
Appendix D

Greater Sage-Grouse Monitoring Framework

APPENDIX D

GREATER SAGE-GROUSE MONITORING FRAMEWORK

D.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this US Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and US Forest Service (Forest Service) Greater Sage-grouse Monitoring Framework (hereafter, monitoring framework) is to describe the methods to monitor habitats and evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the BLM planning strategy (BLM Instruction Memorandum 2012-044) and the Forest Service Land Use Plans to conserve the species and its habitat. The regulations for the BLM (43 CFR 1610.4-9) require that land use plans establish intervals and standards, as appropriate, for monitoring and evaluations, based on the sensitivity of the resource to the decisions involved. The BLM and Forest Service will use the methods described herein to collect monitoring data to evaluate implementation and effectiveness of the Greater Sage-grouse (hereafter, GRSG) planning strategy and the conservation measures contained in land use plans. The type of monitoring data to be collected at the land use plan scale will be described in the monitoring plan which will be developed after the signing of the Record of Decision. For a summary of the frequency of reporting see **Attachment A**, An Overview of Monitoring Commitments. Adaptive management will be informed by data collected at any and all scales.

To ensure the BLM and Forest Service have the ability to make consistent assessments about GRSG habitats across the range of the species, this framework lays out the methodology for monitoring the implementation and evaluating the effectiveness of BLM and Forest Service actions to conserve the species and its habitat through monitoring that informs effectiveness at multiple scales. Monitoring efforts will include data for measurable quantitative indicators of sagebrush availability, anthropogenic disturbance levels, and sagebrush conditions. Implementation monitoring results will provide information to allow the BLM and Forest Service to evaluate the extent that decisions from the BLM resource management plans (RMP) and Forest Service land and resource management plans (LRMPs) to conserve GRSG and its habitat have been implemented. Population monitoring information will be collected by state fish and wildlife agencies and will be incorporated into effectiveness monitoring as it is made available.


This multi-scale monitoring approach is necessary as GRSG are a landscape species and conservation is scale-dependent whereby conservation actions are implemented within seasonal habitats to benefit

populations. The four orders of habitat selection (Johnson 1980) used in this monitoring framework are described by Connelly et al. (2003) and Stiver et al. (2015 *In Press*) as first order (broad scale), second order (mid-scale), third order (fine scale), and fourth order (site scale) to apply them to GRSG habitat selection. Habitat selection and habitat use by GRSG occurs at multiple scales and is driven by multiple environmental and behavioral factors. Managing and monitoring GRSG habitats are complicated by the differences in habitat selection across the range and habitat utilization by individual birds within a given season. Therefore, the tendency to look at a single indicator of habitat suitability or only one scale limits the ability for managers to identify the threats to GRSG and to respond at the appropriate scale. For descriptions of these habitat suitability indicators for each scale, see the Sage-grouse Habitat Assessment Framework (HAF; Stiver et al. 2015 *In Press*).

Monitoring methods and indicators in this monitoring framework are derived from the current peer-reviewed science. Range wide best-available datasets for broad and mid-scale monitoring will be acquired. If these existing datasets are not readily available or are inadequate, but are necessary to effectively inform the three measurable quantitative indicators (sagebrush availability, anthropogenic disturbance levels, and sagebrush conditions), the BLM will strive to develop datasets or obtain information to fill these data gaps. Datasets that are not readily available to inform the fine and site scale indicators will be developed. These data will be used to generate monitoring reports at the appropriate and applicable geographic scales, boundaries and analysis units: across the range of GRSG as defined by Schroeder et al. (2004), and clipped by Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) Management Zone (MZ) (Stiver et al. 2006) boundaries and other areas as appropriate for size (e.g., populations based on Connelly et al. 2004; **Figure D.1**, Map of Greater Sage-grouse Range, Populations, Subpopulations and Priority Areas for Conservation (PACs) as of 2013). This broad and mid-scale monitoring data and analysis will provide context for RMP/LRMP areas; states; GRSG priority habitat management areas (PHMA) and general habitat management areas (GHMA); and Priority Areas for Conservation (PACs) as defined in the Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Objectives: Final Report (COT report; US Fish and Wildlife Service 2013). Throughout the remainder of the document, all of these areas will be referred to as “GRSG areas”.

This monitoring framework is divided into two sections. The broad and mid-scale methods, described in **Section D.2**, provide a consistent approach across the range of the species to monitor implementation decisions and actions, mid-scale habitat attributes (e.g., sagebrush availability and habitat degradation), and population changes to determine the effectiveness of BLM and Forest Service planning strategy and management decisions (see **Table D.1**, Indicators for Monitoring Implementation of the Strategy, Decisions, Sage-grouse Habitat, and Sage-grouse Populations at the Broad and Mid-scales). For the GRSG habitat fine and site scales (**Section D.3**), this framework describes a consistent approach (e.g., indicators and methods) for monitoring GRSG seasonal habitats. Funding, support, and dedicated personnel for broad and mid-scale monitoring will be renewed annually through the normal budget process. For an overview of the BLM and Forest Service multi-scale monitoring commitments see **Attachment A**.

