
| stipulation may be approved by | i. Will not have direct, | | habitat create an effective | |
| the Authorized Officer only with | indirect, or cumulative | | barrier to adverse impacts | |
| the concurrence of the State | effects on GRSG or its | | (e.g., protected from visual and | |
| Director. The Authorized | habitat; or, | i i | audible disturbances to GRSG | |
| Officer may not grant an | ii. Is proposed to be | ars | and its habitat). | |
| exception unless the applicable | undertaken as an alternative | 70 | By co-locating the proposed | |
| state wildlife agency, the USFWS, | to a similar action occurring | 30 00 | authorization with existing | |
| and the BLM unanimously find | on a nearby parcel, and | 410 4 411 | disturbance, no additional | |
| that the proposed action satisfies | would provide no net loss | : C3 73 0 | impacts would be realized | |
| (i) or (ii). Such finding shall | to GRSG. | Allo the Ch | above those already associated | |
| initially be made by a team of one | Exceptions based on no net loss | 110 et 5 11 De 1 | with the existing similarly-sized | |
| field biologist or other GRSG | (ii) may only be considered in (a) | co co illi co | infrastructure, including | |
| expert from each respective | PHMA of mixed ownership | Prepublication version of the property of the property will be property will be property of the property of th | indirect disturbance to or | |
| agency. In the event the initial | where federal minerals underlie | et al al is | disruption of adjacent seasonal | |
| finding is not unanimous, the | less than fifty percent of the total | M We sills of 12 | habitats that would impair their | |
| finding may be elevated to the | surface, or (b) areas of the public | Moume fine ter le document that may be salvent to be s | biological function. | |
| appropriate BLM State Director, | lands where the proposed | " Oca Me dis b | | |
| USFW S State Ecological Services | exception is an alternative to an | 90 11.000 27 | Beyond considering an exception | |
| Director, and state wildlife | action occurring on a nearby | rol. K. Wa | where no direct or indirect | |
| agency head for final resolution. | parcel subject to a valid Federal | igt of at | impacts on GRSG or its habitat | |
| In the event their finding is not | fluid mineral lease existing as of | 11- EL "Ha | would occur, an exception could | |
| unanimous, the exception will | the date of this RMP amendment. | Harry | also be considered if the | |
| not be granted. Approved | Exceptions based on | 31 011 | proposed location on public lands | |
| exceptions will be made publicly | conservation gain must also | in in | would be undertaken as an | |
| available at least quarterly. | include measures, such as | CU | alternative to a similar action | |
| | enforceable institutional controls | 0 | occurring on a nearby non-public | |
| WY: NSO 0.6 lek buffer in | and bullers, sufficient to allow | | lands parcel (for example, due to | |
| PHMA: | the BLM to conclude that such | | landownership patterns), and | |
| Exception : The authorized | benefits will endure for the | | development on the public parcel | |
| officer may grant an exception if | duration of the proposed action's | | in question would eliminate | |
| an environmental record of | impacts. | | impacts on more important | |
| review determines that the | | | and/or limited GRSG habitat (e.g., | |
| action, as proposed or | Any exceptions to this lease | | wet meadows, brood-rearing | |
| conditioned, would not impair | stipulation may be approved by | | habitat, etc.) on the non-public | |
| the function or utility of the site | the Authorized Officer only with | | nearby parcel; this exception must | |
| for the current or subsequent | the concurrence of the State | | also include measures sufficient to | |
| seasonal habitat, life-history, or | Director and in coordination | | allow the BLM to conclude in its | |
| behavioral needs of Greater | with the Technical and Policy | | documenting analysis that such | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|----------------------|
| Sage-Grouse. The BLM can and | Team. Approved exceptions will | (See above.) | benefits will endure for the | (See above.) |
| does grant exceptions if the BLM, | be made publicly available at least | (| duration of the proposed action's | (, |
| in coordination with the WGFD, | quarterly. | | impacts on public lands (e.g., | |
| determines that granting an | 4 | | confirmation of an easement). | |
| exception would not adversely | NV/CA: | | nis | |
| impact the population being | An exception to stipulations | | To approve this exception based | |
| protected. | associated with GRSG Habitat | | on any of the above criteria, after | |
| · | Management Areas (HMAs) may | | coordination with the appropriate | |
| | be granted by the authorized | i i | State agency, the Authorized | |
| | officer (State Director), in | ar's | Officer must document, that the | |
| | coordination with the | prepublication version were proportion to the property will be proportional document will be proportional document with the property of the pr | proposed action satisfies at least | |
| | appropriate state agency | on he | one of the criteria listed above. If | |
| | (NDOW, SETT, and/or CDFW), | 410 411 | the State agency does not concur | |
| | if one the following conditions | prepublicational docional document will document will document will document will document with all document with the property of the property | with granting the exception, the | |
| | are met: | Will the b | Authorized Officer must provide | |
| | i. The location of the | all ets 11 best | rationale for how the criteria are | |
| | proposed authorization is | 66 60 vill 00 | met considering the information | |
| | determined to be unsuitable | 16 16 4 14 90 | the State provides. | |
| | (by a biologist with GRSG | 6 3 3 3 is | 1/16 | |
| | experience using methods | M We sille of 1 | Prior to granting an exception to | |
| | such as Stiver et al 2015) | Chill Chickers | an NSO stipulation, the potential | |
| | and lacks the ecological | 100 KHO 413 1 P | exception shall be subject to | |
| | potential to become | 0 1 000 37 | public review for at least a 30-day | |
| | marginal or suitable habitat; | *61. V K. W. | period (e.g., could be part of the | |
| | and would not result in | Prepublicate will be come and the property of | APD NEPA process). | |
| | direct, indirect, or | 3. IE. The | 16.1 | |
| | cumulative impacts on | 11/2/1 | If the area associated with the | |
| 1 | GRSG and its habitat. | 3, 26, | proposed development seeking | |
| | Management allocation | 'III' | the exception (e.g., well pad, | |
| | decisions would not apply | C | compressor station, etc.) is in an | |
| | to those areas determined | | area (neighborhood cluster) that has met one of the adaptive | |
| | to be unsuitable because the | | management thresholds (hard or | |
| • | area lacks the ecological potential to become | | soft) (see Section 2.5.13), no | |
| | marginal or suitable habitat, | | exceptions would be considered | |
| | and/or | | until the causal factor analysis is | |
| | ii. The proposed activity's | | completed. If the causal factor | |
| | impacts could be offset to | | analysis concludes that | |
| | result in no adverse impacts | | development associated with the | |
| | on GRSG or its habitat, | | type of activity seeking the | |
| | through use of the | | exception is or could contribute | |
| | mitigation hierarchy | | to the threshold being met or not | |
| | consistent with Federal law | | recovering, no exception would | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| (See above.) | and the state's mitigation | (See above.) | be granted. If the analysis is | (See above.) |
| | policies and programs, such | | inconclusive on cause, exceptions | |
| | as the State of Nevada's | republication version where he property will be property will be property will be property and the property will be property to the property of the property o | could be considered. | |
| | Executive Order 2018-32 | | .6 | |
| | (and any future regulations | | Mis | |
| | developed to implement | | E II. M | |
| | this order). In cases where | | 0, 10 01,0 | |
| | exceptions may be granted | | 10 0, 0 7 11. | |
| | for projects with a residual | i i | TO THE SO | |
| | impact, voluntary | ars | July 1 Che Of | |
| | compensatory mitigation | 70 | 50 4 11 1115 017 | |
| | consistent with the State's | 30 00 | "60 'Ip. !O. | |
| | mitigation policies and | 410 4 411 | St. Dr Sts | |
| | programs, such as the State | 163 mal 0 | 4, 10 | |
| | of Nevada's Executive | MIL THE OF | ve. 11 v. | |
| | Order 2018-32 (and any | prepublication version of the property of the | on of this are BLM in steed in the only version of the only versio | |
| | future regulations | co co illi co | 0 110 | |
| | developed to implement | 16. 100 W. 40 | "No you | |
| | this order) would be one | et on al is | 1,160 | |
| | mechanism by which a | M WE SILG A 13 | 16/ | |
| | proponent achieves the | 1111 111 110 | 2. | |
| | Approved RMP Amendment | Dogwood is b | | |
| | goals, objectives, and | 90 1,000,04 | | |
| | exception criteria. When a | or. Re Mar | | |
| | proponent volunteers | Sto DA AL | | |
| | compensatory mitigation as | M. E. W. | | |
| | their chosen approach to | Mr. F. I. | | |
| _ | address residual impacts, | al elle | | |
| | the BLM can incorporate | ic Me | | |
| | those actions into the | CUIT | | |
| | rationale used to grant an | 00 | | |
| | exception. The final decision | | | |
| | to grant a waiver, | | | |
| | exception, or modification | | | |
| | would be based, in part, on | | | |
| | criteria consistent with the | | | |
| | State's GRSG management | | | |
| | plans and policies. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | • UT: | | | |
| | Within PHMA, the Authorized | | | |
| | Officer may grant an exception | | | |
| | to a fluid mineral lease NSO | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|---|--|----------------|----------------------|
| (See above.) | stipulation where the proposed | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| | action: | | | |
| | Occurs in non-habitat that | republication version will be possible of the property will be possible of the property will be possible of the property of th | | |
| | does not provide important | | .6 | |
| | connectivity between habitat | | chlo " | |
| | areas and the development | | 8 1, 3 M | |
| | would not cause indirect | | 0, 10 81.0 | |
| | disturbance to or disruption | . (| 10,000 | |
| | of adjacent seasonal habitats | .51 | The the red t | |
| | that would impair their | 10/3 | 311 10 1611 01 | |
| | biological function of | 2100 | 2 4 1. MI . OL | |
| | providing the life-history or | ion the | ter all ele | |
| | behavioral needs of the | 2612 | 19 4 6 61 | |
| | Greater Sage-Grouse | "Co" Na D | SUC 1 | |
| | population due to project design (e.g., minimize sound, | , on 1, ne , | Up 4/1 24. | |
| | preclude tall structures, | On cis ill b | 11. 01. 00. | |
| | require perch deterrents), as | 164 VEC 111, 700 | ne I NA | |
| | demonstrated in the project's | D, 46 46 10 | 41.00 | |
| | NEPA document; or | 110, 61, 43, 13 | alle | |
| | Is proposed to be undertaken | 14. 141. Ell. " EL | 10 | |
| | as an alternative to a similar | prepublication version and the policy of the property will be policy to the final doctor of the final doct | Ŏ. | |
| | action occurring on a nearby | 40 11, 201, 21 p | | |
| | parcel, and development on | o. 1. 500 yas | | |
| | the parcel in question would | The Day of It | | |
| | have less of an impact on | prepublication version of the property of the property will be property will be property by the property by th | | |
| | Greater Sage-Grouse or its | 2 4 F. El. | | |
| | habitat than on the nearby | al and | | |
| | parcel; this exception must | ic ne | | |
| | also include measures | -Ull. | | |
| | sufficient to allow the BLM to | 00 | | |
| | conclude that such benefits | | | |
| | will endure for the duration | | | |
| | of the proposed action's | | | |
| | impacts. | | | |
| | 61. | | | |
| | Approved exceptions will be | | | |
| | made publicly available at least | | | |
| | quarterly. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | In addition, any lease activities | | | |
| | will apply the pertinent | | | |
| | management for discretionary | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (See above.) | activities in PHMA identified in | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| | MA-SSS-3 (e.g., mitigation, | | | |
| | disturbance cap, minerals/energy | | | |
| | density, seasonal restrictions, and | | . 6 | |
| | RDFs), including if an exception | | Nis | |
| | to the NSO is granted. | | 17. 17.3 | |
| Not applicable | A two-tiered NSO exception is | No WEMs would be necessary, | Exception #2 - No Surface | Exception #2 - No Surface |
| | not applicable for any state but | since all GRSG habitat | Occupancy Stipulation in the | Occupancy Stipulations in |
| | CO. | management areas would be 🔍 | Remainder of PHMA (or | the Remainder of PHMA (or |
| | • CO: | management areas would be closed to new fluid mineral leasing. | IHMA in Idaho) beyond 0.6 | IHMA in Idaho) beyond 0.6 |
| | NSO-2 - One Mile from Active | leasing. | miles from active leks - as | miles from active leks - as |
| | Leks to the Remainder of PHMA: | 30 00 | applicable: | applicable: |
| | **Exception: The BLM will | 410 411 | The Authorized Officer may | Same as Alt 4, except under the |
| | grant an exception (any | . 63 . 32 . 0 | consider and grant an exception | #2 criteria, compensatory |
| | occupancy must be removed | Allo the 6 h | to the NSO stipulation associated | mitigation would not have to be |
| | within I year of approval) to | JUP at 11 De 1 | with the remainder of PHMA (and | completed and functioning prior |
| | NSO-2 after consulting with the | eb ec illi oci | IHMA in Idaho) if one of the | to being able to grant the |
| | State of Colorado, consistent | 10 100 " W 90 | following criteria apply – after | exception. To grant the activity |
| | with MD-SSS-3 and based on the | et all al is | documenting the review of | based on compensatory |
| | following factors: | M We sills at 12 | available information associated | mitigation, prior to construction, |
| | It is determined by evaluating | leasing. | with the site proposed for the | surface occupancy, or surface |
| | the proposed lease activities | Ocallo dis b | exception – both internally | disturbing activities the |
| | that adverse or undesirable | 00 1 200 27 | compiled and as provided by | compensation project must be |
| | impacts to Greater Sage- | Prepublicate will be coment with at may be coment that may be coment to be coment. | State, County and other local | planned, funded, and approved by |
| | Grouse can be avoided based | ist of at | agencies, tribal governments, | the operator, BLM, surface |
| | on site-specific terrain, | J. E. HOO | project proponents, other federal | owner, and in coordination with |
| | topography and habitat type, | 'Wall | agencies, or interested | the appropriate State agency. |
| _ | or offset consistent with | 31 611 | stakeholders: | However, due to the uncertainty |
| | criterion #2 below. For | MI | The criteria presented in | associated with whether the |
| | example, in the vicinity of | COL | Exception #1. | planned compensatory mitigation |
| | leks, local terrain features | 0 | 2) If it can be demonstrated by a | project would successfully |
| | such as ridges and ravines | | biologist with GRSG | become habitat in order to offset |
| | may shield potential | | experience, based on site- | the impacts, one of the following |
| | disruptive impacts from | | specific information (using | would need to apply: |
| | affecting nearby Greater | | tools such as the Habitat | The area of habitat |
| | Sage-Grouse habitat. | | Assessment Framework, State | improvement associated with |
| | or | | mitigation programs, or | compensatory mitigation |
| | It is determined, based on | | others), where it has been | would need to increase to |
| | site-specific information | | demonstrated that the project | account for a level of risk that |
| | (using tools such as the | | cannot be avoided or | the compensatory mitigation |
| | Habitat Assessment | | minimized and granting the | action may fail or not persist |
| | Framework, the Colorado | | exception would not result in | for the full duration of the |
| | Habitat Exchange Habitat | | adverse effects to GRSG | impact based on the typ e of |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| (See above.) | Quantification Tool, or | (See above.) | seasonal habitats. Granting the | the specific compensato ry |
| | others), that the impacts | | exception must be in | project(s) and local ecological |
| | anticipated by the proposed | | conformance with the RMP | conditions, or |
| | activity would be offset | | GRSG goal and habitat | The operator provides long- |
| | through compensatory | | objectives, and the impacts | term assurances that the |
| | mitigation developed in | | anticipated by the proposed | compensatory project would |
| | coordination with the State | | activity would be addressed | become functional for the |
| | of Colorado (as a | | through application of the | duration of the impact (e.g. |
| | requirement of State policy | i i | mitigation hierarchy, including | project maintenance or |
| | or authorization or as | ar's | consideration of | retreatment, easements, |
| | offered voluntarily by | 70 | compensatory mitigation | mitigation bonding – BLM H- |
| | leaseholder) that meets | 30 00 | developed in coordination | 1794-1, section 7.3, etc.). |
| | accepted principles of | 110. 111. | with the applicable state | Compensatory mitigation rate |
| | compensatory mitigation | . 63 . 32 .0 | agency that meets the GRSG | would need to consider number |
| | including: | ore Publication Version of the poly of the poly of the final document will be poly of the | mitigation principles identified | of acres necessary to offset acres |
| | Achieving measurable | 110 45 1100 | in the RMP, including providing | affected by direct and indirect |
| | outcomes for Greater | 20° CC ill CC | for no net loss of habitat. To | effects (see Mitigation section), as |
| | Sage-Grouse habitat | 16, Op " N. 40. | grant an exception based on | well as likelihood that the |
| | function that are at least | et of alice | the use of compensatory | mitigation project may not |
| | equal to the lost or | My We, allo Alz | mitigation, the following must | provide the anticipated |
| | degraded values. | 1, 111, 11, 16, | be followed and documented: | compensation for the duration of |
| | **If, prior to development, the | Collegion b | a. As the first step in | the impact. |
| | including: Achieving measurable outcomes for Greater Sage-Grouse habitat function that are at least equal to the lost or degraded values. All, prior to development, the county in which the tract is located provides information indicating that an NSO stipulation can be excepted or modified based on a reasonable understanding of likely development because either of the criterion above would apply, the BLM would manage that lease accordingly unless the BLM | republication that the particular terment will document will document will document the final document the final document will be particular to the final document the final document the final document to the final docume | mitigating impacts to | · |
| | located provides information | or. Roman | GRSG, efforts to avoid | |
| | indicating that an NSO | Sto OA AL | impacts by locating the | |
| | stipulation can be excepted or | No The Mo | proposed project in areas | |
| | modified based on a reasonable | Mr. F. I. | outside the NSO areas or | |
| ~ | understanding of likely | al ch | in areas of non-habitat | |
| | development because either of | ic Me | shall be documented. | |
| | the criterion above would apply, | -Ull | b. As the second step in | |
| | the BLM would manage that | 00 | mitigating impacts to | |
| | lease accordingly unless the BLM | | GRSG, efforts to minimize | |
| | determines, at the APD stage | | impacts by applying project | |
| | and in consultation with the State | | design features shall be | |
| | of Colorado, that neither of the | | documented (e.g., use of | |
| | criteria identified above is met. | | RDFs, buffer distances, | |
| | | | seasonal limitations, etc.). | |
| | In order to approve exceptions or | | c. Using compensatory | |
| | modifications to this lease | | mitigation may not be | |
| | stipulation, the Authorized Officer | | appropriate in some GRSG | |
| | must obtain agreement, including | | habitats/populations. | |
| | written justification, between the | | Before using | |
| | BLM District Manager and CPW | | compensatory mitigation | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|----------------------|
| (See above.) | that the proposed action satisfies at | (See above.) | as an approach for this | (See above.) |
| | least one of the criteria listed above. | | exception, the | |
| | | | effectiveness of whether | |
| | | | compensatory mitigation | |
| | | | can offset impacts to the | |
| | | | impacted habitat and | |
| | | | associated population | |
| | | *.(| without risking other | |
| | | .51 | impacts shall consider local | |
| | | 18 | biological considerations, | |
| | | 270 | including, but not limited | |
| | | iol' We | to population size, | |
| | | atte of the | connectivity to other | |
| | Chis is an unofficial of the Bland of the Bland of the BLM Nation of the Bland of t | 1100 Wa 6 | populations, availability of existing functional habitat, | |
| | | 101, e 1, he | and the availability of | |
| | | On C. 11 P. C. | mitigation projects that | |
| | | 164 VEC 111, 100 | could benefit the impacted | |
| | | D' +4 46 10 | could belieff the impacted | |
| | 18: | 10, 61, 73, 18 | d. The compensation project | |
| | CiCICI | W. We Elli CL | must be completed and | |
| | offi, B. | come ist n | habitat functionality | |
| | 30.00 | 400 11, 001, of | documented before the | |
| | n. The | C. 500 783 | exception is granted to | |
| | 31, 4. 113. | Le D ALL | ensure the offset in | |
| | is an in | 12 Sb. Mar | impacts will occur | |
| | :6 Me 51 76 | 2 Mr. 41. | e The compensation | |
| | WI COLIN IN VE | all and | necessary to grant this | |
| | 1,700 1191,01 | ia Me. | exception must provide | |
| | 0 411 181 40 | -Ull | the offsetting benefit to | |
| | 43, 14 130 | 200 | the population being | |
| | 12 23, W 12 9 | | impacted by the potential | |
| | Mr. Oli Wine | | development. | |
| | S. The Br fil. | | governous. | |
| | 40.00 | Arepublic te thin be to the Arepublic terment will be to the final document that may be to the final may b | To approve this exception, the | |
| | . Alle | | Authorized Officer must | |
| | | | document, in coordination with | |
| | | | the appropriate State authority, | |
| | | | that the proposed action satisfies | |
| | | | at least one of the criteria listed | |
| | | | above. If the State agency does | |
| | | | not concur with granting the | |
| | | | exception, the Authorized Officer | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | must provide rationale for how | (See above.) |
| | | | the criteria are met considering | |
| | | | the information the State | |
| | | | provides. | |
| | | | Mis | |
| | | | Prior to granting an exception to | |
| | | | an NSO stipulation the potential | |
| | | | exception shall be subject to | |
| | | -i | public review for at least a 30-day | |
| | | 15 | period (e.g., could be part of the | |
| | | 16. | APD NEPA process). | |
| | | 901 170 | 0 10, 10, | |
| | | 10. 411 | If the area associated with the | |
| | | - 3t - 2t - 0 | proposed development seeking | |
| | | illo the ch | the exception (e.g., well pad, | |
| | | 10. 48 , 100 | compressor station, etc.) is in an | |
| | | 20° C/2 ill . C | area (neighborhood cluster) that | |
| | 0.0 | 16, 06 M. 40 | has met one of the adaptive | |
| | 1 | 6. of 4 4 4 | management thresholds (hard or | |
| | iai | 10 26, 100, 1 | soft) (see Section 2.5.13), no | |
| | (8)0.01 | 1, 14, 41, 46, | exceptions would be considered | |
| | Off. B | active ist v | until the causal factor analysis is | |
| | in he | 40 11.00, 4. | completed. If the causal factor | |
| | 20. 11. 21 | of. Bordios | analysis concludes that | |
| | 31, of illo | CLO OF IT | development associated with the | |
| | 19 el im | IS CK, War | type of activity seeking the | |
| | :6' M . 6' 26 | S Mr F LI. | exception is or could contribute | |
| | WI. Ch. 11A VE | al, all | to the threshold being met or not | |
| | 100 1191 OF | la Me. | recovering, no exception would | |
| | 0 41 1E, 40 | -UII. | be granted. If the analysis is | |
| | 43, 14 135 | 000 | inconclusive on cause, exceptions | |
| | 12 23, 16 0 | | could be considered. | |
| | This is an unofficial the Brand of the Brand | 1 | | |
| | 73, 36 | | | |
| | 12 "No | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, | ID, MT/DK, OR and WY: | No WEMs would be necessary, | Modification: The Authorized | Same as Alternative 4, except for |
| UT: None | Same as Alternative I. | since all GRSG habitat | Officer may consider and grant a | the addition of the following: |
| WY: NSO 0.6 lek buffer in | | management areas would be | modification to the fluid mineral | |
| PHMA: | • CO: | closed to new fluid mineral | lease NSO stipulation, allowing | Specifically for Wyoming: In |
| Modification: The authorized | NSO-I – Within One mile of | leasing. | for surface occupancy only where: | addition to the above, the |
| officer may modify the area | Active Leks: | | an exception is granted, as | Authorized Officer may consider |
| subject to the stipulation or the | **Exceptions or | | described above, for the | and grant a modification if after |
| NSO criteria if an environmental | modifications may be | | primary disturbance (e.g., well | documenting the review of |
| record of review finds that a | considered if, in consultation | i si | pad, compressor station), and | available information, in |
| portion of the NSO area is | with the State of Colorado, it | also also | the potential associated | coordination with the |
| nonessential, or it is identified | can be demonstrated that there | Prepublication version will be portion will be possible to the property will be property | infrastructure related to the | appropriate State agency, that a |
| | is no impact on Greater Sage- | -11 | development is not individually | portion of the NSO area is |
| | Grouse based on one of the | 410 4 41. | precluded by other GRSG | nonessential (e.g., the lek upon |
| criteria are inadequate or overly | following: | Ca Mar O | actions (e.g., roads, pipelines, | which the NSO is centered is |
| protective for maintaining the | Topography/areas of non- | 13/10 111 100 1 | power lines that could | not active), or it is identified |
| function or utility of the site for | habitat create an effective | all the ill be | otherwise be considered | through scientific research or |
| the seasonal habitat, life-history, | barrier to impacts. | 66 60 MIL. OC. | through a ROW). | monitoring that the existing area |
| or behavioral needs of the | No additional impacts | 16 Th 4 16 90 | While the NSO stipulation could | (i.e., the active lek and associated |
| Greater Sage-Grouse, including | would be realized above | 6 6 6 3 3 is | be modified for these additional | buffer) is inadequate or overly |
| (but not limited to) reproductive | those created by existing | My We sills at | developments, they must still | protective for maintaining the |
| display, daytime loafing/staging | major infrastructure (for | cull of Gib | comply with other GRSG | function or utility of the site for |
| activities, and nesting. | example, State Highway | republication at the poly of t | management actions (e.g., | the seasonal habitat, life-history, |
| | 13). | 0 1 200 37 | mitigation, disturbance cap, | or behavioral needs of the |
| | The exception or | *6, VL " U. | minerals/energy density, seasonal | GRSG, including (but not limited |
| | modification precludes or | 19, 64, 31 | restrictions, RDFs, etc.) if an | to) reproductive display, daytime |
| | offsets greater potential | 3. TE. 411. | exception to the NSO is granted. | loafing/staging activities, and |
| | impacts if the action were | 1/4 2/ | exception to the river is granteen | nesting. |
| 1 | proposed on adjacent | D. 76, | Prior to modifying the area | |
| | parcels (for example, due | III. | subject to the NSO stipulation, | |
| | to landownership | 200 | the potential modification shall be | |
| | patterns). | | subject to public review for at | |
| -1 | **In order to approve exceptions or | Mexpent wilders document that may be dister. A Register to dister. The final nay be distered. The final nay be dister | least a 30-day period (e.g., could | |
| | modifications to this lease | | be part of the APD NEPA | |
| | stipulation, the Authorized Officer | | process). | |
| | must obtain: agreement, including | | <u>'</u> | |
| | written justification, between the | | If the area (neighborhood cluster) | |
| | BLM District Managers and CPW | | associated with the proposed | |
| | that the proposed action satisfies at | | exception has met one of the | |
| | least one of the criteria listed above. | | adaptive management thresholds | |
| | | | (hard or soft) (see Section | |
| | | | 2.5.13), no exceptions would be | |
| | | | considered until the causal factor | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|----------------------|
| (See above.) | • CO: | (See above.) | analysis is completed. If the causal | (See above.) |
| | NSO-2 – One Mile from Active | | factor analysis concludes that | |
| | Leks to the Remainder of PHMA: | | development associated with the | |
| | **Modification: The BLM will | | type of activity seeking the | |
| | grant modifications (changes to | | exception is or could contribute | |
| | the stipulation either temporarily | | to the threshold being met or not | |
| | or for the term of either part of | | recovering, no modification would | |
| | the entire lease) to NSO-2 after | | be granted. If the analysis is | |
| | consultation with the State of | i i | inconclusive on cause, | |
| | Colorado, consistent with MD- | ars | modifications could be | |
| | SSS-3 and based on the following | 70 | considered. | |
| | factors: | 30 00 | "60 '10. !O. | |
| | It is determined by | 410 4 411 | St. Dr old | |
| | evaluating the proposed | . C. 3 10 2 0 | 45, 10 | |
| | lease activities that adverse | Prepublication at the property of the property | be granted. If the analysis is inconclusive on cause, modifications could be considered. | |
| | or undesirable impacts to | 110 et 5 11 De 1 | 14, 24, 201, | |
| | Greater Sage-Grouse can | co co illi co | 0,119 | |
| | be avoided based on site- | 110, 100 " W. 40 | "No you | |
| | specific terrain, | et al al is | 1,160 | |
| | topography and habitat | M We sills of 12 | 16/ | |
| | type, or offset consistent | I THE THE | 2 | |
| | with criterion #2 below. | " Oca Me dis b | | |
| | For example, in the vicinity | 90 1.000 24 | | |
| | of leks, local terrain | of Roman | | |
| | features such as ridges and | igto OR at | | |
| | ravines may shield | M. E. W. | | |
| | potential disruptive | Mr. F. J. | | |
| ~ | impacts from affecting | 21 011 | | |
| | nearby Greater Sage- | in in | | |
| | Grouse habitat. | CUI | | |
| | or to late | 00 | | |
| | It is determined, based on | | | |
| | site-specific information | | | |
| | (using tools such as the | | | |
| | Habitat Assessment | | | |
| | Framework, the Colorado | | | |
| | Habitat Exchange Habitat | | | |
| | Quantification Tool, or | | | |
| | others), that the impacts | | | |
| | anticipated by the | | | |
| | proposed activity would be | | | |
| | with the State of Colorado | | | |
| | (as a requirement of State | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|---|--|---------------|----------------------|
| (See above.) | offset through | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| | compensatory mitigation | | | |
| | developed in coordination | | | |
| | policy or authorization or | | .6 | |
| | as offered voluntarily by | | Mis | |
| | leaseholder) that meets | | E LI WI | |
| | accepted principles of | | 0, 10 01, 0 | |
| | compensatory mitigation | | 10 0, 6 7 11. | |
| | including: | , sil | TO THE GO | |
| | Achieving measurable | ars. | July 1 Che Of | |
| | outcomes for Greater | 70 | So di inis an | |
| | Sage-Grouse habitat | on he | *60 110 cio. | |
| | function that are at | tio " fil. | St. Prais | |
| | as offered voluntarily by leaseholder) that meets accepted principles of compensatory mitigation including: Achieving measurable outcomes for Greater Sage-Grouse habitat function that are at least equal to the lost or degraded values; Accounting for a level of risk that the mitigation action may fail or not persist for the full duration of the impact. **If, prior to development, the county in which the tract is located provides information indicating that an NSO stipulation can be excepted or modified based on a reasonable understanding of likely development because either of the criterion above would apply, the BLM would manage that lease accordingly unless the BLM determines, at the APD stage and in consultation with the State | republication version will be possible to the final document will be possible to the final docum | 4, 10 | |
| | or degraded values; | Will think t | ve, 11 v. | |
| | Accounting for a level | JID 45 11 10 1 | 11, 01, 01, | |
| | of risk that the | 66 60 vill 00 | 0,119 | |
| | mitigation action may | 16 16 " W. 90 | *Ho - 4 or | |
| | fail or not persist for | 1 et al :6 | 1160 | |
| | the full duration of the | M We sills of 12 | 16/ | |
| | impact. | L'all all the | 2 | |
| | **If, prior to development, the | " Oca Me dis b | | |
| | county in which the tract is | 90 11.000 27 | | |
| | located provides information | rol. K. Wa | | |
| | indicating that an NSO | igt of at | | |
| | stipulation can be excepted or | 11- EL "Ha | | |
| | modified based on a reasonable | ' Harris | | |
| | understanding of likely | 31 011 | | |
| | development because either of | in in | | |
| | the criterion above would apply, | CUI | | |
| | the BLM would manage that | 0 | | |
| | lease accordingly unless the BLM | | | |
| | determines, at the APD stage | | | |
| | and in consultation with the State | | | |
| | of Colorado, that neither of the | | | |
| | criteria identified above is met. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | In order to approve exceptions or | | | |
| | modifications to this lease | | | |
| | stipulation, the Authorized Officer | | | |
| | must obtain agreement, including | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|--|----------------|----------------------|
| (See above.) | written justification, between the | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| | BLM District Manager and CPW | | | |
| | that the proposed action satisfies at | | | |
| | least one of the criteria listed above. | | . 6 | |
| | NV/CA: | | Nis | |
| | The only language for | | 6 61. | |
| | modifications and waivers related | | 0, 13 01,0 | |
| | to timing stipulations. The | | 10 01 0 111. | |
| | language from the NV/CA 2019 | lia li | ve the so | |
| | ARMPA is located in that section. | ar's | all a graph of | |
| | | 10 | 50 4 11 119 11 | |
| | • UT: | 30 70 | 160 1/0. 10. | |
| | • NV/CA: The only language for modifications and waivers related to timing stipulations. The language from the NV/CA 2019 ARMPA is located in that section. • UT: The BLM Authorized Officer may grant a modification to a fluid mineral lease no surface occupancy stipulation only where an exception is granted, as described above, for the primary disturbance (e.g., well pad, compressor station). A modification to the no surface occupancy stipulation could be considered for the associated infrastructure related to the development that are not individually precluded by other Greater Sage-Grouse actions (e.g., roads, pipelines, power lines). While the no surface occupancy stipulation could be modified for this infrastructure, it must still comply with other | prepublication version will be possible to the property will be possible to the property of th | Sr. 0 019 | |
| | grant a modification to a fluid | . C3 12 0 | 4, 10 | |
| | mineral lease no surface | Allo the Ch | ve, 11 v. | |
| | occupancy stipulation only where | THE ST STORY | 14. 04. 01. | |
| | an exception is granted, as | op och illi och | 0 119 | |
| | described above, for the primary | 10, 100 " 11, 90 | the grant | |
| | disturbance (e.g., well pad, | 1 et al 3 :6 | "ies | |
| | compressor station). A | M We sills of 1 | 10/ | |
| | modification to the no surface | L'alli Caralle | 2 ` | |
| | occupancy stipulation could be | Ocallo dis b | | |
| | considered for the associated | 0 1000 27 | | |
| | infrastructure related to the | "El F We | | |
| | development that are not | istop at | | |
| | individually precluded by other | JIEI WHO | | |
| | Greater Sage-Grouse actions | ' Waster | | |
| | (e.g., roads, pipelines, power | 31 611 | | |
| | lines). While the no surface | MI | | |
| | occupancy stipulation could be | Chi | | |
| | modified for this infrastructure, it | 0~ | | |
| | must still comply with other | | | |
| | Greater Sage-Grouse | | | |
| | management contained in MA- | | | |
| | SSS-3. | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| • CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, | • ID, MT/DK, OR, WY: Same as | No WEMs would be necessary, | Waiver: The Authorized Officer | Same as Alternative 4. |
| UT: None | Alternative I. | since all GRSG habitat | may consider and grant a waiver | |
| WY: NSO 0.6 lek buffer in | | management areas would be | of the NSO stipulation on an | |
| PHMA: | • CO: | closed to new fluid mineral | existing lease after documenting, | |
| Waiver: This stipulation may be | NSO-1 (Within One mile of | leasing. | in coordination with the | |
| waived over the entire lease if, in | Active Leks) and NSO-2 (One | | appropriate State agency, that the | |
| coordination with the state | Mile from Active Leks to the | | lease with the GRSG NSO | |
| wildlife agency, it is determined | Remainder of PHMA): | | stipulation is no longer in PHMA | |
| that the Greater Sage-Grouse lek | No waivers are authorized unless | Si | (and IHMA in Idaho). This would | |
| has been classified as unactive as | the area or resource mapped as | C. C. | only be applicable on leases that | |
| determined by the state wildlife | possessing the attributes | 70 | were issued when the parcel was | |
| agency. Any changes to this | protected by the stipulation is | on he | in PHMA, then the PHMA | |
| stipulation will be made in | determined during collaboration | TIO " TI | boundaries were subsequently | |
| accordance with the land use | with the State of Colorado to | republication version was the property will be procured to the final document will be procured t | adjusted through the appropriate | |
| plan and/or the regulatory | lack those attributes or potential | 17/10 111. 100 1 | planning process (i.e., plan | |
| provisions for such changes. (For | attributes. A 30-day public notice | all the II be | maintenance or amendment). | |
| guidance on the use of this | and comment period is required | 66 60 MILL OC. | - PU - 11P | |
| stipulation, see BLM Manuals | before waiver of a stipulation. | 16 16 14 19 19 | Prior to waiving the NSO | |
| 1624 and 3101.) | Waivers would require BLM | 6 64 31 19 | stipulation for a given area, the | |
| | State Director approval. | M Me sille of | potential waiver shall be subject | |
| | Str. B | republices the period of the property of the period of the | to public review for at least a 30- | |
| | NV/CA: | 100 The dis 10 | day period (e.g., could be part of | |
| | Waiver: The stipulation may be | 0 1 200 33 | the APD NEPA process). | |
| | waived if the authorized officer, | 16, VL 14, | | |
| | in consultation with the | 19, 64, 31 | | |
| | appropriate state agency | 3. TE. 440 | | |
| | (NDOW, SETT, and/or CDFW), | Mexpent windlows document that may be all when the start may be all wh | | |
| ^ | determines that the entire | (a. 00) | | |
| | leasehold is within unsuitable | 'III' | | |
| | habitat (see exceptions above) | 200 | | |
| | and would not result in direct, | | | |
| | indirect, or cumulative impacts | | | |
| | to GRSG and/or its habitat. | | | |
| | · DT: We | | | |
| | The PLM Andread Officers | | | |
| | The BLM Authorized Officer may | | | |
| | grant a waiver to a fluid mineral lease no surface occupancy | | | |
| | | | | |
| | stipulation if, through the | | | |
| | appropriate planning process | | | |
| | (i.e., plan maintenance, amendment) the area is no | | | |
| | | | | |
| | longer within PHMA. | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|---|--|---|------------------------|
| | | | IT/DK, WY, CO, OR, and UT), | |
| ID, NV/CA do not have NSO | • CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, | No WEMs would be necessary, | Exception: The Authorized | Same as Alternative 4. |
| for GRSG in GHMA. | UT, WY: Same as Alternative | since all GRSG habitat | Officer may grant an exception if | |
| While UT has NSO on leks in | 1. | management areas would be | an environmental record of | |
| GHMA, they are associated | | closed to new fluid mineral | review determines that the action, | |
| with RMP decisions that pre- | | leasing. | as proposed or conditioned, | |
| date the 2015 amendment. As | | | would not impair the function or | |
| such, no new stipulations or | | . (| utility of the site for the current | |
| WEMs were considered in the | | .61 | or subsequent seasonal habitat, | |
| 2015 ARMPA. | | .013 | life-history, or behavioral needs of | |
| CO: w/in 2 miles of active | | 700 | GRSG due to site-specific terrain | |
| leks: | | in the | and habitat features, such as | |
| Exception: In consultation with | | Till of the | topographic features that would | |
| the State of Colorado, an | his is an unofficial to do on the his is an unofficial to the his in the his | prepublication verse, and prepublication verse, and a prepublication verse, and a prepublication verse, and a prepublication of the | reduce the habitat impacts by | |
| exception to occupancy of the | | Plication, | shielding nearby habitat from | |
| surface associated with GRSG | | JUL 45 11 6 1 | disruptive factors. | |
| NSO-46e(2) in GHMA could be | | ek sec Milling | 10 . UP | |
| granted on a one-time basis (any | | 10 10 10 | An exception could also be | |
| occupancy must be removed | :21 | 16, 61, 31 18 | granted if it can be demonstrated | |
| within I year of approval) based | ci Cle v | M. We Elli St. | by a biologist with GRSG | |
| on an analysis of the following | All B | cuine set in | experience, based on site-specific | |
| factors: | 70.00 | 400 The dis 1 p | information (using State mitigation | |
| Location of proposed lease | n. The | 0 1. 500 700 | tools such as Habitat Equivalency Analysis or Habitat Quantification | |
| activities in relation to | 21, 4. 113, | 46, V 4 4. | Tool, or other State mitigation | |
| critical GRSG habitat areas | is an in | is is war | programs), that the impacts | |
| as identified by factors | ·6 1 70 61 78 | 3 715 FILE | anticipated by the proposed | |
| including, but not limited | Wis Chilly K | all and | activity would be offset through | |
| to, average male lek | 100 131101 | ia de | compensatory mitigation | |
| attendance and/or | 0, 4, 18, 10, | THE STATE OF THE S | developed in coordination with | |
| important seasonal habitat | 131 1 131 | 200 | the appropriate State agency that | |
| An evaluation of the | 20 31 1 1 9 | | meets principles of GRSG | |
| potential threats from | Jr. Our W. Ze | | compensatory mitigation | |
| proposed lease activities | S. The Br th. | | identified in the RMP, including | |
| that may affect the local | 40.00 | | providing for no net loss of | |
| population as compared to benefits that could be | , the | | habitat. | |
| penelits that could be | • | Mexpects will be postering the property of the | | |
| accomplished through compensatory or off-site | | | | |
| mitigation (see Chapter 2, | | | | |
| Section 2.6.3 of the | | | | |
| Proposed LUPA/Final EIS, | | | | |
| Regional Mitigation) | | | | |
| regional mugation) | | | l . | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--|-----------------|---|----------------------|
| o An evaluation of the | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| proposed lease activities in | 1 | | | |
| relation to the site-specific | | | | |
| terrain and habitat | | | . 6 | |
| features. For example, in | | | Mis | |
| the vicinity of leks, local | | | 6 41. | |
| terrain features such as | | | 0, 19 01,0 | |
| ridges and ravines may | | | 10 01 0 111. | |
| reduce the habitat | | lia. | Le Me CO | |
| importance and shield | | ars | July 1 Who Of | |
| nearby habitat from | | 10 | So y III alle all | |
| disruptive factors. | | 30 70 | "60 '10. !O. | |
| | | 110 11. | St. Dr Sts | |
| MT/DK: | Chis is an unofficial of the Brand of the Brand of the BLM Nation of the Bland of t | 163 May 0 | and in the BLI in steel in the only version of the only version of the relied upon. | |
| Miles City (w/in 0.6 miles of a lek | | MIL ALL OF | ve, 11 v. | |
| in GHMA: The AO, may grant an | | THE STATE | 14. 04. 01. | |
| Exception if the action will not | | eb ec illi oci | 0 119 | |
| result in sage-grouse lek | | 16 160 " W. 90 | "Ho - 4 or | |
| abandonment. | | 61 W 31 :6 | 1160 | |
| South Dakota (w/in .06 miles of | Cla | M We sills of 1 | 10/ | |
| leks in GHMA and in winter | 8910 C | L'alli Circle | 2 ` | |
| habitat): The AO may grant an | 201 | Ocalle dis b | | |
| Exception only where the | M. The | 00 1000 27 | | |
| proposed action: | 10 11 12 | " El. K. We | | |
| Will not have direct, | S. Mr. Alle | ist or at | | |
| indirect, or cumulative | 13 26, 111, 30 | JIEL HOS | | |
| effects on GRSG or its | 19 111 11 Be | 'Wall | | |
| habitat; or | (Co alla VV | 31 61, | | |
| ii. Is proposed to be | 90 410 CK, 101 | MI | | |
| undertaken as an alternative | Wall Mr. Atla | -CO. | | |
| to a similar action occurring | eta al Na d | 0 | | |
| on a nearby parcel and will | 1/2 -U. M. 60 | | | |
| provide a clear conservation | 50 x10. 21, x10 | | | |
| gain to GRSG. | 730 | | | |
| Exceptions based on | 12 "He | | | |
| conservation gain (ii) may only be | 2. | | | |
| considered in: | | | | |
| a) PHMAs of mixed ownership | | | | |
| where Federal minerals | | | | |
| underlie less than fifty | | | | |
| percent (50%) of the total | | | | |
| surface, or | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|----------------------|
| b) Areas of the public lands | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| where the proposed | | | | |
| Exception is an alternative | | | | |
| to an action occurring on a | | | | |
| nearby parcel subject to a | | | Nis | |
| valid Federal fluid mineral | | | 13 133 | |
| lease existing as of the date | | | 0, 3 3/10 | |
| of this RMP. (See further | | | U 01 0 111 | |
| requirements in the WEMs | his is an unofficial to do cument similar do cument similar de cument similar de cument de cumen | i i | se the co | |
| preamble near the beginning | | 219. | Mi Ji No Of | |
| of the Appendix G.1.) | | 10 | 50 111 119 1 | |
| Billings (w/in .06 miles of leks in | | 301 120 | 160 10, 10, | |
| GHMA): A Modification or | | 410. 411 | Sto. Ou ors. | |
| Exception may only be | | 1 C 3 L 3 L 3 | D. 46, 16. | |
| considered where the proposed | | A South Alle | ne 14 n. | |
| action is determined to be non- | | 110 45 1100 | 14, 24, 01, | |
| habitat, the area is not used by | | op cor ill co | 0.110 | |
| GRSG, and the proposed action | | 16, 06 " W. 40 | "He You | |
| would not have direct, indirect, | | et of alice | 1,160 | |
| or cumulative effects to GRSG or | ia. | M Je, allo 1/2 | ·eli | |
| its habitat. The determination | 410 21 | 1, 111, 11, 46, | 2 | |
| would be made by the BLM in | 01, 0 | De Me Ties A | | |
| consultation with a team of | inche | 90 1,000,01 | | |
| agency GRSG experts, including | 7 7 7 | or. Re Ma. | | |
| an expert from the state wildlife | S. 24. Jilo | Sto DA AL | | |
| agency, USFWS, and BLM/USFS. | is "61, !!!! | M. E. W. | | |
| The State Director must have | is 111, 15, 00 | S Mr F. I. | | |
| received a determination before | W. Co. Illa VI | 31 6/1 | | |
| approving any Modification or | 40 x13. 161 01 | ine | | |
| Exception. All Modifications or | o alle Mr. allo | CUI | | |
| Exceptions must be approved by | eta alla Mary | 0 | | |
| the State Director. | 102 43, 11 1, 00 | | | |
| Billings: winter habitat: The AO, | 10, 10, 17 WE | | | |
| after coordination with the state | 137, 12, | | | |
| wildlife management agency, may | his is an unofficial of the Bland of the Bland of the Bland NEPA Reconstitution at the Bland of | | | |
| grant an Exception if the action | 11. | | on of this are Billing of steel in the only version of the only ve | |
| will not result impair the function | | | | |
| or suitability of the winter range | | | | |
| habitat. | | | | |
| HiLine (w/in 0.6 miles of leks in | | | | |
| GHMA): The AO, in consultation | | | | |
| with Montana Fish, Wildlife and | | | | |
| Parks (MFWP), may grant an | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|---|---------------|--|----------------------|
| Exception if portions of the area | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| can be occupied without | | | | |
| adversely affecting Greater Sage- | | | | |
| Grouse leks. | | | | |
| Lewistown (winter habitat): The | | | vis | |
| Authorized Officer, after | | | 17 173 | |
| coordination with the state | | | 0, 13 3/10 | |
| wildlife management agency, may | | | U 01 0 111 | |
| grant an Exception if the action | | i i | se the co | |
| will not impair the function or | | ar's. | July 1 - He Of | |
| suitability of the crucial winter | | 10 | 50 4 111 -119 -17 | |
| range habitat. | | 30 00 | 160 10, 10, | |
| Lewistown (w/in 0.6 miles of leks | | 410. 411 | Sto OU ars | |
| in GHMA): The Authorized | | · c3 . 32 0 | 15, 16. | |
| Officer may grant Exception if the | | Allo the of b | ve, 11 v. | |
| action will not result in Greater | | 110 45 11 0 | 14, 24, 01, | |
| Sage-Grouse lek abandonment. | | co co illi co | 91,16 | |
| OR: NSO within I mile of | | 16. 100 M. 40 | "Ho y a. | |
| pending or occupied lek in | | et all al is | 1160 | |
| GHMA: | Cla | M We sille Il | 16/ | |
| Exception : The BLM authorized | 8900 | I THIS IS THE | 2 | |
| Officer may grant an exception, | 201.0 | Ocallo dis b | | |
| in coordination with the ODFW, | MIL THE | 00 1000 34 | | |
| during project implementation | 121 | relief Kills | | |
| and if BMPs (e.g., anti-perch | S. W. Wille | istop at | | |
| devices for raptors) are | 13 26, 111, 30 | JIEI WYC | | |
| implemented. | vie illing Be | ' Waster | | |
| <u> </u> | his is an unofficial of the distribution of the Bland NEPARON Action at the distribution of the Bland the distribution of the Bland the distribution of the Bland the | 31 61, | on of this are BLM in same or the only version of the only version of the relied upon. | |
| WY: NSO 0.25 lek buffer | 90 July 51, 10, | MI | | |
| outside PHMA: | ALL ALL | -CV | | |
| Exception : The authorized | -Sto al No d | 0 | | |
| officer may grant an exception if | " Po do M. Co | | | |
| an environmental record of | or rio all rive | | | |
| review determines that the | Mac D | | | |
| action, as proposed or | L We | | | |
| conditioned, would not impair | 1, | | | |
| the function or utility of the site | | | | |
| for the current or subsequent | | | | |
| seasonal habitat, life-history, or | | | | |
| behavioral needs of Greater Sage- | | | | |
| Grouse. The BLM can and does | | | | |
| grant exceptions if the BLM, in | | | | |
| coordination with the WGFD, | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| determines that granting an | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| exception would not adversely | | | | |
| impact the population being | | | | |
| protected. | | | | |
| ID: None | • CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, | No WEMs would be necessary, | Modification: The Authorized | Same as Alternative 4. |
| CO: w/in 2 miles of active | UT, WY: Same as Alternative | since all GRSG habitat | Officer may grant a modification | |
| leks: | 1. | management areas would be | after a review of available | |
| In consultation with the State of | his is an unofficial to document similar documents in the property of the prop | closed to new fluid mineral | information, and in coordination | |
| Colorado, a modification | | leasing. | with the applicable state agency, | |
| (changes to the stipulation either | his is an unofficial of the Brain of the Bra | , ers | documents that a portion of the | |
| temporarily or for the term of | | 70 | NSO area is nonessential, or it is | |
| either part of or the entire lease) | | on he | identified through scientific | |
| to GRSG NSO-46e(2) could be | | The state of | research or monitoring that the | |
| granted based on an analysis of | | :: Ca . Nat 0 | existing area is inadequate or | |
| the following factors: | | 17/10 111. 100 1 | overly protective for maintaining | |
| Location of proposed lease | | all ste il be i | the function or utility of the site | |
| activities in relation to | | 66 60 vill 00 | for the seasonal habitat, life- | |
| critical GRSG habitat areas | | 16 16 4 16 90 | history, or behavioral needs of the | |
| as identified by factors | | 61 W 31 18 | GRSG, including (but not limited | |
| including, but not limited | Cla | M Me sille of 1 | to) reproductive display, daytime | |
| to, average male lek | 8910 B | CUIT OF STORY | loafing/staging activities, and | |
| attendance and/or | 20, 6 | 100 4/40 dis 10 | nesting, considering both direct | |
| important seasonal habitat | M. The | 0 1000 00 | and indirect impacts from a | |
| An evaluation of the | 181: 12 | 161. VE 1410 | potential modification. | |
| potential threats from | is a windling | STOP AT | | |
| proposed lease activities | is de elle | DILLE ALLO | | |
| that may affect the local | Mis III W Ro | 14 4 | | |
| population as compared to | II. Occ. alls DV. | 3, 61, | | |
| benefits that could be | 90 TIO. CY 10 | , ILL | | |
| accomplished through | " SIL ML STI | CO | | |
| compensatory or off-site | est al No d | 0 | | |
| mitigation (see Chapter 2, | his is an unofficial of the Brands of the Blund of the Bl | | | |
| Section 2.6.3 of the | So the Or the | | | |
| Proposed LUPA/Final EIS, | 730 | | | |
| Regional Mitigation) | "No | | | |
| An evaluation of the | 4 | | | |
| proposed rease accivities in | | Mexpect will doc. Mexpent will doc. The final document that may be all the steriles and the steriles are all the s | | |
| relation to the site-specific | | | | |
| terrain and habitat | | | | |
| features. For example, in | | | | |
| the vicinity of leks, local | | | | |
| terrain features such as | | | | |
| ridges and ravines may | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|-----------------|------------------|----------------------|
| reduce the habitat | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| importance and shield | | | | |
| nearby habitat from | his is an unofficial to documents in the Brain of the Bra | | | |
| disruptive factors. | | | . 6 | |
| | | | Mis | |
| MT/DK: NSO 0.6 lek buffer in | | | E 11. 11 | |
| GHMA: | | | 0, 19 01, 1 | |
| Miles City: The AO, may modify | | | 10 01 0 111. | |
| the boundaries of the stipulated | | il a | Le Me CO | |
| area if portions of the leasehold | | ars. | July 1 Che Of | |
| are no longer within 6/10 mile of | | 70 | 50 4 11 1115 017 | |
| the perimeter of an active lek, or | | 30 No | *60 /10. 10. | |
| a portion of the habitat has been | | tio the | St. Prais | |
| altered to the point sage-grouse | | Ca Mar O | 115, 10 | |
| no longer occupy the site and | | Will think t | ve. 11 v. | |
| there is no likelihood of habitat | | JIL 45 11 10 11 | 11, 01, 01, | |
| capable of supporting sage-grouse | | 66 60 vill 00 | 911 | |
| being restored. | | 16 16 4 W. 90 | *Ho of | |
| South Dakota: No modifications. | | 61 00 31 is | lies | |
| Billings: Modification included in | Cla | M Me silve of 1 | 46, | |
| the exception language. | 890 01 | CUIT CIT CALL | S . | |
| Billings: winter habitat: The AO, | 0, 6 | 100 440 dis 10 | | |
| after coordination with the state | M. The | 0 1 000 00 | | |
| wildlife management agency, may | 181: 12 | 16, 6 K. W. | | |
| modify the boundaries of the | · E a Mi Mile | ist program | | |
| stipulated area if portions of the | is we ellison | 3. TE, The | | |
| leasehold no longer support | vis III IN BO | 14 26 | | |
| wintering wildlife | 1, 00° 3/1, 2V. | 3, 61, | | |
| HiLine (w/in 0.6 miles of leks in | 90 Allo (E.K. 10) | 11/1 | | |
| GHMA): The boundaries of the | 131, Mr. 311 | CO | | |
| stipulated area may be modified if | 128 31 1 No 9 | 3 | | |
| the AO, in consultation with | 110 010 M 10 | | | |
| of the area can be accurried | So the Br. the | | | |
| or the area can be occupied | Mo o | | | |
| Creator Sage Crouse lake The | "We | | | |
| nearby habitat from disruptive factors. • MT/DK: NSO 0.6 lek buffer in GHMA: Miles City: The AO, may modify the boundaries of the stipulated area if portions of the leasehold are no longer within 6/10 mile of the perimeter of an active lek, or a portion of the habitat has been altered to the point sage-grouse no longer occupy the site and there is no likelihood of habitat capable of supporting sage-grouse being restored. South Dakota: No modifications. Billings: Modification included in the exception language. Billings: winter habitat: The AO, after coordination with the state wildlife management agency, may modify the boundaries of the stipulated area if portions of the leasehold no longer support wintering wildlife HiLine (w/in 0.6 miles of leks in GHMA): The boundaries of the stipulated area may be modified if the AO, in consultation with MFWP, determines that portions of the area can be occupied without adversely affecting Greater Sage-Grouse leks. The AO, in consultation with MFWP, may also modify the size and shape of the area based on studies documenting actual | | | | |
| may also modify the size and | | | | |
| shape of the area based on | | | | |
| shape of the area based on studies documenting actual | | | | |
| habitat suitability and/or local | | | | |
| periods of actual use | | | | |
| perious of actual use | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--|-------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| Lewistown (winter habitat): The | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| Authorized Officer, after | | | | |
| coordination with the state | | | | |
| wildlife management agency, may | | | | |
| modify the boundaries of the | | | vis | |
| stipulated area if portions of the | | | 113 1133 | |
| leasehold no longer support | | | 0, 13 3/10 | |
| wintering wildlife. | | | U 01 0 111 | |
| Lewistown (w/in 0.6 miles of leks | | i i | se the co | |
| in GHMA): The Authorized | | 219. | Mi Ji No Of | |
| Officer may modify the | | 10 | 50 1111119 | |
| boundaries of the stipulation area | | 301 120 | 160 10, 10, | |
| if portions of the leasehold are | | 4,0, 411 | Sto. Ou ors. | |
| no longer within 0.6 miles of the | | 1 C 3 L 3 L 3 | D. 46, 16. | |
| perimeter of an active lek, or a | | A South office by | ne 14 n. | |
| portion of the habitat has been | | 10. 45 100 | W. W. Oli | |
| altered to the point Greater | | 20° CC ill Cl | 0.16 | |
| Sage-Grouse no longer occupy | | 16, 06 " W. 40 | "He You | |
| the site and there is no likelihood | | et of alice | 1,160 | |
| of habitat capable of supporting | ia. | M de cino 1/2 | ·eli | |
| Greater Sage-Grouse being | 410 21 | 1, 111, 41, 46, | 2 | |
| restored. | 01, 0 | occure is b | | |
| OR: NSO within I mile of | inche | 90 1,000,01 | | |
| pending or occupied lek in | 7 7 7 21 | or. Roman | | |
| GHMA: | 31 75. Jilo | . Groop at | | |
| Modification: None. | his is an unofficial to do on the his is an unofficial to the his indiana to the his indi | Mark. Ma | | |
| | 19 11 19 De | Mr. F. I. | | |
| WY: NSO 0.25 lek buffer | W. CO. 113 - V. | al elle | | |
| outside PHMA: | , 40 *19. 16 V | in me | | |
| Modification : The authorized | o We Alt High | CUI | | |
| officer may modify the area | to Ille Mary | 00 | | |
| subject to the stipulation or the | 102 43. 11 1.00 | | | |
| NSO criteria if an environmental | 10, 10, 17 WE | | | |
| record of review finds that a | 1311 1 | | | |
| portion of the NSO area is | H No | | | |
| nonessential, or it is identified | 41. | | | |
| coordination with the state wildlife management agency, may modify the boundaries of the stipulated area if portions of the leasehold no longer support wintering wildlife. Lewistown (w/in 0.6 miles of leks in GHMA): The Authorized Officer may modify the boundaries of the stipulation area if portions of the leasehold are no longer within 0.6 miles of the perimeter of an active lek, or a portion of the habitat has been altered to the point Greater Sage-Grouse no longer occupy the site and there is no likelihood of habitat capable of supporting Greater Sage-Grouse being restored. OR: NSO within I mile of pending or occupied lek in GHMA: Modification: None. WY: NSO 0.25 lek buffer outside PHMA: Modification: The authorized officer may modify the area subject to the stipulation or the NSO criteria if an environmental record of review finds that a portion of the NSO area is nonessential, or it is identified through scientific research or monitoring that the existing criteria are inadequate or overly protective for maintaining the | | | | |
| monitoring that the existing | | | | |
| criteria are inadequate or overly | | | | |
| protective for maintaining the | | | | |
| function or utility of the site for | | | | |
| the seasonal habitat, life-history, | | | | |
| or behavioral needs of the | | | | |