Figure D.1
Map of Greater Sage-grouse Range, Populations, Subpopulations and Priority Areas for Conservation (PAC) as of 2013



GRSG PACs, Subpopulations and Populations
LEGEND

-  Subpopulations
-  COT PACs
-  Populations

Sources:
 Current Range: Schroeder et al., 2004
 Populations: Connelly et al., 2004
 Subpopulations: Connelly et al., 2004
 PACs: USFWS COT Report, 2013

Table D.1
Indicators for Monitoring Implementation of the Strategy, Decisions, Sage-grouse Habitat,
and Sage-grouse Populations at the Broad and Mid-scales

Geographic Scales	Implementation	Habitat		Population (State Wildlife Agencies)
		Availability	Degradation	Demographics
Broad Scale: From the range of GRSG to WAFWA MZs	BLM/Forest Service Planning Strategy goal and objectives	Distribution and amount of sagebrush within the range	Distribution and amount of energy, mining and infrastructure facilities	WAFWA MZ population trend
Mid-scale: From WAFWA MZ to populations. PACs	RMP/LRMP decisions	Mid-scale habitat indicators (HAF 2014; Table D.2 e.g., percent of sagebrush per unit area)	Distribution and amount of energy, mining and infrastructure facilities (Table D.2)	Individual population trend

D.2 BROAD AND MID-SCALES

First order habitat selection at the broad scale describes the physical or geographical range of a species. The first order habitat, the range of the species, is defined by populations of GRSG associated with sagebrush landscapes based on Schroeder et al. 2004, Connelly et al. 2004 and population surveys and local adjustments based on population or habitat surveys since 2004. There is an intermediate scale between the broad and mid-scales that was delineated by WAFWA from floristic provinces within which similar environmental factors influence vegetation communities. This scale is referred to as the WAFWA GRSG MZs. Although no indicators are specific to this scale, these MZs are biologically meaningful as reporting units.

Second order habitat selection, the mid-scale, includes GRSG populations and PACs. The second order includes at least 40 discrete populations and subpopulations (Connelly et al. 2004). Populations range in area from 150 to 60,000 square miles. PACs range from 20 to 20,400 square miles and are nested within population areas, and populations are nested within MZs.

Other mid-scale landscape indicators such as patch size and number, patch connectivity, linkage areas, and landscape matrix and edge effects (Stiver et al. 2015 *In Press*) will also be assessed. The methods used to calculate these metrics will be derived from existing literature (Knick et al. 2011; Leu and Hanser 2011; Knick and Hanser 2011).

D.2.1 Implementation (Decision) Monitoring

Implementation monitoring is the process of tracking and documenting the implementation (or the progress toward implementation) of land use plan decisions. The BLM and the Forest Service will monitor implementation of project level and/or site specific actions within PHMA and GHMA for the Utah Greater Sage-Grouse LUPA/EIS. These actions and authorizations as well as progress toward completing and implementing activity-level plans will be monitored consistently across all planning units and reported to BLM and Forest Service headquarters annually, with a summary report every five years.

A national-level Land Use Plan Implementation Monitoring and Reporting Structure (IMARS) that describes how the BLM and Forest Service will monitor and report implementation level activity plans and implementation actions for all amended plans will be developed by the Implementation Monitoring Team and included in the Record of Decision/Approved Plan. A centralized tracking tool (IMARS) for collection, roll-up and reporting of tabular and spatially explicit data will be utilized. The BLM and Forest Service will provide data that can be integrated with other conservation efforts conducted by state and federal partners.

D.2.2 Habitat Monitoring

In the USFWS's 2010 listing decision for GRSG, the USFWS identified 18 threats contributing to the destruction, modification, or curtailment of the GRSG's habitat or range (75 *Federal Register* 13910 2010). The BLM and Forest Service will therefore monitor the relative extent of these threats that remove sagebrush (see **Table D.2**, Relationship between the 18 Threats and the Three Habitat Disturbance Measures for Monitoring), both spatially and temporally, on all lands within PHMA and GHMA and report on amount, pattern and condition of habitat. These 18 threats have been aggregated into three broad and mid-scale measures to account for whether the threat predominantly removes sagebrush or degrades habitat. The three measures are:

- Measure 1: Sagebrush Availability (percent of sagebrush per unit area)
- Measure 2: Habitat Degradation (percent of human activity per unit area)
- Measure 3: Density of Energy and Mining (facilities and locations per unit area)

These three habitat disturbance measures will evaluate disturbance on all lands regardless of land ownership. The direct area of influence will be assessed with the goal to account for actual removal of sagebrush upon which GRSG depend (Connelly et al. 2000) and for habitat degradation as a surrogate for human activity. Measure 1 examines where disturbances have removed plant communities that support sagebrush (or have broadly removed sagebrush from the landscape), and therefore monitors the change in sagebrush availability, or specifically where and how much of the sagebrush community is available within the range of GRSG. The sagebrush community is defined as the ecological systems that have the capability to support sagebrush vegetation and seasonal GRSG habitats within the range of GRSG (see **Section D.2.2.1** below). Measures 2 and 3 (see **Section D.2.2.2** below) focus on where habitat degradation is occurring using the footprint/area of direct disturbance and the number of facilities at the mid-scale to identify the relative amount of degradation per geographic unit of interest and in areas that have the capability to support sagebrush and seasonal GRSG use. Measure 2 is not only a quantification of footprint/area of direct disturbance but also a surrogate for those threats most likely to have ongoing activity. In addition, energy development and mining activities are typically the most intensive activities in sagebrush habitat. Therefore, Measure 3, the density of active energy development, production, and mining sites will be monitored to help identify areas of particular concern for factors such as noise, dust, traffic, etc., that degrade GRSG habitat.

Table D.2
Relationship between the 18 Threats and the Three Habitat Disturbance Measures for Monitoring

USFWS Listing Decision Threat	Sagebrush Availability	Habitat Degradation	Density of Energy and Mining
Agriculture	X		
Urbanization	X		
Wildfire	X		
Conifer encroachment	X		
Treatments	X		
Invasive Species	X		
Energy (oil and gas wells and development facilities)		X	X
Energy (coal mines)		X	X
Energy (wind towers)		X	X
Energy (solar fields)		X	X
Energy (geothermal)		X	X
Mining (active locatable, leasable, and salable developments)		X	X
Infrastructure (roads)		X	
Infrastructure (railroads)		X	
Infrastructure (power lines)		X	
Infrastructure (communication towers)		X	
Infrastructure (other vertical structures)		X	
Other developed rights of ways		X	

Note: Data availability may preclude specific analysis of individual layers. See the detailed methodology for more information.

The methods to monitor disturbance found herein differ slightly from methods used in the Sage-Grouse Baseline Environmental Report (BER; Manier et al. 2013) that provided a baseline of datasets of disturbance across jurisdictions. One difference is that, for some threats, the data in the BER were for federal lands only. In addition, threats were assessed individually in that report, using different assumptions from those in this monitoring framework about how to quantify the location and magnitude of threats. The methodology herein builds on the BER methodology and identifies datasets and procedures to utilize the best available data across the range of the GRSG and to formulate a consistent approach to quantify impact of the threats through time. This methodology also describes an approach to combine the threats and calculate the three measures.

D.2.2.1 Sagebrush Availability (Measure 1)

GRSG populations have been found to be more resilient where a percentage of the landscape is maintained in sagebrush (Knick and Connelly 2011), which will be determined by sagebrush availability. This measure has been divided into two sub-measures to describe sagebrush availability on the landscape:

- Measure 1a) the current amount of sagebrush on the landscape of interest and

- Measure 1b) the amount of sagebrush on the landscape of interest compared to the amount of sagebrush the landscape of interest could ecologically support.

Measure 1a (the current amount of sagebrush on the landscape) will be calculated using this formula: [the existing updated sagebrush layer] divided by [the geographic unit of interest]. The appropriate geographic units of interest for sagebrush availability include the species' range, WAFWA MZs, populations, and PACs. In some cases these GRSG areas will need to be aggregated to provide an estimate of sagebrush availability with an acceptable level of accuracy.

Measure 1b (the amount of sagebrush for context within the area of interest) will be calculated using this formula: [the existing updated sagebrush layer (EVT)] divided by [pre Euro-American geographic extent of lands that could have supported sagebrush (BpS)]. This will provide information during evaluations of monitoring data to set the context for a given geographic unit of interest. That information could also be used for management options for restoration or mitigation.

The sagebrush base layer for the sagebrush availability measure will be based on geospatial vegetation data adjusted for the threats listed in **Table D.2**. The following sub-sections of this monitoring framework describe the methodology to determine both the current availability of sagebrush on the landscape and the context of the amount of sagebrush on the landscape at the broad and mid-scales.