2-69

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Greater Sage-Grouse, including | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| (but not limited to) reproductive | | | | |
| display, daytime loafing/staging | | | | |
| activities, and nesting. | | | | |
| ID: None | • CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, | No WEMs would be necessary, | Waiver: This stipulation may be | Same as Alternative 4. |
| CO: w/in 2 miles of active | UT, WY: Same as Alternative | since all GRSG habitat | waived for a specific lek if, in | |
| leks: | I. | management areas would be | coordination with the appropriate | |
| No waivers are authorized | | closed to new fluid mineral | State agency, it is determined that | |
| unless the area or resource | | leasing. | the GRSG lek that was active has | |
| mapped as possessing the | | er's | been classified as inactive as | |
| attributes protected by the | | 10 | determined by the WAFWA | |
| stipulation is determined during | | on he | definitions and confirmed by the | |
| collaboration with the State of | | THE RELLEGIO | appropriate State agency. Prior to | |
| Colorado to lack those attributes | his is an unofficial of the district of the di | 1100 War 0 | waiving the stipulations, surveys | |
| or potential attributes. A 30-day | | Plie fline | should confirm that the lek is | |
| public notice and comment | | 2010 cts 11 b -1 | inactive and not moved to | |
| period is required before waiver | | eb ec Million | another location in the vicinity. | |
| of a stipulation. Waivers would | . < | 11 Th 12 11 90 | Any changes to this stipulation | |
| require BLM State Director | :21 | 1 6 61 31 19 | will be made in accordance with | |
| approval. | cicle | M. We Elli Cl. | the land use plan and/or the | |
| | Serie Bi | COLOR SELEN | regulatory provisions for such | |
| MT/DK: NSO 0.6 lek buffer in | .70.00 | 100 The dis 1 p | changes. | |
| GHMA: | M. The | 0 1. 500 3 | | |
| Miles City: The AO, may waive | 30 4. 13 | 46, D , 4 U. | | |
| this stipulation if no portion of | is an in | is come | | |
| the leasehold is within 6/10 mile | :6 1 Me 61 781 | 2 Mr. 111 | | |
| of the perimeter of an active lek. | MI CHINA K | all all | | |
| South Dakota: The AO, may waive this stipulation if no | 100 131.0K | ia Me. | | |
| portion of the leasehold is within | 0 41 E. 40. | -UII. | | |
| 6/10 mile of the perimeter of an | 43, 14 13c | 200 | | |
| active lek. | his is an unofficial of documents in the Blue of the Blue the Blue the Blue the desired the Blue the B | | | |
| Billings: The AO may waive this | Mr. M. No | | | |
| stipulation if: | July Br III. | | | |
| The entire leasehold is no | Ho ve | | | |
| longer within 0.6 mile of | 411 | | | |
| the perimeter of a lek; | | Mexpedt will dock the start of | | |
| o It is determined sage- | | | | |
| grouse are no longer a | | | | |
| BLM special status species | | | | |
| or federally threatened or | | | | |
| endangered; | | | | |
| 3 | l . | I . | I . | |

| Su | mmary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| 0 | No reasonable alternative | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| | development scenario | | | | |
| | exists; or | | | | |
| 0 | The habitat has been | | | . 6 | |
| | altered to the point sage- | | | Wis | |
| | grouse no longer use the | | | E II. WI | |
| | site and there is little | | | 0, 10 01,0 | |
| | likelihood of habitat | | | 10 0, 0 7 11. | |
| | capable of supporting sage- | | i si | TO THE SO | |
| | grouse being restored. | | er's | 34. 14 PHO 01 | |
| Billing | gs: winter habitat: The AO, | | 70 | 50 4 11 1115 017 | |
| after | coordination with the state | | prepublication version of the property of the property will be property of the | *60 TIP. CIO. | |
| wildli | fe management agency, may | | The tile | 5, 6, 01 | |
| waive | this stipulation if the entire | | Ca war of | 115. 10 | |
| lease | hold has been altered to an | | MILE ELL | We. 1/1 .U. | |
| exter | nt that future use by | | all ste il be i | 11, 04, 00, | |
| winte | ering wildlife is unlikely. | | 66 60 vill 00 | 911 | |
| HiLin | e (w/in 0.6 miles of leks in | | 16 16 4 16 90 | the of a | |
| GHM | A): The stipulation may be | | 61 W 31 :8 | 116 | |
| waive | ed if the AO, in consultation | Cla | M Me sille of 1 | 16, | |
| with | MFWP, determines that no | 8910 01 | CUIT OF GIRE | ટ ` | |
| porti | on of the leasehold is within | 20, 6 | 100 4/40 dis 10 | | |
| 0.6 m | ile of the perimeter of an | M. The | 0 1 000 00 | | |
| active | e lek. | 181: 12 | *61. V L . U. | | |
| Lewis | stown (winter habitat): The | is a chi will | 19 Ph 31 | | |
| Auth | orized Officer, after | is de ellison | 9, 1E, 4/10 | | |
| coor | dination with the state | vis III IV RO | 14 4 | | |
| wildli | te management agency, may | 1. Oc. 3/1, 2V. | 3, 61, | | |
| waive | this stipulation if the entire | 90 Atla E. 10 | , Ill. | | |
| lease | hold has been altered to an | 1311 Mr. 311 | -CV | | |
| exter | it, future use by wintering | 105 21 1 No d | 0 | | |
| WIIDII | te is unlikely. | 110 OLO MI SO | | | |
| Lewis | Stown (W/In U.6 miles of leks | So the Or the | | | |
| IN GF | nivia): The Authorized | Ma C | | | |
| OTTIC | er may waive this stipulation | "We | | | |
| IT NO | portion of the leasenoid is | | | | |
| withii | n u.o miles of the perimeter | | | | |
| or an | active lek | | | | |
| . 0 | D. NISO suithin I mile of | | | on of this are all in same or the only version of the only version of the relied upon. | |
| _ | | | | | |
| | nding or occupied lek in | | | | |
| | HMA: | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--|-----------------|--|----------------------|
| Waiver: The BLM Field Manager | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| may waive application of the | | | | |
| above use restrictions and | | | | |
| meeting objectives within general | | | . 6 | |
| habitat if off-site mitigation were | | | His | |
| successfully completed in priority | | | e the M | |
| habitat or opportunity areas, | | | 0, 10 01,0 | |
| following discussions with the | | | 10 0, 6 7 11. | |
| BLM and ODFW. Even in | | , GI | TO THE SO | |
| situations where use restrictions | | .0.13 | Mi in chi Oi | |
| are waived in general habitat, to | | 100 | 20 4 11 MIS ON | |
| avoid direct disturbance or | | on the | ter The Ele | |
| mortality of GRSG, disturbances | | The state | 15° x P .0.15 | |
| would not be approved during | | "CO "NO D | 200,10 | |
| the sensitive seasons. | | Pli ti ve , | Je 417 20. | |
| WY: NSO 0.25 lek buffer | | JUL 612 11 1 61 | 11. 01. 00. | |
| • VV 1: NSO 0.25 lek buπer outside PHMA: | | 16 VEC 1/11 100 | ve int | |
| Outside PHMA: | | 1, 4h 44 10 | 41, 60 | |
| Waiver: This stipulation may be waived over the entire lease if, in | :31 | 10, 61, 78, 18 | alle | |
| coordination with the state | CiCICI | M. We Ell, OL | 10 | |
| wildlife agency, it is determined | offi, B. | chine ist n | Ŏ. | |
| that the Greater Sage-Grouse lek | 30.00 | 400 11, coll of | | |
| has been classified as unactive as | 20. 11. 21 | of. Bowles | | |
| determined by the state wildlife | 31, 21. 11/0 | CTO OA . T. | | |
| agency. Any changes to this | is el in | IIS EL, Wa | | |
| stipulation will be made in | 15' 11 , 5' 20' | S Mr F LI | | |
| accordance with the land use plan | 41, CO. 113 VE | M. Sur | | |
| and/or the regulatory provisions | 700 x131 181 01 | ic The | | |
| for such changes. (For guidance | alle Mr. Filo | CU | | |
| on the use of this stipulation, see | eta III Mart | 00 | | |
| BLM Manuals 1624 and 3101.) | his is an unofficial of the distantial NEPARES TO THE DESTRUCTION OF T | | on of this are BLM in steed in the only version of the original upon. The relied upon. | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| · | Cont | rolled Surface Use: Disturband | e Cap | |
| CO, ID, MT/DK and OR did | • CO, ID, MT/DK, OR, WY: | No WEMs would be necessary, | All States: | Same as Alternative 4, except in |
| not include the disturbance | Same as Alternative 1. | since all GRSG habitat | Exception: The Authorized | WY and MT where the project |
| cap as a stipulation. As such, | • CA: | management areas would be | Officer may consider fluid mineral | scale disturbance cap is 5%. All |
| there were no WEMs. | New development/activity would | closed to new fluid mineral | infrastructure on public lands that | states would also include the |
| CA: No exceptions. | not exceed the 3% disturbance | leasing. | could result in exceeding the 3 | following additional exceptions |
| • NV: | cap protocol at the project scale | | percent disturbance cap at the | included under criteria #3: |
| Nevada lands only—Any | in PHMA, except in situations | . (| project scale only if the following | Compensatory mitigation would |
| exceptions to the disturbance | where a net conservation gain to | prepublication version will be possible to the property of the property will be possible to the property of the property | three criteria are met: | not have to be completed and |
| cap may be approved by the | the species is achieved as a | .015 | I) with concurrence from the | functioning prior to being able to |
| Authorized Officer only with the | component of compliance with a | 100 | State Director, | grant the exception. To grant the |
| concurrence of the State | state mitigation plan, program, or | in "he | 2) if the environmental review | activity based on compensatory |
| Director. The Authorized Officer | authority. | atile of the | document(s) explains how the | mitigation, prior to construction, |
| may not grant an exception | | "Co Was b | RMP GRSG goals and objectives | surface occupancy, or surface |
| unless the NDOW, the USFWS, | • NV: | Plistine, | will be met, including compliance | disturbing activities the |
| and the BLM unanimously find | Nevada lands only— | JUL 45 11 6 | with the RMP's GRSG mitigation | compensation project must be |
| that the proposed action satisfies | New development/activity would | et sec villing | strategy, documenting efforts to: | planned, funded, and approved by |
| the conditions stated in the | not exceed the 3% disturbance | Prepublication verse, who have the property will be proposed to the property will be proposed to the property by the property | First avoid impacts by locating | the operator, BLM, surface |
| stipulation. Initially, the technical | cap protocol at the project scale | 10 01 231 19 | the proposed project in areas | owner, and in coordination with |
| team would make such finding; | in PHMA, except in situations | Meume finater is document that that may be all the finate may be all that may be all the finate may be all t | outside of PHMA, collocated | the appropriate State agency. |
| the team consists of a field | where a net conservation gain to | Chine ist w | within the footprint of existing | However, due to the uncertainty associated with whether the |
| biologist or other GRSG expert | the species is achieved as a | 400 The dis 1 p | disturbance, or in areas of non- | |
| from each respective agency. In | component of compliance with a | 0 1. 562 3 | habitat shall be documented. | compensatory mitigation project would successfully offset the |
| the event the initial finding were | state mitigation plan, program, or | 46, V # U. | Second to minimize impacts by | impacts, one of the following |
| not unanimous, the finding may | authority, such as required by the | is is war | applying project design features | would need to apply: |
| be elevated to the BLM State | State of Nevada's Executive | 3 Mr. 111 | shall be documented (e.g., use | the area of habitat |
| Director, USFWS State Ecological | Order 2018-32 (and any future | 1/10/12 | of RDFs, buffer distances, | improvement associated with |
| Services Director, and NDOW | regulations adopted by the State | ia de. | seasonal limitations, etc.). | compensatory mitigation |
| Director for final resolution. In | of Nevada regarding | - Ull | Third, only then to consider | would need to increase to |
| the event their recommendation | compensatory mitigation, | 200 | using compensatory mitigation. | account for a level of risk that |
| were not unanimous to grant the | consistent with federal law). | | It is important to note | the compensatory mitigation |
| exception, the exception would | M. W. W. | | compensatory mitigation may | action may fail or not persist |
| not be granted. | UT: The 3 percent cap may be | | not be appropriate in some GRSG habitats/populations. | for the full duration of the |
| • LIT. No overations | exceeded at the proposed | | Before using compensatory | impact based on the type of |
| • UT: No exceptions. | project analysis scale if a technical | | mitigation as an approach for | specific compensatory |
| WY (Core only): | team determines that site-specific | | this exception, the | project(s) and ecological |
| Exception: The authorized | Greater Sage-Grouse habitat and | | effectiveness of whether | conditions, or |
| officer may grant an exception if an environmental record of | population information, combined | | compensatory mitigation can | The operator provides long- |
| review determines that the | with project design elements | | offset impacts to the affected | term assurances that the |
| action, as proposed or | indicates the project will improve | | habitat and associated | compensatory project would |
| conditioned, would not impair | the condition of Greater Sage- | | population without risking | become functional (e.g., |
| • | Grouse habitat within the | | impacts to those GRSG | project maintenance or |
| the function or utility of the site | Grouse nabitat within the | | impacts to those divod | project manitemance of |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|
| for the current or subsequent | proposed project analysis area. | (See above.) | habitats and populations shall | retreatment, easements, |
| seasonal habitat, life-history, or | Factors considered by the team | | consider local biological | mitigation bonding – BLM H- |
| behavioral needs of Greater Sage- | are in Appendix E and in MA-SSS- | | considerations, including, but | 1794-1, section 7.3, etc.). |
| Grouse. The BLM can and does | 3B (of the 2019 Utah GRSG | | not limited to population size, | Compensatory mitigation rate |
| grant exceptions if the BLM, in | ARMPA). Such exceptions to the | | connectivity to other | would need to consider number |
| coordination with the WGFD, | 3 percent disturbance cap may be | | populations, availability of | of acres necessary to offset acres |
| determines that granting an | approved by the Authorized | | existing functional habitat, and | affected by direct and indirect |
| exception would not adversely | Officer only with the | | the availability of mitigation | effects (see Mitigation section), as |
| impact the population being | concurrence of the State | lia li | projects that could benefit the | well as likelihood that the |
| protected. | Director. The finding and | ars. | impacted population. and | mitigation project may not |
| | recommendation shall be made | 10 | 3) if one of the following | provide the anticipated |
| WY (Connectivity only): | by the technical team, which | 30 No | circumstances can be | compensation for the duration of |
| Exception: The authorized | should consist of a BLM field | republication version be proportionally and the property will be proportionally and the property will be property to the property will be property to the property of the the prop | documented: | the impact. In addition, the |
| officer may grant an exception if | biologist, other local Greater | Ca Mar D | The exceedance at the project | compensation necessary to grant |
| an environmental record of | Sage-Grouse experts, and | Will think t | scale is the result of | this exception must provide the |
| review determines that the | biologists and other | JIL 45 11 10 11 | consolidating disturbance | offsetting benefit in the same |
| action, as proposed or | representatives from the | 66 60 vill 00 | associated with the proposed | HAF Fine Scale unit being |
| conditioned, would not impair | appropriate State of Utah agency. | 16 16 4 W 90 | project as a strategy to leave | impacted by the potential |
| the function or utility of the site | *This would only be applicable to | 61 31 31 is | other portions of the PHMA | development. |
| for the current or subsequent | new fluid minerals leases if the | M Me sille of 1 | (and IHMA) undisturbed from | |
| seasonal habitat, life-history, or | by the technical team, which should consist of a BLM field biologist, other local Greater Sage-Grouse experts, and biologists and other representatives from the appropriate State of Utah agency. *This would only be applicable to new fluid minerals leases if the exception criteria identified for the NSO stipulation above were granted. | prepublication verse proposed that the property will be proposed to the property of the property by the proper | new authorizations, and the | |
| behavioral needs of Greater Sage- | the NSO stipulation above were | 100 440 dis 10 | third bullet below, addressing | |
| Grouse. An exception to the | granted. | 0 1 000 00 | compensatory mitigation, is | |
| stated limits may be granted | 181: 12 | 16, V L 141 | applied to any residual impacts. | |
| when compensatory mitigation is | is a all will | 19 PK 31 | No exceedances would be | |
| determined to provide an overall | is de ellise | 3. TE, The | allowed at the HAF Fine Scale. | |
| beneficial effect to sage-grouse | vis III IV Re | 11/2/1 | If a technical team evaluates | |
| habitat and populations. The BLM | 1. Oc. 3113 D. 3 | 3, 26, | and recommends that site- | |
| can and does grant exceptions if | do 410 EF .: 01 | , Ill. | specific GRSG habitat and | |
| the BLM, in coordination with the | 311 Mr 361 | CC | population information, | |
| WGFD, determines that granting | 1.5° 21.4 No d | 3 | combined with project design | |
| an exception would not adversely | 110 OLO MI CO | | elements – including | |
| impact the population being | So the Or the | | compensatory mitigation, | |
| protected. | Mar al | | indicates the proposed project | |
| | 10 "Ho | | is expected to improve the | |
| | | | condition of GRSG habitat | |
| | | Mexpect will dock the start of | 1 1 1 7 | |
| | | | analysis area. Factors | |
| | | | considered by the team will | |
| | | | include GRSG abundance and | |
| | | | trends, movement patterns – | |
| | | | including impacts to | |
| | | | connectivity, habitat amount | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|----------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | and quality, extent and | (See above.) |
| | | | alignment of project | |
| | | | disturbance, location and | |
| | | | density of existing disturbance | |
| | | | (e.g., potential for increased | |
| | | | fragmentation), project design | |
| | | | options, and other biological | |
| | | | factors (e.g., potential for | |
| | | S | topographic screening, impacts | |
| | | al's | from other threats such as | |
| | | 10 | predation, invasive species, | |
| | | 30 70 | drought, noise, etc.). The | |
| | | 410 411 | technical team should consist | |
| | | · C3 1031 0 | of, at a minimum, a BLM field | |
| | | Allo the of | biologist and a biologist and | |
| | | 110 45 11 00 | other representatives from the | |
| | | che con illi co | appropriate State agency. | |
| | | 10, 00 14 40 | Disturbance associated with | |
| | | et all al is | the renewal or re- | |
| | Cla | M Me cino al | authorization of existing | |
| | 5910 21 | 1, 111, 11, 46, | infrastructure in previously | |
| | 01.00 | Ocalle dis b | disturbed sites or expansions | |
| | III. We | 90 11.000 24 | of existing infrastructure that | |
| | 7 7 12 | of By | do not result in new direct, | |
| | 3, 24. Jilo | igt OR at | indirect, or cumulative impacts | |
| | 18 ver : !!! | 112 Ex "Wa | on GRSG and its habitat. | |
| | 19 111 19 00 | " Hr F. S. | | |
| | W. Cr Illy VI | 31 011 | To approve this exception, the | |
| | 40 410 CP1 01 | in in | Authorized Officer must | |
| | alle Mr. Til | CU. | document, in coordination with | |
| | Cha of I was | 00 | the appropriate State agency, that | |
| | 102 00 11 1 | | the proposed action satisfies the | |
| | 50, 10, 27 12 1AG | | three criteria listed above. | |
| | 131, 12, | | | |
| | This is an unofficial of the Brand of the Brand of the Bland of the Brand of the Br | | For this exception to apply, the | |
| | This is an unofficial of the Brands of the Brands of the Blument. The Brands of the Br | Mexpect will doc Mexpent will doc Jister The Egister is Jister A Register is Jister A Register in a vo Jister in a vo J | compensatory mitigation must be | |
| | | | completed prior to the | |
| | | | disturbance that results in the | |
| | | | exceedance of the disturbance cap | |
| | | | so the value of the mitigation can | |
| | | | be accurately compared to the | |
| | | | value of the habitat to be affected | |
| | | | by the proposed disturbance. In | |

2-75

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------|---|----------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | addition, the compensation | (See above.) |
| | | | necessary to grant this exception | |
| | | | must provide the offsetting benefit | |
| | | | to the population being impacted | |
| | | | by the potential development. | |
| | | | E LI W | |
| | | | Prior to granting an exception to | |
| | | | the disturbance cap stipulation the | |
| | | .61 | potential exception shall be | |
| | | .015 | subject to public review for at | |
| | | 100 | least a 30-day period (e.g., could | |
| | | :011 :100 | be part of the APD NEPA | |
| | | 2610 06 71 | process). | |
| | | "Ca "Nag O | If the area associated with the | |
| | | Pli of the | If the area associated with the | |
| | | JUL 613 1110 | proposed development seeking | |
| | | 16 VEC 411, 100 | the exception (e.g., well pad, | |
| | | 01 24 44 10 | compressor station, etc.) is in an area (neighborhood cluster) that | |
| | :31 | " e, e, vy, ie | has met one of the adaptive | |
| | Cicles | M. M. Ell. OL | management thresholds (hard or | |
| | offi, B | chine ist n | soft) (see Section 2.5.13), no | |
| | 30,00 | 400 11, 001, of | exceptions would be considered | |
| | n. 111. 1 | 1. 500 Vas | until the causal factor analysis is | |
| | Mr. ila | Le Car III | completed. If the causal factor | |
| | is ell im | 112 Eb, Mar | analysis concludes that | |
| | 19 M. S. DE | S Mr " II. | development associated with the | |
| | WI CN, 11A VE | al and | type of activity seeking the | |
| | 1, 700 May 64 M | ia Me | exception is or could contribute | |
| | his is an unofficial of the Brain of the Bra | -Uli | to the threshold being met or not | |
| | 19. 14 Mar | 00 | recovering, no exception would | |
| | 102 23, 11 12 0 | | be granted. If the analysis is | |
| | Chilling We | | inconclusive on cause, exceptions | |
| | July Br. III. | | could be considered. | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|--|---------------------|------------------------|
| NV/CA, and UT: No | • CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, | No WEMs would be necessary, | Modification: None. | Same as Alternative 4. |
| 11.0 | WY: Same as Alternative 1. | since all GRSG habitat | | |
| WY (Core only): | • UT: | management areas would be | | |
| Modification: The authorized | The stipulation can be modified | closed to new fluid mineral | . 6 | |
| officer may modify the area | to allow disturbance to exceed 3 | leasing. | Mis | |
| subject to the stipulation or | percent on the lease if | | e fl. M | |
| surface occupancy criteria if an | disturbance in the project analysis | | 0, 10 01, 0 | |
| environmental record of review | area and PHMA associated with a | | 10 01 0 7 11. | |
| finds that a portion of the CSU | Greater Sage-Grouse population | , si | TO THE SO E | |
| area is nonessential, or it is | area remains under 3 percent. | er's | July 10 Ple Of | |
| identified through scientific | *This would only be applicable to | 70 | 50 411 1119 017 | |
| research or monitoring that the | new fluid minerals leases if the | on he | *60 -110 E10 | |
| existing criteria are inadequate or | exception criteria identified for | The time | St. Propos | |
| overly protective for maintaining | the NSO stipulation above were | "Ca 12 0 | 201.10 | |
| the function or utility of the site | granted. | 10/10 111. 100 1 | We 1/1 - W. | |
| for the seasonal habitat, life- | | 211 St. 11 6 -1 | 11, 01, 00, | |
| history, or behavioral needs of | | 66 60 MIL. OC. | 4U 900 | |
| the Greater Sage-Grouse, | . < | 10 Th 4 1 90 | the od | |
| including (but not limited to) | : 2 | 6 6 6 31 19 | lie | |
| reproductive display, daytime | CiClo. | M We Elle of | (o, | |
| loafing/staging activities, and | Pri B | culture seles | ⊘ ` | |
| nesting. | 20,00 | 700 The dis 1 p | | |
| WY (Connectivity only): | M. The | 0 1. 200 201 | | |
| Exception: The authorized | 21 4. 13 | 10,04 | | |
| officer may modify the area | • UT: The stipulation can be modified to allow disturbance to exceed 3 percent on the lease if disturbance in the project analysis area and PHMA associated with a Greater Sage-Grouse population area remains under 3 percent. *This would only be applicable to new fluid minerals leases if the exception criteria identified for the NSO stipulation above were granted. | 19 18 1031 | | |
| subject to the stipulation or | . 6 1 Me 611 201 | 3. 71. All | | |
| surface occupancy criteria if an | MIS WILL RO | all and | | |
| environmental record of review | 100 1211101 | io. Je. | | |
| finds that a portion of the CSU | 0, July 18, 10, | THE STATE OF THE S | | |
| area is nonessential, or it is | 431 M. 131 | 200 | | |
| identified through scientific | 20 31 1 P 9 | | | |
| research or monitoring that the | J. Oll M. VE | | | |
| existing criteria are inadequate or | Salle Br All | | | |
| the function or utility of the site | 40.00 | | | |
| for the seasonal babitat life | , the | | | |
| history or behavioral roads of | | | | |
| • WY (Core only): Modification: The authorized officer may modify the area subject to the stipulation or surface occupancy criteria if an environmental record of review finds that a portion of the CSU area is nonessential, or it is identified through scientific research or monitoring that the existing criteria are inadequate or overly protective for maintaining the function or utility of the site for the seasonal habitat, life-history, or behavioral needs of the Greater Sage-Grouse, including (but not limited to) reproductive display, daytime loafing/staging activities, and nesting. • WY (Connectivity only): Exception: The authorized officer may modify the area subject to the stipulation or surface occupancy criteria if an environmental record of review finds that a portion of the CSU area is nonessential, or it is identified through scientific research or monitoring that the existing criteria are inadequate or overly protective for maintaining the function or utility of the site for the seasonal habitat, life-history, or behavioral needs of the Greater Sage-Grouse, including (but not limited to) reproductive display, daytime | | | | |
| including (but not limited to) | | | | |
| reproductive display, daytime | | | | |
| loafing/staging activities, and | | | | |
| nesting. | | | | |
| HESUITE. | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | |

| Summary of Altomative I | Summer of Alternative 2 | Altomotive 2 | Altomotive 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--|---|---|------------------------|
| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 No WEMs would be necessary, | Alternative 4 Waiver: The Authorized Officer | Same as Alternative 4. |
| NV/CA, and UT: No waivers. | • CO, ID, MT/DK, NV/CA, OR, WY: Same as Alternative I. | since all GRSG habitat | may consider and grant a waiver | Same as Alternative 4. |
| • WY (Core only): | | management areas would be | of the stipulation on an existing | |
| Waiver: No waiver. | • UT: | closed to new fluid mineral | lease if the area mapped as PHMA | |
| WY (Connectivity only): | The Authorized Officer may | leasing. | (and IHMA in Idaho) when the | |
| Waiver: No waiver. | grant a waiver to a fluid mineral | leasing. | lease was issued is no longer | |
| | lease NSO stipulation if, through the appropriate planning process | | mapped as such through the | |
| | (i.e., maintenance, amendment), | | appropriate planning process (i.e., | |
| | the area is no longer within | - | plan maintenance or amendment). | |
| | PHMA. | 19 | Prior to waiving the disturbance | |
| | *This would only be applicable to | 16, | -'0' '1' '1' '1' '1' '1' '1' '1' '1' '1' | |
| | new fluid minerals leases if the | iblication version be p | the potential waiver shall be | |
| | exception criteria identified for | 10, 4/10 | subject to public review for at | |
| | the NSO stipulation above were | - 3t - 3t - 2 | least a 30-day period (e.g., could | |
| | granted. | Allo the P | be part of the APD NEPA | |
| | 8 | 110. 45 1 100 | process). | |
| Seasonal Constrain | nts/Stipulations (WEMs associat | | is in all applicable habitat mana | |
| ID: No timing/seasonal | • CO, ID, OR, UT, WY: Same | No WEMs would be necessary, | Exception: The Authorized | Same as Alternative 4. |
| stipulations were included in | as Alternative I. | since all GRSG habitat | Officer may consider and provide | |
| the stipulations appendix. | NV/CA: In the 2019 ARMPA, | management areas would be | temporary relief from seasonal | |
| | WEMs for all the | closed to new fluid mineral | constraints by granting an | |
| • CO: | seasonal/timing stipulations | leasing. | exception after documenting the | |
| In consultation with the State of | refer the reader back to the | 0 1. 200 00 | review of available information | |
| Colorado, a modification or an | same WEMs for the NSO. | 16, V 4 4. | associated with the site proposed | |
| exception to GRSG TL-46 could | is a che in | 15 18 1031 | for the exception. While the BLM considers information from all | |
| be granted based on an analysis | . 6 Me 61 28 | 3 7 F. 111 | sources, the State wildlife agency | |
| of the following factors: | MIS WILL K | 1/10/1/2 | can provide information directly | |
| o Location of proposed lease | 100 131.01 | ia de | associated with bird use, including | |
| activities in relation to critical GRSG habitat areas | 0 41, 18, 40, | -UII | whether GRSG populations are | |
| as identified by factors | 43, 14, 130 | 200 | not using the seasonal habitat | |
| including, but not limited | as Alternative I. NV/CA: In the 2019 ARMPA, WEMs for all the seasonal/timing stipulations refer the reader back to the same WEMs for the NSO. | closed to new fluid mineral leasing. | during that year's seasonal life | |
| to, average male lek | Mr. M. No | | cycle period. Based on this | |
| attendance and/or | July Br. III. | | information and recommendation, | |
| important seasonal habitat | Ho ve | | and documented variability in | |
| An evaluation of the | NV/CA: In the 2019 ARMPA, WEMs for all the seasonal/timing stipulations refer the reader back to the same WEMs for the NSO. | | climatic conditions (e.g., early/late | |
| potential threats from | | | spring, long/heavy winter), use | |
| proposed lease activities | | | patterns, or other applicable | |
| that may affect the local | | | information the Authorized | |
| population as compared to | | | Officer may consider a one-time | |
| benefits that could be | | | exception if development | |
| accomplished through | | | associated with it will not affect | |
| compensatory or off-site | | | GRSG habitat use, movement or | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------|---|----------------------|
| mitigation (see Chapter 2, | (See above.) | (See above.) | reproduction, including seasonal | (See above.) |
| Section 2.6.3 of the | | | reproductive displays, nest | |
| Proposed LUPA/Final EIS, | | | attendance, egg or chick survival, | |
| Regional Mitigation) | | | or early brood-rearing success or | |
| An evaluation of the | | | otherwise impair the seasonal | |
| proposed lease activities in | | | function, suitability, and use of | |
| relation to the site-specific | | | winter concentration areas. | |
| terrain and habitat | | | U 01 0 111 | |
| features. For example, | | i i | o we co | |
| within 4 miles of a lek, | | ars. | The of | |
| local terrain features such | | 10 | 50 111 119 1 | |
| as ridges and ravines may | | 301 170 | 100 10, 10, | |
| reduce the habitat | | *10. 411 | Sto Or ors. | |
| importance and shield | | 1631 2 | 0, 4, 10, | |
| nearby habitat from | | A South Alle | ne 14 n. | |
| disruptive factors. | | 10. 45 100 | We die | |
| · | | 20° CC ; ill CC | 0. 10 | |
| MT/DK; | | 16, 06 " W. 40 | The You | |
| Dillon: An Exception to this | | et of allie | 1,460 | |
| stipulation may be granted by the | cja. | M Je and I la | 16/1 | |
| authorized officer if the operator | 410 21 | 1111 111 461 | 0. | |
| submits a plan that demonstrates | 0,00 | De Me Ties A | | |
| that impacts from the proposed | ille he | 90 1,000,01 | | |
| action are minimal or can be | 7 7 12 | or. By war | | |
| adequately mitigated. | 31 24. Jilo | igt OR at | | |
| Butte and Dillon: An Exception to | 18 26, IU. | II. EL "Wa | | |
| this stipulation may be granted by | 19 111 19 00 | " Hart. | | |
| the authorized officer, in | W. Co. Illa V. | 31 011 | | |
| consultation with the Montana | 40 x18. 561. 01 | in in | | |
| Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP) | alle Alle alle | CUL | | |
| and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife | elo alla Mad | 0 | | |
| Service (FWS), if the operator | 102 40 11 | | | |
| submits a plan that demonstrates | 20, 210, 271, "No | | | |
| that impacts from the proposed | 131. P. 1. | | | |
| action are minimal or can be | La "We | | | |
| adequately mitigated. | 11. | | | |
| North Dakota: This stipulation | | | otherwise impair the seasonal function, suitability, and use of winter concentration areas. | |
| may be waived or reduced if | | | | |
| circumstances change, or if the | | | | |
| resocc can demonstrate that | | | | |
| operations can be conducted | | | | |
| without causing unacceptable | | | | |
| impacts. Exceptions to this | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|---|---------------|--|----------------------|
| limitation in any particular year | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| may be specifically approved in | | | | |
| | | | | |
| In all cases, the stipulation | | | | |
| (including any Modification) will | | | vie | |
| be designed to present the least | | | M M | |
| restrictive measure for avoiding | | | 01 3 2/10 | |
| unacceptable adverse impacts. | | | " OI D' !!! | |
| Butte: An Exception to this | | i i | o we co | |
| stipulation may be granted by the | | 219. | Mi Ji No Of | |
| authorized officer if the operator | | 10. | 50 111 119 1 | |
| submits a plan that demonstrates | | 301 120 | 160 10, 10, | |
| that impacts from the proposed | | 410. 411 | Sto. Ou ors. | |
| action are minimal or can be | | 1 C 3 L 3 L 3 | D. 46, 16. | |
| adequately mitigated. | | A South Alle | ne 14 n. | |
| Billings: An Exception to this | | 110 45 1100 | 14, 24, 01, | |
| stipulation may be granted by the | | op cor ill co | 0.110 | |
| AO, in consultation with Montana | | 40, 00 W. 40 | He Yr. | |
| FWP, if the operator submits a | | et of alice | 1,160 | |
| plan which demonstrates that the | cia. | M Je alla LI | 'el' | |
| proposed action will not affect | 410 21 | 1111 111 461 | 2. | |
| may be specifically approved in writing by the authorized officer. In all cases, the stipulation (including any Modification) will be designed to present the least restrictive measure for avoiding unacceptable adverse impacts. Butte: An Exception to this stipulation may be granted by the authorized officer if the operator submits a plan that demonstrates that impacts from the proposed action are minimal or can be adequately mitigated. Billings: An Exception to this stipulation may be granted by the AO, in consultation with Montana FWP, if the operator submits a plan which demonstrates that the proposed action will not affect sage grouse or their habitat. Refer to "Requirements and/or Guidelines for Wildlife Controlled Surface Use (CSU) and Exceptions to No Surface Occupancy (NSO) and Timing Limitation Stipulations", Appendix H or portions of the area no longer have sage grouse or their habitat, or the lek is confirmed inactive (10 years with no males or sign of lek activity). Activities would be allowed, if they are | 0,00 | Occasion D | | |
| Refer to "Requirements and/or | inche | 90 1,000,04 | | |
| Guidelines for Wildlife | 7 7 12 | Ol. Ko War | | |
| Controlled Surface Use (CSU) | 31 24. Jilo | igt OR at | | |
| and Exceptions to No Surface | is 261, 111, 20 | ILL Wa | | |
| Occupancy (NSO) and Timing | 19 111 19 20 | " Harton | | |
| Limitation Stipulations", Appendix | W. Co Illa V | 31 011 | | |
| H or portions of the area no | 40 x10. 561. 01 | in in | | |
| longer have sage grouse or their | alle All alle | CUL | | |
| habitat, or the lek is confirmed | ela alla Mary | 0 | | |
| inactive (10 years with no males | 102 -40 111 | | | |
| or sign of lek activity). Activities | 10, 11, 1/6 | | | |
| would be allowed, if they are | 131. 6. | | | |
| consistent with the goals and | his is an unofficial of the distantial National MEPARES AND THE BLIM THE DESTRUCTION OF THE BLIM | | on of this are BLM in same or the only version of the only version of the relied upon. | |
| objectives for the Restoration | Tr. | | | |
| Area (RA) or General habitat. | | | | |
| milline. The AO may grant an | | | | |
| Exception if the operator submits | | | | |
| a plan that demonstrates the | | | | |
| impacts from the proposed | | | | |
| action are acceptable or can be | | | | |
| adequately mitigated. | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|------------------|--|----------------------|
| NV/CA: (w/in 4 miles of active | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| or pending leks in GHMA, | | | | |
| winter habitat, early and late | | | | |
| brood rearing habitat): | | | .6 | |
| The Authorized Officer may | | | "HIS | |
| grant an exception where an | | | E II WI | |
| environmental review and | | | 0, 10 01.1 | |
| consultation with the appropriate | | | 11 0, 6, 411. | |
| state agency (Nevada | | , GI | TO THE SO | |
| Department of Wildlife, | | , el s | Mills of | |
| Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical | | 70 | 20 4 11 1/13 01 | |
| Team, California Department of | | on the | ter all all | |
| Fish and Wildlife) determines that | | The state of | 5 , 6 ,015 | |
| the action, as proposed or | his is an unofficial to do other the property of the property | 11.CO War 0 | 200 10 | |
| otherwise restricted, does not | | Pli Li Me | Je 417 -U. | |
| adversely affect GRSG or its | | 711 cts .11 b .1 | 1, 01, 00, | |
| habitat. An exception may also be | | eb ec Milion | 441 30 | |
| granted if the proponent, the | . < | 1 Th 1 1 00 | the of | |
| BLM, and the appropriate state | : 2 | 1 6 61 31 19 | die | |
| agency negotiate mitigation that | ci Cle 1 | M. We Elle Ch. | 10. | |
| would provide a clear net | Sell B | cuine ister | <u>ک</u> * | |
| conservation gain to GRSG and | 20.06 | 400 The dis 1 p | | |
| its habitat. | M. The | 0 1. 500 3 | | |
| OR CLIMA (\A/: | 31, 4. 1/3. | 46. D # U. | | |
| OR GHMA (Winter habitat): The BLM Field Manager could | is an in | is ch war | | |
| grant exceptions to the seasonal | :6 Me 61 78 | 2 Mr. 11. | | |
| restrictions and use restrictions if | MI CHINA K | all all | | |
| the project plan and NEPA | 100 131.0K | ia Me. | | |
| document demonstrate that | O ULLIE "10. | -UII | | |
| impacts from the proposed | 13, 14, 131 | 00 | | |
| action can be adequately | his is an unofficial of documents in the Blue the Blue the Blue the documents in the blue the blu | | and or a BL. in sale of the only version of the only version of the relied upon. | |
| mitigated. | N. W. W. | | | |
| OR GHMA (Breeding, | July Br. III. | | | |
| Nesting, Early and late brood | H ve | | | |
| rearing habitat): | 411 | | | |
| The BLM Field Manager could | | | | |
| grant exceptions to the seasonal | | | | |
| and use restrictions under the | | | | |
| following conditions: | | | | |
| If surveys determine there | | | | |
| are no active or occupied | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|------------------|---|----------------------|
| leks within 4 miles of the | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| proposed project during | | | | |
| the year (based on ODFW | | | | |
| lek survey protocol) and | | | . 6 | |
| the proposed activity | | | Mis | |
| would not take place | | | 6 41. | |
| beyond the season being | | | 0, 10 01,0 | |
| excepted | | | 10 0, 0, 111. | |
| If the project plan and | | lia. | Se the So | |
| NEPA document | | ars. | July 1 Che Of | |
| demonstrate that impacts | | 70 | 50 4 11 1115 017 | |
| from the proposed action | | on he | *60 '10. Jo. | |
| could be adequately | | 410 4 411. | St. D. Sis | |
| mitigated | | . C3 12 0 | 4, 10 | |
| | | MIL THE OF | ve, 11 v. | |
| UT (breeding, nesting, early | his is an unofficial to documents in italian antially similar antion | THE TE ILDE | 14, 04, 01, | |
| and late brood rearing, and | | 66 60 vill 00 | 0 119 | |
| winter habitat): No | 4 | 10, 100 14, 90 | the grant | |
| exceptions. | | 1 et al :6 | 1160 | |
| WY PHMA (Core and | cla | M We sills of 12 | *6/ | |
| Connectivity) and GHMA: | 6910 01 | L'alli Caralle | 2 ` | |
| Exception: The authorized | 201.0 | " Oca Me dis b | | |
| officer may grant an exception if | M. The | 00 1000 24 | | |
| an environmental record of | 10 11 12 | el. K. We | | |
| review determines that the | S. Mr. Alle | istop at | | |
| action, as proposed or | 12 26, 111, 30 | JIEL ALLO | | |
| conditioned, will not affect | rie III. 11 Se | ' W. J. C. | | |
| reproductive displays, nest | III OCC III OV | 3, 61, | | |
| attendance, egg or chick survival, | 90 410 Ch, 101 | MI | | |
| or early brood-rearing success. | JAN ALL STILL | -CO | | |
| Actions designed to enhance the | -Sto al No d | 0 | | |
| long-term utility or availability of | 1/2 W. W. C. | | | |
| suitable Greater Sage-Grouse | 20 410 ST. 4/10 | | | |
| habitat may be exempted from | 73, 0 | | | |
| this timing limitation. The BLM | his is an unofficial of the Bludstantial NEPARES AND STATE BLIN WE ARE A STATE BLIN THE DESTRUCTION OF THE BLIN THE DESTRUCTION OF THE BLIN THE BLI | | on of this are all with a steel in the only version of the only version of the only version of the relied upon. | |
| can and does grant exceptions to | 7. | | | |
| seasonal restrictions if the BLM, | | | | |
| in coordination with the WGFD, | | | | |
| determines that granting an | | | | |
| exception would not adversely | | | | |
| impact the population being | | | | |
| protected. | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| WY Winter Concentration | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| Areas: | | | | |
| Exception: The authorized | | | | |
| officer may grant an exception if | | | . 6 | |
| an environmental record of | | | Mis | |
| review determines that the | | | 6 411. | |
| action, as proposed or | | | 0, 19 01,0 | |
| conditioned, will not impair the | | | 10 01 0 1 111. | |
| function and suitability of the | | i i | se the so c | |
| winter concentration area, or it is | | ar's | all a liche of | |
| determined that the winter | | 10 | 50 111 119 1 | |
| concentration area is not active | | 30 12 | 100 10, 10, | |
| by concentrated populations of | | 110. 111. | 510 OV 215 | |
| Greater Sage-Grouse during the | | . 63 . 32 .0 | D. 46, 16. | |
| period of concern. Actions | | allo the P | 26, 1A V. | |
| designed to enhance the long- | | 110 45 1100 | 14, 241, 01, | |
| term utility or availability of | | 20° CC ill CC | 60.116 | |
| suitable Greater Sage-Grouse | | 16, 00 W. 40 | He You | |
| habitat may be exempted from | | P. ot of allie | 1,160 | |
| this timing limitation. The BLM | cia. | M De cilla 1/2 | 16/1 | |
| can and does grant exceptions to | crital | 1111 111 461 | 0. | |
| seasonal restrictions if the BLM, | 0, 0 | Destro is b | | |
| in coordination with the WGFD, | inche | 90 1,000,04 | | |
| determines that granting an | 20 71 21 | or. Be way | | |
| exception would not adversely | 31 M. Jilo | Sto OR AL | | |
| impact the population being | is '61, !!!! | M. E. M.O | | |
| protected. | 19 M. 19.00 | S Mr F II | | |
| | 14. Co 113 0 1 | 21 01 | | |
| | , 40 x13, 16 1 | in the | | |
| | o We Ale dio | CUIT | | |
| | 40 114 430 | 00 | | |
| | 102 23, 11/20 | | | |
| | The Oil IN THE | | | |
| | S' Str. Br. II. | | | |
| | My No. | Are Publication Version of the Politication Version Ve | on of this are BLM in same on the only version of the only version of the relied upon. | |
| | 411 | | | |
| | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| CO: Modification language | CO, ID, MT/DK, OR, UT, | No WEMs would be necessary, | Modification: The BLM can and | Same as Alternative 4. |
| included in the exception | WY: Same as Alternative 1. | since all GRSG habitat | does grant modifications to | |
| language above. | NV/CA: | management areas would be | seasonal restrictions if the BLM, in | |
| MT/DK: | The authorized officer, in | closed to new fluid mineral | coordination with the state | |
| Dillon: The boundaries of the | coordination with the | leasing. | wildlife agency on a case-by-case | |
| stipulated area may be modified if | appropriate state wildlife agency | | basis, determines that granting the | |
| the authorized officer determines | (NDOW, and/or CDFW), can | | modification would not adversely | |
| that portions of the area can be | modify and/or waive dates for | | impact the population being | |
| occupied without adversely | seasonal timing restrictions based | are Publication version be portionally the post of the | protected. The authorized officer | |
| affecting sage grouse leks. | on the criteria described below, | ars. | may consider and grant a | |
| Butte and Dillon: The boundaries | based on site-specific information | 70 | modification to the dates and | |
| of the stipulated area may be | that indicates: | on he | areas associated with seasonal | |
| modified if the authorized officer | i. A project proposal's NEPA | 110 " 11. | timing restrictions based on the | |
| determines that portions of the | analysis and/or project | : C3 23 5 | criteria described below – after | |
| area no longer contain Sage | record, and | MIL ALLO F | documenting the review of | |
| Grouse winter/spring range. The | correspondence from | JUD 45 11 DO | available information associated | |
| dates for the timing restriction | NDOW and/or CDFW, | 66 60 vill 00 | with the site proposed for the | |
| may be modified if new | demonstrates that any | 16 16 " W 90 | modification, if: | |
| information indicates that the | modification | 61 W 31 :8 | i. The geographic and | |
| December I through May 15 | (shortening/extending | M We sills of 1 | temporal conditions | |
| dates are not valid for the | seasonal timeframes or | Arepublication verse, will be possible to the property will be possible to the property will be possible to the property by th | demonstrate that any | |
| leasehold. | waiving the seasonal timing | 100 4/10 4/12 1 p | modification | |
| North Dakota: This stipulation | restrictions all together) is | 0 1000 00 | (shortening/extending | |
| may be waived or reduced if | justified on the basis that it | 161. VE 1410 | seasonal timeframes) is | |
| circumstances change, or if the | serves to better protect or | ist or at | justified on the basis that it | |
| lessee can demonstrate that | enhance GRSG and its | DILE AND | serves to better protect or | |
| operations can be conducted | habitat than if the strict | 14 4 | enhance GRSG and its | |
| without causing unacceptable | application of seasonal | 3, 61, | habitat than if the strict | |
| impacts. Exceptions to this | timing restrictions are | , ILL | application of seasonal | |
| limitation in any particular year | implemented. Under this | CO | timing restrictions are | |
| may be specifically approved in | scenario modifications can | 0 | implemented. Under this | |
| writing by the authorized officer. | occur it | | scenario modifications can | |
| In all cases, the stipulation | a. A proposed | | occur if one or more of the | |
| (including any Modification) will | authorization would | | following conditions can be | |
| be designed to present the least | have beneficial or | | documented: | |
| restrictive measure for avoiding | neutral impacts on | | a. A proposed | |
| unacceptable adverse impacts. | GRSG and its habitat. | | authorization is expected | |
| Butte: The boundaries of the | b. Topography or other | | to have beneficial or | |
| stipulated area may be modified if | factors eliminate direct | | neutral impacts on | |
| the authorized officer determines | and indirect impacts | | GRSG and its habitat. | |
| that portions of the area can be | from visibility and | | b. Topography or other | |
| occupied without adversely | audibility to GRSG and | | factors eliminate direct | |
| affecting sage grouse leks. | its habitat. | | and indirect impacts | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Billings: The boundaries of the | c. There are documented | (See above.) | from visibility and | (See above.) |
| stipulated area may be modified if | local variations (e.g., | | audibility to GRSG and | (, |
| the AO determines that portions | higher/lower elevations) | | its habitat. | |
| of the area can be occupied | and/or annual climatic | | c. There are documented | |
| without adversely affecting sage | fluctuations (e.g., | | local variations that | |
| grouse leks or portions of the | early/late spring, | | indicate the seasonal life | |
| | | | -1 1 | |
| or their habitat. The timing | indicate the seasonal life | | different than presented. | |
| restriction dates may be modified | cycle periods are | i. | ii. Modifications are needed to | |
| if new information indicates that | different than presented, | 15. | address an immediate public | |
| the dates are not valid for the | or that GRSG are not | 76. | health and safety concern in | |
| leasehold. | using the area during a | 90 | a timely manner (e.g., | |
| HiLine: The boundaries of the | given seasonal life cycle | 10, 4/1 | maintaining a road impacted | |
| stipulated area may be modified if | period. | - 3t 2t 2 | by flooding). | |
| the AO determines that portions | ii. Modifications are needed to | lio the b | 00 W | |
| of the area no longer contain | address an immediate public | 10. 18 , 100 | We dis Our | |
| viable winter range. The dates for | health and safety concern in | 00 C/2 :: 11 - C/ | 0, 10 | |
| the timing restriction may be | a timely manner (e.g., | 16, 06, 14, 40 | The You | |
| modified if new wildlife use | maintaining a road impacted | S of all all a | 1, 160 | |
| information indicates that the | by flooding). | 110 26, 110, 113 | ·ell | |
| dates are not valid for the | Gio al | 14 TH. 41, 461 | 210 | |
| leasehold. The AO may also | Off. P | occure is b | | |
| modify the size and shape of the | inche | 90 1,000,04 | | |
| area based on studies | 20 71 21 | or. Remain | | |
| documenting actual habitat | 31 75. Jilo | . Gro DA At 1 | | |
| suitability and/or local periods of | is col. ill. | No Ex Ma | | |
| actual use | 19 111 19 20 | S Mr F II | | |
| ~ | 4, CO 113 V | 31 6/1 | | |
| NV/CA: (w/in 4 miles of active | 70 *19. 161 V | in in | | |
| or pending leks in GHMA, | of the Alice | CUI | | |
| winter habitat, early and late | Eta Ille Mart | 00 | | |
| brood rearing habitat): | 102 US. W. 1. 00 | | | |
| The Authorized Officer may | 10, 10, Vr. 146 | Arepublication version of the property of the property will be property of the | | |
| modify the size and shape of the | 130 6 | | | |
| restricted area or the period of | B. We | | | |
| limitation where an | 41. | | | |
| environmental review and | | | | |
| consultation with the appropriate | | | | |
| state agency (Nevada | | | | |
| Department of Wildlife, | | | | |
| Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical | | | | |
| Team, California Department of | | | | |
| Fish and Wildlife) determines that | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--|---|---|----------------------|
| the action, as proposed or | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| otherwise restricted, does not | | | | |
| adversely affect GRSG or its | | | | |
| habitat. | | | .6 | |
| | | | Mis | |
| OR GHMA (Winter and | | | E. L. W. | |
| breeding, nesting, and early | | | 0, 10 01,0 | |
| and late brood-rearing | | | 10 0, 6 7 11. | |
| habitat): | | GI | The Who so | |
| Additionally, the BLM Field | | O. C. | July 10 girelle Ol | |
| Manager may modify the seasonal | | 10 | 20 4 11 1113 017 | |
| restrictions and use restrictions | | on he | *60 -110 e10 | |
| under the following conditions: | his is an unofficial of the distantial of the Blubstantial NEPA Reconstitutional NEPA Reconstitution at the distantial of the distantial of the BLM the BLM the distantial of the BLM the BL | The training | S. 6 613 | |
| o If portions of the area do | | 1100 War 0 | 100 100 | |
| not include winter habitat | | 10/12 11. 106 1 | We 1/7 - U. | |
| (lacking the principle | | 711 St. 11 6 11 | 11, 01, 00, | |
| habitat components of | | 166 60 MIL. OC. | 44. 30. | |
| winter GRSG habitat, as | . < | 16 16 16 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 | the od | |
| defined in GRSG habitat | : 2 | 1 6 61 31 19 | lie | |
| indicators Table 2-2) or | Ci Clo | MI WE FILL OF | 16. | |
| are outside the current | Selle B | CUILE GE W | ⊘ * | |
| defined winter habitat | 70, 6 | 100 The dis 1 p | | |
| area, as determined by the | M. The | 0 1. 500 3 | | |
| BLM in discussion with the | 21 4. 13 | 46, V . U. | | |
| ODFW, and indirect | is and in | 19, 18, 19, | | |
| impacts would be | . 6 1 Me 61 78 | 3. 715. Also | | |
| mitigated o If documented local | MIS WILL RO | 1/10-11 | | |
| variations (e.g., higher or | 100 3000 | ia de | | |
| lower elevations) or | 0 41, 18, 40, | -UII | | |
| annual climate fluctuations | 431 14 130 | 200 | | |
| (e.g., early or late spring, | 12 23, 41 L Q | | | |
| long or heavy winter) | Mr. M. Me | | | |
| reflect a need to change | July Br III. | | | |
| the given dates to better | H ve | | | |
| protect GRSG in a given | 111 | | on of this are BLM in same or published in the only version of the only version of the relied upon. | |
| area and the proposed | | | | |
| activity would not take | | | | |
| place beyond the season | | | | |
| being excepted | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|----------------------|
| UT (breeding, nesting, early | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| and late brood rearing, and | | | | |
| winter habitat): | | | | |
| Specific time and distance | | | . 6 | |
| determinations would be based | | | Mis | |
| on site-specific conditions and | | | E 11. 11. | |
| may be modified due to | | | 0, 10 01,0 | |
| documented local variations (e.g., | | | 11 0, 6 7 11. | |
| higher/lower elevations) or | | i i | Le Me CO | |
| annual climactic fluctuations (e.g., | | ars. | 34, 14 CHE O. | |
| early/late spring, long and/or | | 70 | 50 4 11 1115 017 | |
| heavy winter) in order to better | | on he | *60 110 cio. | |
| protect GRSG, in coordination | | tio the | St. Prais | |
| with UDWR biologists. | | : C3 23 0 | 14, 10 | |
| | | Will the Ch | ve, 11 v. | |
| WY PHMA (Core and | | JIL 45 11 10 11 | 11, 01, 01, | |
| Connectivity) and GHMA | | 66 60 vill 00 | 911 | |
| Modification : The authorized | | 16 16 4 W. 90 | the of a | |
| officer may modify the size and | | 61 00 al is | lies | |
| shape of the TLS area or the TLS | ciclo. | M Me silve at 1 | 46, | |
| criteria if an environmental | 8910 01 | Chill Chicker | S * | |
| record of review indicates the | his is an unofficial to do cument. The Brainian document similar de contration de cont | 100 446 412 1 P | | |
| actual habitat suitability for | M. The | 0 1 000 00 | | |
| seasonal Greater Sage-Grouse | 181: 12 | *61. V 1. W. | | |
| activities is greater or less than | is a windle | 19 PK 21 | | |
| the stipulated area, or it is | Les Me. Ell. S. | 9, 1E, 4/6 | | |
| identified through scientific | vis III IV RO | 14 4 | | |
| research or monitoring that the | 1. Oc. 3/13 DV. 3 | 3, 61, | | |
| existing criteria are inadequate or | 90 Allo E. 101 | , IU, | | |
| overly protective for maintaining | 311 Mr 311 | CO | | |
| the function or utility of the site | 10 31 1 No d | O · | | |
| for the seasonal habitat, life- | 110 OLO MI CO | | | |
| history, or behavioral needs of | his is an unofficial of the Bland of the Bland of the Bland NEPARE OF THE BLAND THE OF THE BLAND | | on of this are BLM in same or the only version of the only version of the relied upon. | |
| the Greater Sage-Grouse, | Mar of | | | |
| including (but not limited to) | 1 "We | | | |
| reproductive display, daytime | | | | |
| loafing/staging activities, and | | | | |
| nesting. | | | | |
| WY Winter Concentration | | | | |
| Areas: | | | | |
| Modification: The authorized | | | | |
| officer may modify the size and | | | | |
| shape of the TLS area or the TLS | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| criteria if an environmental | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| record of review indicates the | | | | |
| actual habitat suitability for | | | | |
| seasonal Greater Sage-Grouse | | | | |
| activities is greater or less than | | | Nis | |
| the stipulated area, or it is | | | 13 2 | |
| identified through scientific | | | 0, 3 3/10 | |
| research or monitoring that the | | | U 01 0 111 | |
| existing criteria are inadequate or | | i i | o we co | |
| overly protective for maintaining | | 219. | Mi Ji Ne Of | |
| the function or utility of the site | | 10 | 50 1111119 -17 | |
| for the seasonal habitat, life- | | 301 170 | 160 10, 10, | |
| history, or behavioral needs of | | *10. " #KI | St. 00 15. | |
| the Greater Sage-Grouse. | | Now Wisation Version V | Waiver: The Authorized Officer | |
| • CO: | • CO, ID, MT/DK, OR, UT, | INO VVEINS Would be necessary, | waiver: The Authorized Officer | Same as Alternative 4. |
| No waivers are authorized | WY: Same as Alternative 1. | since all GRSG habitat | may consider and grant a waiver | |
| unless the area or resource | NV/CA: In the 2019 ARMPA, | management areas would be | of the stipulation on an existing | |
| mapped as possessing the | WEMs for all the | closed to new fluid mineral | lease if the area that was mapped | |
| attributes protected by the | seasonal/timing stipulations | leasing. | as a GRSG habitat management | |
| stipulation are determined during | refer the reader back to the | M We sills of 12 | area (regardless of type) when the | |
| collaboration with Colorado | same WEMs for the NSO. | L'ALL STILLE | lease was issued is no longer | |
| Parks and Wildlife to lack those | 001.00 | " Oca Me dis b | mapped as such through the | |
| attributes or potential attributes. | "ILL WE | 90 11.000 24 | appropriate planning process (i.e., | |
| A 30-day public notice and | 7 7 7 | of Roman | plan maintenance or amendment). | |
| comment period is required | 3, 24. Jilo | ist of at | | |
| before waiver of a stipulation. | 18 ve, ill. | M. Er Ma | | |
| Waivers would require BLM | 19 111 19 00 | " Harris | | |
| State Director approval. | 11, CO 1113 V | 31 6/1 | | |
| | 40 x13. 561. 01 | in in | | |
| MT/DK: | alle Mr. Til | CUI | | |
| Dillon: This stipulation may be | Cha III Mart | 0 | | |
| waived if the authorized officer, | 100 100 11 00 | | | |
| in consultation with the Montana | 10, 20, 20 TH THE | | | |
| Fish, Wildlife and Parks, | NV/CA: In the 2019 ARMPA, WEMs for all the seasonal/timing stipulations refer the reader back to the same WEMs for the NSO. | | | |
| determines that the entire | W. We | | | |
| leasehold can be occupied | NV/CA: In the 2019 ARMPA, WEMs for all the seasonal/timing stipulations refer the reader back to the same WEMs for the NSO. | management areas would be closed to new fluid mineral leasing. | | |
| without adversely affecting Sage | | | | |
| Grouse Leks or the surrounding | | | | |
| breeding habitat. | | | | |
| Butte and Dillon: This stipulation | | | | |
| may be waived if the authorized | | | | |
| officer determines that the entire | | | | |
| leasehold no longer contains sage | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|----------------------|
| grouse winter/spring range or, if | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| in coordination with the FWP | | | | |
| and FWS, determines that the | | | | |
| area is not critical for Sage | | | . 6 | |
| Grouse. | | | Mis | |
| Butte: This stipulation may be | | | 6 61. | |
| waived if the authorized officer, | | | 0, 13 01,0 | |
| in consultation with the Montana | | | U 01 0 111 | |
| Fish, Wildlife and Parks and U.S. | | i i | Je We GO | |
| Fish and Wildlife Service, | | ar's | Mi Ji We Of | |
| determines that the entire | | 10 | 50 111 119 1 | |
| leasehold can be occupied | | 30 00 | 160 10, 10, | |
| without adversely affecting Sage | | 410, 411 | Sto Or ors | |
| Grouse Leks or the surrounding | | 1 C 3 L 3 L 3 | D. 46, 16. | |
| breeding habitat. | | A Solls | 26, 14 2. | |
| North Dakota: This stipulation | | 10. 45 100 | W. W. Oli | |
| may be waived or reduced if | | 10° CC illi cl | 0. 10 | |
| circumstances change, or if the | | 16, 06 " W. 40 | He You | |
| lessee can demonstrate that | | et of allie | 1,160 | |
| operations can be conducted | ig. | 110000000000000000000000000000000000000 | · ell | |
| without causing unacceptable | 410 21 | 1, 111, 11, 46, | 2 | |
| impacts. Exceptions to this | his is an unofficial to the line of the li | LOCANO LIST D | | |
| limitation in any particular year | inche | 90 1,000,01 | | |
| may be specifically approved in | 7 7 7 | or. Re Ma. | | |
| writing by the authorized officer. | 31 24. Jillo | Sto DA AL | | |
| In all cases, the stipulation | is "61, !!!! | M. E. W. | | |
| (including any Modification) will | 19 11 19 DE | S Mr F. I. | | |
| be designed to present the least | W. Co. Illa VI | 31 6/1 | | |
| restrictive measure for avoiding | 40 x13. 181 01 | in in | | |
| unacceptable adverse impacts. | o We All File | CUIT | | |
| Billings: This stipulation may be | to Ill Mart | 00 | | |
| waived if the AO, in consultation | 102 23, 11 120 | | | |
| with Montana FWP and the | his is an unofficial of documents in the Blue of the BLM the documents in | | and or a BLI in same of the only version of the only version of the relied upon. | |
| USFWS, determines that the | 131. 1 | | | |
| entire leasehold can be occupied | W. We | | | |
| without adversely affecting sage | \$11. | | | |
| grouse leks or the surrounding | | | | |
| breeding nabitat, the lek is | | | | |
| confirmed inactive (10 years with | | | | |
| no males or sign of lek activity), | | | | |
| or sage grouse are no longer | | | | |
| considered BLM special status | | | | |
| species and not listed by USFWS. | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|-----------------|--|----------------------|
| HiLine: This stipulation may be | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| waived if the AO determines that | | | | |
| the entire leasehold no longer | | | | |
| contains viable winter range. | | | . 6 | |
| | his is an unofficial to documents in italian antially similar ation | | His | |
| NV/CA: (w/in 4 miles of active | | | e the M | |
| or pending leks in GHMA, | | | 0, 10 01.0 | |
| winter habitat, early and late | | | 11 0, 6, 411. | |
| brood rearing habitat): | | ·SI | TO WHO SON | |
| The Authorized Officer may | | , QI'S | SIL IN ELLO | |
| waive the stipulation where an | | 700 | S. YII MIS OU | |
| environmental review and | | ion ine | ter all ell | |
| consultation with the appropriate | | atile of the | S & P GE | |
| state agency (Nevada | | 1100 Was 6 | Che 1 | |
| Department of Wildlife, | | 101, e 1, he . | 40 4/A 44. | |
| Sagebrush Ecosystem Technical Team, California Department of | | On Che :11 p c1 | 01,00 | |
| Fish and Wildlife) determines that | | 164 Jes MI, 700 | We I MA | |
| the described lands do not | | 5, th of 10 | th. ieo | |
| contain GRSG or suitable habitat | :31 | 10, 61, 13, 13 | elle | |
| or are otherwise incapable of | ceic, al | 14. H. 411 461 | 10 | |
| serving the requirements of | 041. 1 | active ist b | 0 | |
| GRSG and therefore no longer | "We he | 90 11,000,01 | | |
| warrant consideration as a | 20 71 21 | el. Borda | | |
| component necessary for their | 31 Jr. Jilo | Sto OR At 1 | | |
| protection. | 12 26, 111, 00 | II. Ex Wa | | |
| | 19 11 12 BO | ' Was I'V | | |
| OR GHMA (Winter and | LI CON SILAND | 31 611 | | |
| breeding, nesting, and early | 90 TIS EP 101 | MI | | |
| and late brood-rearing | " SIL ML STI | CO | | |
| habitat): No waivers. | 105 21 1 No d | 0 | | |
| • UT (breeding, nesting, early | 110 We W | | | |
| and late brood rearing, and | So the Br the | | | |
| winter habitat): No waivers. | 40 | | | |
| WY PHMA (Core only): | his is an unofficial of the Blad of the Blad of the Blad with the design of the Blad of th | | on of this are Billing of Sted in the only version of the only ver | |
| Waiver: No waiver. | _ | | | |
| WY PHMA (Connectivity and CHMA) | | | | |
| only), and GHMA: Waiver: This stipulation may be | | | | |
| waived over the entire lease if, in | | | | |
| coordination with the state | | | | |
| wildlife agency, it is determined | | | | |
| that the Greater Sage-Grouse lek | | | | |
| chac the Greater Sage-Grouse lek | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--|--|---|----------------------|
| has been classified as unactive as | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| determined by the state wildlife | | | | |
| agency. Any changes to this | | | | |
| stipulation will be made in | | | . 6 | |
| accordance with the land use plan | | | Nis | |
| and/or the regulatory provisions | | | c the M | |
| for such changes. (For guidance | | | 0, 13 0/10 | |
| on the use of this stipulation, see | | | 10 01 0 111 | |
| BLM Manuals 1624 and 3101.) | | i i | ve the co | |
| WY Winter Concentration | | ars. | July Williams | |
| Areas: | | 10 | So y III all all | |
| Waiver: No waiver. | | 30 No. | 10. io. | |
| | his is an unofficial of the Bland of the Bla | Prepublicational doctors In expects will be portable to the property of the pr | on of this are BLM in steed in the only version of the relied upon. | |

2.5.8 Renewable Energy Development and Associated Transmission

There have been very few published scientific studies on the impacts of wind development on GRSG (Lloyd et al., 2022), direct habitat loss and degradation from facilities and human disturbance are known impacts, and are similar to impacts from development of non-renewable energy resources. Roads account for most of the direct, permanent ground disturbance at wind facilities (Lloyd et al., 2022). Mortality from collision with turbine blades is infrequent (Lloyd et al. 2022). Indirect impacts include potential avoidance of tall structures (Pruett et al., 2009), disturbance due to noise (Blickley et al., 2012) and changes in habitat use by female GRSG (LeBeau et al., 2020). Habitat avoidance and changing habitat use may have compounding effects for extremely philopatric (species that return or stay at a particular location) species, such as GRSG. Increased numbers of known and novel predators may also be a concern, although research on changes in predator abundance at wind facilities is limited. Indirect impacts from solar energy development are anecdotal (Gerringer et al., 2022) and mostly unknown. Loss of habitat from clearing sites for solar panel installation is a direct impact, and can include hundreds to thousands of acres, depending on the scale of the solar development. Such direct habitat loss can also increase habitat fragmentation.

Impacts of transmission lines on GRSG vary with topography and habitat suitability. In general, the presence of transmission lines negatively impacted GRSG habitat selection (Gibson et al., 2018, Kohl et al., 2019, Lebeau et al., 2019, Kirol and Fedy 2023), demographic rates (Gibson et al., 2018) and survival rates (Lebeau et al., 2019). Long-term impacts to GRSG or their demographics are unknown. Ravens using powerline poles for perching and nesting significantly affected habitat use in proximity to powerlines out to a distance of 12.5 km in Nevada (Gibson et al. 2018), but lesser distances were reported in other studies (e.g., Boarman and Heinrich 1999, Bui et al. 2010).

The BLM is currently updating the BLM RMPs for solar energy development in the Solar Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). The is updating the BLM's RMPs related to solar energy development In that analysis of impacts the Solar PEIS considers existing management associated with the 2015 GRSG amendments as those direct current GRSG habitat management on BLM- administered lands. However, the Solar PEIS update defers to this GRSG planning effort to decide how solar energy development is conducted in GRSG habitat management areas.

The following range of alternatives allow for renewable energy development that will contribute to meeting administrative objectives while conserving GRSG habitats from known impacts and addressing potential indirect impacts.

Table 2-10, Comparison of Alternatives, Renewable Energy Development and Associated Transmission, presents management by alternative for this management issue.

Table 2-10. Comparison of Alternatives, Renewable Energy Development and Associated Transmission

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | Wind and Solar | | |
| PHMA/IHMA (ID): Except as noted below, PHMA in all states are Exclusion for wind and solar. ID, NV/CA, and OR specify that the exclusion applies to utility scale wind and solar development. WY is Avoidance for wind unless sufficiently demonstrated that | PHMA/IHMA (ID): Same as Alt I, except NV/CA added exception criteria to the closure and UT changed to Avoidance for wind outside PHMA but w/in 5 miles of leks inside PHMA. | • PHMA: • All states: Exclusion. | PHMA: All states: Manage PHMA as exclusion areas for utility scale wind and solar, including testing and development (including all associated infrastructure [e.g., met towers, powerlines]). Manage ID IHMA as exclusion areas within 3.1 | PHMA: All states except MT/DK: PHMA and IHMA (ID) would be avoidance areas for utility scale wind and solar energy testing and development (including met towers). Development in all states but ID would not be allowed in breeding and nesting habitats, or in limited/high value (e.g., |
| development would not result in population declines. WY does not specifically address solar but general surface disturbance limits would exclude solar near leks (0.6 miles) and minimize (e.g., disturbance cap, mitigation) elsewhere in PHMA. ID IHMA is Avoidance for wind and solar. OR is Avoidance for wind and solar in Lake, Harney, and Malheur Counties outside of SFAs. UT includes an Exception for wind outside PHMA but w/in 5 miles of leks inside PHMA. | his is an unofficial of documents in the Blubstantial NEPARES AND THE BLIM WATER OF THE BLIM THE OF THE BLIM TH | republication version of the property of the property of the final document that may be all the property of th | (Cook et al., 2023; unless there are justifiable departures — see buffer appendix) and avoidance in the remainder of the IHMA. Infrastructure could be considered only if it can be demonstrated that as proposed or conditioned it would not impair habitat use by GRSG and will meet that the RMP GRSG goal and habitat objective. Additionally, do not allow surface use, occupancy, or placement of utility scale wind and solar facilities and associated infrastructure within one-half mile of PHMA to protect adjacent PHMA from indirect impacts from development in IHMA. Renewable energy decisions in MT/DK include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. | winter, limited mesic) seasonal habitats unless one of the criteria below is met. In ID, development would not be allowed inside lek buffers (ID Buffers Appendix). The area is determined to be non-habitat or unsuitable, lacks the ecological potential to become marginal or suitable habitat, and does not provide important connectivity between habitat areas |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| (See above.) | (See above.) (See above.) (See above.) | (See above.) (S | (See above.) Of this and in the hed in steed published in the hed | disruption of adjacent seasonal habitats. Topography/areas of non-habitat create an effective barrier to impacts. Co-location of the proposed authorization with existing disturbance will result in no additional impacts to those already associated with the existing major infrastructure, including indirect disturbance to or disruption of adjacent seasonal habitats. The remainder of PHMA/IHMA would be avoidance areas for utility scale wind and solar testing and development. Infrastructure could be considered only if it can be demonstrated that as proposed or conditioned (including disturbance cap and mitigation requirements) it would not impair habitat use by GRSG (as determined in coordination with state wildlife agency) and will meet that the RMP GRSG goal and habitat objective. Renewable energy decisions in MT/DK include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--------------------------|---|--|--|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) Major Rights-of-Way (ROWs) | PHMA to use GHMA seasonal habitats. Work with State and County governments to locate developments in areas of prior disturbance, including areas where invasive vegetation populations are dominant and areas of non-habitat. Apply compensatory mitigation to offset habitat losses due to direct and indirect impacts (see mitigation section). Renewable energy decisions in MT/DK include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. | (See above.) |
| PHMA/IHMA (ID): | PHMA/IHMA (ID): | • PHMA: | PHMA/IHMA (ID): | PHMA/IHMA (ID): |
| All states are Avoidance for major ROWs (≥100 kV transmission and ≥24" pipeline). OR, UT and WY encourage placement of new lines in designated corridors, or collocated with existing disturbance. Except as noted below, all states are avoidance for smaller ROWs | Same as Alternative I | All states: Exclusion for major rights-of-way (≥100 | ○ All states (except MT/DK) are Avoidance for major ROWs (≥100 kV transmission and ≥24" pipeline). ○ Where development cannot be avoided it would not be allowed in breeding and nesting habitats, or in other limiting/high value seasonal habitats unless one of the following criteria is met: The ROW can be routed through non-habitat/unsuitable (as determined by a GRSG biologist using criteria such as the Habitat Assessment Framework | o All states (except MT/DK) are Avoidance for major ROWs (≥100 kV transmission and ≥24" pipeline). o Micro-siting (siting based on local data) is required to avoid placement near active leks or in connectivity corridors between seasonal habitats. o Areas where major ROWs cannot be avoided apply minimization measures (e.g., disturbance cap, seasonal constraints, tall structure limitations, RDFs, nest and perch deterrents, etc.). Residual direct and indirect impacts |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|---|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | and coordinated with | would be mitigated |
| | | | State wildlife agencies) | through compensato ry |
| | | | and lacks the ecological | mitigation. |
| | | | potential to become | Major ROWs that are |
| | | | suitable habitat. ROWS | located inside RMP |
| | | | shall not disrupt | designated utility/ROW |
| | | | connectivity between | corridors would not need |
| | | | habitat areas and should | to comply with disturbance |
| | | , GI | be designed to prevent | cap (at either the HAF fine |
| | | .0.15 | indirect disturbance to | scale or project level) or |
| | | 10 | or disruption of | compensatory mitigation |
| | | on he | adjacent seasonal | requirements unless |
| | | 410 4 11. | habitats (as disclosed in | required by State |
| | | : C3 N31 0 | the environmental | regulations. |
| | | 17/10 411.106 4 | analysis). | |
| | | all to 11 b | Co-location of the | |
| | | ele ec villi oci | proposed authorization | |
| | | 16 16 4 16 90 | with existing ROW | |
| | | 6 00 al 16 | disturbance results in no | |
| | cicio. | M Me silve of | additional impacts to | |
| | 8910 B1 | CUIT OF GIRE | those already associated | |
| | 20, 6 | 100 The dis 10 | with the existing major | |
| | M. The | 0 1 000 23 | infrastructure, including | |
| | 181: 12 | 161. V 1 141 | construction, indirect | |
| | · E a Wir Will | 19 PK 21 | disturbance to or | |
| | is de ellison | J. IE, FLIC | disruption of adjacent | |
| | Mis Illing Ro | 14 26 | seasonal habitats. | |
| A | 1, 00, 3/1, 2V. | S. Ver | Additionally, where major | |
| | 90 Alla E. 101 | 11/1 | ROVVs cannot be avoided | |
| | 1311 Mr. 311 | CC | apply minimization | |
| | 12 31 1 No 9 | 0 | the environmental analysis). Co-location of the proposed authorization with existing ROW disturbance results in no additional impacts to those already associated with the existing major infrastructure, including construction, indirect disturbance to or disruption of adjacent seasonal habitats. Additionally, where major ROWs cannot be avoided apply minimization measures (e.g., disturbance cap, seasonal constraints, tall structure limitations, RDFs, nest and perch deterrents, etc.). Residual | |
| | 110 WO MILE | | cap, seasonal constraints, | |
| | So the Or the | | tall structure limitations, | |
| | Mar of | | determents and perch | |
| | 1 "We | | deterrents, etc.). Residual direct and indirect impacts | |
| | | republice that be produced in the start of t | would be mitigated | |
| | | | through compensatory | |
| | | | mitigation. | |
| | | | G | |
| | | | Micro-siting is required to | |
| | | | avoid disrupting | |
| | | | connectivity corridors | |
| | | | between seasonal habitats. | |

| GHMA: CO, NV/CA, and OR GHMA are Avoidance for major ROWs subject to minimization measures such as RDFs, and mitigation. WY is open to major ROWs. With minimization. All States except MYDK. All States except MYDK. With minimization roughers to measure to major ROWs. With minimization ROWs. |
|--|
| o CO, NV/CA, and OR GHMA are Avoidance for major ROWs. o ID and UT GHMA are open to major ROWs subject to minimization measures such as RDFs, and mitigation. O WY is open to major ROWs. O WY is open to major ROWs. O WY is open to major ROWs. O WY is ope |
| GHMA are Avoidance for major ROWs. o ID and UT GHMA are open to major ROWs subject to minimization measures such as RDFs, and mitigation. O WY is open to major ROWs. O WY is open to major |
| major ROWs. ID and UT GHMA are open to major ROWs subject to minimization measures such as RDFs, and mitigation. O WY is open to major ROWs. O WY is open to major ROWs. Major ROWs. BMPs. BMPs. BMPs. BMPs. BMPs. BMPs. seasonal habitats to meet the RMP GRSG goal and habitat objective. Additionally, any ROW should not be placed within one-half mile of PHMA or IHMA unless adjacent PHMA and IHMA are protected from indirect impacts. Outside those areas, open with compensatory mitigation requirements. Major ROW decisions in MT/DK |
| o ID and UT GHMA are open to major ROWs subject to minimization measures such as RDFs, and mitigation. O WY is open to major ROWs. O WY is open to major ROWs. Major ROW decisions in MT/DK ROW decisions in MT/DK RMP GRSG goal and habitat objective. Additionally, any ROW agency habitat designation restoration, connectivity, seasonal, or other), and to preclude negative impacts adjacent PHMA habitats. Major ROW decisions in MT/DK RMP GRSG goal and habitat objective. Additionally, any ROW agency habitat designation restoration, connectivity, seasonal, or other), and to preclude negative impacts adjacent PHMA habitats. Major ROW decisions in include state specific difference in those offices. |
| open to major ROWs subject to minimization measures such as RDFs, and mitigation. O WY is open to major ROWs. O WY is open to majo |
| subject to minimization measures such as RDFs, and mitigation. O WY is open to major ROWs. Should not be placed within one-half mile of PHMA or IHMA unless adjacent PHMA and IHMA are protected from indirect impacts. Outside those areas, open with compensatory mitigation requirements. Should not be placed within one-half mile of PHMA or IHMA unless adjacent PHMA and IHMA are protected from indirect impacts. Outside those areas, open with compensatory mitigation requirements. Major ROW decisions in MT/DK in those offices. |
| measures such as RDFs, and mitigation. O WY is open to major ROWs. half mile of PHMA or IHMA unless adjacent PHMA and IHMA are protected from indirect impacts. Outside those areas, open with compensatory mitigation requirements. half mile of PHMA or IHMA unless adjacent PHMA and IHMA are protected from indirect adjacent PHMA habitats. Major ROW decisions in include state specific difference in those offices. |
| measures such as RDFs, and mile of PHMA or IHMA and mitigation. O WY is open to major ROWs. Major ROW decisions in MT/DK include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. |
| and mitigation. O WY is open to major ROWs. Major ROW decisions in MT/DK include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. |
| O WY is open to major ROWs. The protected from indirect impacts. Outside those areas, open with compensatory mitigation requirements. Major ROW decisions in MT/DK include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. The protected from indirect impacts. Outside those areas, open with compensatory mitigation requirements. Major ROW decisions in include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. |
| ROWs. Impacts. Outside those areas, open with compensatory mitigation requirements. Major ROW decisions in include state specific diffesee Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. Major ROW decisions in MT/DK include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. |
| Major ROW decisions in MT/DK include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. Major ROW decisions in MT/DK in those offices. Major ROW decisions in include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. |
| Major ROW decisions in MT/DK include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. |
| Major ROW decisions in MT/DK include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. |
| include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. |
| See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. |
| in those offices. |
| TOFFICIAL IN EUROPE FINANCE TO THE POLICE TO |
| include state specific differences. See Section 2.6.3 for allocations in those offices. |

2.5.9 Minimizing Threats from Predation

GRSG are a prey species and face a suite of non-specialist predators across their range (Hagen 2011, USFWS 2023). Where sagebrush habitats are intact nest success and adult survival rates are high (Hagen 2011), indicating that predators generally do not limit GRSG populations. However, highly fragmented sagebrush landscapes reduce protective cover and often provide subsidies for sustaining abnormally large populations of predators, and the establishment of novel predators (predators not typically found in sagebrush, Coates et al., 2020). One example is the common raven which has experienced population growth across sagebrush ecosystems due to anthropogenic development (Coates et al., 2020, Dinkins et al. 2021, USFWS 2023). Reduction, isolation, and fragmentation of native shrublands increase GRSG nest exposure to ravens (Lyon and Anderson 2003, Bui et al., 2010, Coates and Delehanty 2010), although research has not been able to determine if raven predation contributes to compensatory or additive GRSG mortality (Taylor et al., 2017) in some areas of the GRSG range ravens are now considered a hyperpredator – having an increased population and therefore increased predation impacts due to the availability of multiple anthropogenic subsidies (e.g., food, nesting substrates) within previously undisturbed sagebrush (Coates et al., 2020).

Where sagebrush habitats are diminished by anthropogenic subsidies and disturbances or other ecological disturbance (i.e., wildfire) predator management may be necessary to conserve local at-risk GRSG populations (Hagen 2011, USFWS 2023). The BLM has committed to work with APHIS and local predator management groups as needed. To address habitat concerns associated with increasing predator abundance, the BLM will minimize new infrastructure and other human subsidies associated with permitted activities to conserve intact landscapes and implement RDFs and BMPs to reduce risk where infrastructure is unavoidable. New anthropogenic developments shall consider their influence on increasing predator abundance, and subsequent impacts on GRSG and make appropriate design modifications. Where ravens have been documented as a concern (e.g., densities greater than 0.4 ravens/km²; Coates et al., 2022), the BLM supports implementation of the strategy outlined by Dettenmaier et al. (2021) and adopted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (2023).

Table 2-11, Comparison of Alternatives, Minimizing Threats from Predation, presents management by alternative for this management issue.