Establishing the Sagebrush Base Layer

The current geographic extent of sagebrush vegetation within the range wide distribution of GRSG populations will be ascertained using the most recent version of the Existing Vegetation Type (EVT) layer in LANDFIRE (2010). LANDFIRE EVT was selected to serve as the sagebrush base layer for five reasons: 1) it is the only nationally consistent vegetation layer that has been updated multiple times since 2001; 2) the ecological systems classification within LANDFIRE EVT includes multiple sagebrush type classes that, when aggregated, provide a more accurate (compared with individual classes) and seamless sagebrush base layer across jurisdictional boundaries; 3) LANDFIRE performed a rigorous accuracy assessment from which to derive the range wide uncertainty of the sagebrush base layer; 4) LANDFIRE is consistently used in several recent analyses of sagebrush habitats (Knick et al. 2011; Leu and Hanser 2011; Knick and Hanser 2011); and 5) LANDFIRE EVT can be compared against the geographic extent of lands that are believed to have had the capability to support sagebrush vegetation pre Euro-American settlement [LANDFIRE Biophysical Setting (BpS)]. This fifth reason provides a reference point for understanding how much sagebrush currently remains in a defined geographic area compared with how much sagebrush existed historically (Measure 1b). Therefore, BLM and Forest Service have determined that LANDFIRE provides the best available data at broad and mid-scales to serve as a sagebrush base layer for monitoring changes in the geographic extent of sagebrush. Along with aggregating the sagebrush types into the sagebrush base layer, BLM and Forest Service will aggregate the accuracy assessment reports from LANDFIRE to document the cumulative accuracy for the sagebrush base layer. For the long-term, BLM through its Assessment, Inventory, and Monitoring (AIM) program and specifically the BLM'S Landscape Monitoring Framework (Taylor et al. *in press*) will provide field data to the LANDFIRE program to support continuous quality improvements in their products specifically for rangeland systems to improve the LANDFIRE EVT layer.

Within the Forest Service and BLM, forest-wide and field office-wide existing vegetation classification mapping and inventories are available that provide a much finer level of data than provided through LANDFIRE. Where available, these finer scale products are useful for additional and complimentary mid-

scale indicators and local scale analyses (see **Section D.3**, Fine and Site Scale). The fact that these products are not available everywhere limits their utility for monitoring at the broad and mid-scale where consistency of data products is necessary across broader geographies.

The sagebrush layer based on LANDFIRE EVT will allow for the mid-scale estimation of existing percent sagebrush across a variety of reporting units. This sagebrush base layer will be adjusted by changes in land cover and successful restoration for future calculations of sagebrush availability (Measures 1a and 1b).

This layer will be used to determine the trend in other landscape indicators, e.g. patch size and number, patch connectivity, linkage areas, and landscape matrix and edge effects (Stiver et al. 2015 *In Press*). In the future, changes in sagebrush availability, generated bi-annually, will be included in the sagebrush base layer. The landscape metrics will be recalculated to examine changes in pattern and abundance of sagebrush at the various geographic boundaries. This information will be included in effectiveness monitoring (see **Section D.2.4**).

Data Sources to Establish and Monitor Sagebrush Availability

In much the same manner as how the LANDFIRE data was selected as the data source, described above, the criteria for selecting the datasets (**Table D.3**, Datasets for Establishing and Monitoring Changes in Sagebrush Availability) for establishing and monitoring the change in sagebrush availability, Measure 1, were threefold:

- Nationally consistent dataset available across the range
- Known level of confidence or accuracy in the dataset
- Dataset is continually maintained with a known update interval

Table D.3
Datasets for Establishing and Monitoring Changes in Sagebrush Availability

Dataset	Source	Update Interval	Most Recent Version Year	Use
BioPhysical Setting (BpS) v1.1	LANDFIRE	Static	2008	Denominator for Sagebrush Availability (1.b.)
Existing Vegetation Type (EVT) v1.2	LANDFIRE	Static	2010	Numerator for Sagebrush Availability
Cropland Data Layer (CDL)	National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS)	Annual	2012	Agricultural Updates; removes existing sagebrush from numerator of sagebrush availability
National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD) Percent Imperviousness	Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium (MRLC)	5 Year	2011 available in March 2014	Urban Area Updates; removes existing sagebrush from numerator of sagebrush availability
Fire Perimeters	GeoMac	Annual	2013	< 1,000 acres Fire updates; removes existing sagebrush from numerator of sagebrush availability

Table D.3
Datasets for Establishing and Monitoring Changes in Sagebrush Availability

Dataset	Source	Update Interval	Most Recent Version Year	Use
Burn Severity	Monitoring Trends in Burn Severity (MTBS)	Annual	2012 available in April 2014	> 1,000 acres Fire Updates; removes existing sagebrush from numerator of sagebrush availability except for unburned sagebrush islands

LANDFIRE Existing Vegetation Type (EVT) Version 1.2

LANDFIRE EVT represents existing vegetation types on the landscape derived from remote sensing data. Initial mapping was conducted using imagery collected in approximately 2001. Since the initial mapping, there have been two update efforts: version 1.1 represents changes up to 2008 and version 1.2 reflects changes on the landscape up to 2010. Version 1.2 will be used as the starting point to develop the sagebrush base layer.

Ecological systems from the LANDFIRE EVT to be used in the sagebrush base layer were determined by GRSG subject matter experts through the identification of the ecological systems that have the capability of supporting sagebrush vegetation and could provide suitable seasonal habitat for the GRSG (**Table D.4**, Ecological Systems in BpS and EVT Capable of Supporting Sagebrush Vegetation and Could Provide Suitable Seasonal Habitat for Greater Sage-grouse). Two additional vegetation types that are not ecological systems were added to the EVT and are *Artemisia tridentata* ssp. *vaseyana* Shrubland Alliance and *Quercus gambelii* Shrubland Alliance. These alliances have species composition directly related to the Rocky Mountain Lower Montane - Foothill Shrubland ecological system and the Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland ecological system, both of which are ecological systems in LANDFIRE BpS. In LANDFIRE EVT however, in some map zones, the Rocky Mountain Lower Montane - Foothill Shrubland ecological system and the Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland ecological system were named *Artemisia tridentata* ssp. *vaseyana* Shrubland Alliance and *Quercus gambelii* Shrubland Alliance respectively.

Accuracy and Appropriate Use of LANDFIRE Datasets

Because of concerns over the thematic accuracy of individual classes mapped by LANDFIRE, all ecological systems listed in **Table D.4** will be merged into one value that represents the sagebrush base layer. By aggregating all ecological systems, the combined accuracy of the sagebrush base layer (EVT) is much greater than if all categories were treated separately.

LANDFIRE performed the original accuracy assessment of their EVT product on a map zone basis. There are 20 LANDFIRE map zones that cover the historic range of GRSG as defined by Schroeder (2004). **Attachment C**, User and Producer Accuracies for Aggregated Ecological Systems within LANDFIRE Map Zones, lists the user and producer accuracies for the aggregated ecological systems that make up the sagebrush base layer and also defines user and producer accuracies. The aggregated sagebrush base layer for monitoring had producer accuracies ranging from 56.7 percent to 100 percent and user accuracies ranging from 57.1 percent to 85.7 percent.

Table D.4
Ecological Systems in BpS and EVT Capable of Supporting Sagebrush Vegetation and
Could Provide Suitable Seasonal Habitat for Greater Sage-grouse

Ecological System	Sagebrush Vegetation that the Ecological System has the Capability to Produce
Colorado Plateau Mixed Low Sagebrush Shrubland	<i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> ssp. <i>longiloba</i> <i>Artemisia bigelovii</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia frigida</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i>
Columbia Plateau Scabland Shrubland	<i>Artemisia rigida</i>
Great Basin Xeric Mixed Sagebrush Shrubland	<i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> ssp. <i>longicaulis</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> ssp. <i>longiloba</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i>
Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Shrubland	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>xericensis</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i>
Inter-Mountain Basins Mixed Salt Desert Scrub	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i> <i>Artemisia spinescens</i>
Wyoming Basins Dwarf Sagebrush Shrubland and Steppe	<i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> ssp. <i>longiloba</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i> <i>Artemisia tripartita</i> ssp. <i>rupicola</i>
Columbia Plateau Low Sagebrush Steppe	<i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> ssp. <i>longiloba</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i>
Inter-Mountain Basins Big Sagebrush Steppe	<i>Artemisia cana</i> ssp. <i>cana</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>xericensis</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i> <i>Artemisia tripartita</i> ssp. <i>tripartita</i> <i>Artemisia frigida</i>
Inter-Mountain Basins Montane Sagebrush Steppe	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>spiciformis</i>
Northwestern Great Plains Mixed grass Prairie	<i>Artemisia cana</i> ssp. <i>cana</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i> <i>Artemisia frigida</i>
Northwestern Great Plains Shrubland	<i>Artemisia cana</i> ssp. <i>cana</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i>
Western Great Plains Sand Prairie	<i>Artemisia cana</i> ssp. <i>cana</i>
Western Great Plains Floodplain Systems	<i>Artemisia cana</i> ssp. <i>cana</i>
Columbia Plateau Steppe and Grassland	<i>Artemisia</i> spp.