Table 2-11. Comparison of Alternatives, Minimizing Threats from Predation

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| All states include some language | Same as Alternative I, except UT | All states: | All states: | Same as Alternative 4, except no |
| related to reducing opportunities | added language addressing corvid | Manage habitats to maintain, and | Same as Alternative 3. | restrictions applied to GHMA and |
| for avian predators (e.g., nest and | nests discovered during habitat | as needed, restore healthy native | isis | except as noted below: |
| perch deterrents, considering | treatments. | vegetation conditions, especially | Apply minimization measures and | |
| burying powerlines, etc.), though | | with respect to providing | BMPs to new authorizations and | Where avoidance of new |
| the location and except varies | | adequate sagebrush, other shrub, | activities in PHMA (and IHMA in | infrastructure is not feasible in |
| substantially between states (e.g., | | and herbaceous vegetation cover | Idaho) and GHMA to minimize | undisturbed habitat, the AO |
| some include references in an | | on the landscape, to minimize | threats from predators shown to | could require the project |
| objective, some in a management | | occurrence and effectiveness of | pose a threat to GRSG, | proponent to develop a predator |
| action, some in a Required | | predators. The BLM will | consistent with applicable law. | management plan. |
| Design Feature or Best | | collaborate with appropriate state | This includes, but is not limited to | |
| Management Practice). | | agencies, other landowners, | stopping, slowing, and/or | |
| , | | federal agencies (e.g., USFWS, | discouraging the incursion of new | |
| NV/CA, UT, and WY include | | APHIS), and tribal governments in | predators, increased levels of | |
| language encouraging | | their efforts to minimize impacts | predators, or predators | |
| coordinating with other partners | | from predators on GRSG where | expanding into new areas and can | |
| on predator management issues. | | needs have been documented | be accomplished by including the | |
| | ig. | (e.g., reduced recruitment of | following: | |
| NV/CA, OR, UT, and WY include | cric al | GRSG from predation), including | Avoiding new anthropogenic | |
| management precluding and/or | 01, 0 | providing needed authorizations, | infrastructure into undisturbed | |
| minimizing subsidies for | inche | to support predator management | habitats, | |
| predators. | his is an Inofficial of the design of the de | actions. | Eliminating or minimizing | |
| | 31 Jr. 1110 | Sto OR ALL | external food resources from | |
| CO, NV/CA, and UT include | is "61, !!!! | Prior to implementation of | anthropogenic sources (e.g., | |
| language related to habitat | 19 111 19 20 | control actions, data must be | road killed animals, carcass | |
| management to provide GRSG 🤏 | W. CO. 113 V. | presented that demonstrates the | dumps, trash resources from | |
| concealment from predators. | 70 x19, 16 1 | targeted predators are limiting | human activities associated | |
| | or We all die | GRSG populations in a specified | with development or | |
| UT includes a header section | 40 11 73 | area. A strategy for monitoring | recreation). | |
| with management that addresses | 102 VS. W/10 O | removal efficacy shall be | Where avoidance of new | |
| the threats from predation. | his is all hent. similar documents with National MEPARED Mational Meration of the design of the desi | developed. | infrastructure is not feasible | |
| | Jan B. II | | the project proponent shall | |
| WY includes management for | H No | Where infrastructure associated | develop a predator | |
| monitoring predator populations. | 11. | authorizations and activities in | management plan that: | |
| | | i i ii ii (and ii ii ii (iii idano) arc | Outlines how the project | |
| | | not avoidable, apply or request, | will be designed to | |
| | | consistent with applicable law, | minimize increasing | |
| | | minimization measures and BMPs | predator abundance, | |
| | | to minimize threats from | Details structure design to | |
| | | predators shown to pose a threat | reduce or eliminate | |
| | | to GRSG. This includes, but is not | opportunities for raven | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | limited to stopping, slowing, | and raptor perching and | (See above.) |
| | | and/or discouraging the incursion | nesting (e.g., burying | |
| | | of new predators, increased | powerlines, locating | |
| | | levels of predators, or predators | structures out of line of | |
| | | expanding into new areas and is | site of breeding and | |
| | | accomplished: | nesting habitat, using | |
| | | Precluding new anthropogenic | tubular non-branching | |
| | | infrastructure if consistent | material for structures, | |
| | | with applicable law and subject | etc.), | |
| | | to existing authorizations and | o Identifies predators to | |
| | | valid existing rights. Where | remove, with an estimate | |
| | | preclusion is not possible, | of predator abundance, | |
| | | avoid new anthropogenic | Includes a monitoring strategy | |
| | | infrastructure into undisturbed | | |
| | | habitats, | predator removal (e.g., | |
| | | Eliminating or minimizing | number and location of | |
| | | external food resources from | removal) and GRSG | |
| | | anthropogenic sources (e.g., | population response, and | |
| | 18: | road killed animals ASAP, | Explains how predator control programs will be | |
| | CiCICI | carcass dumps, trash resources from human | developed and coordinated | |
| | offi, B | activities associated with | if they become necessary. | |
| | an one | development or recreation). | Is coordinated with the | |
| | 0. 41. | Where avoidance of new | appropriate state agency | |
| | Mr. of ila | infrastructure is not feasible | and other federal agencies | |
| | is ell im | the project proponent shall | (e.g., USFWS, APHIS) as | |
| | :6' M. 5'06' | develop a predator | appropriate. | |
| A | WI. CO. 11A VE | management plan that: | For existing development, | |
| | 700 M31 BL 30 | Outlines how the project | reduce opportunities for raven | |
| | a Willer Hio | will be designed to | and raptor perching and | |
| | 49.14 730 | minimize increasing | nesting through measures such | |
| | 102 33, 11 120 | predator abundance, | as nest/perch deterrents | |
| | 11 101 1 1 W. W. | Details structure design to | (including regular | |
| | Jate Br II | reduce or eliminate | maintenance). | |
| | Hone | opportunities for raven | , | |
| | 411. | and raptor perching and | | |
| | | nesting (e.g., burying | | |
| | | powerlines, locating | | |
| | | structures out of line of | | |
| | | site of breeding and | | |
| | | nesting habitat, using | | |
| | | tubular non-branching | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|----------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | other federal agencies (e.g., USFWS, APHIS) as appropriate. • For existing development, | (See above.) (See above.) (See above.) | (See above.) |
| | his is an und the initary of the harion and the BLM the de the harional Mation at the de the harion at the de the blank the | ocum | | |

2.5.10 Livestock Grazing

Livestock grazing is the most widespread land use in the sagebrush ecosystem (Knick et al. 2011, Boyd et al. 2014). Well-managed public lands grazing done in accordance with the laws that guide livestock grazing management, (including but not limited to 43 CFR Part 4100, Taylor Grazing Act of 1934, FLPMA, and the Public Rangelands Improvement Act of 1978) and with consideration of local climatic conditions (e.g., drought) can be compatible with GRSG persistence (FWS 2015). In the 2015 USFWS not-warranted determination on GRSG, the agency determined that meeting Land Health Standards, including proper management of livestock numbers, season of grazing and application of adaptive management strategies minimized population level effects on the species (FWS 2015).

On BLM grazing allotments, grazing activities are managed through several mechanisms (permit terms and conditions, allotment management plans, annual pre-turnout authorization meetings, and ongoing monitoring) to ensure that grazing meets or move towards meeting Land Health Standards. Management for meeting land health standards avoids long-term and wide-spread improper grazing will be avoided. Table 3-7 shows that of the allotments with at least 15% PHMA, 5,140 allotments (53% of all allotments) are in Category A, meeting all standards or making significant progress toward meeting the standard, while 1,887 allotments (19% of all allotments) are in Categories B through F, representing different categories of not meeting land health standards. The remainder of the allotments do not have information on evaluations.

In some instances grazing activities may not meet or make significant progress toward meeting Land Health Standards. In such cases, improper grazing (defined as grazing at an intensity or in ways that impair ecosystem functions of the sagebrush ecosystem) can have localized adverse effects to GRSG habitats by altering the composition, productivity and structure of plants resulting in the loss of abundance or quality of GRSG food and cover (Boyd et al., 2014, Fleischner 1994). Improper grazing may also work synergistically with other threats, such as invasive plants and wildfire, increasing impacts from those sources. The USFWS found improper grazing by domestic livestock and free-roaming horses and burros can have negative impacts to sagebrush and GRSG at local scales (USFWS 2015) but previously did not find it was a principal factor affecting the status of the species (USFWS 2010).

Impacts from improper grazing associated with not meeting Land Health Standards are analyzed in Chapter 4. Areas experiencing these effects are generally spatially and temporally distinct, and are addressed through implementation-level corrective actions.

Livestock/range management actions were reviewed to determine if they address potential threats to GRSG at the RMP-level of decision-making. Alternatives I and 2 include many livestock grazing actions addressed by regulation, policy, or that duplicate actions already in the RMPs. As these actions would be implemented whether included in this amendment or not they are being considered for removal in Alternatives 4, 5, and 6. The actions from Alternatives I and 2 are summarized in the table below with the full text included in **Appendix I5**. Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 would focus on the threat to GRSG from improper livestock grazing and relocating or removing actions that are not needed in the RMP to implement.

Table 2-12, Comparison of Alternatives, Livestock Grazing, presents management by alternative for this management issue.

Table 2-12. Comparison of Alternatives, Livestock Grazing

| addressed through law, regulation or policy were consistent concepts across GRSG range, but there is substantial variability beyond these main concepts, and even in details associated with those main concepts. There are a number of other management actions that some states include that others don't, including addressing issues such as livestock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing,-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 15 for specific language by state. **addressed through law, regulation or policy were regulation or policy were regulation or policy were regulation or policy were removed, since they are addressed outside the RMP. **wy': clarifications were provided regarding grazing in riparian areas, management or ange improvements, and prioritization (removed SFAs). Additionally, clarifications to applying dresholds and responses were made. **Discrete and the last bit standard for special status species, 2) avoid direct adverse impacts to limiting GRSG hibitats from livestock management range improvements, and prioritization (removed SFAs). Additionally, clarifications to applying dresholds and responses were made. **Discrete and the last bit standard for special status species, 2) avoid direct adverse impacts to limiting GRSG hibitats from livestock management range improvements; and 3) applies the guideline that addresses "restoring, maintaining, or enhancing habitats ofspecial status species, 2) avoid direct adverse impacts to limiting GRSG hibitations to applying dresholds and prioritization (removed SFAs). Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards and applies the formation of the grazing in the last way and the last between the standards and applies the guideline that discussed in providing addresses "restoring, maintaining, or enhancing habitats ofspecial status spe | Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| anguage and actions that address how domestic livestock grazing would be administered in GRSG HMAs. There are some consistent concepts across GRSG range, but there is substantial variability beyond these main concepts, and even in details associated with those main concepts. There are a number of other management actions that some states include that others don't, including addressing issues such as livestock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination of program in GRSG HMSs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. **OR Livestock grazing in a manner that 1) meets on makes progress toward meeting the Land Health Standard objective would be needed. **OR Livestock grazing prioritization, or issues objective would be needed.** **University objective would be needed.** **Including addressing in a manner that 1) meets or makes progress toward meeting the Land Health Standard for special status species of immining GRSG habitat, manage livestock grazing in a manner that 1) meets or makes progress to ward meeting the Land Health Standard for special status species. All provided regarding grazing in riparian areas, management of range improvements, and prioritization (removed SFAs). Additionally, clarifications to applying GRSG objectives to land health standards and applying thresholds and responses were made. **Di. areas that met an adaptive management program in GRSG HMSA. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. **OR. Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the best of the special status species of management and applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. **OR. Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the best of the species and application of management and program in GRSG HMSAs. **OR Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the best of the land the language that pre-dated the best of the lan | There is substantial variation | All States: | All states: | All states: | All states: |
| now demestic livestock grazing would be administered in GRSG HMAs. There are some consistent concepts across GRSG range, but there is substantial variability beyond these main concepts, and even in details associated with those main concepts. There are a number of other management actions that some states include that others don't, including addressing issues such as livestock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing reparated actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Prioritization, or issues addressed through law regulation or policy were removed, since they are addressed chrough law, regulation or policy were removed, since they are addressed clusted the RMP. WY: clarifications were provided regarding grazing in right and concepts. There are a number of other management actions that some states include that others don't, including addressing issues such as livestock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Provided regarding grazing in right and prioritization of various other grazing in rangement of range improvements, and prioritization (removed SFAs). Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards and applying thresholds and responses were made. Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Provided regarding grazing in objective would be needed. Provided resparding regarding reg | between the various states in the | Same as Alt I, except: | Because PHMA would be | Objective RM-I: Specific to | Objective RM-1: Specific to |
| addressed through law, regulation or policy were removed, since they are addressed outside the RMP. Wy: clarifications were provided regarding grazing in riparian areas, management of remove difficulties to land health standards and applying thresholds and responses were made. ID: areas that met an adaptive management or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing implementation of the gr | language and actions that address | UT: all actions addressing | unavailable for livestock grazing, | GRSG habitat, manage livestock | GRSG habitat, manage livestock |
| HMs. There are some consistent concepts across GRSG range, but there is substantial variability beyond these main concepts, and even in details associated with those main concepts. There are a number of other management actions that some states include that others don't, including addressing issues such as livestock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, and gardeness of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during program in GRSG HMs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. HMs. There are some concepts, and even in details addressed outside the RMP. WY: clarifications were provided regarding grazing in riparian areas, management of range improvements, and prioritization (removed SFAs). Additionally, clarifications to applying thresholds and responses were made. In June 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Hand I be an indicate they are discussed outside the RMP. WY: clarifications were provided regarding grazing in riparian areas, management of range improvements, and prioritization (removed SFAs). Additionally, clarifications to applying thresholds and responses were made. In June 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. The provided regarding grazing in riparian areas, management of range improvements, and prioritization of variety of the provided regarding grazing in the status species to promote their conservation (43 CFR Part 4180.2(e)(9) or subsequent conservation (43 CFR Part 4180.2(e)(9). The provided regarding grazing in the status species to form invariant and direct adverse impacts of limiting difference adverse | how domestic livestock grazing | prioritization, or issues | | | grazing in a manner that 1) meets |
| consistent concepts across GRSG range, but there is substantial variability beyond these main concepts, and even in details associated with those main concepts. There are a number of other management actions that some states include that others don't, including addressing issues such as livestock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing program in GRSG hIMAs. See Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Corp. Language by state. Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for special status species, 2) avoid direct adverse—innext supplies the guideline to grazing addressing applies the guideline for grazing administration that addresses "restoring, maintaining, or enhancing habitats ofspecial status species, and applies the guideline that direct adverse—impacts of limiting GRSG habitats from livestock management range improvements, and prioritization (removed SFAs). Additionally, clarifications to applying GRSG objectives to land health standards and applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. ID: areas that met an adaptive management hard origger would be prioritized for monitoring. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NVICA: prioritization in SFAs vas removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Vestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | would be administered in GRSG | addressed through law, | objective would be needed. | | |
| arage, but there is substantial variability beyond these main concepts, and even in details associated with those main concepts. There are a number of other management actions that some states include that others don't, including addressing issues such as livestock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Applications were made. NVGA: prioritization in SFAs was returned to land health standards were made. NVGA: prioritization in SFAs was returned to language that pre-dated the labitat objectives to land health standards were made. NVGA: prioritization in SFAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | | | | |
| as investock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Discretal applying thresholds and responses were made. ID: areas that met an adaptive management hard trigger would be prioritized for monitoring. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NVICA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | • | removed, since they are | i s | | |
| as investock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Discretal applying thresholds and responses were made. ID: areas that met an adaptive management hard trigger would be prioritized for monitoring. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NVICA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | • | addressed outside the RMP. | al's | | |
| as investock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Discretal applying thresholds and responses were made. ID: areas that met an adaptive management hard trigger would be prioritized for monitoring. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NVICA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | , , | WY: clarifications were | 70 | GRSG habitats from livestock | |
| as investock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Discretal applying thresholds and responses were made. ID: areas that met an adaptive management hard trigger would be prioritized for monitoring. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NVICA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | provided regarding grazing in | on he | management range | |
| as investock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. ID: areas that met an adaptive management hard trigger would be prioritized for monitoring. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NVICA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | riparian areas, management of | Tio the | improvements; and 3) applies the | |
| as investock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. ID: areas that met an adaptive management hard trigger would be prioritized for monitoring. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NVICA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | • | range improvements, and | 1.Co 100 0 | guideline for grazing | |
| as investock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. ID: areas that met an adaptive management hard trigger would be prioritized for monitoring. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NVICA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | prioritization (removed SFAs). | Alle Hine | administration that addresses | |
| as investock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. ID: areas that met an adaptive management hard trigger would be prioritized for monitoring. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NVICA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | O . | Additionally, clarifications to | 711 St. 11 6 -11 | restoring, maintaining, or | changes to regulations or policy). |
| as investock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. ID: areas that met an adaptive management hard trigger would be prioritized for monitoring. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NVICA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | applying GRSG objectives to | 166 60 MIII. OC. | enhancing habitats ofspecial | |
| as investock trailing, placement of feed or mineral supplements, language encouraging coordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Discretal applying thresholds and responses were made. ID: areas that met an adaptive management hard trigger would be prioritized for monitoring. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NVICA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | land health standards and | 16 16 16 | status species to promote their | |
| coordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Specific language by state | | applying thresholds and | 16, 61, 31 .8 | conservation (43 CFR Part | |
| roordination, prioritization of various other grazing-related actions, or suggestions of what could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix I 5 for specific language by state. **NV/CA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the I3 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | responses were made. | M. We Ellis St. | 4180.2(e)(9). | |
| could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NV/CA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | ID: areas that met an adaptive | Chine , etc M | 8 | |
| could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NV/CA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | management hard trigger | 400 The dis 1 p | | |
| could be considered during implementation of the grazing program in GRSG HMAs. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. Clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. NV/CA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | would be prioritized for | 0 (, 500 73) | | |
| Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. NV/CA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | monitoring. Additionally, | 16,0 | | |
| Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. NV/CA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | ciarifications to applying the | 15 CP 12 | | |
| Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. NV/CA: prioritization in SFAs was removed. Additionally, clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | habitat objectives to land | 2 7/2 / 1/1 | | |
| clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | nealth standards were made. | all out | | |
| clarifications to applying the habitat objectives to land health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | NV/CA: prioritization in SFAs | ia ve. | | |
| health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the I3 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | ioi specific language by states. | was removed. Additionally, | Ulli | | |
| health standards were made. OR: Livestock grazing in the I3 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | habitat abjective to land | 000 | | |
| OR: Livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | health standards were made | | | |
| 13 key RNAs was returned to language that pre-dated the | | | | | |
| language that pre-dated the | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | 2015 amendments. | | | |
| 2013 amendments. | | ZOTO attletiditietits. | | | |
| See Appendix 2 or Appendix | | See Annendix 2 or Annendix | | | |
| 15 for specific language by state. | | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| There is substantial variation | Same as Alternative I, except as | All states: | Management Action RM-I: | Same as Alternative 4. |
| between the various states in the | summarized under the row for | PHMA would be unavailable for | The presence of GRSG HMAs | |
| language and actions that address | Objective RM-1 above. See | livestock grazing. | would not affect whether an area | |
| how domestic livestock grazing | Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 | | is available for livestock grazing; | |
| would be administered in GRSG | for specific language by state. | | maintain existing areas designated | |
| HMAs. There are some | | | as available or unavailable for | |
| consistent concepts across | | | livestock grazing. | |
| GRSG range, including the | | | 0 0 0 111 | |
| following concepts in all states, | | are Publication Version of the property of the final document will be produced by the final document that may be all the final that may be all the f | During grazing authorization | |
| unless noted otherwise: | | 2/3. | renewals, Allotment Management | |
| GRSG management areas are | | 10. | Plan development, or other | |
| available for livestock grazing, | | Sec. 12- | appropriate implementation-level | |
| except in OR, where all or | | 10. 4/1 | planning, consider adjustments to | |
| portions of 13 key Research | | 2000 | active AUMs, timing, intensity, | |
| Natural Areas (RNAs) would | | Ho the of | duration, and frequency of grazing | |
| be unavailable, though not | | 10. 10. | are completed at the allotment | |
| every state has a management | | 200 CC : 111 - CL | scale based on site-specific | |
| action that explicitly states | | 16, 06 M, 40 | conditions to meet or make | |
| that. | | S. of W. M. M. C. | progress towards meeting Land | |
| Include/adjust permit terms | igi | 10 06, 100, 12 | Health Standard for special status | |
| and conditions needed to meet | Sio. 21 | 1, 14, 41, 46, | species. Additionally, temporary | |
| land health standards and | Off. B | active ist b | adjustments of timing, intensity, | |
| GRSG habitat objectives, | in the | 40 11.00,01 | duration, and frequency of grazing | |
| including suggestions for what | 20. 11. 21 | of. 50 No. | can be made annually to livestock | |
| the BLM could do on specific | 31, 4. 110 | TO DE TI | numbers, the number of AUMs, | |
| allotments if problems were | 19 ell in | 12 Sh, Mar | and season of use within the | |
| identified. | :6 M 61 76 | 2 Mr. 11. | range of the terms and conditions | |
| identified. | 11 CM 114 0 K | al land | and in accordance with applicable | |
| See Appendix 2 or Appendix | 100 131.01 | ia de. | regulations. | |
| 15 for specific language by state. | 0 70 18, 10, | Are Publication Version of the Area of the | | |
| 13 IOI specific language by state. | 131 1 131 | 200 | In managing livestock grazing, | |
| | 20 31 1 M 9 | Prepublication the poly of the property of the | consider and apply where | |
| | Jr. Oll W. Co | | appropriate the livestock grazing | |
| 9 | STO BY THE | | best management practices and | |
| | 70 | | design features in Appendix 15. | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------|
| There is substantial variation | Same as Alternative I, except as | Not applicable. | Management Action RM-2: | Same as Alternative 4. |
| between the various states in the | summarized under the row for | | (PHMA/IHMA, GHMA) During | |
| language and actions that address | Objective RM-1 above. See | | the land health assessment (LHA) | |
| how domestic livestock grazing | Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 | | process, use the criteria identified | |
| would be administered in GRSG | for specific language by state. | | in the Sage-Grouse Habitat | |
| HMAs, including addressing issues | | | Assessment Framework (BLM- | |
| such as livestock trailing, | | | TR-6710-1 - Stiver et al. 2015 – | |
| placement of feed or mineral | | Republication version of the poly of the poly of the final document that may be all the poly of the final document that may be all the poly of the final document that may be all the poly of the poly | as revised) and other BLM | |
| supplements, language | | is a | approved methodology to | |
| encouraging coordination, | | ar's | provide multiple lines of evidence | |
| prioritization of various other | | 10.0 | (which are consistent with BLM | |
| grazing-related actions, or | | 30 M | Manual 1283) for determining | |
| suggestions of what could be | | 410. 411. | whether vegetation structure, | |
| considered during | | 1630 30 | condition, and composition are | |
| implementation of the grazing | | A Salls office b | meeting or making significant | |
| program in GRSG HMAs. Many | | 10. 10 100 | progress towards meeting the | |
| actions are not decisions, but lists | | Republication version of the poly of the property will be poly of the final document that may be all when the poly of the poly | Land Health Standards (LHS) for | |
| of items to consider during | | 10, 00 M. 40 | BLM special status species – | |
| implementation. There are some | | et a along | which includes GRSG. referencing | |
| consistent concepts across GRSG | ig. | Me Je, alla ils | appropriate ESD, associated State | |
| range, including the following | Gio al | 1, 111, 41, 46, | and Transition Model (STM) and | |
| concepts in all states,: | 01, 0 | ocche is b | existing ecological condition | |
| Prioritize monitoring (both | inche | 90 1,000,04 | information., For GRSG, the | |
| field checks and land health | 20 71 21 | of Roman | standard would generally be met | |
| assessments) and renewal of | 31. V. illa | Sto DA St. | when vegetation conditions | |
| grazing in SFAs (as applicable) | is el in | Is Et Wa | provide for suitable or marginal | |
| and PHMAs outside of SFAs. | :6' M . 6' 20' | S Mr 4 L | GRSG habitat at the HAF site | |
| Include/adjust permit terms | 41, CD. 11A VE | al all | scale (see Table 8-1, Appendix | |
| and conditions needed to meet | 700 x131 161 00 | is The | 8), based on existing ecological | |
| land health standards and | or We The Ho | CUIT | condition, ecological potential, | |
| GRSG habitat objectives, | 49. 14 Mg. | | and existing vegetation | |
| including suggestions for what | 102 33, 11 12 0 | | information. | |
| the BLM could do on specific | 11 101. 11 W. W. | | | |
| allotments if problems were | Mr. Dr. II. | Republication the poly of the | Where the LHS for SSS habitat | |
| identified. | Ho we | | (including GRSG) is not being met | |
| | 411 | | – as indicated by an unsuitable | |
| See Appendix 2 or Appendix | | | site-scale HAF assessment | |
| 15 for specific language by state. | | | relative to site potential – and | |
| 10.0. specific language by state. | | | existing livestock grazing is a | |
| | | | significant causal factor (43 CFR | |
| | | | Part 4180, BLM H-4180-1 or | |
| | | | subsequent changes to | |
| | | | regulations or policy), | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|---|-----------------|--|---|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | adjustments to livestock grazing practices and activities will be made at the authorization, allotment or activity plan level and in accordance with applicable regulations (43 CFR Part 4180.21 or subsequent changes to regulations or policy). Any adjustments to grazing will be made based on current ecological potential according to ESD, associated STM and existing ecological state. | (See above.) |
| All the states include language related to thresholds and responses to address and respond to future conditions in new fully processed permits. The specificity of this language and when it is required varies by state. See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. | Same as Alternative I, except as summarized under the row for Objective RM-I above. See Appendix 2 or Appendix I5 for specific language by state. | Not applicable. | Management Action RM-3: In PHMA (and IHMA in ID) the NEPA analysis when fully processing grazing authorizations (I.e., permit or lease) shall include at least one alternative that includes specific thresholds and defined responses in the terms and conditions of the grazing authorization in the following circumstances, as workload capacity allows: • Where the special status species standard is not being met, specific to GRSG habitat suitability and current livestock grazing has been identified as a significant causal factor (43 CFR Part 4180, BLM H-4180-1 or subsequent changes to regulations or policy); • In high priority allotments (e.g., based on prioritization from IM 2018-024, as amended or | Management Action RM-3: In PHMA (and IHMA in ID) the NEPA analysis when fully processed grazing authorizations should consider including at least one alternative that considers specific thresholds and defined responses in the terms and conditions of the grazing authorization, where the special status species standard is not being met, specific to GRSG habitat suitability, and current livestock grazing has been identified as a significant causal factor (43 CFR Part 4180, BLM H-4180-1 or subsequent changes to regulations or policy), as workload capacity and priorities allow. One or more defined responses will allow the authorizing officer to implement adjustments to livestock grazing during the term of the authorization that have already been analyzed in a NEPA document. Thresholds specific to GRSG habitat would be developed to maintain or move |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | superseded) in | PHMA/IHMA toward providing |
| | | | PHMA/IHMA; or | suitable GRSG habitat (Table 8- |
| | | | When changing grazing | I, Appendix 8), and be designed |
| | | | management on a | to address the site-level HAF |
| | | | grazing authorization | indicators that warranted the |
| | | | (e.g., new season of | HAF assessment rating, and |
| | | | use, rotation schedule, | consider ecological site potential, |
| | | | new livestock type, | and relevant locally specific |
| | | Sil | etc.) to provide an | conditions, and Land Health |
| | | 0.13 | alternative approach if | Standards (43 CFR Part 4180.2 or |
| | | 10 | alternative approach if the terms and | subsequent changes to |
| | | on he | conditions do not have | regulations or policy). |
| | | 410 4 71 | the desired intent. | |
| | | "Co NO 0 | 45.10 | |
| | | Alle illine | One or more defined responses | |
| | | 2016 of 11 6 -11 | will allow the authorizing officer | |
| | | eb ec will oc | to implement adjustments to | |
| | . < | 16 Th 1 19 | livestock grazing during the term | |
| | : 2 | 16 61 31 19 | of the authorization that have | |
| | ci Clo | M. We till of | already been analyzed in a NEPA | |
| | All B | CUI SE GIE W | document. Thresholds specific to | |
| | 20,00 | 100 The dis 1 p | GRSG habitat will be developed | |
| | M. The | 0 (, 200 /3) | to maintain or move | |
| | 31, 4. , 1/3, | 10,00 | PHMA/IHMA toward providing suitable GRSG habitat (Table 8 - | |
| | is an in | 15 Ph Var | I, Appendix 8), designed to | |
| | :6 Me 61 78 | 3. 71. All | address the site-level HAF | |
| | Wis Chill K | all and | indicators that warranted the | |
| | 1,00 :31.05 | ia. De. | HAF assessment rating, and | |
| | 0 711 181 10 | -Ull | consider ecological site potential, | |
| | 431 W 131 | 200 | and relevant locally specific | |
| | 20 031 1 M 9 | | conditions, and Land Health | |
| | Ar in in we | Mexpects final document that may be all the property of the pr | Standards (43 CFR 4180.2). | |
| | 2 4/2 ON 4/1 | | Standards (T3 C1 IX T100.2). | <u> </u> |

| Summary of Alternative I Summary of Alternative 2 Alternative 3 All states include guidance on how livestock grazing/range management infrastructure projects are addressed. Some states include actions for existing Summary of Alternative 2 Alternative 3 Same as Alternative 1, except UT consolidated multiple actions into one, and WY clarified their action. | Management Action RM-4 (existing Range Improvement Projects): | Same as Alternative 4. |
|---|---|------------------------|
| management infrastructure one, and WY clarified their projects are addressed. Some action. | | |
| projects are addressed. Some action. | Improvement Projects): | |
| | | |
| states include actions for existing | During the grazing authorization | |
| | renewal process, evaluate all | |
| water projects, new water | existing livestock management range improvements with respect | |
| projects, existing non-water projects, and new non-water | to their effect on GRSG and | |
| projects. All generally relate to | GRSG habitat. Consider removal | |
| | or modification of projects that | |
| existing water and structural | negatively affect GRSG or GRSG | |
| range improvements, See | habitat. Functional projects | |
| Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 | needed for management of | |
| for specific language by state. | sensitive species habitat or other | |
| Allo this of | sensitive resources should be | |
| all ets il be | maintained but consider | |
| ieb ec villion | improving in a manner less | |
| of the thirds | impactful to GRSG (See | |
| existing water and structural range improvements, See Appendix 2 or Appendix I5 for specific language by state. | Appendix 15 for Livestock | |
| cicle Wind fill at | Grazing Management Best Management Practices and Design | |
| office by culine istem | Features). | |
| 100 ne 100 The dis 11 | reactives). | |
| limiting impacts from new and existing water and structural range improvements, See Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 for specific language by state. | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| All states include guidance on | Same as Alternative I, except UT | I. | Management Action RM-5 | Same as Alternative 4. |
| how livestock grazing/range | consolidated multiple actions into | | (new Range Improvement | |
| management infrastructure | one, and WY clarified their | | Projects): Design new range | |
| projects are addressed. Some | action. | | improvement projects (any | |
| states include actions for existing | | | activity or program relating to | |
| water projects, new water | | | rangelands which is designed to | |
| projects, existing non-water | | | improve forage, change vegetative | |
| projects, and new non-water | | | composition, control patterns of | |
| projects. All generally relate to | | is | use, provide water, stabilize soil | |
| limiting impacts from new and | | al's. | and water conditions and provide | |
| existing water and structural | | 10 | habitat for livestock and wildlife) | |
| range improvements, See | | 30 70 | to enhance livestock distribution | |
| Appendix 2 or Appendix 15 | | 410 " El. | or management and to control | |
| for specific language by state. | | : C3 1231 0 | the duration, timing and intensity | |
| | | Who the b | of utilization, including application | |
| | | THE STATE OF | of new technologies such as | |
| | | el ec illi | virtual fencing. In PHMA, focus | |
| | | 16 16 " W. 90 | authorization of new water | |
| | | 1 61 31 31 is | developments and structural | |
| | : Cla | M Me silve M | range improvements (e.g., fences) | |
| | 8910 01 | - chi che | to projects that have a nominal | |
| | 20, 6 | 100 Mp 412 1 p | or incidental effects or that are | |
| | M. The | 0 1 000 23 | beneficial to GRSG seasonal | |
| | 181: 12 | 161. VF 1410 | habitats. Any new structural | |
| | . C. S. W. Wille | Stoph at | range improvements should be | |
| | is de ellis | PILL ALLO | placed along existing disturbance | |
| | vis III II Be | 14 76 | corridors or in the least suitable | |
| | 1, Occ. 3/13 DV. 1 | 3, 61, | habitat, to the extent practical, | |
| | 90 The Ch. 101 | IN | and are subject to appropriate | |
| | Will All Street | CV | design features (Appendix 15). | |
| | his is an unofficial for documents in the Bland of the Bl | 0 | | |
| | his is an unofficial of documents in the an artificial of the Bland Nation at the artific at the | Mexpert Wildows Mexperts of the final down of the final down of the final may be all the fina | | |
| | S THE BY THE | | | |
| | Ma C | | | |
| | "We | | | |
| | • | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|------------------------|
| All states include a management | Same as Alternative I. | Not applicable. | Management Action RM-6 | Same as Alternative 4. |
| action related to fences in GRSG | | | (fences): Identify fences in high- | |
| habitat management areas, though | | | risk areas - especially within 1.2 | |
| the level of detail varies state-to- | | | miles of an active lek | |
| state. See Appendix 2 or | | | (Christiansen 2009; Stevens 2011) | |
| Appendix 15 for specific | | | - or other areas identified as | |
| language by state. | | | important seasonal habitats or | |
| | | | areas of GRSG concentration | |
| | | .61 | (e.g., geophagy sites) in | |
| | | (0) | coordination with the state | |
| | | 2700 | wildlife agency. Evaluate if the | |
| | | ion the | fence is needed and/or up to BLM | |
| | | 2000 | fencing standards (BLM H 1741). | |
| | | "Co "Na b | If the fence is unnecessary, | |
| | | 101, et, he, | remove it. If the fence is needed to support management, mark | |
| | his is an unofficial to document similar action | OUI CAS :11 P CI | fences (install reflective fence | |
| | | 164 Vec 111, 100 | markers) in high risk or | |
| | | D, 44 46 10 | important areas (Christiansen | |
| | 18: | We, el, va, ie | 2009; Stevens 2011). Where | |
| | CiCICI | 14. 14. Ell. " El | marking fences does not reduce | |
| | offi, B. | chine ist no | fence-related GRSG mortality, | |
| | 170.76 | 400 11, colo 1 | modify fences. Modification could | |
| | V 11. V | of. 500 000 | include re-routing, altering | |
| | 31, 2. 110 | Cto DA TI | construction materials, drop | |
| | is all im | 12 Ch, Mar | fencing, or limiting perch | |
| | '8, 'W, 8, VE, | S Mr * 11. | potential. New fences within | |
| A | WI. CO. 11A VE | al, all | high-risk areas would only be | |
| | 700 1131 64 00 | ia me | authorized if: | |
| | O W. TE. HO | -Ull | It is consistent with the overall | |
| | -49. 14 May | 00 | RMP GRSG objective; | |
| | 102 vg, 11/2 0 | | Local terrain features shield | |
| | ME IN IN WE | | nearby habitat or reduce the | |
| | July Br II. | | habitat importance; | |
| | his is an unofficial of the distantial of the Bland Albertanial NEPARATION AND THE BLAND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE BLAND THE BLAN | | The fence is constructed to | |
| | his is an unofficial of the Blund of the Blu | Mexpedt will dock in a doc | BLM standards and with high | |
| | | | visibility markers to reduce | |
| | | | GRSG strikes. | |
| | | | | |
| | | | Monitoring of existing fences to | |
| | | | assess mortality risk is | |
| | | | recommended in all GRSG | |
| | | | habitats. | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| All states include language related | Same as Alternative 1. | Not applicable. | Management Action RM-7: | Same as Alternative 4. |
| to agency considerations if a | | | At the time a permittee or lessee | |
| permittee voluntarily relinquishes | | | voluntarily relinquishes grazing | |
| a permit or lease. See Appendix | | | preference and the associated | |
| 2 or Appendix 15 for specific | | | authorization, the BLM will | |
| language by state. | | | consider whether to offer the | |
| | | | permit for re-authorization to | |
| | | | other grazing applicants or if the | |
| | | i | public lands where that permitted | |
| | | 219. | use was authorized shall be used | |
| | | 70 | for other resource management | |
| | | 30 m | objectives. This does not apply to | |
| | | 410. 411 | or impact grazing preference | |
| | | 1 C 3 L 3 L 3 | transfers, which are addressed in | |
| | | A South office | 43 CFR Part 4110.2-3. | |
| | | 110 45 1 10 | 4, 44, 61, | |
| | | op cor ill co | When a permittee or lessee | |
| | 4 | 16, 06 " W. 40 | voluntarily relinquishes grazing | |
| | | et of alice | preference and associated grazing | |
| | cia. | M Je alla LIS | authorization, consider | |
| | cfil 21 | 1, 111, 11, 46, | conversion of the allotment to a | |
| | 01, 0 | LOCANO IS D | reserve common allotment that | |
| | inche | 90 1,000,01 | will remain available for use on a | |
| | 2 7, 31 | or. Roman | temporary, nonrenewable basis | |
| | 31 V. Villa | STO SA ST. | for the benefit of GRSG habitat. | |
| | is '61' in | VIS THE MA | Authorize temporary nonrenewal | |
| | 18 M 18 20 | Mr. I | permits in reserve common | |
| * | 41, CD. 11A VE | M. Chr. | allotments to meet resource | |
| ` | his is an unofficial of the Brain and the Br | Are Publication Version of the Area of the | objectives elsewhere such as rest | |
| | o We The Flo | -Ul | or deferment due to wildfire or | |
| | 49. 14 Mar | 00 | vegetation treatments. | |
| | 102 VS, 11 12 0 | | Temporary use of reserve | |
| | nr ion In We | | common allotments would not be | |
| | July Br III. | | allowed due to drought or | |
| | No C | | overuse of allotments. | |

2.5.11 Wild Horse and Burro Management

Grazing of wild horses and burros results in reduced plant diversity, altered soil characteristics, lower grass cover, lower grass density, fragmented and reduced shrub cover and increased abundance of cheatgrass (Beever et al. 2008, Beever and Brussard 2000, Coates et al. 2021), although impacts vary with elevation, density, and season and duration of use (Beever and Aldridge, 2011). The loss of shrub and grass cover can increase predation risk to nesting GRSG (Connelly et al., 2000). Wild horse and burros also negatively impact important mesic areas that provide GRSG brood-rearing habitats (Beever and Aldridge 2011). Unlike domestic livestock there is little if any direct management of wild horses and burros, such as fencing, lease deferral and pasture rest, potentially exacerbating their impacts on GRSG habitats at local scales. Recent research in Nevada predicted GRSG declines due to habitat alteration and loss from wild horses when appropriate management levels established for wild horse herds are exceeded (Coates et al., 2021). Therefore, management of wild horses and burros at appropriate management levels is a key component for GRSG planning.

At the RMP-level, the BLM identifies wild horse or burro Herd Areas, Herd Management Areas, and Herd Areas not designated as Herd Management Areas. This planning effort considers not designating wild horse and burro Herd Management Areas in areas that overlap PHMA under Alternative 3. Under alternatives 4, descripendix 2 for a perfining the appropriated Herd Manageme decisions. Such actions are depriority at a such a such as a such a such as a such a such as a 5, and 6, changes focus on the few actions described below, but the rest of existing wild horse and burro actions would be unchanged. See Appendix 2 for a description of which actions would be unchanged under Alternatives 4, 5 and 6 by state. Defining the appropriate management level (AML) and managing wild horse and burro populations in designated Herd Management Areas to the AML are implementation-level actions rather than RMP-level decisions. Such actions are dependent on local conditions and available resources to

The document that Table 2-13, Comparison of Alternatives, Wild Horse and Burro Management, presents management by

Table 2-13. Comparison of Alternatives, Wild Horse and Burro Management

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| All states (where wild horses | Same as Alternative I, except | No new wild horse and burro | Same as Alternative 2, except | Same as Alternative 2, except |
| and burros overlap with | removal of references to SFAs | herd management areas would | references to GHMA in Utah | references to GHMA in Utah |
| GRSG): | for the states that removed | be designated in areas that | would be retained and applied | would be retained and applied |
| Manage wild horse and burro | them, and removal of the | overlap PHMA. Where there | to GHMA as defined under this | to GHMA as defined under this |
| populations within | reference to GHMA in UT, | are currently herd management | alternative | alternative. |
| established appropriate | which removed that HMA type | areas, wild horses and burros | 10 01 D'III | |
| management levels (AML). | under this alternative. | would be removed. | se the co | |
| Incorporate GRSG habitat | | are currently herd management areas, wild horses and burros would be removed. Because there would be no wild horse and burros herd management areas in PHMA, the wild horse and burro objectives and associated management actions associated with GRSG would be removed. These areas will be monitored and any wild horses or burros that re-establish in PHMA will be removed. | alternative | |
| objectives into wild horse | | Because there would be no wild | 20, 111, 119, 1 | |
| and burro management (e.g., | | horse and burros herd | 100 10, 10, | |
| herd management area plans, | | management areas in PHMA, | er or re. | |
| | | the wild horse and burro | 2 4 16, | |
| prioritization, with | | objectives and associated | 26, 17 | |
| prioritization of such | | management actions associated | We Wis Oliv | |
| activities in SFAs, then | | with GRSG would be removed. | 0. 10 | |
| PHMA, then GHMA. | | These areas will be monitored | We You | |
| • CO, ID, NV/CA, OR, UT: | | and any wild horses or burros | r, iec | |
| Prioritize gathers in GRSG | igi | that re-establish in PHMA will | CIT | |
| SFAs and PHMA unless | crio al | be removed. | | |
| removals are necessary in | 011. 1 | acrive is b | | |
| other areas to address higher | inche | 90 11,000,01 | | |
| priority issues, including herd | 20 11 21 | of. Bowley | | |
| health impacts. | 31. At. aile | Great I | | |
| | 12 °61, 141, | 113.C.Y. "119 | I. | |
| | 'S' M' S' 20' | S Mr " LI | | |
| A | 11, CD. 11A VE | al, chi | | |
| ` | , 700 F/3, 161 V | ic Me | | |
| | or Wer Alexander | -Uli | | |
| | 40 11 Mar 1 | 0 | | |
| | 102 33, 11 120 | | | |
| | The 101 of the We | | | |
| | 130 8 | the wild horse and burro objectives and associated management actions associated with GRSG would be removed. These areas will be monitored and any wild horses or burros that re-establish in PHMA will be removed. | | |
| | W. We | | | |
| | 611 | | | |
| | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Altamativa 2 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| ID, NV/CA, OR, UT, WY: | Same as Alternative 1. | Alternative 3 No wild horse and burro herd | All States: | All States: |
| Manage wild horse and burros | Same as Alternative 1. | management areas would be | Manage wild horse and | Manage wild horse and |
| herd management areas in | | designated in the Herd Areas | burros herd management | burros herd management |
| GRSG habitat within established | | that overlap PHMA, or portions | areas in GRSG habitat (or | areas in GRSG habitat (or |
| appropriate management level | | of the Herd Areas, if the | portions of the herd | portions of the herd |
| (AML) ranges to achieve and | | remaining areas outside PHMA | management area overlapping | management area overlapping |
| maintain GRSG habitat | | could still support herd | or within GRSG habitat) | or within GRSG habitat) |
| objectives. | | management areas. In those | within the low-end of the | within the established AML |
| | | areas where there are currently | established AML ranges to | ranges to achieve and |
| CO: Manage wild horse | | herd management areas, wild | achieve and maintain GRSG | maintain GRSG habitat |
| population levels within | | horses and burros would be | habitat objectives and achieve | objectives and achieve or |
| established AML. | | removed. | or make significant progress | make significant progress |
| | | Because there would be no wild horse and burros herd | towards achieving LHS, | towards achieving LHS, |
| | | management areas in PHMA, | considering the full suite of approaches to maintain AML, | considering the full suite of approaches to maintain AML, |
| | | TANK TO THE TANK | including temporary fertility | including temporary fertility |
| | | objectives and associated | control and non-reproducing, | control and non-reproducing, |
| | | management actions associated | or partially non-reproducing | or partially non-reproducing |
| | | with GRSG would be removed. | herds. | herds. |
| | i di | These areas will be monitored | 18/1 | |
| | efic 21 | and any wild horses or burros | | |
| | 201. 6 | that re-establish in PHMA will | | |
| | Miche | be removed | | |
| | his is an imofficial of the Bland of the Bland of the Bland NEPARE OF THE BLAND THE BL | Jistersed Resimas | | |
| | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|----------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| D, NV/CA, OR, UT: In SFA | Same as Alternative I, except | No wild horse and burro herd | All States: | Same as Alternative 4. |
| (where applicable) and PHMA | removal of references to SFAs | management areas would be | If GRSG site scale habitat | |
| outside of SFA, assess and | for the states that removed | designated in the Herd Areas | objectives are not being met | |
| adjust AMLs through the NEPA | them. | that overlap PHMA, or portions | in PHMA and GHMA (and | |
| process within HMAs when wild | | of the Herd Areas, if the | IHMA in Idaho), evaluate | |
| norses or burros are identified | | remaining areas outside PHMA | AMLs and adjust if necessary | |
| s a significant causal factor in | | could still support herd | through the NEPA process | |
| not meeting land health | | management areas. In those | where wild horse or burro | |
| standards, even if current AML | | areas where there are currently | use is identified as significant | |
| s not being exceeded. | | herd management areas, wild | causal factor to not meeting | |
| S | | horses and burros would be | LHS, or is a factor in the area | |
| CO: AML would be prioritized | | removed. | not meeting the GRSG | |
| or all BLM HMAs within PHMA | | *10. *// | | |
| pased on indicators that address | | Because there would be no wild | habitat objectives. | |
| regetation | | horse and burros herd | 00,17 | |
| structure/condition/composition | | management areas in PHMA, | We Wis Our | |
| and measurements specific to | | the wild horse and burro | 0, 100 | |
| achieving GRSG habitat | | objectives and associated | No You | |
| objectives. GRSG habitat | | management actions associated | 11:00 | |
| requirements would be | 121 | with GRSG would be removed. | elle | |
| considered, and preference | isio, al | These areas will be monitored | 10 | |
| given to GRSG habitat unless | offi. B | and any wild horses or burros | 0 | |
| site-specific circumstances | 30.00 | that re-establish in PHMA will | | |
| warrant an exemption. | 0. 41. 4 | be removed | | |
| variant an exemption. | 31, 4. 113. | beremoved | | |
| WY: PHMA (core only) | is an in | 12 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 | | |
| management objectives will be | . 6 ' Me 61' 28' | 2 7 F. F. | | |
| considered when evaluating | his is an unofficial to | 1/2-11 | | |
| AML. | his is an unofficible his is an internal with A Reconstitution | 10. Ver | | |
| AITL. | 0,70,64,70 | Mr. | | |
| | *31. M. 131. | 200 | | |
| | 125 - 21 1 No 0 | | | |
| | his is an unofficible his is an unofficible his is an unofficial his similar and his initial his district the blank in the district the blank in the district the blank in the | that re-establish in PHMA will be removed | | |
| • | So the Or the | | | |
| | 72. 6 | | | |
| | 1 "We | | | |
| | 1. | | | |

2.5.12 Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) are designated where special management attention is needed to protect important historical, cultural, and scenic values, or fish and wildlife or other natural resources. To be analyzed in the EIS, potential ACECs must be evaluated and determined to meet two evaluation criteria – relevance and importance. The presence of GRSG meets the relevance criteria across the entire range. Importance evaluations considers substantial significance to include special worth, consequence, distinctiveness, or cause for concern. For the importance criteria to be met values must be more than locally significant.