Table D.4
Ecological Systems in BpS and EVT Capable of Supporting Sagebrush Vegetation and
Could Provide Suitable Seasonal Habitat for Greater Sage-grouse

Ecological System	Sagebrush Vegetation that the Ecological System has the Capability to Produce
Inter-Mountain Basins Semi-Desert Shrub-Steppe	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia bigelovii</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i>
Rocky Mountain Lower Montane-Foothill Shrubland	<i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia frigida</i>
Rocky Mountain Gambel Oak-Mixed Montane Shrubland	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i>
Inter-Mountain Basins Curl-Leaf Mountain Mahogany Woodland and Shrubland	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i>
<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i> Shrubland Alliance (EVT only)	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i>
<i>Quercus gambelii</i> Shrubland Alliance (EVT only)	<i>Artemisia tridentata</i>

LANDFIRE EVT data are not designed to be used at a local level. In reporting the percent sagebrush statistic for the various reporting units (Measure 1a), the uncertainty of the percent sagebrush will increase as the size of the reporting unit gets smaller. LANDFIRE data should never be used at the pixel level (30 square meters resolution of raster data) for any reporting. The smallest geographic extent use of the data for this purpose is at the PAC level and for the smallest PACs the initial percent sagebrush estimate will have greater uncertainties compared with the much larger PACs.

Agricultural Adjustments for the Sagebrush Base Layer

The dataset for the geographic extent of agricultural lands will come from the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) Cropland Data Layer (CDL).¹ CDL data are generated on an annual basis with “estimated producer accuracies for large row crops from the mid-80 to mid-90 percent” depending on the State.² Readers are referred to the NASS metadata website for specific information on accuracy.³ CDL provided the only dataset that matches the three criteria (nationally consistent, known level of accuracy, and periodically updated) for use in this monitoring framework and represents the best available agricultural lands mapping product.

¹ <http://www.nass.usda.gov/research/Cropland/Release/index.htm>

² http://www.nass.usda.gov/research/Cropland/sarsfaqs2.htm#Section3_18.0

³ <http://www.nass.usda.gov/research/Cropland/metadata/meta.htm>

The CDL data contain both agricultural classes as well as non-agricultural classes. For this effort, as was also done in the BER (Manier et al. 2013), non-agricultural classes were removed from the original dataset. The excluded classes are as follows:

- Barren (65 & 131)
- Deciduous Forest (141)
- Developed/High Intensity (124)
- Developed/Low Intensity (122)
- Developed/Med Intensity (123)
- Developed/Open Space (121)
- Evergreen Forest (142)
- Grassland Herbaceous (171)
- Herbaceous Wetlands (195)
- Mixed Forest (143)
- Open Water (83 & 111)
- Other Hay/Non Alfalfa (37)
- Pasture/Hay (181)
- Pasture/Grass (62)
- Perennial Ice/Snow (112)
- Shrubland (64 & 152)
- Woody Wetlands (190)

The rule set for adjusting the sagebrush base layer for agricultural lands is that once an area is classified as agriculture in any year of the CDL, those pixels will remain out of the sagebrush base layer even if a new version of CDL classifies that pixel as one of the non-ag classes listed above. The assumption is that even though individual pixels may get classified as a non-agricultural class in any given year the pixel has not necessarily been restored to a natural sagebrush community that would be included in **Table D.4**. It is further assumed that once an area has moved into agricultural use, it is unlikely that it would be restored to sagebrush. Should that occur, the method and criteria for adding pixels back into the sagebrush base layer would follow those found in the Restoration Updates section of this framework.

Urban Adjustments for the Sagebrush Base Layer

The National Land Cover Dataset (NLCD) Percent Imperviousness was selected as the best available dataset to be used for urban updates. These data are generated on a five-year cycle and specifically designed to support monitoring efforts. Other datasets were evaluated and lacked the spatial specificity that was captured in the NLCD product. Any new impervious pixel will be removed from the sagebrush base layer during the update process. Although the impervious surface layer includes a number of impervious pixels outside of urban areas, there are two reasons why this is acceptable for this process. First, an evaluation of national urban area datasets did not reveal a layer that could be confidently used in conjunction with the NLCD product to screen impervious pixels outside of urban zones because unincorporated urban areas were not being included, thus leaving large chunks of urban pixels unaccounted for in this rule set. Secondly, experimentation with setting a threshold on the percent imperviousness layer that would isolate rural features proved to be unsuccessful. No combination of values could be identified that would result in the consistent ability to limit impervious pixels outside urban areas. Therefore, to ensure consistency in the monitoring estimates, it was determined to include all impervious pixels.

Fire Adjustments for the Sagebrush Base Layer

Two datasets were selected for performing fire updates: GeoMac fire perimeters and Monitoring Trends in Burn Severity (MTBS). An existing data standard in the BLM requires all fires with sizes greater than 10 acres to be reported to GeoMac, therefore there will be many small fires less than 10 acres in size

that will not be accounted for in the fire updates. In the update process using fire perimeters from GeoMac, all sagebrush pixels falling within the perimeter of fires less than 1,000 acres in size will be used to update the sagebrush layer.

MTBS was selected for use as a means to account for unburned sagebrush islands during the update process of the sagebrush base layer. The MTBS program⁴ is an on-going multi-year project to consistently map fire severity and fire perimeters across the US. For lands in the western US, MTBS only maps burn severity for fires greater than 1,000 acres in size. One of the burn severity classes within MTBS is an unburned to low severity class. This burn severity class will be used to represent unburned islands of sagebrush within the fire perimeter that will be retained in the sagebrush base layer. Areas within the other severity classes within the fire perimeter will be removed from the base sagebrush layer during the update process. However, not all wildfires have the same impact on the recovery of sagebrush habitat depending largely on soil moisture and temperature regimes. For example, cooler, moister sagebrush habitat has a higher potential for recovery or, if needed restoration, than the warmer, dryer sagebrush habitat. These areas will likely be detected as sagebrush in future updates to LANDFIRE.

Conifer Encroachment adjustment for the Sagebrush Base Layer

Conifer encroachment into sagebrush vegetation reduces the spatial extent of GRSG habitat (Davies et al. 2011; Baruch-Mordo et al. 2013). Conifer species that show propensity for encroaching into sagebrush vegetation which results in GRSG habitat loss include various juniper species such as Utah juniper (*Juniperus osteosperma*), western juniper (*Juniperus occidentalis*), Rocky Mountain juniper (*Juniperus scopulorum*), pinyon species including singleleaf pinyon (*Pinus monophylla*) and pinyon pine (*Pinus edulis*), ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*), lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta*), and Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) (Gruell et al. 1986; Grove et al. 2005; Davies et al. 2011).

A rule set for conifer encroachment was developed to determine the existing sagebrush base layer. To capture the geographic extent of sagebrush that is likely to experience conifer encroachment, ecological systems within LANDFIRE EVT version 1.2 (NatureServe 2011) were identified if they have the capability of supporting the conifer species (listed above) and sagebrush vegetation. Those ecological systems (**Table D.5, Ecological Systems with Conifers Most Likely to Encroach into Sagebrush Vegetation**) were deemed to be the plant communities with conifers most likely to encroach into sagebrush vegetation. Sagebrush vegetation was defined as including sagebrush species (**Attachment B, List of All Sagebrush Species and Subspecies Included in the Selection Criteria for Building the EVT and BpS Layers**) that provide habitat for the GRSG and are included in the Sage-Grouse HAF. An adjacency analysis was conducted to identify all sagebrush pixels that were directly adjacent to these conifer ecological systems. Those immediately adjacent sagebrush pixels were removed from the sagebrush base layer.

⁴ <http://www.mtbs.gov>

Table D.5
Ecological Systems with Conifers Most Likely to Encroach into Sagebrush Vegetation

EVT Ecological Systems	Coniferous Species and Sagebrush Vegetation that the Ecological System has the Capability to Produce
Colorado Plateau Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	<i>Pinus edulis</i> <i>Juniperus osteosperma</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i> <i>Artemisia bigelovii</i> <i>Artemisia pygmaea</i>
Columbia Plateau Western Juniper Woodland and Savanna	<i>Juniperus occidentalis</i> <i>Pinus ponderosa</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia rigida</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i>
East Cascades Oak-Ponderosa Pine Forest and Woodland	<i>Pinus ponderosa</i> <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i>
Great Basin Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	<i>Pinus monophylla</i> <i>Juniperus osteosperma</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i>
Northern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland and Savanna	<i>Pinus ponderosa</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i>
Rocky Mountain Foothill Limber Pine-Juniper Woodland	<i>Juniperus osteosperma</i> <i>Juniperus scopulorum</i> <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i>
Rocky Mountain Poor-Site Lodgepole Pine Forest	<i>Pinus contorta</i> <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> <i>Pinus ponderosa</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i>
Southern Rocky Mountain Pinyon-Juniper Woodland	<i>Pinus edulis</i> <i>Juniperus monosperma</i> <i>Artemisia bigelovii</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>wyomingensis</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i>

Table D.5
Ecological Systems with Conifers Most Likely to Encroach into Sagebrush Vegetation

EVT Ecological Systems	Coniferous Species and Sagebrush Vegetation that the Ecological System has the Capability to Produce
Southern Rocky Mountain Ponderosa Pine Woodland	<i>Pinus ponderosa</i> <i>Pseudotsuga menziesii</i> <i>Pinus edulis</i> <i>Pinus contorta</i> <i>Juniperus</i> spp. <i>Artemisia nova</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> <i>Artemisia arbuscula</i> <i>Artemisia tridentata</i> ssp. <i>vaseyana</i>

Invasive Annual Grasses Adjustments for the Sagebrush Base Layer

There are no invasive species datasets from 2010 to present (beyond the LANDFIRE data) that meet our 3 criteria (nationally consistent, known level of accuracy, and periodically updated) for use in the determination of the sagebrush base layer. For a description of how invasive species land cover will be incorporated in the sagebrush base layer in the future, see the **Monitoring Sagebrush Availability** section below.