An evaluation of importance for all GRSG habitats was conducted to determine if any habitat within the range of GRSG met the importance criteria. Evaluation criteria included population density (e.g., Doherty et al., 2016), lek and habitat persistence (e.g., Wann et al., 2022, Palmquist et al., 2021, Rigge et al. 2021), genetic uniqueness and connectivity (e.g., Cross et al, 2018, Row et al. 2018, Cross et al. 2023, Oyler-McCance et al., 2022), amount of existing habitat disturbance and habitat quality (e.g., Doherty et al., 2022). Areas identified with the above criteria are analyzed in this EIS to determine if they meet the third FLPMA required: the need for special management to protect and prevent irreparable damage.

The BLM also received multiple nominations for ACEC designations. Each of these nominations were reviewed using the criteria presented by the nominator(s) and the criteria listed above. Nominated areas that met the importance criteria based on the rangewide review listed above and subsequent local evaluations were moved forward for further consideration. Additional details associated with the ACEC evaluation process is available in **Appendix 5**. These evaluations will be updated and finalized following the public comment period.

ACEC designations are only presented for Alternatives 3 and 6. Management allocations within potential ACECs is targeted at maintaining the importance value for which they would be designated, which varied across the range of GRSG.

Table 2-14, Comparison of Alternatives, ACEC Management, presents management by alternative for this management issue.

Table 2-14. Comparison of Alternatives, ACEC Management

| Summary of Alt. I | Summary of Alt. 2 | Alternative 3 | Alt. 4 | Alt. 5 | Alternative 6 |
|-------------------------|------------------------|---|---|-------------|--|
| No new ACECs specific | No new ACECs | ACECs specific to the management of | No new | No new | ACECs specific to the management of |
| to management of GRSG | specific to | GRSG would be designated | ACECs specific | ACECs | GRSG would be designated |
| were designated as part | management of GRSG | (see Map 2.3). | to management | specific to | (see Map 2.6). |
| of the 2015 planning | were designated as | Colorado: 4,547 acres | of GRSG 💪 🖔 | management | Colorado: 4,547 acres |
| effort. | part of the 2019 | Idaho: 3,438,307 acres | would be | of GRSG | Idaho: 3,438,307 acres |
| | planning effort. | Montana: 726,062 acres | designated. | would be | Montana: 726,062 acres |
| | | Nevada/California: 5,766,150 acres | ejo ve | designated. | Nevada/California: 5,766,150 acres |
| | | Oregon: 0 acres | ol sur | Ur. Cho | Oregon: 0 acres |
| | | Utah: 365,181 acres | 30 4 | " Wills " | Utah: 365,181 acres |
| | | • Wyoming: 839,225 acres | designated. | OUDGESTO | Wyoming: 839,225 acres |
| | | Under Alternative 3, the ACECs would | , 00 W | 10 | In addition to the management of the |
| | | have the same allocations as the rest of | e we. | 14 0. | GRSG habitat management areas |
| | | PHMA: | b Million | ,, O, | described in Alternative 5, apply the |
| | | Locatable minerals –The BLM recommends all PHMA for | ersione the sted the posted document document document document document document document document document document document document document document document document document document | JUP | following management in the potential ACECs: |
| | | withdrawal from location and entry | 19 110 | | Locatable minerals –Available for |
| | | under the Mining Law of 1872. The | 01, 16, | | mineral location. Based on federal |
| | | portion of the PHMA that is within | o ve | | regulations (43 CFR 3809.11(c)(3)), |
| | | the SFA boundaries from 2015 is | 10 | | within In designated ACECs |
| | N. | already being analyzed for | 23 | | operators must submit a plan of |
| | 20 | withdrawal in a separate NEPA | • | | operations and obtain BLM approval |
| | This is an und | document. Lands recommended for | | | before beginning any operations |
| | :6 m | withdrawal would remain open for | | | causing surface disturbance greater |
| | MI CHILL | mineral location and entry under the | | | than casual use (as defined in 43 CFR |
| | This curried | Mining Law of 1872 unless and until | | | Part 3809.5). (see 43 CFR Part |
| | O Villa | the Secretary of the Interior | | | 3809.11(c)(3)). |
| | 431 1 | withdraws them. In addition, In | | | Fluid minerals (including geothermal) |
| | 105 031 | designated ACECs operators must | | | – Open to leasing subject to ma jor |
| | CUP : Oliver | submit a plan of operations and | | | constraints (no surface occupan cy |
| | S. Still BI | obtain BLM approval before | | | stipulation). An exception could be |
| | substantional National | beginning any operations causing | | | considered to allow surface |
| | 111 | | | | occupancy only if the criteria |
| | | casual use (as defined in 43 CFR Part | | | described under the NSO Exception |
| | | 3809.5). (see 43 CFR Part | | | #I are met, but applicable to the |
| | | 3809.11(c)(3)). | | | entire ACEC area, not just in areas |
| | | Fluid minerals (including geothermal) | | | near to the lek(s) (see WEMs |
| | | - Closed to leasing | | | language). |
| | | Non-Energy minerals – Closed to | | | Non-Energy minerals – Closed to |
| | | leasing | | | new leases and expansion associated |

| Summary of Alt. I | Summary of Alt. 2 | Alternative 3 | Alt. 4 | Alt. 5 | Alternative 6 |
|-------------------|-------------------|---|--------------|---|--|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | Saleable Minerals/Mineral Materials – Closed to saleable mineral sale/development, including sand and gravel and other common variety minerals. Major ROWs – Exclusion area for major ROWs. Wind – Exclusion Solar – Exclusion All management not included above would be same as described for PHMA. | (See above.) | (See above.) nis nis nis nis nis nis nis ni | with existing operations (e.g., fringe leases). Saleable Minerals/Mineral Materials − Closed to new operations for all sale types except for free-use pits in order to support maintenance needs for existing local roads to ensure public safety. Even in these instances, new pits should avoid the ACEC; if avoidance is not possible, they would need to apply the minimization measures identified for PHMA (e.g., disturbance cap, noise reduction, seasonal limitations, etc.). Major ROWs − Exclusion to major ROWs (≥100 kV transmission lines and ≥24" pipelines). Minor ROWs would be avoidance. Designated RMP ROW corridors in the ACECs would be open for new ROWs, but new ROWs within the corridor would require compensatory mitigation to offset direct and indirect impacts of the development. Wind − Exclusion Solar − Exclusion No exceptions to the disturbance cap otherwise available in PHMA. All management not included above would be same as described for PHMA. |

2.5.13 Adaptive Management

Implementing adaptive management can address unanticipated negative impacts to GRSG and its habitat before consequences become severe or irreversible. Adaptive management was identified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) as a key component of BLM land use plans "...to help ensure that implementation of allocative decisions and limitations on disturbance are effective at conserving sage-grouse and their habitats, and mitigation provisions where disturbance cannot be avoided. Like monitoring, adaptive management is a key element of complex long-term conservation strategies, particularly where there is uncertainty" (FWS, 2015).

Establishing thresholds for adaptive management is essential to identify when potential management changes are needed to continue meeting GRSG conservation objectives. "Soft" thresholds are indicators that management or specific activities may not be achieving the intended results of conservation actions or that unanticipated changes have occurred that have the potential to place habitats or populations at risk. "Hard" thresholds are indicators that management for species conservation is likely not achieving desired conservation results. Adaptive management thresholds are not specific to any one project, but rather identify anomalies in habitat and/or population status. For this planning effort adaptive management responses are directed to addressing habitat concerns on BLM lands and are limited to PHMA (and IHMA in Idaho) even though data are collected across the entire species' range. Local responses to thresholds reached in GHMA can be considered if deemed necessary by the BLM and the appropriate state agency.

Sagebrush habitat fragmentation, loss and disturbance have been identified as the primary influences on GRSG population trends (Knick and Hanser, 2011). GRSG population trends can provide valuable information about habitat conditions on BLM lands. Both the BLM and the States have a responsibility to use the best available information for assessing whether a habitat and/or population threshold (as described below) has been met, and to work together to address causes.

To accurately assess any anomalies or thresholds being met, and any necessary responses, monitoring of habitat and population trend should be conducted at the same scale. The BLM will use neighborhood clusters identified by USGS (Coates et al., 2021) to track habitat conditions, the same spatial scale used by USGS for population trend analyses. A neighborhood cluster generally represents a GRSG population unit and includes local aggregations of leks and seasonal habitats used by birds attending those leks based on state wildlife agency and research data. Habitat trends can also be monitored at smaller scales (e.g., lek level) as identified by state wildlife agency plans for GRSG, or at larger scales if local GRSG populations are known to consistently range outside of neighborhood clusters. (Note: Monitoring habitat for adaptive management purposes does not preclude the need to track habitat losses for conformance with the anthropogenic disturbance caps).

To assess sagebrush habitat availability, the BLM will use geospatial data, updated at a minimum biennially (e.g., RCMAP, LandFire, and multiple geospatial data sources for habitat degradation; see 2023 Monitoring Framework, **Appendix 7**). Additional data collected through the Habitat Assessment Framework (HAF) – a multi-scale assessment tool that provides data to evaluate sagebrush habitats for GRSG suitability (Stiver et al., 2015 and subsequent updates) may also be considered where available. HAF data can inform pre-existing habitat conditions and threshold analyses. Habitat baselines will be determined using geospatial data layers updated in the year prior to threshold assessment.

State wildlife agencies have primacy over GRSG populations and collect data essential for estimating population trends. Population data collected by States are important to the BLM for effective management of the species habitat. Population monitoring methods in previous adaptive management strategies varied

by state, and the metrics to measure trends varied widely. In most instances methods used were inadequate to establish when an anomaly in population trends could be linked to habitat management actions. Further, results were not comparable across political boundaries, creating challenges in determining effective habitat management responses and applying differential management to projects crossing state boundaries. Finally, none of the previous methods identified where habitat concerns, and not climatic conditions were contributing to trends.

The BLM's use of a population threshold as a proxy for habitat condition does not supersede the responsibility of the state for monitoring populations and identifying population areas of concern. The BLM must consider all available information regarding population threshold status. This includes state wildlife agency population trend analyses and annual population trend results published using the Hierarchical Population Monitoring Framework (currently the Targeted Annual Warning System procedures [TAWS]; Coates et al., 2021) or subsequent updates or revisions which provides a consistent and objective range-wide tool incorporating state lek count data and is able to identify if habitat conditions, not climatic conditions, are likely influencing populations. This model was developed with the cooperation of state wildlife agencies to provide an objective and consistent tool to alert land managers to potential habitat issues affecting population trends anywhere within the range of the species. The BLM will additionally use results from population trend analyses provided by state wildlife agencies in determining if habitat concerns may be affecting populations. If a soft or hard population trend threshold is identified by either source, the BLM will coordinate with the state wildlife agency to verify the trend as the first step in an initial causal factor analysis (see below).

Table 2-15, Comparison of Alternatives, Adaptive Management, presents management by alternative for this management issue.

Summary of Alternative I

Every state has an adaptive management process. All the states include language to the effect of the following:

- While there should be no expectation of hitting a hard trigger, if unforeseen circumstances were to occur that trip either a habitat or population hard trigger, more restrictive management would be required.
- Hard triggers represent a threshold indicating that immediate action is necessary to stop a severe deviation from GRSG conservation objectives set forth in the BLM plans.
- The BLM will also undertake any appropriate plan amendments or revision if necessary.

While the adaptive management concept and the potential for changes in management are consistent across the GRSG range, there is no consistency in the specific triggers between states or the strategies associated with responding to those triggers. The metrics, thresholds, and timeframes and spatial scales vary state by state, as does the level of detail that explains each of these. Similarly, the responses associated with adaptive management triggers varies by state, with some prescribing specific actions and others identifying teams to develop a response.

Summary of Alternative 2

Same as Alternative I, though some states applied strategies to improve the process based on lessons learned during implementation between 2015 and 2019. This included the addition of "un-triggers" in some states, to allow management to return to what was in the RMP amendments if conditions improved, requiring timeframes for determining the cause of the trigger being met, or clarifying what management changes would apply. The differences between the states persisted, creating challenges for comparing rangeas well as pulations that pulations that habit.

GRSG enhancing necessary to GRSG habitat. wide trends by using adaptive

Alternative 3

Alternative 4

Alternatives 5 and 6

Habitat Adaptive Management Thresholds:

- A soft habitat threshold is met when any single occurrence or combination of occurrences in PHMA/IHMA in a neighborhood cluster result in the loss of more than 5% of the area capable of supporting sagebrush in a given year (including wildfire). Where a neighbor cluster overlaps with more than one habitat designation (e.g., PHMA and GHMA) the percent habitat loss will be calculated on the PHMA/IHMA only. Baselines for calculating sagebrush loss will be determined by the sagebrush base layer delineated using LandFire data (detailed in Appendix 7) and from the most recent year prior to publication of the RODs.
- A hard habitat threshold will be met when existing sagebrush extent, as described in the
 first bullet, within a neighborhood cluster drops below 65% of the area capable of
 supporting sagebrush (Aldridge et al., 2008; Connelly et al., 2000).
- A hard habitat threshold will also be met if a soft habitat threshold is met in 4 consecutive years (≥5% decline in each of 4 consecutive years).

A hard or soft habitat threshold can be reversed if restoration of sagebrush vegetation communities within the neighborhood cluster returns to the sagebrush conditions and/or habitat function prior to the events that resulted in meeting a habitat threshold. If the neighborhood cluster cannot be restored to original sagebrush conditions and/or habitat function due to ecological or disturbance limitations (e.g., intense fire killed soil microfauna, dense anthropogenic activities) restoration and/or habitat enhancement in adjacent neighborhood clusters can be considered to increase the number of GRSG supported in those areas. This will be done in coordination with appropriate state agencies. If enhancing habitats in adjacent areas does not reverse the threshold, and further assessment may be necessary to determine if the area in which the habitat threshold was met should still be considered GRSG habitat.

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Population triggers vary by state. See | | Population Trend Adaptive Mana | | Same as Alternatives 3 and 4 |
| Appendix 2, Existing GRSG | See Appendix 2 , Existing GRSG | State wildlife agencies can alert t | | except new authorizations can |
| Management, for specifics. | Management, for specifics. | | t to initiate a causal factor analysis. | be considered during the rapid |
| • | | The BLM will also review the an | nual results of TAWS in | assessment period. Project |
| | | | indicate potential habitat concerns. | level NEPA will specifically |
| | | All population thresholds identifi | | evaluate if any new permitted |
| | | with the state wildlife agency wit | | activity could contribute to any |
| | | | ood cluster scale by the model. If | cause identified during the rapid |
| | | | nes the TAWS model was in error, | assessment. |
| | | | he threshold will be documented. If | |
| | | | yses, BLM and the state will work | |
| | | together to identify the source of | of the error (in either agency's | |
| | | analysis). | Styt P Vers | |
| | | Interpretation of TAWS model i | | |
| | | A soft population trend thres | | |
| | Sisan unofficial production of the BLN and Signal NEPA Registrational National Astronal Astronauthor Astron | watch (a 2 consecutive year, i | negative rate of population change | |
| | , 01 | at the neighborhood cluster t | hat shows a population decline that | |
| | :21 | is either different or more ra | | |
| | CiCle I | climate cluster; Coates et al., | | |
| | Str. Br | A hard population trend three | | |
| | 10 .ee 4 | warning (a 2 out of 3 (fast) or | 3 out of 4 (slow) consecutive year | |
| | m. The | that is either different or mor | nange at the neighborhood cluster | |
| | Mr. ila | associated climate cluster; Co | | |
| | is on im di | associated climate cluster, Co | dates et al., 2021). | |
| | S' 'WE SI'DES | A hard or soft population trend | threshold can be reversed if the | |
| 4/2 | cn, 117 6 6 3 | A hard or soft population trend following criteria are met: | threshold can be reversed if the | |
| | 700 1/31 Br 240 | Population trends at the neighbor. | | |
| | o We Ale dio | with the climate cluster trend | I as indicated by the TAWS model | |
| | 40 1/2 My 10 | (i.e., no longer a TAWS "wate | | |
| | 02 NS. W/ 12 Oc | There are sufficient numbers | of GRSG (abundance) to allow for | |
| SU | documents Ress documents Ress ostantially PARess ostantially PARess ostantially She doc ostantially She doc ostantially She doc ostantially She doc ostantially She doc | recovery of population number | ers to those present at or before | |
| | 31. P. 1. | the threshold was met, based | on local growth rates determined | |
| * | "Ne | by the state wildlife managem | | |
| | 41. | concurrence of the state wild | | |
| | | The state wildlife managemen | | |
| | | TAWS model incorrectly idea | | |
| | | <u> </u> | - | |
| | | If a habitat or population thresho | | |
| | | | nnel and other stakeholders with | |
| | | | ill initiate an assessment as soon as | |
| | | alerted to a threshold being hit t | to determine the causal factor(s). | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|----------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | | ams will include at a minimum the | (See above.) |
| | | local BLM biologist, BLM state sa | | |
| | | representative from the state wi | | |
| | | matter experts and other affects | | |
| | | | cific analyses. Causal factor analyses ds described below and will be used | |
| | | to inform the adaptive managem | | |
| | | analysis shall be detailed in a wri | | |
| | | | s, landownership patterns, history | |
| | | of population and habitat trends | | |
| | | habitat, cause(s) of habitat and/o | | |
| | | | nt actions to address the potential | |
| | | causes of decline, and the data a | | |
| | | | oort. The report will be submitted | |
| | | | LM state sage-grouse lead in the | |
| | | | and the BLM national sage-grouse | |
| | -e | coordinator as well as all members | | |
| | , 01 | the analyses are complete. An ar population information between | the PLM and associated state | |
| | 131 | wildlife agency is encouraged eve | en if no thresholds are identified | |
| 1 Y | is is an unofficial production of the Bland of the Bland NEPAREORAL NATIONAL THE DOCUMENTAL THE DOCUMENT THE | wildlife agency is encouraged eve | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Habitat and population adaptive | Habitat and population adaptive | Adaptive Management Response | | _ |
| trigger responses vary by state. See | trigger responses vary by state. | | threshold is met, (and population | |
| Appendix 2, Existing GRSG | See Appendix 2 , Existing GRSG | thresholds confirmed with the st | | |
| Management, for specifics. | Management, for specifics. | | causes will be completed within | |
| | | | s are those easily identified such as | |
| | | | sment identifies the cause, a formal | |
| | | CFA will not be needed. No nev | | |
| | | authorized until the rapid assess | | |
| | | documented. Existing permitted | | |
| | | those activities are causing mort | | |
| | | | nabitat. If an obvious causal factor | |
| | | cannot be identified in the rapid | | |
| | | | management threshold being met | |
| | | | hs of the rapid assessment. If a soft | |
| | | | activities can be considered during ong as those activities do not result | |
| | | in mortality of GRSG or GRSG | as those activities do not result | |
| | * | However if a soft threshold is m | net and the CFA is not completed | |
| | , 6, | within the above time frame, no | | |
| | 131 | authorized until a CFA is compl | | |
| | isic. | authorizations, or reauthorization | on of existing permits can then be | |
| | Offir Br | considered if similar activities we | | |
| | in the y | resulting in meeting either a pop | | |
| | 20. 11. 21. | threshold. Project level NEPA w | | |
| | Si st. sila | permitted activity could result in | the threshold being sustained or | |
| | 15 cl. 111, di | met again. | _ | |
| | S. 141 1 2. 563 | Mr. F. J. | | |
| 17 | CC 1/1/2 0 13 | If a hard threshold is met no nev | w proposed permitted activities will | |
| * | 40 x18. 561. 040 | be authorized until a CFA is con | | |
| | and Mr atio | then specifically evaluate if the n | ew permitted activity could result | |
| | 240 11 May 40, | in additional or cumulative impa | cts to GRSG. | |
| | backs M. Co | | | |
| 5 | 10.271 AL | The CFA team can alter the leve | | |
| | 130 | hard, or hard to soft) based on t | | |
| | "He | local data. For example, habitat | loss of 5 percent results in a soft | |
| | 7. | threshold, but if the loss is of lim | nited crucial habitat (e.g., the only | |
| | sisan unofficial production of the document. The BLN document similar of the document with the document of the | winter or mesic nabitat in the ne | eighborhood cluster) the CFA team | |
| | | can request hard threshold mana | | |
| | | | issessment of habitat loss meeting a | |
| | | areas documented as not suppor | if the loss is of marginal areas, or | |
| | | | data and fully detailed in a written | |
| | | report. Final determination of the | | |
| | | Treport. Tillal determination of the | he reversal will be made by the | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | authorizing officer, in consultation | | (See above.) |
| | | CFA team can expand the analys | | |
| | | adjacent neighborhood clusters | | |
| | | | that utilize multiple neighborhood | |
| | | clusters may require increased p | | |
| | | habitats and use areas to reverse | e population declines. | |
| | | ICAL CEATA TO TO THE | 0, 10 Br. V | |
| | | If the CFA identifies the cause for | | |
| | | | ctivity identified as a causal factor | |
| | | to meeting a threshold, as legally coordination with the permit he | | |
| | | | appropriate) will be necessary to | |
| | | assess the efficacy of the modific | | |
| | | project level NEPA will specifica | | |
| | | | ing to sustaining the threshold or | |
| | | (D. 1) (Face 1 1.10) | t again. New authorizations may be | |
| | | limited to restrictions identified | | |
| | -4 | resource, as determined necessa | | |
| | 16. | et 12 10 .c. | 1,100 | |
| | ig, | Exceptions to limitations impose | ed for exceeding thresholds include: | |
| | chic al | Renewal of existing activities | | |
| | 01, P | The activity is scheduled v | within 60 days of when a threshold | |
| | in he d | is met and identified, and | • | |
| | 7 7 12 | o The project proponent ca | n show significant negative | |
| | 3, 4. Jile ! | economic impacts (i.e., do | ocumented loss of income | |
| | 12 261 - ILL ON | equivalent to the income | potential of the event), and The | |
| | 15 111, 112 500 | renewal can only be consi | idered if it does not result in | |
| 1 | , oc. 1113 00, 03 | known impacts to habitat | | |
| | 90 His Ch. 1011 | Activities essential for human | health and safety in a current or | |
| | " All Mr atio | likely catastrophic event (e.g., | repair of dams, emergency vehicle | |
| | 12 31, 40 40. | access). | | |
| | 10 de Mico | ES&R activities essential to re | | |
| 5 | tio Br. the | Grazing permits that will expire | | |
| | Mar o | threshold is identified. A perr | nit or lease to extend the current | |
| | *No | grazing practice for less than | 10 years may be renewed until the | |
| | is is an unofficial production of the BLM National NEPA Regional NEPA Regional National Natio | causal factor analysis is comp | leted. If grazing is not determined | |
| | | as a causal factor to an adapti | ve management threshold, grazing | |
| | | | proceed normally. If grazing is a | |
| | | | tive management threshold, the | |
| | | | razing permit or lease will need to | |
| | | be examined and based on th | | |
| | | appropriately be modified to | reduce or eliminate the impact. | |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|----------------------|
| ee above.) | (See above.) | Continuing the terms and conal permit or lease has expired grazing preference transfer in of the FLPMA as amended by BLM will work with proponents to reduce potential impacts on the trend deviation. If meeting the trend deviation. If meeting the trend deviation. If meeting the trend deviation in the trend deviation, completing conflict with any GHMA designates agency. (restoration, connectivity activity will not negatively impact adjacent PHMA. If a reduction in support GRSG occurs as a result restrictions may be necessary to Local responses to thresholds in deemed necessary by the BLM as similar analysis will be conducted in the result of habitat administered lands, new authoritations. | Inditions for livestock grazing when I or was terminated due to a a accordance with Section 402(c)(2) Public Law No. 113-291. Is identified in the above exceptions GRSG habitats. Which a population trend threshold in the leks are contributing to the threshold is the result of lek hin GHMA new permits can be a CFA if that activity is not in action identified by the state wildlife y, seasonal, or other), and if that it habitats or populations in the inthe ability for the habitat to let of habitat impacts, additional or preclude further habitat losses. In GHMA can be considered if and the appropriate state agency. A dif a neighborhood cluster covers level cluster will determine the ing to the threshold. If the conditions on non-BLM izations can be considered if the ct habitats or populations in the | (See above.) |

| Summary of Alternative I | Summary of Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| Habitat triggers vary by state. See | Habitat triggers vary by state. See | | <u>re</u> : An assessment of impact on affe | |
| Appendix 2, Existing GRSG | Appendix 2, Existing GRSG | | ss) by BLM staff and appropriate sta | |
| Management, for specifics. | Management, for specifics. | | of habitat loss (which can include an | |
| | | | kill the sagebrush) within the wildfir | |
| | | | . No new discretionary authorizatio | |
| | | | 1A in affected neighborhood cluster | |
| | | | s completed (this can include the in | |
| | | | n be reversed). If the assessment in | |
| | | | of the area to provide food, cover, | |
| | | | or GRSG within the wildfire perime | |
| | | | GRSG that was present prior to the | |
| | | | ssessment determines the PHMA (a | |
| | | | RSG populations at levels prior to | |
| | | | rred if consistent with applicable lav | |
| | | | ntil an assessment demonstrates the | |
| | | | vildfire event have been restored. A | |
| | .0 | | no direct or indirect impact to GR | |
| | , 01 | | e documented in a report to the Bl | |
| | :21 | | onal BLM GRSG coordinator. If the | |
| | Ciclo, N | | manently, further assessment may l | be necessary to determine if the |
| N | No similar action. | area in should still be considered | | |
| No similar action. | No similar action. | Inconclusive CFAs: If no cause to | or a habitat or population decline ca | |
| | m. The Co | consider implementing additiona | I restrictions on existing or new au | |
| | 31 4. 13 | consistent with permits/surface t | use rights in coordination with the parties is to reduce disturbance until eith | |
| | is and in it | descensioned through additional m | nonitoring and analyses, or the popu | |
| | 6 12 We 21, 260 | determined through additional if | that supports limiting these potenti | |
| 10 | SUI WY RE OF | population threshold data (vs. ha | ibitat data) if they can demonstrate | the population analyses are |
| 7, | 100 31,06 40 | incorrect New authorizations m | nust disclose a threshold has been n | |
| | 0, VII. EL "10, | activity's potential cumulative im | pact to either the habitat or popula | |
| | 431 / W. 135. 00 | threshold has been met) Any re | strictions will be determined by the | |
| | 22 31 1 1 go | documented hiological rationals | from BLM field biologists. Any disag | 9 |
| -1 | OU. 1 11 76 | he elevated to the RIM State Di | rector for resolution. New permits | |
| 5 | NO SIIIIIdi action. | inconclusive cannot be authorize | ed until the full CFA analyses is com | |
| | 40 | I III CONCIDENTE CAMBIOL DE AUGIONIZE | e artal are fall City analyses is com | proces and reports submitted. |

2.6 STATE-SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES

Though this EIS is range-wide in its scope, there are also state-specific circumstances that will be considered. Such state specific circumstances may warrant consideration at the state level rather than at a range wide level. This could include the following:

- Differences in management tools or approaches specific to a given state such as Research Natural Areas present in Oregon, Important Habitat Management Areas in Idaho, or Restoration Habitat Management Areas in Montana. These tools are limited to those given states, and adjustments to their management, if considered, would only be applicable in those states.
- Ecological and topographic differences such as the differences between the sweeping prairies of eastern Montana and Wyoming compared to the basin and range of the Great Basin, or the high mountain valleys in Idaho and Utah, or the areas with substantial differences in elevation and vegetation associated with the plateaus associated with the Colorado Plateau in Utah and Colorado.
- Different management situations in different states such as the presence of state-run management tools such as mitigation banks, regulatory state plans, etc.

Issues or management differences between states are not based on preference, but rather on specific circumstances that fall into the above categories. And are focused on issues, topics, and actions that would help meet the purpose and need of improving GRSG conservation. Through the alternative development process all states identified at least one state-specific circumstance. However consideration of non-habitat in the habitat management areas during implementation identified by one state became a cross-cutting topic after discussion with agency staff and cooperating agencies. The following sections present the alternatives associated with state-specific circumstances. Colorado

Most state-specific circumstances in Colorado are a result of different planning approaches in the 2015 and 2019 NWCO GRSG ARMPAs (plans). The BLM will also clarify management decisions that have been unclear since implementation of the 2015 plan.

Colorado has variable topography leading to naturally fragmented habitats, affecting ecology and plant communities, and therefore differences between GRSG population areas.. Significant elevational changes may fall within standard lek buffer distances in some Colorado GRSG populations (e.g., Parachute Piceance Roan (PPR) population). Colorado typically does not see large wildfires in sagebrush ecosystems or conversion to agriculture to the same degree as other states.

Prior to the current planning process, the BLM and the State of Colorado adopted refined habitat management area maps. The multi-year (2016-2019), collaborative mapping process refined previously mapped areas to remove non-habitat in habitat management areas or expand areas with documented GRSG use. The re-mapping effort incorporated state-specific, timely research and mapping tools. See **Appendix 3** for a summary of the Colorado habitat management area mapping strategy. The state specific circumstances for the State of Colorado being addressed in this effort include the following: I) management scale, 2) application and use of lek buffers, 3) consistency across resource uses, and 4) integration of lessons learned during implementation.

Management Scale

Colorado manages populations and sub-populations by Management Zone (MZ) which are biologically driven units delineated by GRSG use, topographic and other natural features, differences in ecological potential, and differences in issues affecting GRSG (Colorado Greater Sage-grouse Steering Committee 2008). The BLM uses the CO MZs to calculate project-scale disturbance and density caps rather than the

density and disturbance methodology used by many other states. The MZs are geographically consistent with the areas used by Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) but have different numbering (e.g.- BLM MZ 2 is the same area as CPW MZ I). For ease of communication, the BLM intends to adjust the MZ numbering during this planning effort to be more consistent with the CPW naming convention.

Lek Buffers

Clarification of lek activity periods

The BLM will clarify the activity period for the leks being included in management allocations and decisions. Both the 2015 and 2019 plans included allocations and management decisions based on the distance from "active" leks using CPW's definition, which is an area used by two or more displaying males in two of the last five years in larger populations and one or more males in any of the last five years in small populations (Colorado Greater Sage-grouse Steering Committee 2008). There are inconsistencies between the CPW definition and the WAFWA definition, which describes an active lek as a lek that has 2 or more males counted during two or more years within the last 10 years (Cook et al. 2022, Connelly et al. 2000). Because GRSG populations generally follow 9- to 10-year population cycles (Rich 1985, Fedy and Aldridge 2011, Fedy and Doherty 2011), the BLM will use a lek definition that better captures the fluctuation of population dynamics. The BLM will analyze use of the "occupied" lek definition from the 2015 and 2019 plans, which is defined as a lek that has been active during at least one strutting season within the past 10 years. CPW concurs with the approach.

The clarification of lek activity periods results in an increase to the amount of BLM-managed lands within the corresponding buffer distances. According to the Colorado 2022 lek count data from CPW, 276 leks are classified as active using the 5-year activity timeframe. The total number of leks with activity in the last 10 years increases to 445 leks. Using the 2015 and 2019 plan definitions, approximately 571,375 acres of BLM-managed lands were within 1-mile of an active lek (CPW, 5-year timeframe). With the clarification, approximately 811,215 acres are within 1-mile of an occupied lek, representing a 42% increase in BLM-managed lands that are subject to more intensive management decisions for the protection of leks, nesting, and early brood-rearing habitat.

Distance of buffer

In the 2015 plan, fluid mineral leasing was closed within I-mile of an active lek compared to a 0.6 mile. In coordination with CPW, the BLM increased the previous stipulation area (i.e.- 0.6-mile buffer NSO) to a I-mile closure to provide protection for leks and nesting and early brood rearing habitat in the closest proximity to leks. The 2019 plan amended the decision from a I-mile closure to a I-mile NSO with a different set of waiver, exception, and modification (WEM) criteria than the rest of PHMA (also NSO) but maintained the I-mile closure around an active lek. The I-mile standard was subsequently incorporated into the State of Colorado oil & gas regulations (CO Code § 34-60-101, 2022). The BLM will analyze the I-mile lek buffer distance as the minimum threshold in Colorado under Alternatives I and 2 (No Action alternatives), and 5.

Allocations/management decisions within 1-mile buffer

The 2019 plan amended the decision from a 1-mile closure to a 1-mile NSO with a different set of WEM criteria than the rest of PHMA (also NSO). To reconcile the difference between the 2015 and 2019 plans, the BLM will analyze PHMA as being open to fluid mineral leasing subject to NSO. WEMs will include additional criteria within 1-mile of occupied leks rather than being limited to active (CPW) leks. This clarification would allow for PHMA to remain NSO with the distinction of more intensive management within 1-mile of a lek requiring the use of one NSO stipulation.

Allocations for GHMA

In the 2015 and 2019 plans, Colorado included a NSO stipulation within 2-miles of active leks in GHMA. Because of the lek status clarification above, the BLM will analyze the change between an NSO around active leks versus occupied leks in Alternative 4. The BLM will also analyze using a Controlled Surface Use (CSU) stipulation within 2-miles of occupied leks in Alternative 5 and a CSU within 1-mile of PHMA in Alternative 6 instead of the NSO to assess the impacts of different stipulation types.

CSU stipulations are applied at the leasing phase and allow the BLM to carefully consider site-specific factors during implementation that provide the appropriate level of protection and restrictions. Common CSU measures include relocating operations by more than 200 meters (656 ft) or deferring the action for more than 60 days to avoid or minimize impacts.

Alternative 4 would increase the acreage of GHMA with NSO stipulations compared to Alternatives I and 2. Under Alternative 5, the same amount of acreage under major stipulation (NSO) in Alternative 4 would be under moderate stipulation (CSU). Alternative 5 would allow for more flexibility in development while maintaining the BLM's ability to apply site-specific criteria for GRSG habitat protection. Alternative 6 also analyzes CSU stipulations but would be applied in GHMA within I mile of PHMA. This would allow for increased flexibility while allowing the BLM to consider the indirect effects that development in GHMA may have on all PHMA, not just where leks occur.

Consistency Across Resources

The BLM will analyze use of more consistent criteria for management actions such as fluid mineral permitting and ROW authorizations. Many fluid mineral permits include both an Application for Permit to Drill (APD) and a ROW (e.g.- an access road to a well pad begins off-lease and crosses on-lease). Under the 2015 and 2019 plans, the authorization would be subject to two varying sets of siting criteria. By using consistent criteria, the BLM intends to ease plan conformance and coordination across resource uses.

Lessons Learned

The BLM is including clarifications to several management decisions because of lessons learned during implementation of the previous GRSG plans. The BLM will clarify management decisions in the Fluid Mineral and Land and Realty sections. Lessons learned primarily involve administrative clarifications and remedies and are not likely to impact GRSG habitat, other resources, or resource uses.

Table 2-16. Colorado State-Specific Circumstances – Fluid Minerals (MR)

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | Unleased Fluid Minerals | | |
| MD MR-1: No new leasing I mile from active leks in ADH. | MD MR-I: One mile from active | No new leasing in PHMA. | No similar action (see line below) | No similar action (see line below) |
| mile from active leks in ADA. | leks: Open to leasing subject to NSO-1. | Upon expiration or termination | No Miles | |
| | | of existing leases, prohibit | 01 3 2/10 | |
| | See Appendix B (Existing | issuance of new leases or | 10 01 P 111 | |
| | Management) for WEM criteria. | reinstatement of leases in PHMA. | Se "He SO ! | |
| MD MR-2: No Surface | MD MR-2: (one mile from active | No similar action (Alt 3 is closed | PHMA will be open to fluid | PHMA will be open to fluid |
| Occupancy (NSO) without | leks to the remainder of PHMA): | to new leasing) | mineral leasing subject to No | mineral leasing subject to No |
| waiver or modification in PHMA. | Open to leasing subject to No | on he | surface occupancy with waivers, | surface occupancy with waivers, |
| | Surface Occupancy (NSO-2) | Tile the | exceptions, or modifications | exceptions, or modifications |
| See Appendix B (Existing | with waivers, exceptions, or | 11.00 NOT 01 | (WEMs). | (WEMs). |
| Management) for exception | modifications in PHMA. | plie fine, | (WEMs). See range-wide WEM criteria. | C NA/ENA I |
| criteria. | San Annual dia B (Friedina | JUL 613 11 10 61 | See range-wide VVEM criteria. | See range-wide WEM criteria, but |
| | See Appendix B (Existing Management) for WEM criteria. | repurpects will doci | ne int | the exception distance for Colorado will be 1 mile from |
| | | D. Th " O. | (1, 60 | occupied leks. |
| MD MR-3: In GHMA, any new | Same as Alternative I (no change | No similar action (Alt 3 is closed | In PHMA & GHMA, any new | Same as Alternative 4 |
| leases would include TL | made in 2019). | to new leasing) | leases would include TL | |
| stipulations to protect GRSG and | Office | occure is b | stipulations to minimize impacts | |
| its habitat. The following | illo he | 90 1,000,04 | to GRSG during lekking, nesting, | |
| stipulation would apply: | 7 7 7 | ral. Ke was | and early brood-rearing. The | |
| | made in 2019). | No similar action (Alt 3 is closed to new leasing) | following stipulation would apply: | |
| GRSG TL-46e: No activity | is de ellison | J. IE. The | | |
| associated with construction, | nis will Re | 1/4 2/ | No activity associated with | |
| drilling, or completions within 4 | 100 31100 | a. Jer | construction, drilling, or | |
| miles from active leks during lekking, nesting, and early brood- | 00 VIII 'EL "10, | THE STATE OF THE S | completions within 4 miles of occupied leks during lekking, | |
| rearing (March 1 to July 15). | 431 M 131 | CC | nesting, and early brood-rearing | |
| Authorized Officer could grant an | 12 23, " La 9 | | (March I to July 15). | |
| exception, modification, or | The Oly I'M WE | | (| |
| waiver in consultation with the | July Br. III. | | The Authorized Officer could | |
| State of Colorado. | H ve | | grant an exception, modification, | |
| | 611 | | or waiver in coordination with | |
| | | | the State of Colorado. | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternativ | ves 5 and 6 |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| MD MR-4: No Surface | Same as Alternative I (no change | No similar action (Alt 3 is closed | GHMA will be open to fluid | Alt 5 | Alt 6 |
| Occupancy (NSO) within 2 | made in 2019). | to new leasing) | mineral leasing subject to No | GHMA will be | GHMA will be |
| miles of active (CO definition) | | | Surface Occupancy (NSO) | open to fluid | open to fluid |
| leks in GHMA. | | | within 2 miles of active* | mineral leasing | mineral leasing |
| | | | (WAFWA active, CO occupied) | subject to | subject to |
| See Appendix B (Existing | | | leks. | Controlled | Controlled |
| Management) for WEM criteria. | | | 01 3 2/10 | Surface Use | Surface Use |
| | | | See range-wide WEM criteria. | (CSU) within 2 | (CSU) in |
| | | i e | se the co | miles of | GHMÁ within I |
| | | ers | Shill ishe of | active* leks. | mile of PHMA. |
| | | 30, 100 | " d'iphision | See CSU | See CSU |
| | Mo similar action | Atio Atin | stor puers | criteria below. | criteria below. |
| | | lice this b | 26117 | See range-wide | See range-wide |
| | | 110, 48 11 06 | We Will Our | WEM criteria. | WEM criteria. |
| No similar action | No similar action | No similar action | No similar action | Controlled Sur | |
| | 4 | 16 160 14 90 | the 9 or | (CSU): Apply C | |
| | | 1 et al 3 :6 | 1160 | on surface use, o | |
| | cla | M Me cillo of 1 | 46/ | placement of per | |
| | 8910 01 | chill a state | 2 ` | structures, and s | urface-dist urbing |
| | 20, 6 | Ocallo dis b | | activities in [GH/ | |
| | M. The | 0 1000 27 | | of occupied leks for | |
| | 181. | relief We | | within I mile of P | |
| | ie g. W. Wille | Stop at | | that would decre | |
| | 12 26, 111, 30 | DIEL THE | | breeding/nesting | |
| | vie illing be | 14 4 | | availability or fur | ctionality, or that |
| * | III OCO ALIA | 3, 61, | | create new perc | |
| | 90 Mis Ch. 101 | MI | | opportunities for | r avian predators. |
| | ALL ALL STILL | CO | | Surface use inclu | |
| | esto al No d | 0 | | infrastructure an | |
| | 1/2 WO MI CO | | | disturbing activit | |
| | or file of the | | | special design, co | |
| | Mac Ch | | | implementation | |
| | "We | | | actual required r | |
| | 4. | | | based on the pur | • |
| | | | | and extent of the | |
| | | | | occupancy includ | |
| | | | | infrastructure an | |
| | | | | | affected seasonal |
| | | | | habitat, and the f | |
| | | | | relocating the pr | • |
| | | | | structure is any | man-made |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---------------|--|--|--|---|
| (See above.) | (See above.) (See above.) (See above.) | (See above.) (See above.) (See above.) (See above.) | (See above.) (S | structure that provides for perching/nesting opportunities for predators (e.g., raptors, ravens) that may naturally be absent, or that decreases the use of an area. A determination as to whether something is considered a tall structure would be made based on local conditions such as existing vegetation or topography. Examples of measures and limitations include: 1) Relocate operations more than 200 meters (656 feet) to areas outside of habitat, to areas of existing disturbance, or to areas where site-specific topography mitigates project impacts; 2) Defer activities longer than 60 days to avoid seasonal habitat use periods; 3) Modify project design to discourage avian predator perching; 4) Limit or relocate placement of tall structures to reduce impacts of project infrastructure; 5) Limit activity associated with construction, drilling, or completions to certain seasons or times of day; 6) Minimize noise using the best available technology to dampen or direct noise away from breeding or nesting habitat. Modify access routes to avoid important areas or habitats. |
| | <u> </u> | | l . | important areas or nabitats. |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| MD MR-5: Disturbance on new | Same as Alternative I (no change | No similar action (Alt 3 is closed | Disturbance on new leases would | Disturbance on new leases would |
| leases would be limited to 3 | made in 2019). | to new leasing) | be limited to 3 percent in PHMA | be limited to 3 percent in PHMA |
| percent in PHMA (biologically | , | <u> </u> | (biologically significant unit) and | (biologically significant unit) and |
| significant unit) (see Appendix E, | | | would be limited to I disturbance | would be limited to I disturbance |
| Methodology for Calculating | | | per 640 acres calculated by | per 640 acres calculated by |
| Disturbance Caps) and would | | | Colorado MZ. The following | Colorado MZ. The following |
| limited to 1 disturbance per 640 | | | Controlled Surface Use (CSU) | Controlled Surface Use (CSU) |
| acres calculated by Colorado MZ. | | | would apply: | would apply: |
| The following Lease Notice (LN) | | i | o we ad | 117 |
| would apply: | | 19. | Any lands leased in PHMA are | Any lands leased in PHMA are |
| | | 18, | subject to the restrictions of 3 | subject to the restrictions of 3 |
| GRSG LN-46e: Any lands leased | | 9 0 | percent disturbance and 1 | percent disturbance and I |
| in PHMA are subject to the | | 10, The | disturbance per 640 acres | disturbance per 640 acres |
| restrictions of I disturbance per | | 20 20 | calculated by Fine Scale and | calculated by biologically |
| 640 acres calculated by | | lice the b | proposed project analysis area | significant unit (Colorado |
| biologically significant unit | | 10, 50, 100 | (Colorado MZ) to allow | populations) and proposed |
| (Colorado populations) and | | -01 CL :11 -CL | clustered development. | project analysis area (Colorado |
| proposed project analysis area | | 16, 00 M, 402 | No 4 ph | MZ) to allow clustered |
| (Colorado MZ) to allow | | S. C. L. V. JO | Ci iec | development. |
| clustered development. | 131 | 10 26, 29, 13 | elle | |
| MD MR-7: (PHMA) Allow | Same as Alternative I (no change | Same as Alternative I | (PHMA) Allow geophysical | Same as Alternative 4 |
| geophysical exploration within | made in 2019). | occine ist b | exploration within PHMA to | |
| PHMA to obtain information for | incine | 90 11.00, 4. | obtain information for existing | |
| existing federal fluid mineral | 20, 11, 21 | of. Bowles | federal fluid mineral leases or | |
| leases or areas adjacent to state | 31. 21. 11/2 | CLO OF ST. | areas adjacent to state or fee | |
| or fee lands within PHMA. Allow | is el im | IS EL, Wa | lands within PHMA. Allow | |
| geophysical operations only using | :6' M , 6' 20' | S Mr * U | geophysical operations with the | |
| helicopter-portable drilling, | 41. Cn. 11A VE | al, all | application of reasonable | |
| wheeled or tracked vehicles on | 700 May 64 W | io Me | measures that minimize impacts | |
| existing roads, or other approved | 0 W. IE. 410 | -UII | to GRSG and GRSG habitat (e.g., | |
| methods conducted in | 49. 14 Mg. | 00 | helicopter-portable drilling, | |
| accordance with seasonal TLs and | 102 43, 11/2 0 | | wheeled or tracked vehicles on | |
| other restrictions that may apply. | Same as Alternative I (no change made in 2019). | Same as Alternative I | existing roads) and are in | |
| Geophysical exploration shall be | VIII. Br. III. | | accordance with seasonal TLs and | |
| subject to seasonal restrictions | Ho we | | other applicable restrictions. | |
| that preclude activities in | 411 | | Geophysical exploration shall be | |
| breeding, nesting, brood-rearing, | | | subject to seasonal restrictions | |
| and winter habitats during their | | | that preclude activities in | |
| season of use by GRSG. | | | breeding, nesting, brood-rearing, | |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | | and winter habitats during the | |
| | | | season of use by GRSG. | |
| | <u>I</u> | l | Joanson of use of Groot. | <u> </u> |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|---------------|-----------------------|---|----------------------|
| | | Leased Fluid Minerals | | |
| MD MR-8: Within I mile of active leks, disturbance, disruptive activities, and occupancy are precluded. If it is determined that this restriction would render the recovery of fluid minerals infeasible or uneconomic, considering the lease as a whole, or where development of existing leases requires that disturbance per 640 acres and/or the 3 percent disturbance cap (see Appendix E, Methodology for Calculating Disturbance Caps), use the criteria* below to site proposed lease activities to meet GRSG habitat objectives and require mitigation as described in Appendix F (Greater Sage-Grouse Mitigation Strategy). | | - | Within I mile of occupied leks, disturbance, disruptive activities, and occupancy are precluded. If it is determined that this restriction would render the recovery of fluid minerals infeasible or uneconomic, considering the lease as a whole, or where development of existing leases requires that disturbance density exceeds I disturbance per 640 acres and/or the 3 percent disturbance cap, use the criteria* below to site proposed lease activities to meet GRSG habitat objectives and require mitigation. | |
| | the the | | | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|---------------------------------|---|---|
| MD MR-9: In PHMA and within | Same as Alternative I (no change | Same as Alternative 4, but both | In PHMA and GHMA, the | In PHMA and GHMA, the |
| 4 miles of an active lek, the | made in 2019). | PHMA and GHMA are classified | criteria* below would be applied | criteria* below would be applied |
| criteria* below would be applied | | as PHMA under Alternative 3 | to guide development of the lease | to guide development of the lease |
| to guide development of the lease | | | or unit that would result in the | or unit that would result in the |
| or unit that would result in the | | | fewest impacts possible to GRSG. | fewest impacts possible to GRSG. |
| fewest impacts possible to GRSG. | | | The location of the proposed | I) The location of the proposed |
| | | | authorization is determined to | authorization is determined to |
| Criteria*: | | | be nonhabitat, lacks the | be nonhabitat, lacks the |
| Location of proposed lease | |)is | ecological potential to become | ecological potential to become |
| activities in relation to critical | | ar's | habitat, does not provide | habitat, does not provide |
| GRSG habitat areas as | | 10 | important connectivity | important connectivity |
| identified by factors, including, | | 30 12 | between habitat areas, and the | between habitat areas, and the |
| but not limited to, average | | 410 411 | project includes design | project includes design |
| male lek attendance and/or | | . C.3 123 10° | features to prevent indirect | features to prevent indirect |
| important seasonal habitat | | Allo the Ch | disturbance to or disruption of | disturbance to or disruption of |
| An evaluation of the potential | | THE STATE OF | adjacent seasonal habitats that | adjacent seasonal habitats that |
| threats from proposed lease | | ep ec villi oci | would impair their biological | would impair their biological |
| activities that may affect the | | 10 100 14 90 | function. | function. |
| local population as compared | | 1 61 M 31 19 | 2) Topography/areas of non- | 2) Topography/areas of non- |
| to benefits that could be | : Cla | M Me sille of 1 | habitat create an effective | habitat create an effective |
| accomplished through | 8910 01 | CALL CALL | barrier to impacts. | barrier to impacts. |
| compensatory or off-site | 20, 6 | 100 Kho dis 10 | 3) By co-locating the proposed | 3) By co-locating the proposed |
| mitigation | M. The | 0 1 000 34 | authorization with existing | authorization with existing |
| An evaluation of the proposed | 181: 12 | 161. VF 1410 | disturbance, impacts would be | disturbance, impacts would be |
| lease activities, including design | · E & Mr. Who | ist ph at | minimized or similar to | minimized or similar to |
| features, in relation to the site- | 12 VB. EII 60 | J. IE. FLIC | impacts associated with the | impacts associated with the |
| specific terrain and habitat | his is an unofficial of documents in the Brand of the Bra | 110 26 | existing infrastructure. | existing infrastructure. |
| features. For example, within 4 | 1. Oc. 3/130 V. 3 | 3, 26, | 4) The proposed location would | 4) The proposed location would |
| miles from a lek, local terrain | do 410 EF .:01 | III. | be undertaken as an | be undertaken as an |
| features such as ridges and | 131, Mr. 311 | CO | alternative to a similar action | alternative to a similar action |
| ravines may reduce the habitat | 125 21 1 No d | 3 | occurring on a nearby parcel | occurring on a nearby parcel |
| importance and shield nearby | ID OUR MILE | | (for example, due to | (for example, due to |
| habitat from disruptive factors. | So the Br. the | | landownership patterns), and | landownership patterns), and |
| This is particularly likely in | Ma CL | | authorizing the activity on the parcel in question would have | authorizing the activity on the parcel in question would have |
| Colorado MZ 17, which has an | 10 HAS | | less of an impact on GRSG or | less of an impact on GRSG or |
| atypical GRSG habitat | | | its habitat than on the nearby | its habitat than on the nearby |
| featuring benches with GRSG | | | parcel; this criterion must also | parcel; this criterion must also |
| habitat interspersed with steep | his is an unofficial of documents in the armonial NEPARATION And Mation at the armonial wheelf the armonial water and the armonial water and the armonial water armonial wa | | include measures sufficient to | include measures sufficient to |
| ravines | | | allow the BLM to conclude | allow the BLM to conclude |
| To such outpoon and activities have done | | | that such benefits will endure | that such benefits will endure |
| To authorize an activity based on | | | Giac such benefits will endure | chat such behelits will endule |
| the criteria above, the environmental record of review | | | | |
| environmental record of review | | | | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|-------------------|--|--|
| must show no significant direct | (See above.) | (See above.) | for the duration of the | for the duration of the |
| disturbance, displacement, or mortality of GRSG. | | | proposed action's impacts. | proposed action's impacts. |
| mortality of GR3G. | | | If the criteria above do not apply | In addition to meeting one of the |
| | | | but it can be demonstrated that | criteria above, applicable |
| | | | the direct and indirect impacts of | minimization measures including |
| | | | the proposed activity would be | Disturbance Caps, Timing |
| | | | offset through compensatory | Limitations, Design Features, or |
| | | ic | mitigation, the authorized officer | other site-specific constraints |
| | | 2,5, | may consider permitting the | would be included as Conditions |
| | | 10. | action. The environmental record | of Approval (COAs) on the |
| | | 30 M | of review must demonstrate the | authorized activity. |
| | | tio, the | following: 1) As the first step in mitigating | If the criteria above do not apply but it can be demonstrated that |
| | | : C3 1/31 0 | impacts to GRSG, efforts to | the direct and indirect impacts of |
| | | Will thing t | avoid impacts by locating the | the proposed activity would be |
| | | all the ill be | proposed project in areas | offset through compensatory |
| | | eb ec will oc | outside the NSO areas or in | mitigation, the authorized officer |
| | | 1 16 16 1 GO | areas of non-habitat shall be | may consider permitting the |
| | : 21 | 16, 61, 78, 18 | documented. | action. The environmental record |
| | cicles | M. We Ell, OL | 2) As the second step in | of review must demonstrate why |
| | offi, B | come ist no | mitigating impacts to GRSG, | avoidance is not attainable. |
| | and he | 400 11, 001, of | efforts to minimize impacts by | |
| | 20. 11. 21 | V. 50 Va. | applying project design | To grant the activity based on |
| | 31, 21. 11/2 | Cto OA TI | features shall be documented | compensatory mitigation, the |
| | is 'el' in | Is The Ma | (e.g., use of RDFs, buffer | compensation project must be |
| | 19 11 19 20 | " Mr " II | distances, seasonal limitations, | planned, funded, and approved by |
| | W. Co. 113 VE | al all | etc.). | the operator, BLM, surface |
| | 40 x13, 161, 01 | in in | The compensation project must | owner, in coordination with the |
| | his is an unofficial to document and Rendered Area (NEPARE) | c'h. | be completed and habitat | State of Colorado prior to construction, surface occupancy, |
| | Grading No. 4 | 0~ | functionality documented before | or surface disturbing activities. |
| | 1/2 - U.S. M. O. | | the authorization is granted to | or surface disturbing activities. |
| | 50 x10, 27, x10 | | ensure the offset in impacts will | |
| | his is an unofficial of the Brands of the Brands of the Blumber of the Brands of the B | Mexpect will dock | occur. | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| MD MR-10: Based on site- | Same as Alternative I (no change | Prohibit construction, drilling, and | | Same as Alternative 4, but with |
| specific conditions, prohibit | made in 2019). | completion within PHMA during | prohibit construction, drilling, and | siting criteria from Alternatives 5 |
| construction, drilling, and | | lekking, nesting, and early brood- | completion in PHMA or GHMA | and 6 (see above) |
| completion within PHMA within | | rearing (March I to July 15). | within 4 miles of an occupied lek | (|
| 4 miles of a lek during lekking, | | | during lekking, nesting, and early | |
| nesting, and early brood-rearing | | | brood-rearing (March I to July | |
| (March I to July 15). In | | | 15). In coordination with the | |
| consultation with the State of | | | State of Colorado, this TL may be | |
| Colorado, this TL may be | | i- | adjusted based on application of | |
| adjusted based on application of | | 219. | the criteria * above. | |
| the criteria * above. | | 10. | 30, 7 11, 113, 1 | |
| | his is an unofficial of the Brain of the Brain of the Blumph Are of the Blumph Blumphe de the Bl | Prepublication version of the property of the | the only very | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternati | es 5 and 6 |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| No Similar action | No Similar action | No Similar action | No Similar action | Alt 5 | Alt 6 |
| No Similar action | No Similar action | No Similar action | No Similar action | Alt 5 No Similar action | In the Case Flats ACEC, any new leases would include TL stipulations to minimized impacts to GRSG during winter concentration. The following stipulation would apply: No activity associated with construction, drilling, or completions during the winter concentration period (December I to March I5). The Authorized Officer could grant an exception, in consultation with the State of Colorado, if the environmental record of review shows no significant direct or indirect disturbance, |
| | | | | | displacement, or mortality of GRSG. No modifications or waivers would be authorized. |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 | |
|---|----------------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| MD MR-14: For future actions in | | | Same as Alternative I | In PHMA and GHMA, require a | Same as Alternative 4 | |
| ADH, require a full reclamation | made in 2019). | | | full reclamation bond specific to | | |
| bond specific to the site in | , | | | the site in accordance with 43 | | |
| accordance with 43 CFR Parts | | | | CFR Parts 3104.2, 3104.3, and | | |
| 3104.2, 3104.3, and 3104.5. | | | | 3104.5. Ensure bonds are | | |
| Ensure bonds are sufficient for | | | | sufficient for costs relative to | | |
| costs relative to reclamation | | | | reclamation that would result in | | |
| (Connelly et al. 2000; Hagen et al. | | | | full restoration of the lands to the | | |
| 2007) that would result in full | | | i i | condition prior to disturbance. | | |
| restoration of the lands to the | | | al's | Base the reclamation costs on the | | |
| condition it was found prior to | | | 10 | assumption that contractors for | | |
| disturbance. Base the reclamation | | | 30. 70 | the BLM will perform the work. | | |
| costs on the assumption that | | | 410 " EL. | St. Progra | | |
| contractors for the BLM will | | | : C3 23 0 | 15, 10 | | |
| perform the work. | | | blication vine | ve, 11 v. | | |
| restoration of the lands to the condition it was found prior to disturbance. Base the reclamation costs on the assumption that contractors for the BLM will perform the work. Sase the reclamation costs on the assumption that contractors for the BLM will perform the work. | | | | | | |

Table 2-17. Colorado State-Specific Circumstances – Solid Minerals (MR)

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------|
| Nonenergy Leasable Minerals | | | | |
| MD MR-20: Existing nonenergy | Same as Alternative I (no change | Same as Alternative 4 | Existing nonenergy mineral leases: | Same as Alternative 4 |
| mineral leases: Apply the | made in 2019). | | Apply the following conservation | |
| following conservation measures | | | measures as conditions of | |
| as conditions of approval (COAs) | | | approval (COAs) where | |
| where applicable and feasible: | | Republication version of the poly of the property will be poly of the final document that may be all when the poly of the final document that may be all when the poly of the | applicable and feasible: | |
| Preclude new surface | | i s | Preclude new surface | |
| occupancy on existing leases | | al's | occupancy on existing leases | |
| within I mile of active leks | | 10 | within I mile of occupied leks | |
| (Blickley et al. 2012; Harju et | | 30 70 | (Blickley et al. 2012; Harju et | |
| al. 2 012). | | 410 411 | al. 2012). | |
| • If the lease is entirely within I | | . C.3 1231 D | If the lease is entirely within I | |
| mile of an active lek, require | | Allo the ex | mile of an occupied lek, | |
| any development to be placed | | 110 45 11 Po 11 | require any development to be | |
| in the area of the lease least | | el co villi oci | placed in the area of the lease | |
| harmful to GRSG based on | 4 | 10, 100 " 14, 90 | least harmful to GRSG based | |
| vegetation, topography, or | | 1 et al 3 :6 | on vegetation, topography, or | |
| other habitat features | cla | M Me cillo al 1 | other habitat features | |
| (Appendix G, Stipulations | 8910 Q1 | in the state of | (Appendix G, Stipulations | |
| Applicable to Fluid Mineral | 20, 6 | Och Me dis b | Applicable to Fluid Mineral | |
| Leasing and Land Use | M. The | 0 1000 27 | Leasing and Land Use | |
| Authorizations). | 181. 17 | 161. FF W. | Authorizations). | |
| Preclude new surface | ie g. W. Wille | Stop at | Preclude new surface | |
| disturbance on existing leases | 12 06, ell, of | JULE AND | disturbance on existing leases | |
| within 2 miles of active leks | vie Milling Be | Are Publication Verse, will be pool of the property will be pool of the property be disterned by the property | within 2 miles of occupied leks | |
| within PHMA. If the lease is 🔨 | I Co. Alla V. | ar cer. | within PHMA. If the lease is | |
| entirely within 2 miles of an | 90 JUSTA | · Illi | entirely within 2 miles of an | |
| active lek, require any | AL AL STI | CO | occupied lek, require any | |
| development to be placed in | is all Mad | 0 | development to be placed in | |
| the area of the lease least | 110 May MILE | | the area of the lease least | |
| harmful to GRSG based on | or flo of the | | harmful to GRSG based on | |
| vegetation, topography, or | 730 00 | | vegetation, topography, or | |
| other habitat features | In the | | other habitat features | |
| (Appendix G, Stipulations | | Republices the bearing of the period of the period of the final documents that may be all the period of the period | (Appendix G, Stipulations | |
| Applicable to Flaid Fillieral | | | 7 Applicable to Fluid Fillieral | |
| Leasing and Land Use | | | Leasing and Land Use | |
| Authorizations). | | | Authorizations). | |
| Limit permitted disturbances | | | Limit permitted disturbances | |
| to I disturbance per 640 acres | | | to I disturbance per 640 acres | |
| average across the landscape | | | average across the landscape | |
| in PHMA. Disturbances may | | | in PHMA. Disturbances may | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|--|---|----------------------|
| not exceed 3 percent in | (See above.) | (See above.) | not exceed 3 percent in | (See above.) |
| PHMA (see Appendix E, | (See above.) | (See above.) | PHMA in any biologically | (See above.) |
| Methodology for Calculating | | | significant unit (Colorado | |
| Disturbance Caps) in any | | | populations) and proposed | |
| biologically significant unit | | | project analysis area | |
| (Colorado populations) and | | | (Colorado MZ). | |
| proposed project analysis area | | | 01 13 011 | |
| (Colorado MZ). | | | GRSG TL-47-51 $-$ Based on site- | |
| | | Sil | specific conditions, prohibit | |
| GRSG TL-47-51 – Based on site- | | (8) | surface occupancy or disturbance | |
| specific conditions, prohibit surface occupancy or disturbance | | 270 | within PHMA within 4 miles of an occupied lek during lekking, | |
| within PHMA within 4 miles of a | | iol' who | nesting, and early brood-rearing | |
| lek during lekking, nesting, and | | 211 21 0 | (March I to July 15) | |
| early brood-rearing (March 1 to | | lice the b | (Tal Chi P to July 13). | |
| July 15). | | 10, 48 , 100 | (March I to July 15). | |
| | his is an unofficial of the Brands of the Blumbert of the Blum | Prepublication version of the property of the property will be property by the | relied . | |

Table 2-18. Colorado State-Specific Circumstances – Lands and Realty (LR)

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 | |
|--|---|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Lands and Realty (LR) | | | | | |
| MD LR-I: Manage areas within | Same as Alternative I (no change | Manage areas within PHMA as | Manage areas within PHMA as | Manage areas within PHMA as | |
| PHMA as avoidance areas* for | made in 2019). | exclusion areas for BLM ROW | avoidance areas* for BLM ROW | avoidance areas* for BLM ROW | |
| BLM ROW permits. (See | | permits, except for designated | permits. | permits, except for designated | |
| Appendix G, Stipulations | | corridors. | 0, 19 0/10 | corridors, which would be open | |
| Applicable to Fluid Mineral | | | *ROW Avoidance Criteria: | to ROW permits. | |
| Leasing and Land Use | | i i | ROWs may be issued if it can be | | |
| Authorizations.) | his is an unofficial to do on the his is an unofficial to the his indicated and the his | ar's | demonstrated that the proposed | *ROW Avoidance Criteria: | |
| | | 10 | authorization would have no | ROWs may be issued if it can be | |
| *GRSG PHMA ROW | | 30 120 | adverse impacts on GRSG or its | demonstrated that the proposed | |
| Avoidance. ROWs may be | | 410. 411 | habitat based on at least one of | authorization would have no | |
| issued after documenting that the | | . 630 . 31 . 00 | the following: | adverse impacts on GRSG or its | |
| ROWs would not adversely affect | | A South Olla | The location of the proposed | habitat based on at least one of | |
| GRSG populations based on the | | 110 45 110 | authorization is determined to | the following: | |
| following criteria: | | op co illi oci | be nonhabitat, lacks the | The location of the proposed | |
| • Location of proposed activities | , | " OF " N. YO | ecological potential to become | authorization is determined to | |
| in relation to critical GRSG | | at all al | habitat, does not provide | be nonhabitat, lacks the | |
| habitat areas as identified by | cia. | My We sillo il | important connectivity | ecological potential to become | |
| factors, including, but not | 410 21 | 111111111111111111111111111111111111111 | between habitat areas, and the | habitat, does not provide | |
| limited to, average male lek | 01. 0 | " Oca Me die b | project includes design | important connectivity | |
| attendance and/or important | in he | 90 1,000,01 | features to prevent indirect | between habitat areas, and the | |
| seasonal habitat. | 20 7 121 | ich. Kr. War | disturbance to or disruption of | project includes design | |
| An evaluation of the potential | 31 M. Jilo | Stop At | adjacent seasonal habitats that | features to prevent indirect | |
| threats from proposed | is 261, 111, 20 | II. EL Wa | would impair their biological | disturbance to or disruption of | |
| activities that may affect the | 19 111 19 20 | " What is a | function. | adjacent seasonal habitats that | |
| local population as compared | W. Co. Illy V | 31 011 | 2) Topography/areas of non- | would impair their biological | |
| to benefits that could be | 40 418. 561. VI | in in | habitat create an effective | function. | |
| accomplished through | of the office | CU. | barrier to impacts. | 2) Topography/areas of non- | |
| compensatory or off-site | eto all Mary | Republication version of the property of the property will be property will be property by the | 3) By co-locating the proposed | habitat create an effective | |
| mitigation | 102 40 11 100 | | authorization with existing | barrier to impacts. | |
| An evaluation of the proposed | 10, Vr. "Ne | republication the poly of the property of the | disturbance, impacts would be | By co-locating the proposed | |
| activities in relation to the site- | 13r. P. | | minimized or similar to impact | authorization with existing | |
| specific terrain and habitat | La Me | | associated with the existing | disturbance, impacts would be | |
| features. For example, within 4 | 41. | | infrastructure. | minimized or similar to impact | |
| miles from a lek, local terrain | | | | associated with the existing | |
| features such as ridges and | | | be undertaken as an | infrastructure. | |
| ravines may reduce the habitat | | | alternative to a similar action | 4) The proposed location would | |
| importance and shield nearby | | | occurring on a nearby parcel | be undertaken as an | |
| habitat from disruptive factors. | | | (for example, due to | alternative to a similar action | |
| | | | landownership patterns), and | occurring on a nearby parcel | |
| | | | authorizing the ROW on the | (for example, due to | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---------------|--|--|---|--|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | parcel in question would have | landownership patterns), and |
| | | | less of an impact on GRSG or | authorizing the ROW on the |
| | | | its habitat than on the nearby | parcel in question would have |
| | | | parcel; this criterion must also | less of an impact on GRSG or |
| | | | include measures sufficient to | its habitat than on the nearby |
| | | | allow the BLM to conclude | parcel; this criterion must also |
| | | | that such benefits will endure | include measures sufficient to |
| | | | for the duration of the | allow the BLM to conclu de |
| | | Sil | proposed action's impacts. | that such benefits will endure |
| | | 0.13 | In addition to meeting one of the | for the duration of the |
| | his is an unofficial to do cument. The Bland of the Bland | 21000 | criteria above, applicable | proposed action's impacts. |
| | his is an unofficial of documents in the Blundstantial NEPARE OF THE BLUNDSTONE BLINDS THE BUSTINGS OF THE BLUNDS THE BLU | 101. "He | minimization measures including | In addition to meeting one of the |
| | | 200 26 00 | Disturbance Caps, Timing | criteria above, applicable |
| | | lice "Ha b | Limitations, Design Features | minimization measures including |
| | | 101, 20, 00 | (Appendix XX- Design Features), | Disturbance Caps, Timing |
| | his is an unofficial of the Blad of the Bl | -01 -cl3 :11 cl | or other site-specific constraints | Limitations, Design Features |
| | | 164 Des MI 700 | would be included as Terms & | (Appendix XX- Design Features), |
| | | S. Str. M. JO | Conditions of the ROW. | or other site-specific constraints |
| | 131 | 10 26, 29, 12 | If the criteria* above do not | would be included as Terms & |
| | cric. 21 | 12, 14, 41, 16, | apply but it can be demonstrated | Conditions of the ROW. |
| | Off. P. | active ist by | that the direct and indirect | If the criteria * above do n ot |
| | inche | 90 11.00, 4. | impacts of the proposed activity | apply but it can be demonstrated |
| | 7 71.01 | of. Boyla | would be offset through | that the direct and indirect |
| | 31 V. Villa | Sto OR St. | compensatory mitigation, the | impacts of the proposed activity |
| | 15 cel : 11/1 | 12 EL Wa | authorized officer may consider | would be offset through |
| | 19 M. 18, 50 | Mr. I. | permitting the action. The | compensatory mitigation, the |
| | W. Co. Illa VI | 31 6/1 | environmental record of review | authorized officer may consider |
| | 40 x13. 561. 01 | in in | must demonstrate the following: | granting a ROW. The environmental record of review |
| | alle Mr. Tilo | CU. | As the first step in mitigating impacts to GRSG, efforts to | |
| | elo alla Mary | 00 | avoid impacts by locating the | must demonstrate why avoidance is not attainable. |
| | 102 40 11 | | proposed project in areas | To grant a ROW based on |
| | 20, "10, V/1, "Up | | outside the NSO areas or in | compensatory mitigation, the |
| | 13r. P. r. | | areas of non-habitat shall be | compensation project must be |
| | 12 "He | | documented. | completed prior to construction, |
| | Tr. | | 2) As the second step in | surface occupancy, or surface |
| | | Mexpedt wirdock, Mexpent in Alacument that may be all MEPA that may be a | mitigating impacts to GRSG, | disturbing activities. Applicable |
| | | | efforts to minimize impacts by | minimization measures including |
| | | | applying project design | Disturbance Caps, Timing |
| | | | features shall be documented | Limitations, Design Features |
| | | | (e.g., use of RDFs, buffer | (Appendix XX- Design Features), |
| | | | (0.,,, | or other site-specific constraints |
| | 1 | I. | I | The state of the s |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | distances, seasonal limitations, | would be included as Terms & |
| | | | etc.). | Conditions of the ROW. |
| | | | 3) The compensation project | |
| | | | must be completed and habitat | |
| | | | functionality documented | |
| | | | before the authorization is | |
| | | | granted to ensure the offset in | |
| | | | impacts will occur. | |
| | | Gil | Le Me CO | |
| | | , ers | The compensation necessary to grant this authorization must | |
| | | 10 | provide the offsetting benefit to | |
| | | in he | | |
| | | The training | the population being impacted by the potential development. | |
| MD LR-2: Manage areas within | Same as Alternative I (no change | No similar action | Manage areas within GHMA as | Manage areas within GHMA as |
| GHMA as avoidance areas* for | made in 2019). | No similar action | avoidance areas* BLM ROW | avoidance areas* for BLM ROW |
| major (transmission lines greater | made in 2017). | JUL 613 11 1 61 | permits (see avoidance criteria | permits, except for designated |
| | | 16h 260 MIL 100 | above). | corridors, which would be open |
| greater than 24 inches) and minor | | 11 14 14 10 | (10 VC). | to ROW permits (see avoidance |
| BLM ROW permits (see | :31 | W 6, 61, VS, 12 | alle | criteria above). |
| avoidance criteria above). | No similar action | No similar action | 10 | |
| No similar action | No similar action | No similar action | In PHMA and GHMA, If the | Same as Alternative 4 |
| | inche | 90 11,00,01 | ROW authorization is the off- | |
| | 70 71 21 | of. Bo Mar | lease component of an action that | |
| | 31 J. Jilo | Sto SA St | occurs on-lease (e.g a road | |
| | is cel. !!!! | 113 E. W. | beginning off-lease that crosses | |
| | 19 11 19 De | Mr. I. | on-lease would require both a | |
| * | 41, CP, 113 V | al elle | ROW and subject to the | |
| | 40 *19. 161 VL | in the | conditions of the APD), ensure | |
| | aur Mr. Jil | CUI | that the conditions for each | |
| | 660 11 Mgg 7 | | authorization are consistent for | |
| | 102 43, 111, 00 | | mitigation, reclamation, and | |
| | 10, 10, 17, 10c | | design features, as appropriate. | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|
| MD LR-3: No new roads or | Same as Alternative I (no change | No similar action | No new tall structures would be | Same as Alternative 4, but with |
| above-ground structures would | made in 2019). | | authorized within I mile of an | ROW avoidance criteria from |
| be authorized within I mile of an | | | occupied lek. | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
| active lek. | | | T II | |
| | | | Tall structures are defined as any | |
| Above-ground structures are | | | man-made structure that | |
| defined as structures that are | | | provides for perching/nesting | |
| located on or above the surface | | | opportunities for predators (e.g., | |
| of the ground, including but not | | i e | raptors, ravens) that may | |
| limited to: roads, fences, | | ar's. | naturally be absent, or that | |
| communication towers, and/or | | 10 | decreases the use of an area. A | |
| any structure that would provide | | 30 120 | determination as to whether | |
| perches. | | 410. 411 | something is considered a tall | |
| | | . 630 . 30 . 00 | structure would be made based on local conditions such as | |
| Above-ground structures would | | Allo the of | existing vegetation or | |
| only be authorized if: | | The state of the | topography. Tall structures | |
| 1. It is consistent with the overall | | co co illi co | include but are not limited to: | |
| objective of the RMP | 4 | 16. 100 " W. 40 | communication towers, | |
| Amendment; | | et all al is | meteorological towers, power | |
| The effect on GRSG | Cla | M We silve it | lines, and transmission lines. | |
| populations or habitat is | 89000 | , The starte | Tall structures would only be | |
| nominal or incidental; | 001.00 | Doglas dis b | authorized if it can be | |
| Allowing the exception | The He | 90 11 260 24 | demonstrated that the proposed | |
| prevents implementation of an | 121 | Cl. K. Wo | authorization would have no | |
| alternative more detrimental | S. Mr. Jile | St. OR at | adverse impacts on GRSG or its | |
| to GRSG or similar | 13 26, 111, 00 | IL "HO | habitat based on the ROW | |
| environmental concern, and; | his is an unofficial of documents in the Bland of the Brand of the Bra | 'Waster | Avoidance Criteria* above. | |
| Rigid adherence to the restriction | Li Con alla DV | 31 611 | Additionally, if tall structures | |
| would be the only reason for | 90 410 Ch. 01 | M | cannot be buried (i.e power | |
| denying the action. | ALL ALL STILL | CO | lines), require perch deterrents. | |
| 20.76 110 400011 | his is an unofficial of documents in the arms of the BLM when the BLM when the arms of the BLM when the BLM when the BLM | Mexpent Midolis document that may be all MEPA that may be all ment that may be accomment to the control of the cont | i mes, require per en decerrents. | |
| | 110 SUS MILES | | | |
| | 30 till all the | | | |
| | 73. 6 | | | |
| | 12 "We | | | |
| | - | | | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| MD LR-4: PHMA and GHMA | Same as Alternative I (no change | No similar decision | No similar decision | No similar decision |
| are designated as avoidance areas | made in 2019). | | | |
| for high-voltage transmission line | , | | | |
| ROWs, except for the | | | | |
| transmission projects specifically | | | wis | |
| identified below. All | | | Ma 112 all | |
| authorizations in these areas, | | | 01 3 2/10 | |
| other than the following identified | | | 10 01 D'III | |
| projects, must comply with the | | i | se the co | |
| conservation measures outlined | | ars. | alling the of | |
| in this ARMPA, including the | | 10 | 20 4 111 -119 -17 | |
| RDFs and avoidance criteria | | 30 120 | 160 16, 10. | |
| presented in this document. The | | 410, 411, | 510 OV 015 | |
| BLM is currently processing | | . 63, 25, 50 | 4, 10 | |
| applications for the TransWest | | Allo the of | ve, 11 v. | |
| and Energy Gateway South | | The state of the | U. 201, 01. | |
| Transmission Line projects, and | | ep ec illi oci | 0 119 | |
| the NEPA review for these | 4 | 10, 100 " 14, 90 | Ho y | |
| projects is well underway. | | 1 et al 3 :6 | lies | |
| Conservation measures for | cla | M Me cillo | 16/ | |
| GRSG are being analyzed through | 8910 01 | - Will Gricker | 2 | |
| the projects' NEPA review | 20, 6 | Oc The dis 'b | | |
| process, which should achieve a | M. The | 0 1 000 34 | | |
| net conservation benefit for the | 181: 12 | 161. VF 1410 | | |
| GRSG. | | STORAL | | |
| MD LR-6: Prohibit surface | Same as Alternative I (no change | No similar decision | In PHMA and GHMA, prohibit | Same as Alternative 4 |
| occupancy and surface-disturbing | made in 2019). | 11/2/2 | surface occupancy and surface- | |
| activities associated with BLM | 1, 00, 3/1, 3V. | 3, 61, | disturbing activities associated | |
| ROW within 4 miles from active | 90 Mile (E.K. 110) | 'IU' | with BLM ROVV within 4 miles of | |
| leks during lekking, nesting, and | *31, Mr 31, | C | occupied leks during lekking, | |
| early brood-rearing (March 1 to | 25 31 1 Po d | 3 | (Marsh Lea Luly LE) | |
| July 15). (See special stipulations applicable to GRSG PHMA | M. W. M. | | (March 1 to July 13). | |
| ROW TL.) | Still Br th | | | |
| MD LR-8: (PHMA) In PHMA, or | Same as Alternative I (no change made in 2019). Same as Alternative I (no change made in 2019). | No similar decision | (PHMA and GHMA) In PHMA | Same as Alternative 4 |
| within 4 miles of an active lek, for | made in 2019). | | and GHMA, for ROW renewals. | |
| ROW renewals, where existing | , | | where existing facilities cannot be | |
| facilities cannot be removed, | | | removed, buried, or modified, | |
| buried, or modified, require | | | require perch deterrents. | |
| perch deterrents. | | | | |
| MD LR-9: (PHMA) Reclaim and | Same as Alternative I (no change | _ | (PHMA and GHMA) Reclaim and | Same as Alternative 4 |
| restore ROWs considering | made in 2019). | | restore ROWs considering | |
| GRSG habitat requirements. | | | GRSG habitat requirements. | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| MD LR-10: (PHMA) Designate | Same as Alternative I (no change | No similar decision | (PHMA and GHMA) Designate | Same as Alternative 4 |
| new ROW corridors in GRSG | made in 2019). | 140 Sirillar decision | new ROW corridors in GRSG | Same as Arternative 1 |
| PHMA only where there is a | made in 2017). | | PHMA and GHMA only where | |
| compelling reason to do so and | | | there is a compelling reason to | |
| location of the corridor within | | | do so and location of the | |
| PHMA will not adversely affect | | | corridor within PHMA will not | |
| GRSG populations due to habitat | | | adversely affect CPSC | |
| loss or disruptive activities. | | | populations due to habitat loss or | |
| · | | o ic | disruptive activities. | |
| | his is an unofficial of the Bland of the Bland of the Bland NEPARE OF THE BLAND THE OF THE BLAND | Prepublication Version of the property of the property of the final document that may be a likely be a likely by the property of the property | Sted in poission of the only version of the on | |

2.6.1 Idaho

In addition to Idaho's three-tier habitat approach, state specific circumstances are a result of specific language unique from 2015 and 2019, and clarifying 2015 implementation management decisions. State specific circumstances for the State of Idaho include 1) management of saleable minerals/mineral materials se of nuclear a.

This is an unofficial property to the property of the proper specifically consideration of new free use pits in PHMA, 2) application and use of lek buffers (see Substantial Mer A Redister. The Final Locument in the State of the Sta Appendix 19), and 3) application of renewable energy management to nuclear and hydropower Jubstantially similar document will be posted in the BLM of the only yersion of the posterior of the properties of the only yersion of the parties of the pa

ational NEPA Register. The final document published in of the relied upon.

Table 2-19. Idaho State-Specific Circumstances – Mineral Resources (MR)

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 150 150 150 150 150 150 150 150 150 150 | | leable Minerals/Mineral Materi | | |
| MD MR II: PHMA are closed to | MD MR II: PHMA: All PHMA | MD MR II: Same as Alternative | MD MR II: PHMA—All PHMA | MD MR II: Same as Alternative |
| new mineral materials sales. | will be closed to new mineral | I. All HMA is PHMA. | will be closed to new mineral | 4 |
| However, these areas remain | materials development, but | | materials development but | |
| "open" to free use permits and | continued use of existing pits will | | continued use of existing pits will | |
| the expansion of existing active | be allowed. New free use permits | | be allowed. New free use permits | |
| pits only if the following criteria | and the expansion of existing free | | and the expansion of existing pits | |
| are met: | use permits may be considered | .61 | may be considered only if the | |
| the project area disturbance | only if the following criteria are | 0.15 | following criteria are met: | |
| cap is not exceeded within a BSU; | met: • the project area disturbance | republication version | a. The disturbance cap is not exceeded in a within a fine- | |
| • the activity is subject to the | cap is not exceeded within a | "10, "We | scale HAF; | |
| provisions set forth in the | BSU; | 21, 25, 0 | b. The activity is subject to the | |
| mitigation framework | the activity is subject to the | republication at the popular of the final document will be possible to the final document will be possible to the final document of | provisions set forth in the | |
| [Appendix F in the 2015 | provisions set forth in the | republice the final document will be conditioned by the final document will be disterned by the final may be distorted by the | mitigation framework | |
| ARMPA]; | mitigation framework | JUL 9 11 6 -11 | (Appendix F in the 2019 | |
| all applicable required design | [Appendix F in the 2015 | 10 CO MILL OC | ARMPA); | |
| features are applied; and | ARMPA]; | 110 16 4 11 90 | c. All applicable RDFs are | |
| the activity is permissible | all applicable required design | 6 of all 3 :6 | applied; and | |
| under the Idaho exception and | features are applied; and | M We sills at 1 | d. The activity is permissible | |
| development criteria (MD SSS | the activity is permissible | 1, 111, 11, 40, | under the Ídaho exception and | |
| 29 and MD SSS 30 in the 2015 | under the Idaho exception and | Mexpent wilds is document that may be all when the theter is a line of the | development criteria (MD SSS | |
| ID ARMPA) | development criteria (MD SSS | 90 1,000,01 | 29 and MD SSS 30 in the 2019 | |
| , | 29 and MD SSS 30 in the 2019 | of. Boylor | ID ARMPA). | |
| IHMA: All IHMA will be open to | ID ARMPA) | CLO OD . I. | In order to support maintenance | |
| mineral materials development, | HIMAS OF HIMAS HILL | 12 SK, NO. | needs for existing local roads and | |
| consistent with the Idaho | IHMA: All IHMA will be open to | 2 7 F. El. | ensure public safety, exceptions | |
| Anthropogenic Disturbance | mineral materials development, | 1/2 1/2 | to criteria b) and d) listed above | |
| Criteria (MD SSS 30 in the 2015 | consistent with the Idaho | 9, V6, | may be granted for new free-use | |
| ID ARMPA), and subject to RDFs, | Anthropogenic Disturbance | 10, | permits in areas with existing | |
| and buffers. Sales from existing | Criteria (MD SSS 30 in the 2019 | CO | anthropogenic disturbance. | |
| community pits within IHMA will | ID ARMPA), and subject to RDFs, | | and opogetile disturbance. | |
| be subject to seasonal timing | and buffers. | | IHMA—All IHMA will be open to | |
| restrictions (Appendix C in 2015 | GHMA: All GHMA will be open | | mineral materials development, | |
| ARMPA). | to mineral materials | | consistent with the Idaho | |
| GHMA: All GHMA will be open | development, subject to best | | Anthropogenic Disturbance | |
| to mineral materials | management practices, as | | Criteria (MD SSS 30 in the 2019 | |
| development, subject to RDFs | described in Appendix C (in 2019 | | ID ARMPA) and subject to RDFs | |
| and buffers. Sales from existing | ARMPA). | | and buffers. | |
| community pits within GHMA | | | GHMA—All GHMA will be open | |
| will be subject to seasonal timing | | | to mineral materials | |
| restrictions (Appendix C in 2015 | | | development, subject to BMPs as | |
| ARMPA). | | | described in Appendix C (in the | |
| 7. | | | 2019 ID ARMPA). | |

Table 2-20. Idaho State-Specific Circumstances – Special Status Species (SSS)

| A1 | A1: 2 | A.L: 3 | | A1 P 1. |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
| | | Anthropogenic Disturbance | | |
| Appendix B. Buffers (in the 2015 ID ARMPA). {The management action associated with the buffers is MD SSS 35; the details on buffer sizes and how to apply them is in the appendix.} | Appendix B. Buffers (in the 2019 ID ARMPA) {The management action associated with the buffers is MD SSS 35; the details on buffer sizes and how to apply them is in the appendix.} | Same as Alternative 4. | Appendix B. Buffers (see proposed changes in the Idaho Buffers Appendix Alternative Language (Appendix 19). Modified from Appendix B referenced in Alt 1 to apply to active or pending active leks, with no buffer exceptions. | Appendix B. Buffers (see proposed changes in the Idaho Buffers Appendix Alternative Language (Appendix 19). Modified from Appendix B referenced in Alt 2 to apply to active and pending leks and providing buffer exception for IHMA/GHMA. |
| | his is an unofficial of the and the allowed the BLM the allowed the BLM the allowed the al | Prepublication vere prepublication vere interpretation vere document will be pro- document that may be document that may be document that may be document that may be | The only vers | |

Table 2-21. Idaho State-Specific Circumstances – Renewable Energy (Wind and Solar) (RE)

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | Industrial Solar, | Wind, Nuclear, and Hydropow | ver Development | |
| MD RE 1: PHMA: Designate and manage PHMA as exclusion areas for utility scale (20 MW) wind and solar testing and development, nuclear and hydropower energy development. | MD RE I: PHMA: Designate and manage PHMA as exclusion areas for utility scale (20 MW) wind and solar testing and development, nuclear and hydropower energy development. | Same as cross-cutting language for wind and solar described above, but with the additional application to nuclear and hydropower energy development. | Same as cross-cutting language for wind and solar described above, but with the additional application to nuclear and hydropower energy development. | Same as cross-cutting language for wind and solar described above, but with the additional application to nuclear and hydropower energy development. |
| IHMA: Designate and manage IHMA as avoidance areas for wind and solar testing and development, nuclear and hydropower development. | IHMA: Designate and manage IHMA as avoidance areas for wind and solar testing and development, nuclear and hydropower development. | blication vers | sted in version of | |
| GHMA: Designate and manage GHMA as open for wind and solar testing and development and nuclear and hydropower development subject to RDFs and buffers. | GHMA: Designate and manage GHMA as open for wind and solar testing and development and nuclear and hydropower development | Mexpects will be ch | the out, bor, | |
| | his is an uno the kind of the his is an uno the his is an uno the his initial of the district | application to nuclear and hydropower energy development. | | |

2.6.2 Montana/Dakotas

GRSG in Montana range across most of the state, with about 1,000 confirmed active sage-grouse leks. GRSG in North and South Dakota have limited distributions and small population sizes. These differences resulted in variable factors being considered for identifying HMAs (in cooperation with state natural resource entities) (see **Appendix 3**, GRSG HMA State-by-State Mapping Strategies). Factors include differences in the amount of the population in GHMA, HMAs to address different seasonal movement strategies, and addressing cross-state populations. These differences also require consideration of different management approaches at a local level (state specific circumstances) in contrast to range-wide approaches (cross-cutting issues) considered in this EIS/RMPA.

GRSG planning efforts completed in 2015 were initiated while plan revisions were ongoing for multiple other plans in the region. The 2015 effort resulted in updated GRSG management in seven plans. However, the Butte Field Office (BFO) and the Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument (UMRBNM) were not included due to minor amounts of habitat (BFO) and protections provided by inclusion of GRSG as an object and value of the UMRBNM proclamation. Subsequently, the Lewistown Field Office completed a plan revision in 2021, and the North Dakota Field Office is currently undergoing a plan revision. Montana-Dakotas BLM offices were not part of the GRSG plan amendments completed in 2019.

While concepts and approaches are generally consistent between the plans, separate planning efforts resulted both wording and management action inconsistencies. State-specific circumstances address: I) measures to improve consistency between the nine Field Offices (RMPs) for sage-grouse management; 2) incorporating unique circumstances of peripheral populations and accounting for the higher proportion of sage-grouse leks found in GHMA in Montana; and 3) applying 2021 Plan Evaluation recommendations and lessons learned from implementation of the 2015 plans.

Increasing Consistency between Montana-Dakotas BLM Plans and State Conservation Approaches

BLM's review of the seven Montana-Dakotas plans included in the 2015 planning effort identified varying management recommendations. While some of these differences are simply minor wording differences, other inconsistencies include the omission or inclusion of actions not included in neighboring plans. These differences also include numerous stipulations for oil and gas leasing in HMAs and occupied GRSG habitat. Among offices, there are varying objectives for GRSG management under the sensitive status species sections or may contain objectives listed as management action in different plans. Furthermore, BLM identified differences in buffer distances for ROW avoidance around leks, variation in protections for winter range, and several other differences in management among HMAs between offices.

The BLM examined these inconsistencies to determine if they are justified using the following criteria: I) Biological circumstances between offices that warrant distinction; 2) Wording differences that create inconsistent interpretation and management; 3) Whether specific management objectives and actions were needed within BFO and the UMRBNM, and; 4) Relationships with the state GRSG conservation plans from North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana.

The action alternatives below strive to provide better consistency among BLM offices and partner natural resource entities. They are intended to provide clear and consistent direction to applicants and partners for cross-office boundary projects and simplify the coordination among field offices. Other potential changes including monitoring, adaptive management, and implementation tracking would be streamlined to increase internal efficiencies and improve coordination with partners.

Addressing Variations in HMAs and Peripheral Populations

In Montana, general habitat, and BLM GHMA, contains a larger proportion of leks relative to these habitat types than many other states (see Appendix 3, GRSG HMA State-by-State Mapping Strategies). To meet objectives for GRSG and be more consistent with state management approaches, more restrictive GHMA management is presented for some resources in the alternatives below. The Montana-Dakotas BLM is considering crucial winter range in stipulations and maintains lek-based buffers for ROWs in GHMA (including utility scale renewable energy projects). Peripheral populations present unique challenges to management approaches. The population spanning the Montana and North Dakota Border (Cedar Creek Anticline area) has specific objectives considered to address ongoing development in the area, restoration needs, and cross-state and cross organizational GRSG management in this mixed-ownership area. In Montana, this area is considered as an RHMA in most alternatives to reflect the desire for long-term restoration. In North Dakota, GRSG range is PHMA, but specific objectives and management are considered to address restoration and habitat enhancement, including protecting historical leks (those active in 2010) similar to currently active leks. This is intended to conserve the landscape to provide opportunities for restoration. GRSG in northern Montana and Canada exhibit unique migratory behavior, moving from breeding habitat in silver sage communities to winter south in Wyoming Big Sagebrush dominated communities. To capture these migratory pathways and protect stopover sites the BLM identified connectivity areas, called CHMA, based on the State of Montana connectivity areas (see Appendix 3, GRSG HMA State-by-State Mapping Strategies). While the revised GRSG HMAs in the action alternatives and the Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Range overlap by just over 300 acres in the Billings Field Office, GRSG and wild horse use do not overlap due to physical barriers. Therefore, this topic is not addressed in detail.

2015 Plan Evaluations and Lessons Learned

Implementation of the 2015 plans (including 2021 plan evaluations) has identified areas of potential misunderstanding that are included as cross cutting issues in alternatives in this EIS. The BLM Montana-Dakotas has also identified opportunities, unique to the region, including cross-boundary coordination with other natural-resource management entities. Additionally, new local and range-wide research provides updated information to consider for GRSG management action adjustments. As a result, the state-specific alternative below incorporates the following new information. The Dillon FO was previously included in a combined Idaho-SW Montana amendment. However, that amendment included management unique to Idaho, but not applicable in Montana including Wild Horse and Burro management, use of the Fire and Invasives Assessment Tool, and incorporation of Key Habitat references. The Montana-Dakotas BLM also considers options to remove the distinction between major and minor rights of way, both for consistency with state management and to address specific impacts of the proposed disturbance or disruption of ROW actions relative to GRSG. Lastly, the revised guidance on conservation buffer distances, project screens, and design features provides a common approach for analyzing different program and project types that result in similar impacts.

The remainder of this section includes the alternatives related to the applicable management actions. Columns for Alternatives I and 2 have been merged, since the BLM RMPs in the Montana/Dakota State Office did not amend any plans in 2019.

Table 2-22. Montana State-Specific Circumstances - Special Status Species (GRSG): Goals and Objectives

Alternative | Summary **Alternative 2 Summary** Alternative 3 **Alternative 4** Alternatives 5 and 6 Special Status Species (GRSG): Goals and Objectives Goal: Maintain and/or increase GRSG abundance and distribution by Apply the cross-cutting GRSG goal, Habitat Objectives, etc. In addition, retain existing goals and conserving, enhancing, or restoring the sagebrush ecosystem upon objectives, but edit or add to ensure the following direction is contained: which populations depend, in cooperation with other conservation partners. (Language varies between plans) Goal: (see cross-cutting issue). Objective: Maintain, improve, and restore sagebrush habitats to increase habitat availability and quality **Objective**: Sage-grouse management will utilize the 2005 for GRSG, sagebrush obligates and other sagebrush dependent species. Management Plan and Conservation Strategies for Sage-Grouse in Montana – Final for overall guidance and direction. (Various inclusion aestred conditions and to maxing the street of conditions and to maxing the street of conditions and to maxing the street of parties of the street of t of BLM and state GRSG plans) Objective: Manage GRSG through collaborative, coordinated efforts that utilize cooperative planning and implement and monitor activities to achieve desired conditions and to maximize the utilization of West Nile Virus: When developing or modifying water available funding opportunities. Coordination efforts can include: adjacent landowners, federal and state developments, use applicable RDFs (see RDF/BMP appendix from agencies, local governments, tribes, communities, other agencies, nongovernmental organizations, and each RMP) to mitigate potential impacts from West Nile virus. (Various inclusion as goal, objective, or management action, in All HMAs MA: Greater sage-grouse management will be consistent with current adopted BLM different program areas) conservation strategies, will utilize GRSG conservation plans, as revised or updated, from partners such as WAFWA (e.g., Sagebrush conservation strategy; Remington et al. 2021), USFWS (e.g., Greater Sagegrouse (Centrocercus urophasianus) Conservation Objectives: Final Report; USFWS 2013), and state wildlife or habitat management agency action, management, or conservation plans (e.g., MT EO 2015, All HMAs MA: Assess and modify as needed water features to reduce the risk of potential impacts

Table 2-23. Montana State-Specific Circumstances - Special Status Species (GRSG): Cedar Creek Anticline RHMA Objectives

| Alternative I Summary | Alternative 2 Summary | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | Special Sta | tus Species (GRSG): Goals and | Objectives | |
| Objective I: Strive for proponent | ts to develop area-wide Habitat | Objective I: Develop and implem | nent an area-wide habitat restoratio | n plan. The plan will identify |
| Recovery Plans. | | | g short term actions that can reduc | |
| | | | olicative roads, infrastructure remov | |
| Objective 2: Strive for no net los | s of GRSG habitat. | to increase sagebrush cover and ur | nderstory plants), and longer-term a | ections to put in place as |
| | | development is completed. | 10 01 0 111. | |
| Objective 3: Strive for the restor | | i s | ve the co | |
| landscapes in a manner which incre | eases or improves the quality and | | oss of GRSG habitat, subject to valid | l existing rights, and maintained |
| quantity of GRSG habitat. | | connectivity with North Dakota G | RSG habitat. | |
| | | on he | *60 110. Jo. | |
| | | | estoration, as possible with partner | |
| | | landscapes in a manner which incre | eases or improves the quality and qu | uantity of GRSG habitat. |

Table 2-24. Montana State-Specific Circumstances - Special Status Species (GRSG): North Dakota Specifics

| Alternative I Summary | Alternative 2 Summary (| Alternative 3 | 00 14 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| | Special Sta | tus Species (GRSG): Go | oals and Obje | ctives | |
| Objective SSS-1.1 through Ob | | Objective SSS 1.1-1.4: | See cross-cutti | ng language for HMAs, disturl | bance, and habitat objectives |
| objectives cover disturbance cap, o | delineate PHMA and GHMA, and | above. | ne ne | | |
| identify the Habitat Objectives | The The | 90° 111 601 | Ke | | |
| Objective SSS-1.5: No similar o | bjective (1) | Objective SSS-1.5 (Nev | v): Maintain the | e existing distribution of occup | pied GRSG habitat while tak ing |
| | is a chi in | strategic opportunities to | enhance existir | ng habitat and expand occupie | ed habitat through restoration |
| | :6 Me 61 78 | | , | found on BLM managed surfa | ce acres (e.g., conifer |
| A | 412 CM, 119 VK | encroachment, infrastruct | ure, etc.) in No | orth Dakota. | |
| | 100 131 BK 1 | 10 | | | |
| | 0 45, 18, 40. | | | | interested partners such as the |
| | 13, 14 731 | | | | ervation partners and adjacent |
| | No 33, 11 12 0 | ` | , | | egarding implementation of sage- |
| | The Oliver M. We | | | | tion, site-specific monitoring, |
| | STILL BY III. | | | | n will identify responsibilities, roles |
| | Mr. C. | and interaction to maximi | ze the party's ii | ndividual conservation efforts | · |

Table 2-25. Montana State-Specific Circumstances – Vegetation: GRSG Objectives and Actions

| Alternative I Summary | ternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|---------------------------------|---|
| | ternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
| Vegetation: GRSG Objectives and Actions | | |
| All HMAs: Various objectives and management actions Retain existing objectives and management actions | nt actions, but edit | or add to ensure the following |
| direction is contained: | | |
| PHMA (Goal, Objective, or MA): The desired condition is to | 0 W | |
| maintain all lands ecologically capable of producing sagebrush (but no VEG OBJ-X (PHMA): The desired condition | | |
| less than 70%) with a minimum of 15% sagebrush canopy cover or as sagebrush (but no less than 70%) with a minimum | | |
| consistent with specific ecological site conditions. The attributes specific ecological site conditions. The attributes | | these habitats are described in |
| necessary to sustain these habitats are described in Interpreting Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health (BL) | 1 Tech Ref 1734-6). | |
| Indicators of Rangeland Health (BLM Tech Ref 1734-6). | ille on | |
| VEG OBJ-Y (PHMA): Make re-establishment | | |
| (Slight variations between plans, no quantitative objective for Butte (relative to ecological site potential) a high prior | ity for restoration effo | orts in PHMA. Prioritize areas for |
| and UMRBNM) conifer removal to benefit GRSG habitat. | 10 | |
| All the Page 1 | 1 0. | |
| PHMA: Make re-establishment of sagebrush cover and desirable MA (All HMAs): Remove conifers encroaching | g into s agebrush habita | ats, in a manner that conside rs |
| understory plants (relative to ecological site potential) a high priority tribal and cultural values, as well as other key re | | |
| for restoration efforts in PHMA. Prioritize areas for juniper removal etc.). Prioritize treatments closest to occupied C | | |
| to benefit GRSG habitat. (Slight variation between plans, juniper not encroachment is phase 1 or phase 2. Use of site | -specific analysis and t | ools will help refine the location |
| only issue in MT/Dak). for specific areas to be treated. | | |
| efic all cill a liste se | | |
| MA (All HMAs): Conifers encroaching into sagebrush habitats will VEG MA-X (PHMA): Treatments that conser | | |
| be removed, in a manner that considers tribal cultural values. well as treatments that benefit other resources | and do not adversely a | affect GRSG or their habitat. |
| Treatments will be prioritized closest to occupied sage-grouse | | |
| habitats and near occupied leks, and where juniper encroachment is | | |
| phase I or phase 2. Use of site-specific analysis and principles like | | |
| those included in the Fire and Invasives Assessment Tool (FIAT) | | |
| report (Chambers, et al. 2014) and other ongoing modeling efforts to | | |
| address conifer encroachment will help refine the location for | | |
| specific priority areas to be treated. | | |
| be removed, in a manner that considers tribal cultural values. Treatments will be prioritized closest to occupied sage-grouse habitats and near occupied leks, and where juniper encroachment is phase I or phase 2. Use of site-specific analysis and principles like those included in the Fire and Invasives Assessment Tool (FIAT) report (Chambers, et al. 2014) and other ongoing modeling efforts to address conifer encroachment will help refine the location for specific priority areas to be treated. (Slight variations between plans, no FIAT analysis for MT/Dak) | | |
| (Slight variations between plans, no FIAT analysis for MT/Dak) | | |

PHMA: Treatment actions (Slight variations between plans)

Table 2-26. Montana State-Specific Circumstances – Special Status Species: Surface Disturbing Activities in GRSG Habitat
Objective

| All HMAs: In undertaking BLM management actions and consistent with valid and existing rights and applicable law in authorizing thirdparty actions, the BLM will apply the lek buffer-distances identified in the United States geological Survey (USGS) Report (see Appendix B, GRSG Conservation Buffer). [Minor variations between plans, including if buffers are referenced, or not, indifferent program areas] [Plans variable in including additional language such as: • Conduct implementation and project activities, including construction and short-term anthropogenic disturbances consistent with seasonal habitat restrictions described in Appendix C. • Other resource uses within PHMA may be allowed pending project level environmental review provided that Mitigation, BMPs Guidelines, standard operating procedures (SCP), and RDPs are implemented, Impacts are evaluated as described in the GRSG Effects Analysis Process (Appendix P) and the project does not exceed the disturbance and page and sage-grouse habitat are not comptomised.) Special Status of Septical States (see) Septically and the project does not exceed the disturbance and page and sage-grouse habitat are not comptomised.) |
|--|
| with valid and existing rights and applicable law in authorizing third- party actions, the BLM will apply the lek buffer-distances identified in the United States geological Survey (USGS) Report (see Appendix B, GRSG Conservation Buffer). [Minor variations between plans including if buffers are referenced or not |
| exceed the disturbance cap (Appendix E) and the goals for sage-grouse and sage-grouse habitat are not compromised.) |

Table 2-27. Montana State-Specific Circumstances - Wind, Solar, and Associated ROWs

| Alternative I Summary | Alternative 2 Summary | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Utility Scale Solar and Wind | d (>20 MW and/or based on po | wer supply to a community) | |
| PHMA: Exclusion | | PHMA: Exclusion | PHMA: Exclusion | PHMA: |
| RHMA: | | RHMA: No similar action | RHMA: | • Exclusion |
| • Exclusion (Elk Basin, Cedar Cre | eek, South Carter County, West | GHMA: No similar action | • Exclusion (Cedar Creek, West | Within 3.3 km (2 miles) of |
| Decker) | | CHMA: Avoidance | Decker) | active leks |
| Avoidance (Outside Elk Basin in | n Billings) | | Same as GHMA (Billings) | UMRBNM |
| GHMA: | 3 / |)ia | GHMA: W | North Dakota |
| Avoidance | | al's | Exclusion | Crucial winter habitat |
| • Exclusion (SD in winter habitat | and within I mile of leks) | 10 | o Within 3.3 km (2 miles) of | Avoidance |
| CHMA: No similar action | , | on ne | active leks | >2 miles from active leks |
| | | 410 4 411 | o UMRBNM | RHMA: |
| (No specific action in Butte. UMRE | BNM is Exclusion.) | Mepublication verse | Crucial winter habitat | • Exclusion (Cedar Creek, West |
| • | , | MILE ALL OF F | Avoidance | Decker) |
| | | all of il be in | >2 miles from active leks | Same as GHMA (Billings) |
| | | el ec vill oc | CHMA: Avoidance | GHMA: |
| | . < | 16 16 4 10 90 | che of | Exclusion |
| | : 2 | 6 Ch 31 19 | lie | UMRBNM |
| | ci Cla | M We sills of | ₹@, | Crucial winter habitat |
| | Stie BI | CUI C. GIE W | 2 * | Avoidance |
| | 70° 6. | 100 The dis 16 | | Within 3.3 km (2 miles) of |
| | M. The | 0 1 200 00 | | active leks |
| | 181: 18 | 16, V L 14, | | Wind in HiLine per |
| | is a all will | is Prair | | existing management |
| | ie is we ellise | 9. TE. " " LL | | actions |
| | nis will Re | 11/2 1/2 | | Open, subject to GRSG LUP |
| 1 | I ACCUSATION OF | D. 761 | | objectives |
| do Atla Et io | | III | | >2 miles from active leks |
| Exclusion (SD in winter habitat and within I mile of leks) CHMA: No similar action (No specific action in Butte. UMRBNM is Exclusion.) | | -C | | CHMA: Same as GHMA |
| | 12 23 1 1 M 9 | Mexpect will dock the final dock the | | |
| | JID ON WING | | | |
| | STORY ALL | | | |
| | 40.00 | | | |
| | fle | | | |
| | • | | | |

| Alternative I Summary | Alternative 2 Summary | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | Rights of Way | | |
| <u>Major</u> | | PHMA: | PHMA: | PHMA: |
| PHMA: Avoidance | | Avoidance in currently | Exclusion: | Exclusion: |
| RHMA: Avoidance | | designated corridors | Surface disturbing or | Surface disturbing or |
| GHMA: Avoidance | | Exclusion (otherwise) | disruptive activities within | disruptive activities within |
| <u>Minor</u> | | CHMA: Avoidance | 2km (1.2 miles) of active | Ikm (0.6 miles) of active |
| PHMA: Avoidance (Dillon open w/ | / RDFs and Buffers) | | leks (in ND – occupied | leks (in ND – active leks |
| RHMA: | | | leks in 2010) | and those occupied in |
| Billings – Avoidance | | Sil | Crucial winter range | 2010) |
| • Miles City - Allowed with design | n features | al a | Avoidance | Crucial winter range |
| GHMA: | | 10 | In existing corridors or | Avoidance |
| Avoidance (South Dakota within | 2 miles of leks) | 30. 70 | ROWs | In existing corridors or |
| Open (Dillon, Billings, Lewistown | n, HiLine, Miles City, North | 410 4 41. | Rest of PHMA | ROWs |
| Dakota, and outside 2 miles fron | n lek in South Dakota) | Ca Mar O | RHMA: Same as PHMA | Rest of PHMA |
| | , | MILE ALL OF F | GHMA: Avoidance | RHMA: Same as GHMA |
| (Corridors exist in UMRBNM, HiLi | ne, and Billings, no specific action | all the il being | CHMA: Avoidance | GHMA: |
| in Butte, UMRBNM avoidance) | | el ec villi | 911 | Avoidance |
| , | . < | 16 16 14 90 | the of a | Within 2 km (1.2 miles) of |
| Definitions: | | 6 0 3 3 :6 | lies | active leks |
| Definitions: Major: 100 kilovolts and over for over inches and over in width for pipelin | verhead transmission lines, 24 | Mexpects will be po | 46, | Crucial winter range |
| inches and over in width for pipelin | es. | CALL CALL | 2 ` | Open, subject to GRSG LUP |
| Minor: other ROWs and land use a | uthorizations/permits, such as | 100 Mp 412 1 p | | objectives |
| smaller infrastructure and communi | ication sites and towers. | 0 1000 27 | | o >1.2 miles from active leks |
| | 181. | 161. V 14. W | | CHMA: Open |
| 4 | nis is a ment simile of documentally simple of the BLM the document of the doc | republication the poly of the property of the | | |

Table 2-28. Montana State-Specific Circumstances – Minerals

| Alternative I Summary | Alternative 2 Summary | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | Minerals | | |
| All HMAs: | | All HMAs: | . 6- | |
| Where the federal government ow | ns the mineral estate in PHMA | | | As, and the surface is in nonfederal |
| and GHMA, and the surface is in n | onfederal ownership, the federal | ownership, the federal government | | |
| government will apply the same sti | government will apply the same stipulations, Conditions of Approval | | mineral RDFs as if the mineral esta | te is developed on BLM |
| (COAs), and/or conservation meas | sures and mineral RDFs if the | administered lands in that managem | nent area, to the maximum extent | permissible under existing |
| mineral estate is developed on BLN | 1 administered lands in that | authorities, and in coordination wit | h the landowner. | |
| management area, to the maximun | n extent permissible under existing | al's | all in the of | |
| authorities, and in coordination wi | th the landowner. | Where the federal government ow | ns the surface and the mineral esta | |
| | | GRSG HMAs, the federal government | ent will apply appropriate surface u | |
| Where the federal government ow | ns the surface and the mineral | RDFs through ROW grants or other | er surface management instrument | |
| estate is in non-federal ownership | in PHMA and GHMA, the federal | permissible under existing authoriti | ies, in coordination with the miner | al estate owner/lessee. |
| government will apply appropriate | surface use COAs, stipulations, | Will the B | ve, 11 v. | |
| and mineral RDFs through ROW g | rants or other surface | 11 St. 10 11 | U. 041, 01. | |
| management instruments, to the m | aximum extent permissible under | eb ec illi oce | 911 | |
| existing authorities, in coordination | n with the mineral estate | 16 16 " M. 90" | Ho 9 a | |
| owner/lessee. | | 61 W 31 :8 | lies | |
| | ri Cla | M Me silve at 1 | 46, | |
| (Language and inclusion varies, sile | nt on other HMAs) | V. CALL 6 1. C. C. C. | <u>`</u> | |
| | 20, 6, 7 | GRSG HMAs, the federal governme RDFs through ROW grants or othe permissible under existing authoriti | | |
| | M. The | 0 1 200 3 | | |
| | 181: 18 | 16, V 4 14, | | |
| | is a and will | ist Physic | | |
| | . 6 1 Me 611 78 | 3. Tr. " 4110 | | |
| | MIS WILL RO | Ille Ut | | |
| 1 | 100 3110 | 10, 76, | | |
| | 0, 41, EL "10, | 'III' | | |
| | *31. Mr. 131. | 200 | | |
| | 20 31 1 P 9 | O | | |
| | JU ON WING | | | |
| 6 | Salle Brail | | | |
| | Ma e | | | |
| | , the | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Alternative I Summary | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 | | |
|--|--|--|----------------------|--|--|
| | Oil and Gas (including Geotherm | | | | |
| PHMA: | PHMA: Closed | All HMAs: | HMAs: Same as 4 | | |
| Open with Major stipulations (NSO) | CHMA: Open with Major | TL (Breeding and Winter) | | | |
| No WEMs in SFAs | Stipulations (NSO) | PHMA: | | | |
| RHMA: | , , , | Open with Major Stipulations | | | |
| Open with Major stipulations (NSO in West Decker and South | | (NSO) | | | |
| Carter) | | CSU for Disturbance/Density | | | |
| Open with Major stipulations (0.6 m NSO from leks in Billings) | | Closed (UMRBNM) | | | |
| Open with moderate (CSU for Billings and Cedar Creek, but | , sil | RHMA: | | | |
| language varies) | er's | Open with Major stipulations | | | |
| Open with Minor (TL w/in 3 miles of a lek in Billings) | 700 | (NSO in West Decker) | | | |
| GHMA: | ion the | Open with moderate (CSU for | | | |
| • Open with Major stipulations (0.6 m NSO from leks in Billings, | atile of the | Cedar Creek) | | | |
| Lewistown, HiLine, Miles City, South Dakota) | 11C0 "NO D | Billings-Musselshell (same as | | | |
| Open with Major stipulations (NSO in winter range in Billings and | prepublication verse post of the post of t | GHMA) | | | |
| South Dakota) | OU. C. 11 P. C. | GHMA: | | | |
| Open with moderate (CSU for crucial winter range in HiLine) | 164 Jes MI 700 | Open with Major stipulations | | | |
| • Open with moderate (CSU for Dillon, North Dakota, HiLine, | 6, 44 4, 10 | (NSO) | | | |
| Miles City, and South Dakota, but language and distances vary) | We Ver 13, 13 | 0.6 m from active leks | | | |
| • Open with Minor (TL varies by office including winter range, lek- | Prepublicate will be come and the comment will be come and the comment will be come and the comment of the comm | Crucial winter range | | | |
| buffers, etc.) | occure ist o | Open with moderate (CSU for | | | |
| Other: | 90 11,000,01 | all GHMA) | | | |
| • LN – GRSG Habitat and compensatory mitigation (some offices) | Col. Borda | Closed (UMRBNM) | | | |
| • ¼ mile lek NSO (Butte) | " ACOLO | CHMA: Open with CSU | | | |
| Winter/spring TL (Butte) | distr. Ma | | | | |
| Winter/spring TL (Butte) Geothermal is based on O&G where explicit decisions do not exist | Mr Fr | | | | |
| exist | 31 611 | | | | |
| UMRBNM: Closed | 1, 11, | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| PHMA: Closed | PHMA: Closed | PHMA: Closed | HMAs: Same as 4 | | |
| PHMA: Closed RHMA: Language/inclusion varies GHMA: Language/inclusion varies | CHMA: Open | RHMA: Closed | | | |
| GHMA: Language/inclusion varies | | GHMA: | | | |
| | | UMRBNM (Withdrawn) | | | |
| (No specific action in Butte, Miles City, and Billings, and UMRBNM | | Other offices open | | | |
| Withdrawn) | | CHMA: Open | | | |

| Alternative Summary | Alternative 2 Summary | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Saleable Minerals/Mineral Materials | | | | | | | |
| PHMA: | | PHMA: Closed | PHMA: | HMAs: Same as 4 | | | |
| • Lewistown (Open to new for bo | oth free and commercial use with | CHMA: Open | Closed UMRBNM | | | | |
| guidelines) | | | Other offices closed (Open for | | | | |
| Other offices closed (Open for r | new free use permits & expansion | | new free use permits & | | | | |
| of existing) | | | expansion of existing) | | | | |
| RHMA: Language/inclusion varies | | | RHMA: Closed (Open for new | | | | |
| GHMA : Language/inclusion varies | | ** | free use permits & expansion of | | | | |
| (NI C C D | NIM - M. L | ,51 | existing) | | | | |
| (No specific action in Butte, UMRB | INIM Withdrawn) | 16, | GHMA: | | | | |
| | | 00 | UMRBNM (Withdrawn) | | | | |
| | | 10, The | Other offices open CHMA: Open | | | | |
| | | Locatable Materials | CHMA: Open | | | | |
| PHMA: | | PHMA | PHMA: | HMAs: Same as 4 | | | |
| The BLM recommended all SFAs | s for withdrawal from location and | | Withdrawn (UMRBNM) | THE 12 to Summe as 1 | | | |
| entry under the Mining Law of I | | SFAs for withdrawal from | RHMA: Same as PHMA | | | | |
| itself is being analyzed in a separa | | location and entry under the | GHMA: | | | | |
| recommended for withdrawal w | | Mining Law of 1872. The | UMRBNM (Withdrawn) | | | | |
| location and entry under the Mir | ning Law of 1872 unless and until | proposed withdrawal itself is | Other offices same as PHMA | | | | |
| the Secretary of the Interior wit | hdraws them. | being analyzed in a separate | CHMA: Same as PHMA | | | | |
| Withdrawn (UMRBNM) | 100 he | NEPA document. Lands | | | | | |
| RHMA: Same as PHMA, but witho | ut the SFA recommendation for | recommended for withdrawal | | | | | |
| withdrawal. | 31, 4. 1/3. | would remain open for | | | | | |
| GHMA : Same as RHMA. | is all im | mineral location and entry | | | | | |
| 15 m 51 26 | | under the Mining Law of 1872 | | | | | |
| (No specific action in Butte, UMRBNM withdrawn) | | unless and until the Secretary of the Interior withdraws | | | | | |
| RHMA: Same as PHMA, but without the SFA recommendation for withdrawal. GHMA: Same as RHMA. (No specific action in Butte, UMRBNM withdrawn) | | them. | | | | | |
| | all Mr. Til | UMRBNM (Withdrawn) | | | | | |
| | Elo all Mary | OF INDINIT (Withdrawil) | | | | | |
| | NM withdrawn) | CHMA: Open | | | | | |
| | 2 KO. V. KO. | | 1 | | | | |

Table 2-29. Montana State-Specific Circumstances – Fire and Fuels

| Alternative Summary | Alternative 2 Summary | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Alternative i Summary | Alternative 2 Junimary | Fire and Fuels | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 | | |
| All HMAs: If prescribed fire is use | ed in GRSG habitat, the NEPA | All HMAs: If prescribed fire is used in GRSG habitat, the NEPA analysis for the Burn Plan will address: | | | | |
| | analysis for the Burn Plan will address: | | why alternative techniques were not selected as a viable options; | | | |
| why alternative techniques were | | how GRSG goals and objectives | | | | |
| how GRSG goals and objectives | | how choos goals and objectives how the COT Report objective | | | | |
| how the COT Report objective. | | | w potential threats to GRSG habita | at will be minimized | | |
| • a risk assessment to address ho | | Sil | Le Me GO | | | |
| habitat will be minimized | • | Prescribed fire as vegetation or fue | els treatment shall only be consider | ed after the NEPA analysis for the | | |
| | | Burn Plan has addressed the four b | pullets outlined above. Prescribed fi | re can be used to meet specific | | |
| Prescribed fire as vegetation or fue | | | | n of fuel breaks that will disrupt the | | |
| considered after the NEPA analysis | | fuel continuity across the landscape | | | | |
| the four bullets outlined above. Pre | escribed fire can be used to meet | the understory, burning slash piles | from conifer reduction treatments | | | |
| specific fuels objectives that will pr | otect GRSG habitat in PHMA (e.g., | treatment methods to combat annu | ual grasses and restore native plant | : communities). | | |
| creation of fuel breaks that will dis landscape in stands where annual in | rupt the fuel continuity across the | Proscribed fire in known winter to | ngo shall only be considered after t | the NEPA analysis for the Burn Plan | | |
| component in the understory, burn | ning slash piles from conifer | has addressed the four bullets out | inge shall only be considered after to | | | |
| reduction treatments, used as a co | mponent with other treatment | designed to strategically reduce wil | Idfire risk around and/or in the win | | | |
| methods to combat annual grasses | and restore native plant | winter range habitat quality. | 10 | тел тапов или постоя развити | | |
| communities). | 8910 Q1 | right of the second | 3 | | | |
| | 70, 6 | 100 440 dis 16 | | | | |
| Prescribed fire in known winter rai | nge shall only be considered after | 0 1. 200 20 | | | | |
| the NEPA analysis for the Burn Pla | n has addressed the four bullets | 16,04 | | | | |
| outlined above. Any prescribed fire | in winter habitat will need to be | 115 CP Wat | | | | |
| designed to strategically reduce will | latire risk around and/or in the | O Mr. Ell. | | | | |
| winter range and designed to prote | ect writer range habitat quality. | al and | | | | |
| (Slight variations between plans) | 400 x131 181 01 | in The | | | | |
| (Oligne variations between plans) | o der aprivito | COL | | | | |
| | eta alla Mara | 00 | | | | |
| | 110 040 M . 60 | treatment methods to combat annual prescribed fire in known winter rathas addressed the four bullets outlined designed to strategically reduce with winter range habitat quality. | | | | |
| 9 | of the Or the | | | | | |
| | March | | | | | |
| | " Flee | | | | | |
| | • | | | | | |

Table 2-30. Montana State-Specific Circumstances – Field Office Specific Actions

| Alternative I Summary | Alternative 2 Summary | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | Objectives and Management I | | |
| Fire and Invasives Tool (FIAT): MD Objective 2, VEG MD 2, 8, and 9; a and 33. | s including SSS MD 5, 6, 37; VEG | Remove or modify Management Adscope ended at Idaho border) | ctions to clarify the FIAT does not | apply to SW Montana (geographic an ID specific GRSG habitat effort). |
| Key Habitat References: MDs inclu 41, and 42 | ding as SSS MD 8, 9, 17, 18, 13, | Ramaya MDa an alarify than and | daning as NA/LIO Dia in Idaha (ha NA/L | |
| Wild Horse and Burro Section | his is an unofficial of documents in the document of the docum | Remove MDs or clarify these only | seted in version control with the only version of the only version | |

2.6.3 Nevada/California

As noted in Appendix 3 (GRSG HMA State-by-State Mapping Strategies) Nevada and California states developed their HMAs using a habitat prioritization model based on an intersection of seasonal habitat selection patterns and indices of space use to prioritize areas with varied relevance to GRSG. This model was initially developed for 2015 and is periodically updated with additional field data and advances in mapping products. An update of this model provided the base for HMA delineation in the 2019 planning effort. The model is currently being updated again and will incorporate GRSG survival metrics, which allow for the identification of population source areas. The latest version will be incorporated into this EIS following publication. The identification of source areas is unique to the States of Nevada and California, and the alternatives consider this draft data in both HMA identification and several management actions within this document. The role wildfire and invasive grasses play in the health of GRSG habitat in Nevada and California resulted in considering adjustments to several management actions focused on addressing these threats compared to the 2015 and 2019 decisions. Decisions being considered for amendment for these states are development of non-energy leasable minerals on lands where mining operations are currently authorized at of sand lek to and Wily disconnection of the state Mational MEPA Register is the relied upon. Gulostantially Similar document in the state of the state under 43 CFR Subpart 3715, 3802, or 3809, adjustment of allocation exception language considered in 2019, errent;

An inofficial preputations

This is an inofficial preputations. and clarification of application of perch deterrents and lek buffers to newly discovered leks.

Table 2-31. Nevada/California State-Specific Circumstances – Special Status Species

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 | |
|--|----------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| | | Special Status Species | | | |
| MD SSS I: In PHMAs and | Same as Alternative I (no change | MD SSS I: In PHMAs and GHMA | s, work with the proponent/applica | int, whether in accordance with a | |
| GHMAs, work with the | made in 2019). | valid existing right or not, and use | the following screening criteria to a | avoid effects of the proposed | |
| proponent/applicant, whether in | A. | human activity on GRSG: | C 211. | | |
| accordance with a valid existing | | A. First priority—locate project/act | tivity outside PHMAs and GHMAs | while avoiding and/or minimizing | |
| right or not, and use the | | direct and indirect impacts to GRSG and/or their habitat; | | | |
| following screening criteria to | | human activity on GRSG: A. First priority—locate project/activity outside PHMAs and GHMAs while avoiding and/or minimizing direct and indirect impacts to GRSG and/or their habitat; B. Second priority—if the project/activity cannot be placed outside PHMAs and GHMAs, locate and adjust the project/activity to: a. avoid and/or minimize indirect impacts to lekking and source areas (e.g., PHMA+ in Coates et al. HMA manuscript in review; See Appendix 3) by using topography and/or other available methods to negate or reduce auditory and visual intrusions; AND b. locate direct impacts (i.e., surface-disturbing activities) in non-habitat areas first, then in the least suitable habitat for GRSG without creating a barrier to movement or connectivity between GRSG seasonal habitats and populations. C. Third priority—collocate the project/activity next to or in the footprint of existing infrastructure. | | | |
| avoid effects of the proposed | | adjust the project/activity to: | all is the of | | |
| human activity on GRSG habitat. | | a. avoid and/or minimize indire | ct impacts to lekking and source a | reas (e.g., PHMA+ in Coates et al. | |
| A. First priority—locate | | HMA manuscript in review; | See Appendix 3) by using topogra | aphy and/or other available | |
| project/activity outside | | methods to negate or reduc | e auditory and visual intrusions; Al | ND | |
| PHMAs and GHMAs | | b. locate direct impacts (i.e., su | rface-disturbing activities) in non-h | abitat areas first, then in the least | |
| B. Second priority—if the | | suitable habitat for GRSG w | ithout creating a barrier to movem | ent or connectivity between GRSG | |
| project/activity cannot be | | seasonal habitats and popula | tions. | | |
| placed outside PHMAs and | | C. Third priority—collocate the pr | oject/activity next to or in the foot | print of existing infrastructu re. | |
| GHMAs, locate the surface- | 4 | 16. 100 " W. 90 | No you | | |
| disturbing activities in non- | | et all al is | 1,160 | | |
| habitat areas first, then in the | Cla | M We sille at 12 | 16/ | | |
| least suitable habitat for GRSG | 890 01 | I will a starter | | | |
| In non-habitat, ensure | 201.0 | " Oca the dis b. | | | |
| the project/activity will | M. We | 00 1000 27 | | | |
| not create a barrier to | 10 1 13 | of the Wood | | | |
| movement or | Sy Mr. Mile | 181 OF 21. | | | |
| connectivity between | 13 26, 111, 30 | JIEI WHO | | | |
| seasonal habitats and | is in is be | 'W' The | | | |
| populations | LI CON SILAND | 31 611 | | | |
| C. Third priority—collocate the | 90 410 Ch. 01 | im | | | |
| project/activity next to or in | ALL ALL STILL | CO | | | |
| the footprint of existing | eta al Na A | 0 | | | |
| infrastructure | 102 00 01,00 | | | | |
| | 30 410. 21, 440 | | | | |
| | 730 | | | | |
| | 1- "We | | | | |
| | 1, | | | | |

Table 2-32. Nevada/California State-Specific Circumstances – Fire and Vegetation

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | Fire and Vegetation Actions | | |
| Not included | Not included | in development of restoration proj | Groups, Shared Stewardship, etc.) to ects. Projects of this type will use ex SG working groups, permitted land input from interested partners will l ects. | o develop and implement habitat expertise and ideas from entities users, and other federal, state, be solicited by BLM and considered |
| Objective Fire 3: Protect post- fire treatments in SFA first, followed by PHMAs outside of SFA, and then GHMAs from subsequent wildfires. Not included | Objective Fire 3: Protect post- fire treatments in PHMAs first, followed by GHMAs from subsequent wildfires. Not included | Objective FIRE 3: Protect post-fivulnerable to invasive annual grass followed by similar areas in GHMA the prioritization of post-fire treatments of the persistence of GRSG source at Doherty et al. 2022, Ricca and Coamaintaining current GRSG population. | conversion, including areas essentials from subsequent wildfires. Incorposents. ions (pre-suppression, suppression, reas (e.g., see Appendix 3). Use that the suppression of the suppre | and rehabilitation) that support the best available science (e.g., |
| MD FIRE 23: If prescribed fire is used in GRSG habitat, the NEPA analysis for the Burn Plan will address: Why alternative techniques were not selected as a viable option How GRSG goals and objectives will be met by its use How the COT report objectives will be addressed and met A risk assessment to address how potential threats to GRSG habitat will be minimized. Allow prescribed fire as a vegetation or fuels treatment, and it shall only be considered after the NEPA analysis for the burn plan has addressed the four bullets outlined above. Prescribed | Same as Alternative I (no change made in 2019). | MD FIRE 23: Use prescribed fire there is no other feasible means to implementation will address: • Why alternative techniques wer • How GRSG goals and objectives • How the COT report objectives • A risk assessment to address how the considering shall only be considered. | designed to reduce wildfire risk or achieve the same or similar result. The not selected as a viable option is will be met by its use is, as updated, will be addressed and ow potential threats to GRSG habits are after the NEPA analysis for the fire can be used to meet specific fue tion of fuel breaks, burning slash pillate brood-rearing habitat (e.g., respective the same of the seatment methods to combat annual achieves. | I met at will be minimized. e project has addressed the four els objectives that will protect es from conifer reduction tore senescent vegetation, etc.), |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| fuels objectives that will protect | (See above.) | (See above.) | | |
| GRSG habitat in PHMAs (e.g., | | | | |
| creation of fuel breaks that would | | | | |
| disrupt the fuel continuity across | | | . 6 | |
| the landscape in stands where | | | Mis | |
| annual invasive grasses are a | | | E III | |
| minor component in the | | | 0, 10, 01, 0 | |
| understory, burning slash piles | | | U 0, 6 7 11. | |
| from conifer reduction | | Sic | Le Me CO | |
| treatments, used as a component | | al's | July 1 Che Of | |
| with other treatment methods to | | 70 0 | a dilligion | |
| combat annual grasses and | | 30 00 | "60 'Ib. 10. | |
| restore native plant | | 410 411 | St. 100 ols | |
| communities). | | . C. 3 1 32 100 | 4, 10 | |
| | | Will the of h | ne 14 n. | |
| Allow prescribed fire in known | | THE ST TO IT | U. 011. 01. | |
| winter range, and it shall only be | | So so villi oco | 9119 | |
| considered after the NEPA | | 10, 100 " 14, 40 " | No you | |
| analysis for the burn plan has | | et all al is | 1160 | |
| addressed the four bullets | cla | M We cillo al | 46/ | |
| outlined above. Any prescribed | 890 01 | i will a state of | | |
| fire in winter habitat will need to | 201.0 | " Oca The dis be | | |
| be designed to strategically | The The | 00 1 200 27 | | |
| reduce wildfire risk around | 121 | Chi K Was | | |
| and/or in the winter range and | Sy Mr. Mile | 161 OF 21. | | |
| designed to protect winter range | 13 26, 111, 00 | JIEI WHO | | |
| habitat quality. | Same as Alternative I (no change made in 2019). | MD FIRE 25: Design fuels treatmeremoval through an interdisciplinary | | |
| MD FIRE 25: Design fuels | Same as Alternative I (no change made in 2019). | MD FIRE 25: Design fuels treatme | ents such as, but not limited to, conif | er or annual invasive grass |
| treatments through an | made in 2019). | removal through an interdisciplinary | , , | maintain, and protect i in ins |
| interdisciplinary team process to | ALL ALL | and GHMAs. Fuel reduction technic | ques, such as mechanical, chemical, a | |
| expand, enhance, maintain, and | eta al Na 4 | prescribed and targeted grazing) tre | eatments and prescribed fire (see MI | |
| protect PHMAs and GHMAs. Fuel | 1/2 -U. M. 60 | green strips and fuel breaks, where | appropriate, to protect treatment a | |
| reduction techniques, such as | 20, x10, 27, x100 | the best available science (e.g., Doh | erty et al. 2022, Ricca and Coates 20 | 020, Stringham et al. 2016, etc.) |
| prescribed fire and chemical, | 130 | to identify habitats essential for mai | ntaining current GRSG populations. | |
| biological (including targeted | 12 THE | | | |
| 3 3/ | 41 | | | |
| treatments, are acceptable. Use | | | | |
| green strips and fuel breaks, | | | | |
| where appropriate, to protect | | | | |
| seeding from subsequent fires. | | | | |

Table 2-33. Nevada/California State-Specific Circumstances - Non-Energy Minerals

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Non-Energy Minerals | | | | | | |
| MD MR 25: Manage PHMAs as | MD MR 25: Manage PHMAs as | MD MR 25: Manage PHMAs as cl | osed to new non-energy leasable | | | |
| closed to new non-energy | closed to new non-energy | closed to new non-energy | mineral (e.g., phosphate, sodium, potassium, sulfur, etc.) leasing, | | | |
| leasable mineral leasing (see | leasable mineral leasing, unless | leasable mineral leasing. | unless the new non-energy leasable mineral lease meets one of the | | | |
| Appendix A; Figure 2-7). | the new non-energy leasable | | allocation exception criteria outlined in MD SSS 5 (see Appendix A | | | |
| | mineral lease meets one of the | | Figure 2-7, in the 2019 NV/CA ARMPA) or the new non-energy | | | |
| | allocation exception criteria | | leasable mineral has coincident occ | | | |
| | outlined in MD SSS 5 (see | | disturbance and is subject to a nor | | | |
| | Appendix A; Figure 2-7). | | direct or indirect impacts shall res | ult from extraction of the new | | |
| | | 30. no | non-energy leasable mineral. | | | |

Table 2-34. Nevada/California State-Specific Circumstances – Allocation Exception Criteria

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | | Alternative 3 | P W | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|-------------------------------------|------|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| | | | location Exception | | 3 , 114 | |
| {MD SSS 5 in the 2015 NV/CA | MD SSS 5 (Allocation | ME | O SSS 5 (Allocation | Exception C | criteria): In PHMA, GHMA, a | nd OHMA, the State Director (in |
| ARMPA addressed designation and | Exception Criteria): In PHMA, | coc | ordination with NDO | W, SETT, and/ | or CDFW) may grant an exce | ption to the allocation decisions |
| management of SFAs. In the 2019 | GHMA, and OHMA, the State | (de | escribed in Table 2-1: | Summary of Al | location Decisions by GRSG H | Habitat Management Areas, in the |
| effort the SFAs were removed. This | Director may grant an exception | 201 | 19 NV/CA ARMPA ar | nd potentially a | mended through this planning | effort in Section 2.5.2) if one of |
| management action number was | to the allocations and stipulations | the | following applies: | V | | |
| then used for the Allocation | described in Table 2-1 (of the | Υī. | | | emoved from this section and a | |
| Exception Criteria. In this effort, | 2019 NV/CA ARMPA): | _1 | | | | at Management Areas. See th at |
| SFAs are addressed as a cross- | Comparative Summary of | 10 | section for compara | ıble language fo | or these alternatives.} | |
| cutting topic in the HMA actions | Alternatives if one of the | ðii. | The proposed activi | ity will be autho | orized to address federal, state | e, or local government public health |
| above. The management number | following applies (in coordination | 1 | and safety concerns | , specifically as | they relate to preventing an e | mergency or responding to a |
| here is less important than the | with NDOW, SETT, and/or | 0 | | | wildfire, or earthquake. | |
| management being considered. | CDEW): | iii, | | | | ve function conducted by fed eral, |
| Under the 2015 NV/CA ARMPA, | i. The location of the proposed | 70 | | | | of prior existing uses, valid existing |
| there was no specific action that | activity is determined to be | _ | | | | expansion of existing county or |
| provided exception criteria for | unsuitable (by a biologist with | | | | | will have no adverse impacts on |
| allocations.} | GRSG experience using | | | | | olicy, CEQ regulations (40 CFR Part |
| MD SSS 5: Designate SFA, as | methods such as Stiver et. al. | | | | n policy (NAC 232.400-480). | |
| shown on Figure 1-3 (of the | 2015, as revised) and lacks | iv. | | | | ed for retention in Appendix A , |
| NV/CA 2015 ARMPA) (2,797,400 | the ecological potential to | | | | RMPA) could be considered if | |
| acres). SFA will be managed as | become marginal or suitable | | | | | ess a Congressional Acts (e.g., the |
| PHMAs, with the following | habitat; and will not result in | | | | | ition, and Development Acts) and |
| additional management: | direct, indirect, or cumulative | | | | , , | b) the agency can demonstra te that |
| Recommended for withdrawal | impacts on GRSG and its | | | | ges, will have no adverse direc | t, indirect or cumulative impacts on |
| from the General Mining Act | habitat. Management | | GRSG and its habita | ıt. | | |
| of 1872, subject to valid | allocation decisions will not | | | | | |
| existing rights | apply to those areas | | | | | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------|----------------------|
| Managed as NSO, without | determined to be unsuitable | (See above.) | | |
| waiver, exception, or | if the area has passed a | | | |
| modification, for fluid mineral | threshold and lacks the | ore Publication Version of expects will be po | | |
| leasing | ecological potential to | | . 6 | |
| Prioritized for vegetation | become marginal or suitable | | Nis | |
| management and conservation | habitat. | | 13.3 | |
| actions in these areas, | ii. The proposed activities | | 0, 13 3/10 | |
| including, but not limited to | impacts will be offset to | | U OI OF III | |
| land health assessments, wild | result in no adverse impacts | orepublication version of the solution of the | Le Me CO | |
| horse and burro management | on GRSG or its habitat, | ar's | alling the of | |
| actions, review of livestock | through use of the mitigation | 10 0 | and Illiania | |
| grazing permits/leases, and | hierarchy and the State's | 30 00 | 160 1/0, 10. | |
| habitat restoration (see | mitigation policies and | 410 411 | St. Dr ors | |
| specific management sections). | programs, such as the State | . C. 3 3 | 4, 10 | |
| , | of Nevada's Executive Order | Will the b | ve, 11 v. | |
| | 2018-32 (and any future | 11 245 11 P 11 | U. 011, 01. | |
| | regulations adopted by the | eb ec iiii oce | 0, 119 | |
| | State of Nevada regarding | 16 160 " M. 90" | Ho 9 or | |
| | compensatory mitigation, | S. 61 00 31 3 | 1160 | |
| | consistent with federal law). | M We silve at 12 | 46/. | |
| | In cases where exceptions | right of the se | | |
| | may be granted for projects | Ocallo dis b | | |
| | with a residual impact, | 00 1000 34 | | |
| | voluntary compensatory | " CI. of the Wood | | |
| | mitigation consistent with the | 15 OK 21 | | |
| | State's mitigation policies and | Or IEI THE | | |
| | programs, such as the State | ore Publication Version of the Area of the | | |
| | of Nevada's Executive Order | 3, 61, | | |
| | 2018-32 (and any future | , ILI | | |
| | regulations adopted by the | CO | | |
| | State of Nevada regarding | P | | |
| | | | | |
| | consistent with federal law) | | | |
| | will be one mechanism by | | | |
| | which a proponent achieves | | | |
| | the Approved RMPA goals, | | | |
| | objectives, and exception | | | |
| | criteria. When a proponent | | | |
| | volunteers compensatory | | | |
| | mitigation as their chosen | | | |
| | approach to address residual | | | |
| | impacts, the BLM will | | | |
| | incorporate those actions | | | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|----------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Alternative I (See above.) | into the rationale used to grant an exception. The final decision to grant a waiver, exception, or modification will be based, in part, on criteria consistent with the State's GRSG management plans and policies. iii. The proposed activity will be authorized to address public health and safety concerns, specifically as they relate to federal, state, local government and national priorities. iv. Renewals or reauthorizations of existing infrastructure in previously disturbed sites or expansions of existing infrastructure that do not result in direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts on GRSG and its habitat. v. The proposed activity is determined to be a routine administrative function conducted by federal, state or local governments, including prior existing uses, authorized uses, valid existing rights and existing infrastructure (i.e., rights-of-way for roads) that serve a public purpose and will have no adverse impacts on GRSG and its habitat, consistent with the State's mitigation | (See above.) (See above.) (See above.) (See above.) (See above.) | of this BLM of same of Sted in of | |
| | policies and programs, such as the State of Nevada's Executive Order 2018-32 (and any future regulations adopted by the State of | | | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---------------|--|--|--|----------------------|
| (See above.) | Nevada regarding compensatory mitigation, consistent with federal law). vi. Exceptions to non-disposal or exchange of lands that are identified for retention in Appendix A, Figure 2-12 could be considered if (a) they are identified for disposal through previous planning efforts or address a Congressional Acts (e.g., the | (See above.) Teolibrication version in the second | on of this BLM in same of or of sted outlings in the sion of sted outling in the sion outling in the s | |
| | consistent with reactar lawy). | T. Control of the Con | | |

Table 2-35. Nevada/California State-Specific Circumstances – Lek Buffers

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|--|---------------|--|---|--|
| | | Lek Buffers | | |
| active and pending leks in GRSG habitat, require ROW, permit, and lease holders to retrofit those portions of power lines and other utility structures with nesting and perch- deterring devices. Do this during the renewal and amendment process if adverse effects, such as increased nest predation, on GRSG populations have been documented. This requirement shall be predicated on research and monitoring studies specific to power lines or other utility structures. Concept not included. | not included. | MD LR 17: Within 4 miles of active retrofit those portions of power lindevices. Do this during the renewal effectiveness through the life of the effectiveness through the life of the lif | MD SSS 17, then move subsequent an area outside of PHMA or GHI (of the 2019 NV/CA ARMPA) to a | MDs down a number): If an Active MA lek buffer-distances will be woid direct and indirect impacts to |

2.6.4 Oregon

State specific circumstances for the State of Oregon include management of 18 Areas of Critical Environmental Concern/Research Natural Areas (ACEC/RNA) as "Key RNAs" or "Key ACECs", as well as management of saleable minerals/mineral materials in GRSG HMAs. This amendment effort is limited to RMP-level actions needed to provide guidance for subsequent implementation-level actions. The land use allocation will be identified in the ROD, but if public lands are disposed of or devoted to a public purpose which precludes livestock grazing, a site-specific NEPA and a site-specific decision process pursuant to the Taylor Grazing Act and 43 C.F.R. 4100.4-2 is necessary to cancel permits and/or removal of livestock from these areas.

Key ACECs/RNAs

The 2015 Oregon GRSG ARMPA designated the entirety of fifteen (15) existing Areas of Critical Environmental Concern/Research Natural Areas (ACEC/RNAs) as "Key RNAs" and all of three additional ACECs as "Key ACECs" (see 2015 ARMPA Special Designations Objective SD 4 and Table 2-6). The 2015 Oregon ARMPA also allocated all or portions of thirteen Key RNAs as unavailable to livestock grazing. Two ACEC/RNAs are already unavailable to livestock grazing; Foster Flat in Three Rivers Field Office under the 1992 Three Rivers RMP and Guano Creek-Sink Lakes in Lakeview Field Office by a 1998 act of Congress. The three ACECs and fifteen ACEC/RNAs were designated in various, underlying district Resource Management Plans (RMPs) prior to the 2015 amendment.

During the 2019 GRSG RMP amendment process, BLM Oregon proposed and analyzed a reversal of the 2015 decision to make all or portions of the 13 key RNAs (excluding the two ACEC/RNAs allocated as unavailable to livestock grazing under the 1992 Three Rivers and 2003 Lakeview RMPs) available to livestock grazing. However, the 2019 GRSG ARMPA retained the Key RNA designations, along with the applicable Management Objectives and Management Direction (BLM OR 2019 FEIS; Pages 2-8 and 2-9). Table 2.26 below displays, as Alternatives 1 and 2 respectively, the 2015 and 2019 estimated acreages available or unavailable to livestock grazing, along with anticipated changes to the number of Animal Unit Months (AUMs) affected by the availability/unavailability decisions.

Alternatives 3, 4, 5, and 6 are based upon changed habitat management area boundaries. In 2022, ODFW informed BLM that they were going to update core and low density HMA s. The timeline outlined by ODFW for updating and approving Core- and Low-Density areas was inconsistent with the EIS analysis process. Therefore, after coordination with the state, BLM used ODFW's published methodology and data up through the 2022 field season to estimate likely core habitat and draft PHMA map.

Under Alternative 3, all proposed PHMA and GHMA from Alternative 4 would become PHMA and be allocated as unavailable to livestock grazing, including all of the 13 key RNAs. The mapping process referenced above became the basis for BLM's proposed PHMA and GHMA designations in Alternative 4. This alternative would retain the 2015 decision that makes all or portions of the 13 key RNAs as unavailable to livestock grazing. Alternatives 5 and 6 propose management clarifications and changes to areas unavailable to livestock grazing. The updated Key RNAs and revised portions allocated as unavailable to livestock grazing would continue to be managed over the long term to meet the objectives established by the 2015 ARMPA and to reflect a diversity of vegetative communities that are representative of important GRSG habitat needs.

Under Alternatives 5 and 6, modifications to areas allocated as unavailable to livestock grazing in the 13 key RNAs are based on district-generated, site-specific information. The proposed modifications vary by individual Key RNA and reflect site specific vegetation or habitat conditions in those areas (Table 2.36).

below). In most cases, the Key RNA designation and objectives to provide opportunities for research and serve as a broad spectrum of vegetation communities across GRSG habitat are retained. Additionally, the BLM is proposing eliminating or modifying certain portions or all of areas within Key RNAs that were allocated as unavailable to livestock grazing, to avoid resource conflicts. These conflicts include but are not limited to constructing fences in proximity to cultural sites, within 1.2 miles of an occupied or pending lek (a conformance violation of the 2015 ARMPA) or within existing designated Wilderness Study Areas, Under Alternatives 5 and 6, and depending on the specific Key RNA, the area presently allocated as unavailable to livestock grazing under the 2015 ARMPA may be reallocated to livestock grazing or the size and/or location A Register is the only water and the paster is the only water on the paster is the only water of the paster is the only water on the paster is t document, the Hill of the final tree for the final of the area excluded from grazing may be modified.

This is an unofficial property of the property ational NEPA Register. The final document published in of the relied unon. The alternatives below present the range of alternatives for management of the Key RNAs/Key ACECs.

Table 2-36. Oregon Key RNAs - Summary of Estimated Acres and AUMs by Alternative

| | | | | Alternative I | A | Alternative 2 | | Alternative 3 | | Alternative 4 | | ernatives 5 and 6 |
|--------------------|----------|---------|-------------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | Key RNA | | Key RNA | 2015 Key | |
| | | | | Key RNA | Key RNA | | | Acros | | Acres / | RNA | Key RNA |
| | | Total | Key RNA | Acres / | Acres / | | Key RNA | estimated | Key RNA | estimated | | estimated Acres |
| RNA | | Acres | Acres | estimated | estimated | Acres | | ALIMs that | Acres | AUMs that | that | / estimated |
| Name | District | of the | A vailable | AUMs | AUMs | Unavailable | Available | would continue | Available | would | would | AUMs that |
| Name | | Key | for | Unavailable | A vailable | for | for | to be | for | continue to | become | would become |
| | | RNA | Livestock | | for | | Livestock | I Local State of the | Livestock | o be | Available | Unavailable for |
| | | | Grazing | Livestock | Livestock | | Grazing | Livestock | Grazing | Unavailable | for | Livestock |
| | | | | Grazing | Grazing | | 7 | Grazing | 1. 112 | for Livestock | | Grazing |
| | | | | | | | 20 | 100 | ALV - | Grazing | Grazing | |
| Black | Vale | 2,600 7 | 0 | 2,600/260 | 2,600/260 | 0 | 10.0 | 2.600/260 | 0 | 2,600/260 | 2,600 | 0/0 |
| Canyon | | | | | | | 2 | 20 Ut | A 16, | | | |
| Dry | Vale | 1,637 | 1,015 | 622/52 | 1,637/52 | 10/10 | 0 | 1, 637 /52 | 1,015 | 622/52 | 622 | 0/0 |
| Creek | | | | | | III. | S Y | 20, 14, 26 | 1,, 0,, | | | |
| Bench | | | | | | 600 | | CO. CO. | 911 | | | |
| East Fork | Burns | 361 | 57 | 304/47 | 361/47 | 000 | * 1/2 O | 361/0 9 | 57 | 304/0 | 57 ⁹ | 304/0 ⁹ |
| Trout | | | | | 14 | 0, | 10 01 | 10,10 | | | | |
| Creek | | | | | C'I'O' | n ve | cillo | is 11301/0 | | | | |
| Fish | Lakeview | 8,725 | 5,966 | 2,750/110 | 8,725/110 | 0 | 0 | 8,725/110 | 5,966 | 2,750/110 | 8,621 | 95/4 ² |
| Creek | | | | _0 | V. D. | 000 | 9 | Po | | | | |
| Rim | | | | 110 | ine . | 70 .1. | 000 | Es | | | | |
| Foley | Lakeview | 2,228 | 959 | 1,269/51 | 2,228/51 | *6 0 | (0 | 2,228/51 | 959 | 1,269/51 | 1,342 | 797/33 ² |
| Lake | | ŕ | 8 | 3, 4 | Jilo. | GTO OF | 2 | ĺ | | • | ĺ | |
| Foster | Burns | 2,687 | 0 | 2,687 | 111 | 2,687 | 0 | 2,687 | 0 | 2,687 | 0 | 2,687 |
| Flat | | | 119 | 110,11 | 2,000 | Buch | C. | | | | | · |
| Guano | Lakeview | 11,185 | 0 | 11,185 | 0/0 | 11,185 | 0 | 11,813 | 0 | 11,813 | 0 | 11,813 3 |
| Creek- | | | . 9 | 110 | 6, 00 | CALLIF 102 | | | | | | · |
| Sink | | | | Jug Mr | die | CA. | | | | | | |
| Lakes | | | G | La III | 40 40 | | | | | | | |
| Lake | Vale | 3,872 | 3,091 | 778/74 | 3,872/74 | 0 | 0 | 3,872/74 | 3,091 | 778/74 | 778 | 13/0 4 |
| Ridge | | ŕ | SV. | 10, 27, | HIO | | | ĺ | , | | | |
| Mahogany | Vale | 444 | 527 | 155/27 | 155/27 | 0 | 0 | 140/27 | 527 | 140/27 | 15 | 140/0 |
| Ridge ⁵ | | | La | 155/2/ | | | | | | | | |
| (southern | | | | 11. | | | | | | | | |
| unit only) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| North | Vale | 1,569 | 1,405 | 164/19 | 1,569/19 | 0 | 0 | 1,569/19 | 1,405 | 164/19 | 164 | 0/0 |
| Ridge | | , | , | | , | | | ,,. | , , , , | | | |
| Bully | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Creek | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rahilly- | Lakeview | 18,678 | 10,396 | 8,282/586 | 18,678/586 | 0 | 0 | 18,678/586 | 10,396 | 8,282/586 | 16,653 | 2,025/144 |
| Gravelly | | -, | -, | | -, | | | ., | ., | -, | ., | , |
| | | | | | | I | | 1 | | | | |

| | | | | Alternative I | | Alternative 2 | | Alternative 3 | | Alternative 4 | Alt | ernatives 5 and 6 |
|---------------------|----------|--------|-----------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|-------------------|
| | | | | | | | | Key RNA | | Key RNA | 2015 Key | |
| | | | | Key RNA | Key RNA | | | Acres / | | Acres / | RNA | Key RNA |
| | | Total | Key RNA | Acres / | Acres / | Key RNA | Key RNA | estimated | Key RNA | estimated | Acres | estimated Acres |
| RNA | | Acres | Acres | estimated | estimated | Acres | | ALIMs that | Acres | | that | / estimated |
| Name | District | of the | Available | AUMs | | Unavailable | | would continue | Available | would | would | AUMs that |
| Haine | | Key | for | Unavailable | Available | | for | to bo | tor | continue to | | |
| | | RNA | Livestock | for | for | | Livestock | Linavailable for | Livestock | | Available | |
| | | | Grazing | Livestock | Livestock | | Grazing | Livestock | (razino | | | Livestock |
| | | | | Grazing | Grazing | | | Grazing | | for Livestock | | Grazing |
| | | | | | | | | | 1 | Grazing | | |
| South | Vale | 770 | 21 | 749/116 | 749/116 | 0 | -0 | 5 749/116 | 43 | 749/116 | 492 | 257/0 |
| Bull | | | | | | | 10: | no ter | JIP 6 | 10 | | |
| Canyon ⁶ | | | | | | | * " " | C. 20, 1 | 5, 67. | 207/11 | | |
| South | Vale | 621 | 224 | 397/61 | 621/61 | 330 | o 7700 | 621/61 | 224 | 397/61 | 397 | 0/0 |
| Ridge | | | | | | 1011 | 41. | 6, 40 | Da 61 | • | | |
| Bully | | | | | | JUL C | 111. 2 | chi, of | | | | |
| Creek |) / I | 007 | | 004/153 | 004/153 | ey rec | MII. | Vacuus | 11h | 00///52 | 005 | 0/0 |
| Spring | Vale | 996 | 0 | 996/153 | 996/153 | 16.0 | 1 10 | 996/153 | 0 | 996/153 | 995 | 0/0 |
| Mountain | \ | 2.000 | 1 122 | 2045/214 | 2.000/214 | 4 6, 6 | , , , | 2.027014 | | 2.045/214 | 2.424 | 220/0 |
| Toppin | Vale | 3,998 | 1,133 | 2865/216 | 3,998/216 | m. Miss | ELL. 0 | 2,865/216 | | 2,865/216 | 2,626 | 239/0 |
| Creek | | | | | U. Br | -CV. W | 3 .6 | Ne | 1,133 | | | |
| Butte 8 | | (0.2/2 | 24.004 | 25 002/1 772 | 44 77F/L 773 | 12,072 | 00 | 50 522/1 772 | 24.007 | 27 417/1 772 | 25 402 | 10 270/200 |
| Totals | | 60,362 | 24,996 | 35,803/1,772 | 46,/73/1,//2 | 13,872 | 2020 | 59,532/1,772 | 24,996 | 36,416/1,772 | 35,403 | 18,370/288 |

- Notes:

 I Acreage estimates and AUM estimates/calculations have been updated from the 2015 ARMPA ROD.
- 2 Estimated AUMs for Alternatives 5 and 6 associated with the area allocated as 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated pasture and/or allocated as 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated pasture and/or allocated as 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated pasture and/or allocated as 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated pasture and/or allocated as 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated with the area allocated as 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated pasture and/or allocated as 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated pasture and/or allocated as 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated pasture and or 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated pasture and or 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated pasture and or 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated pasture and or 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated pasture and or 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated pasture and or 'unavailable to livetock grazing' would be absorbed in portions of the associated pasture and or 'unavailable to livetock grazing and or 'unavailable to livetock grazing and 'unavailable to livetock grazing the Key RNA exists. Site-specific monitoring would inform if AUMs cannot be absorbed, with site-specific NEPA and grazing decisions to implement any reductions in AUMs as a result of implementing removal of livestock from those areas allocated as unavailable to livestock grazing as a result of this alternative.
- 3 The 2015 and 2019 estimates of acres used the Guano Creek Wilderness Study Area boundary. The Guano Creek-Sink Lakes ACEC/RNA is much smaller and contained entirely within the larger WSA boundary. The corrected acres reflect just the ACEC/RNA portion that is, and would continue to be, unavailable to livestock grazing use under all alternatives.
- 4 Lakeridge key RNA would become available for livestock grazing, however a 13-acre area adjacent to the 2015 ARMPA identified Lakeridge key RNA and still within the ACEC/RNA would be available for research and would be unavailable to livestock grazing.
- 5 Mahogany Ridge ACEC/RNA is divided into two "Parcels", totaling 622 acres. The southern parcel is 476 acres; the Key RNA is located solely in the southern parcel and totals 155 acres. In Alternatives 5 and 6, OR/WA BLM proposes 140 acres be retained as Key RNA and allocated as unavailable to livestock grazing. 15 acres would be outside of the Key RNA under this alternative and reallocated to available to livestock grazing.

 6 - South Bull Canyon data has been revised based on district specific information resulting from assessments made during the closure process. The entire ACEC/RNA acreage is 770 of which 749
- acres were designated as Key RNA (and allocated as unavailable to livestock grazing). The acres that would be allocated as available to livestock grazing under Alternatives 5 and 6 is the proposed new exclosure (and retention of unavailable allocation) subtracted from the 2015 Key RNA (749 minus 257 = 492)
- 7 Black Canyon ACEC/RNA acres were reduced by 40 acres to reflect corrections in GIS of the boundary.
- 8 Exception criteria would be have to be met for construction of exclosure fencing within WSA or increased management presence would be needed.
- 9 The Oregon 2015 ARMPA estimated that 47 AUMs may be removed based strictly on the change in acreage. The 2019 RMPA used the same estimate of 47 AUMs. Alternatives 1 and 2 reflect the numbers from the prior EISs. This key RNA has been excluded from the allotment and pasture through an administrative process; no change to permitted AUMs is necessary because the remaining pasture can support the estimated 47 AUMs associated with the key RNA made unavailable to livestock grazing.

Table 2-37. Oregon State-Specific Circumstances – Research Management Areas

| Objective SD 4: Manage key RNAs, or large areas within the RNAs, as undisturbed baseline reference areas for the sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important for Greater Sage-grouse. Manage key RNAs for minimum human disturbance allowing natural succession to proceed. MD LG I: All or portions of key RNAs will be unavailable to Objective SD 4: Manage Key RNAs, or large areas within the RNAs, as base sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important to Greater Sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important for Greater Sage Grouse. Minimize human disturbance in all 15 key RNAs, allowing natural ecological processes to proceed. MD LG I: All or portions of key RNAs will be unavailable to Research Natural Areas Objective SD 4: Manage Key RNAs, or large areas within the RNAs, as base sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important to Greater Sagebrush plant communities and to meet GRSG habitat objectives. Physical Research Natural Areas Objective SD 4: Manage Key RNAs, or large areas within the RNAs, as base sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important for Greater Sage Grouse. Minimize human disturbance in all 15 key RNAs, allowing natural ecological processes to proceed. MD LG I: All or portions of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock grazing management in above). Determine whether to remove, modify or construct additional fences | age-grouse. Active or lance or improvement of lance are improvement are larger are large |
|--|--|
| RNAs, or large areas within the RNAs, as undisturbed baseline reference areas for the sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important for Greater Sage-grouse. Manage key RNAs for minimum human disturbance allowing natural succession to proceed. MD LG I: All or portions of key Foster Flat and Guano Creek—Sink Lakes RNAs as undisturbed baseline reference areas for the sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important to Greater Sagebrush plant communities and to meet GRSG habitat objectives. sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important to Greater Sagebrush plant communities and to meet GRSG habitat objectives. sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important to Greater Sagebrush plant communities and to meet GRSG habitat objectives. Sink Lakes RNAs as undisturbed baseline reference areas for the sagebrush plant communities and to meet GRSG habitat objectives. Sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important to Greater Sagebrush plant communities and to meet GRSG habitat objectives. Sink Lakes RNAs as undisturbed baseline reference areas for the sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important for Greater Sage Grouse. Minimize human disturbance in all 15 key RNAs, allowing natural ecological processes to proceed. MD LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock groups. | age-grouse. Active or lance or improvement of lance are improvement are larger are large |
| RNAs, as undisturbed baseline reference areas for the sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important for Greater Sage-grouse. Manage key RNAs for minimum human disturbance allowing natural succession to proceed. MD LG I: All or portions of key Sink Lakes RNAs as undisturbed baseline reference areas for the sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important for Greater Sage Grouse. Minimize human disturbance in all 15 key RNAs, allowing natural ecological processes to proceed. MD LG I: All or portions of key Sink Lakes RNAs as undisturbed baseline reference areas for the sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important for Greater Sage Grouse. Minimize human disturbance in all 15 key RNAs, allowing natural ecological processes to proceed. MD LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock grouse. | razing (see Table 2.36 |
| reference areas for the sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important for Greater Sage-grouse. Manage key RNAs for minimum human disturbance allowing natural succession to proceed. MD LG I: All or portions of key baseline reference areas for the sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important for Greater Sage Grouse. Minimize human disturbance in all 15 key RNAs, allowing natural ecological processes to proceed. MD LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock grouse. | razing (see Table 2.36 |
| plant communities they represent that are important for Greater Sage-grouse. Manage key RNAs for minimum human disturbance allowing natural succession to proceed. MD LG I: All or portions of key sagebrush plant communities they represent that are important for Greater Sage Grouse. Minimize human disturbance in all 15 key RNAs, allowing natural ecological processes to proceed. MD LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock grouse. MID LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock grouse. MID LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock grouse. MID LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock grouse. MID LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock grouse. MID LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock grouse. MID LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock grouse. MID LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock grouse. MID LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock grouse. | razing (see Table 2.36 |
| MD LG 1: All or portions of key MD LG I is deleted. MD LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock gradual and the sound of the sou | razing (see Table 2.36 |
| MD LG 1: All or portions of key MD LG I is deleted. MD LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock gradual and the sound of the sou | razing (see Table 2.36 |
| MD LG 1: All or portions of key MD LG I is deleted. MD LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock gradual and the sound of the sou | razing (see Table 2.36 |
| MD LG 1: All or portions of key MD LG I is deleted. MD LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock gradual and the sound of the sou | razing (see Table 2.36 |
| MD LG 1: All or portions of key MD LG I is deleted. MD LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock gradual and the sound of the sou | razing (see Table 2.36 s, corrals, or water storage |
| MD LG 1: All or portions of key MD LG I is deleted. MD LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock gradual and the sound of the sou | razing (see Table 2.36 s, corrals, or water storage |
| MD LG 1: All or portions of key MD LG I is deleted. MD LG I: All, some, or none of key RNAs will be unavailable to livestock gradual and the sound of the sou | razing (see Table 2.36 s, corrals, or water storage |
| RNAs will be unavailable to Livestock grazing management in Jahove). Determine whether to remove, modify or construct additional fences | s, corrals, or water storage |
| 2.700001 6.421.6.114.000 | , |
| grazing (see Table 2.X above). the 13 key RNAs returns to being facilities (e.g. reservoirs, catchments, ponds). New proposed water-related ra | |
| Determine whether to remove governed by applicable district pipelines, troughs, etc.) may be authorized where existing critical water development. | |
| fences, corrals, or water storage RMPs as amended by the 2015 accessible as a result of implementing areas within the Key RNAs as unavailab | ole to livestock grazin g. |
| facilities (e.g. reservoirs, Catchments, ponds). Oregon Greater Sage-Grouse ROD/ARMPA goals, objectives, | |
| | |
| and management desired | |
| All or part of Key RNAs and all PHMA areas Key RNAs and areas allocated as unavailable RNAs remain subject to | ~ ~ |
| identified would be closed to all management to promote the key allocated as unavailable to facilitate the ability to compare un-grazed | vegetation types to grazed |
| disturbance types, including characteristics of the RNAs, livestock grazing. vegetation types. | |
| livestock grazing, OHV, minerals including regulation of grazing, to | |
| development, and lands and realty maintain and promote the key | |
| actions. The reason for these characteristics of the RNAs. | |
| closures would be for research- | |
| related activities, including | |
| studying vegetative communities | |
| actions. The reason for these closures would be for research-related activities, including studying vegetative communities important to GRSG that do not contain land disturbing activities, as well as studying the effects of | |
| contain land disturbing activities, | |
| as well as studying the effects of | |
| identified would be closed to all disturbance types, including livestock grazing, OHV, minerals development, and lands and realty actions. The reason for these closures would be for research-related activities, including studying vegetative communities important to GRSG that do not contain land disturbing activities, as well as studying the effects of climate change on these vegetative communities. management to promote the key characteristics of the RNAs, including regulation of grazing, to maintain and promote the key characteristics of the RNAs. | |
| vegetative communities. | |

Table 2-38. Oregon State-Specific Circumstances – Saleable Minerals/Mineral Materials

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Saleable Minerals/Minerals Management | | | | | |
| MD MR 14: PHMA are closed to | Same as Alternative I (no change | MD MR 14: PHMA are closed to | Same as Alt I, with the following a | | | |
| new mineral material sales. | made in 2019). | new mineral material sales. | If BLM's NEPA analysis determines | | | |
| However, these areas remain | | | existing, authorized material site (| | | |
| "open" to free use permits and | | | existing authorized area) could be | | | |
| the expansion of existing active | | | | ın Environmental Assessmen t, BLM | | |
| pits, only if the following criteria | | Sil | determines that a FONSI is applica | able) and the applicable area has | | |
| are met: | | ers | not met the disturbance cap, BLM | is authorized to implement | | |
| The activity is within the | | 100 | without further analysis or mitigat | ion. | | |
| Oregon PAC (also called BSU, | | in he | tel all sio | | | |
| and is the same footprint as | | The state | S P CIS | | | |
| PHMA) and project area | | 11.CO NO 01 | 200, 10 | | | |
| disturbance cap. | | Plie fl. Me, | We 417 - W. | | | |
| The activity is subject to the | | الم الله والم الله | 1, 01, 00, | | | |
| provisions set forth in the | | 164 260 MIL 100 | 40 , UP | | | |
| mitigation framework in | | 10 10 | 11.00 | | | |
| Appendix F (in the 2015 OR | : 21 | 10 61 281 19 | alie | | | |
| GRSG ARMPA). | ciCl -1 | M. We Elli OL | 10 | | | |
| All applicable required design | 261, B | chine ist no | 8 | | | |
| features are applied and the | 100 100 | 400 TH. Odlo 4 P | | | | |
| activity is permissible under | On The | 1. 2000 | | | | |
| screening criteria (see SSS 13 in the 2015 OR GRSG | Mr. ila | TE AL TIL | | | | |
| ARMPA). | is chim | 12 Ch. Mar | | | | |
| AKI 11 A). | :6' M . 6' 26' | 9 4 4 E. | | | | |
| Federal Highway Act material | 41. Cn. 11A VE | al, all | | | | |
| sites are a ROW and not subject | 700 Mar 64 00 | in The | | | | |
| to mineral sale requirements. See | O WE TE TIO | CUI | | | | |
| ROW section for management | 40.14 7301 | 00 | | | | |
| (MD LR 7 in the 2015 OR GRSG | 102 33, 11 12 0 | | | | | |
| AMPRA). | M. "101. The We | republication version of the property of the p | | | | |
| ALIENA). | 5 KI ON KI | | | | | |

2.6.5 Utah

The BLM will address GHMA management as a Utah state-specific circumstance. HMA management in Utah is a result of different approaches to planning in the 2015 and 2019 Utah GRSG RMP amendments. In the BLM's 2019 GRSG ARMPA, the BLM increased habitat management area alignment with the State of Utah's Sage-Grouse Management Areas (SGMAs) and prioritized the importance of management prescriptions on PHMA. This was to focus protection on seasonal habitats that support over 95 percent of GRSG populations in Utah, and removed GHMA designation and management.

The state-specific circumstances for the State of Utah being addressed in this effort is the result of the 2019 amendment effort. The remainder of this section includes management alternatives specific to GHMA in 2015
.or identifying the control of J2019

J2 GOCUMENT. THE LITTURE AREA TO STATE THE LITTURE AREA TO STATE AND A STATE AND on the on the on the one of the o Utah under alternatives 4, 5 and 6. Refer to Appendix 2 for specific language from the 2015 and 2019 amendments, and Appendix 3 for additional information on the Utah approaches for identifying habitat

Table 2-39. Utah State-Specific Circumstances – General Habitat Management Areas

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------|
| | | Special Status Species (SSS) | | |
| MA-SSS-5: In GHMA, apply the following management to meet the objective of a net conservation gain for discretionary actions that can result in habitat loss and degradation: A- Existing Management: Implement GRSG management actions included in the existing | MA-SSS-5: No similar action. | Special Status Species (SSS) MA-SSS-5: No similar action. | MA-SSS-5: In GHMA, apply the following management to meet a minimum standard of no net loss for discretionary actions that can result in habitat loss and degradation: A- Existing Management: Same as Alternative I. B- Net Conservation Gain: Apply a minimum standard of no net loss consistent with cross- | MA-SSS-5: Same as Alternative 4 |
| provides a net conservation gain to the species, including accounting for any uncertainty associated with the effectiveness of such mitigation. This will be achieved by avoiding, minimizing, and compensating for impacts by applying beneficial mitigation actions. Exceptions to net conservation gain for GRSG may | Hational NEPA Hotel | ocument. | US Geological Survey Report Conservation Buffer Distance Estimates for Greater Sage- Grouse – A Review (Open File Report 2014-1239; Manier et al. 2014) in accordance with Appendix B, Applying Lek-Buffer Distances (Utah 2019 ARMPA). D- Required Design | |
| be made for vegetation treatments to benefit Utah prairie dog. Mitigation will be conducted according to the mitigation | | | Features/Best Management Practices: Same as Alternative I. | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|--|----------------|----------------------|
| framework contained in | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| Appendix F (Utah 2015 ARMPA). | | | | |
| | | | | |
| C- Buffers: | | | | |
| In undertaking BLM management | | | Nis | |
| actions, and consistent with valid | | | 119 01 | |
| and existing rights and applicable | | | 0, 13 3/10 | |
| law in authorizing third-party | | | 10 01 0 111. | |
| actions, the BLM will apply the lek | | i s | Le Me GO | |
| buffer-distances identified in the | | al's | oll in the Of | |
| US Geological Survey Report | | 100 | and Illiania | |
| Conservation Buffer Distance | | 30 no | "60, "10. "10. | |
| Estimates for Greater Sage- | | Elo " 11. | Sr. 6, 313 | |
| Grouse – A Review (Open File | | republication version of the poly of the poly of the poly of the final document that may be all the poly of the po | 4, 10 | |
| Report 2014-1239; Manier et al. | | MILE ALL OF F | Je, 11 V. | |
| 2014) in accordance with | | JIP -15 11 P -11 | 11, 04, 00, | |
| Appendix B (Utah 2015 ARMPA). | | op och will och | 911 | |
| | | 16 16 14 90 | the of a | |
| D- Required Design | | 61 ch 21 18 | lies | |
| Features/Best Management | ci Cla | M We sille of | 10, | |
| Practices: | EFIC BI | CUI G GE W | S * | |
| In GHMA, apply the fluid mineral | 20, 6, | 100 The dis 16 | | |
| RDFs that are associated with | M. The | 0 1 200 3 | | |
| GHMA identified in Appendix C | 181: 18 70 | 46, V 4 14, | | |
| (Utah 2015 ARMPA) when | is a afternally | 19 19 13 | | |
| authorizing/permitting site- | is is the silver | 3. TE. 4110 | | |
| specific fluid mineral development | MIS -UII WY RE | 1/2 1/2 | | |
| activities/projects. | 100 31130 | (a. 00) | | |
| The applicability and overall | 0, 410 EL "10, | THE STATE OF THE S | | |
| effectiveness of each RDF cannot | 431 M 131 | 200 | | |
| be fully assessed until the project | 20 031 1 P 9 | | | |
| level when the project location | The Oly Wine | | | |
| and design are known. Because of | STILL BY HILL | | | |
| site specific circumstances, some | 40.00 | | | |
| RDFs may not apply to some | fler | | | |
| projects and/or may require slight | _ | | | |
| variations. All variations in RDFs | | | | |
| will require that at least one of | | | | |
| the following be demonstrated in | | | | |
| the NEPA analysis associated with | | | | |
| the project/activity: | | | | |
| are projectiactivity. | I . | | I | <u> </u> |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------------|
| A specific RDF is documented | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| to not be applicable to the | | | | |
| site-specific conditions of the | | | | |
| project/activity (e.g. due to site | | | .6 | |
| limitations or engineering | | | Mis | |
| considerations). Economic | | | 6 811. | |
| considerations, such as | | | 0, 12 01,0 | |
| increased costs, do not | | | U 01 0 111. | |
| necessarily require that an | | i e | Le Me CO | |
| RDF be varied or rendered | | al's | all is the of | |
| inapplicable; | | 100 | 30 4 11 119 11 | |
| An alternative RDF, state- | | 30 12 | 160 10, 10. | |
| implemented conservation | | 410 411 | 5, 0, 00 | |
| measure, or plan-level | | . c. 2 2 | 4, 10. | |
| protection is determined to | | MIL THE OF | ne 14 n. | |
| provide equal or better | | Mexpects will be po | U. W., OI. | |
| protection for GRSG or its | | co co illi co | 0 110 | |
| habitat; | , | 16, 06 W. 40 | No you | |
| A specific RDF will provide no | | at all al | 1,160 | |
| additional protection to GRSG | cja. | My We sillo 1/2 | 16/1 | |
| or its habitat. | 410 21 | 111111111111111111111111111111111111111 | 2 | |
| MA-SSS-6 | MA-SSS-6: | MA-SSS-6: Same as Alternative 2. | MA-SSS-6: | MA-SSS-6: |
| Sage-Grouse Management | Sage-Grouse Management | Same as Alternative 2. | Same as Alternative 2 but | Same as Alternative 4. |
| Outside PHMA/GHMA | Outside PHMA | 161. VE W. | applying management to areas | |
| Proposed projects within State of | Outside PHMA, implement GRSG | 15 OF 21 | outside GHMA based on | |
| Utah SGMA and USFWS priority | management actions included in | JIEI THE | amended GHMA boundaries. | |
| areas for conservation (PAC), as | the RMPs and project-specific | 14. 4 | | |
| well as adjacent to PHMA outside | mitigation measures associated | 3, 61, | | |
| these areas, will consider impacts | with decisions that predated the | 11/1 | | |
| on GRSG and implement | 2015 amendments. | -CV | | |
| measures to mitigate impacts | egral May | 0- | | |
| when preparing site-specific | Proposed projects within State of | | | |
| | Utah SGMA and USFWS PACs, | | | |
| compliance documents. | as well as adjacent to PHMA | | | |
| | outside these areas, will consider | | | |
| Outside of PHMA, prior to site- | impacts on GRSG and may | | | |
| specific authorizations, the BLM | implement measures to mitigate | | | |
| will evaluate habitat conditions | impacts on GRSG populations | | | |
| and may require surveys to | within adjacent PHMA when | | | |
| determine if the project area | preparing site-specific planning | | | |
| contains GRSG habitat (FLPMA, | and environmental compliance | | | |
| 43 United States Code (USC) | documents. | | | |
| 1701 Sec. 201 (a); BLM Manual | | | | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|----------------------|
| 6840.04 D3; BLM-M-6840.04 E2). | Outside of PHMA, but within | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| Surveys will be required prior to | SGMAs and PACs, avoid removal | | | |
| authorizing discrete | of sagebrush and minimize | | | |
| anthropogenic disturbances | development that creates a | | . 6 | |
| within 4 miles of an occupied lek | physical barrier to GRSG | | Nis | |
| that is located in PHMA, but only | movement; these areas may be | | 6 811. | |
| in existing sagebrush. | used by GRSG to connect to | | 0, 12 01,0 | |
| | other populations or seasonal | | 10 0, 6 7 11. | |
| If an area is determined to be | habitat areas. Exceptions shall be | Sil | Ve *Ne GO | |
| GRSG habitat (e.g., nesting, | made for vegetation treatments | C. C. | July 1 Eles Of | |
| brood-rearing, winter, transition), | to benefit Utah prairie dog, | 70 | of Allialis all | |
| mitigation will be considered as | where the landscape will be | on he | *60 110. Jo. | |
| part of the project level NEPA | managed for both species. | 110 11. | St. Dr of | |
| analysis and will be attached as | | . C3 22 0 | 15, 16 | |
| conditions of approval to new | Outside of PHMA, but within | Alle three b | ve, 11 v. | |
| discretionary actions, if deemed | SGMAs and PACs, consider noise | TIP TE II PO II | 11, 04, 01, | |
| necessary to protect the habitat | and permanent structure | republication version | 911 | |
| (BLM Manual 6840.04 D 5). | stipulations around leks. | 16 160 " M. 90 | the 9 a | |
| Measures that may be considered | | 61 ch 21 :6 | lies | |
| include those identified in | Outside PHMA, after analyzing | M Me sille at 1 | 46, | |
| Appendix C. (Utah 2015 ARMPA) | the impacts using the buffer | republication version was the poly of the poly of the final document will be poly of the final document with the final documen | S * | |
| | distances identified in Appendix B | 100 The dis 16 | | |
| Outside of PHMA, but within | (Utah 2019 ARMPA) from a lek | 0000000 | | |
| SGMAs and PACs, avoid removal | that is located in PHMA, portions | 161. VF W | | |
| of sagebrush and minimize | of State of Utah opportunity | 15 OK 21 | | |
| development that creates a | areas will be managed with the | J. IE, HAS | | |
| physical barrier to GRSG | following allocations: | Republication version of the property of the property will be property will be property by the | | |
| movement; these areas may be | Fluid minerals will be open for | 3, 61, | | |
| used by GRSG to connect to | leasing with CSU stipulations | 11/1 | | |
| other populations or seasonal | (noise and tall structures). | CO | | |
| habitat areas. Exceptions shall be | Lands ROWs, permits, and | 3 | | |
| made for vegetation treatments | | | | |
| to benefit Utah prairie dog, | avoidance criteria for noise | | | |
| where the landscape will be | and tall structures. | | | |
| managed for both species. | 10 the | | | |
| Outside of PHMA, but within | Avoid siting wind energy | | | |
| SGMAs and PACs, consider noise | development in opportunity areas | | | |
| and permanent structure | within the buffer distances | | | |
| stipulations around leks. | identified in Appendix B (Utah | | | |
| supulations around texs. | 2019 ARMPA) from occupied GRSG leks that are in PHMA, if | | | |
| Outside PHMA, portions of State | the lek buffer analysis as identified | | | |
| of Utah opportunity areas (see | in Appendix B (Utah 2019 | | | |
| or otali opportunity areas (see | III Appendix B (Otan 2019 | | | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|--|--|------------------|----------------------|
| Utah 2015 Final EIS Map 2.4) | ARMPA) shows that siting wind | (See above.) | (See above.) | (See above.) |
| within 4 miles of a lek that is | energy development in | | | |
| located in PHMA will be managed | opportunities areas will impact | | | |
| with the following allocations: | lek persistence within PHMA. | | . 6 | |
| Fluid minerals will be open for | | republication version of the poor of the poor of the property of the poor of t | Wis | |
| leasing with CSU stipulations | Outside of PHMA, avoid and | | E LI. | |
| (noise and tall structures). | minimize effects from discrete | | 0, 10 01,0 | |
| Lands ROWs, permits, and | anthropogenic disturbances in | | 11 0, 6, 711. | |
| leases will be avoided, applying | areas that have been treated with | Sil | TO THE GO & | |
| avoidance criteria for noise | the intent of improving or | 013 | 311:10 che 01 | |
| and tall structures. | creating new GRSG habitat. | 1000 | 90 4 11 1113 011 | |
| | Evaluate conditions in the treated | on he | *60 -110 E10 | |
| Do not site wind energy | area to determine if it is providing | 410 4 11 | St. Proper | |
| development in opportunity areas | habitat for GRSG and if additional | ::Ca Nat 0 | 10, 10 | |
| within 5 miles from occupied | measures are necessary to | Alle thing | We 1/1 W. | |
| GRSG leks that are in PHMA. | protect the habitat. | 211 St. 11 6 -11 | 11, 01, 00, | |
| | | eb ec will oc | 441 900 | |
| Outside of PHMA, avoid and | Outside of PHMA, provide that | The things | Chr. 30 | |
| minimize effects from discrete | acres of GRSG seasonal habitat | 16 611 31 19 | die | |
| anthropogenic disturbances in | (based on best available maps, | M. We till of | 10. | |
| areas that have been treated with | then confirmed to be regularly | CUILE GE W | S * | |
| the intent of improving or | used by GRSG Grouse to sustain | 100 The dis 1 p | | |
| creating new GRSG habitat. | one or more seasonal habitat | 0 1. 200 20 | | |
| Evaluate conditions in the treated | requirements through | republication version of the solution of the solution of the sinal document will be possible to the solution of the solution o | | |
| area to determine if it is providing | coordination with the appropriate State of Utah agency | 19 19 131 | | |
| habitat for GRSG and if additional | and through on-the-ground | 3. 71. " # 11.0 | | |
| measures are necessary to | information) that is lost to habitat | 1/2 1/2 | | |
| protect the habitat. | degradation actions (Appendix C, | a. Le. | | |
| | Table C.2 of the Utah 2015 | III. | | |
| | ROD/ARMPA) are replaced by | Mexpects that he pour of the property of the p | | |
| | creating/improving GRSG habitat | | | |
| 100 | within PHMA. | | | |
| | I within i I ii i/A. | | | |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | Changes | to Other Sections/Managemen | nt Actions | |
| The following management actions include a reference to GHMA, usually just pointing to the GHMA polygons or in a prioritization approach (see Appendix 2, Utah existing GRSG management): • MA-SSS-I • MA-FIRE-8 • MA-IG-5 • MA-WHB-2 • Objective MR-I • MA-MR-20 • MA-MR-24 • MA-RE-I The following management actions include a reference to GHMA, only include a reference to GHMA that references application of MA-SSS-5. • MA-MR-I • MA-MR-I • MA-MR-I • MA-MR-14 • MA-MR-16 • MA-MR-23 • MA-LR-7 | No GHMA in Utah under these alt | ernatives, so no similar action. | Same as Alternative I, but with the alternative described in the rangev including the updated GHMA bour Alternatives 4, 5 and 6. Same as Alternative I, by applying described above and the updated Alternatives 4, 5, and 6. | e inclusion of the changes by wide alternatives (Section 2.5), indaries described under the amended MA-SSS-5 language GHMA boundaries described under |
| | | | | |

2.6.6 Wyoming

Wyoming's Alternatives 5 and 6 are considering Stewardship Habitat Management Areas (SHMA) in addition to PHMA and GHMA. The SHMA designation is being applied in northeastern Wyoming where private landowners worked with the State of Wyoming to establish management objectives and approaches.

Alternation of the Alternation o action and the state of the sta The remainder of this section includes the alternatives related to the applicable management actions associated with SHMA. Because these areas are only being considered under Alternative 5 and 6, there is Jubstantially similar document will be posted in the ELIM of the only version of the confusional NEPA Register is the only version of the confusional NEPA Register is the only version of the confusional NEPA Register is the only version of the confusional NEPA Register is the only version of the confusional NEPA Register is the only version of the confusional NEPA Register is the confusional NEPA Register is the confusional NEPA Register is the confusion of the

ational NEPA Register. The final document published in of the relied upon.

Table 2-40. Wyoming State-Specific Circumstances – Additional Habitat Management Area

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|--|
| | | | | agement Area Alignments |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Stewardship Habitat Management Areas (SHMAs) as defined for Wyoming are GRSG habitats that are generally characterized by large percentages of private land, existing disturbance and prior and existing rights, and fragmented landscapes but that continue to support substantial populations of GRSG, |
| | | | | provide important connections between populations, and are important for maintaining GRSG populations. Management in SHMA is consistent with GHMA restrictions. |
| | | | Major I | and Use Allocations |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Allocations in SHMA same as GHMA restrictions as proposed for Alternatives 5 and 6 in the cross-cutting topics above. |
| | | | | al Leasing/Development |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Fluid mineral leasing/development in SHMA same as proposed for Alternatives 5 and 6 in the cross-cutting topics above. |
| | | | Waivers, Excepti | ons, and Modifications (WEMs) |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | WEMs in SHMA same as those proposed for active leks in GHMA for Alternatives 5 and 6 in the cross-cutting topics above. |
| | ' | • | iclo M | Mitigation |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Mitigation in SHMA same as proposed for Alternatives 5 and 6 in the cross-cutting topics above. |
| | ' | • | Wind/S | olar and Major ROWs |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Wind/Solar and Major ROWs in SHMA same as proposed for GHMA in Alternatives 5 and 6 in the cross-cutting topics above. |
| | ' | 15 0 | Ada | tive Management |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Adaptive management in SHMA same as proposed for GHMA. |
| • | | 1,000 | Application | n of Habitat Objectives |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Application of Habitat objectives in SHMA same as proposed for Alternatives 5 and 6 in the cross-cutting topics above. |
| | <u>'</u> | V9 2 | N Di | sturbance Caps |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable (disturbance caps in SHMA same as current GHMA) |
| | | 2 1/10 | Thre | ats from Predation |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Threats from predation in SHMA same as proposed for PHMA for Alternatives 5 and 6 in the cross-cutting topics above. |
| | | | Li | vestock Grazing |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Livestock grazing in SHMA same as proposed for PHMA for Alternatives 5 and 6 in the cross-cutting topics above. |
| | | | Wild Horse | and Burro Management |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Wild horse and burro management in SHMA same as proposed for PHMA for Alternatives 5 and 6 in the cross-cutting topics above. |

| Alternative I | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 | Alternatives 5 and 6 |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------------|--|
| | | | Additional Management C | Considerations |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | In partnership with appropriate Federal and State Agencies and landowners and their representatives, encourage the development and implementation of landowner-led conservation benefit agreements in SHMA that focus on ensuring the long-term viability of GRSG populations in the area, and at a minimum identify key habitats and linkages, potential threats to GRSG and its habitat, appropriate conservation measures, and an avoid/minimize/compensate strategy that identifies mitigation opportunities within the boundaries of SHMA. |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Because the functional movement (i.e., movements that result in genetic connectivity) of GRSG likely occurs among leks, encourage the establishment of conservation benefit agreements that include management measures specific to maintaining active leks in SHMAs. |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Support research that identifies habitat conditions that promote or limit the movement of GRSG through a landscape to better inform management of SHMAs. Research supported by BLM and partners should be actionable. |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Encourage the development and implementation of invasive vegetation — including encroaching native species — management strategies in SHMA. Strategies should be inclusive of all private and public land managers and include, but not be limited to: engagement of all pertinent stakeholders, inventory and monitoring requirements, prioritization approaches, treatment and removal options, restoration (to include site-specific management of livestock), responses to wildfire, and an adaptive management framework. |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Work with the appropriate State and Federal agencies to establish wildfire response in SHMA at the same priority as protection of property. |
| Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable Not applicable | To minimize impact of predators to GRSG, encourage the development of a predator management plan in SHMA. Plans should include, but not be limited to: coordination requirements with appropriate State and Federal agencies if implementation of the plan becomes necessary, assessments of habitat conditions and relationships with predator populations and impacts to GRSG, anthropogenic structure design details to reduce opportunities for corvid and raptor perching and nesting, disposal options for anthropogenic food subsidies, approaches for addressing predation from domestic pets, descriptions of concurrent management actions required to address GRSG survival concerns long-term (for example, habitat enhancement), and monitoring requirements. |

2.7 PLAN EVALUATION AND MONITORING

The BLM planning regulations (including 43 CFR Part 1610.4-9) require land use plans establish intervals and standards for monitoring and evaluation, based on the sensitivity of the resource decisions involved.

2.7.1 Evaluation

Evaluation is the process of reviewing the RMP and determining whether the decisions and NEPA analysis are still valid and whether the RMP is being adequately implemented. The BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1; BLM 2005a) directs that RMPs should be evaluated at a minimum period of every 5 years. Specifically, RMPs are evaluated to determine if:

- Decisions remain relevant to current issues;
- Decisions are effective in achieving (or making progress toward achieving) desired outcomes;
- Any decisions should be revised;
- Any decisions should be dropped from further consideration; and
- Any areas require new decisions.

Data collected during RMP implementation helps to inform the RMP evaluation.

2.7.2 Monitoring

Land use plan monitoring is the process of tracking the implementation of land use plan decisions (implementation monitoring) and collecting data/information necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of land use plan decisions (effectiveness monitoring) in meeting the purpose and need of the plan or plan amendment. Monitoring strategies for GRSG habitat and populations must be collaborative, as habitat occurs across jurisdictional boundaries. As part of the 2015 GRSG amendment effort, the BLM developed a Monitoring Framework to provide consistent approaches to monitor planning actions across the range. In 2021 the BLM published the *Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Implementation Rangewide Monitoring Report for 2015-2020* with the results of implementing the 2015 monitoring framework. As part of this amendment process, the BLM is revisiting the approaches in the monitoring framework, updating it based on lessons learned over the past eight years. The draft updated monitoring framework is in **Appendix 7**. The BLM's monitoring efforts will continue in partnership with Federal and State fish and wildlife agencies. The BLM and other partners will use the resulting information to guide implementation of conservation activities.

Monitoring data is used to draw conclusions on whether management actions are being implemented, and if they are helping to meet the stated objectives. Conclusions are then used to recommend whether to continue current management or to identify what changes may need to be made to meet objectives. The BLM would use land use plan evaluations to determine if the decisions in the RMPA, supported by the accompanying NEPA analysis, are still valid in light of new information and monitoring data. Its evaluations would follow the protocols established by the BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1) or other appropriate guidance in effect at the time the evaluation is initiated.

2.8 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The summary of environmental consequences table is included in **Appendix 10**.