Sagebrush Restoration Adjustments for the Sagebrush Base Layer

There are no datasets from 2010 to present that could provide additions to the sagebrush base layer from restoration treatments that meet the three criteria (nationally consistent, known level of accuracy, and periodically updated) therefore, no adjustments were made to the sagebrush base layer calculated from the LANDFIRE EVT (Version 1.2) due to restoration activities since 2010. Successful restoration treatments prior to 2010 are assumed to have been captured in the LANDFIRE refresh.

Monitoring Sagebrush Availability

Updating the Sagebrush Availability Sagebrush Base Layer

Sagebrush availability will be updated annually by incorporating changes to the sagebrush base layer attributable to agriculture, urbanization, and wildfire. The monitoring schedule for the existing sagebrush base layer updates is as follows:

2010 Existing Sagebrush Base Layer = [Sagebrush EVT] minus [2006 Imperviousness Layer] minus [2009 and 2010 CDL] minus [2009/10 GeoMac Fires < 1,000 acres] minus [2009/10 MTBS Fires excluding unburned sagebrush islands] minus [Conifer Encroachment Layer]

2012 Existing Sagebrush Update = [Base 2010 Existing Sagebrush Layer] minus [2011 Imperviousness Layer] minus [2011 and 2012 CDL] minus [2011/12 GeoMac Fires < 1,000 acres] minus [2011/12 MTBS Fires > 1,000 acres, excluding unburned sagebrush islands within the perimeter]

2013 and beyond Existing Sagebrush Updates = [Previous Existing Sagebrush Update Layer] minus [Imperviousness Layer (if new data are available)] minus [Next 2 years of CDL] minus [Next 2 years of GeoMac Fires < 1,000 acres] minus [Next 2 years MTBS Fires > 1,000 acres, excluding unburned sagebrush islands within the perimeter] plus [restoration/monitoring data provided by the field]

Sagebrush Restoration Updates

Restoration after fire, after agricultural conversion, after seedings of introduced grasses, or after treatments of pinyon pine and/or juniper, are examples of updates to the sagebrush base layer that can add sagebrush vegetation. When restoration has been determined to be successful through range wide, consistent, interagency fine and site-scale monitoring, the polygonal data will be used to add sagebrush pixels back into the broad and mid-scale sagebrush base layer.

Measure 1b – Context for the change in the amount of sagebrush in a landscape of interest

Measure 1b describes the amount of sagebrush on the landscape of interest compared with the amount of sagebrush the landscape of interest could ecologically support. Areas with the potential to support sagebrush were derived from the BpS data layer that describes sagebrush pre Euro-American settlement (biophysical setting (BpS) v1.2 of LANDFIRE). This measure (1b) will provide information during evaluations of monitoring data to set the context for a given geographic area of interest. The information could also be used to inform management options for restoration, mitigation and inform effectiveness monitoring.

The identification and spatial locations of natural plant communities (vegetation) that are believed to have existed on the landscape (BpS) were constructed based on an approximation of the historical (pre Euro-American settlement) disturbance regime and how the historical disturbance regime operated on the current biophysical environment. BpS is composed of map units which are based on NatureServe's (2011) terrestrial ecological systems classification.

The ecological systems within BpS used for this monitoring framework are those ecological systems that have the capability of supporting sagebrush vegetation and could provide seasonal habitat for the GRSG. These ecological systems are listed in **Table D.4** with the exception of the *Artemisia tridentata* ssp. *vaseyana* Shrubland Alliance and the *Quercus gambelii* Shrubland Alliance. Ecological systems selected included sagebrush species or subspecies that are included in the Sage-Grouse HAF and are found in **Attachment B**.

Attributable to the lack of any reference data, the BpS layer does not have an associated accuracy assessment. Visual inspection, however, of the BpS data reveals inconsistencies in the labeling of pixels among LANDFIRE map zones. The reason for these inconsistencies between map zones are the decision rules used to map a given ecological system will vary between map zones based on different physical, biological, disturbance and atmospheric regimes of the region. This can result in artificial edges in the map that are an artifact of the mapping process. However, metrics will be calculated at broad spatial scales using BpS potential vegetation type, not small groupings or individual pixels, therefore, the magnitude of these observable errors in the BpS layer is minor compared with the size of the reporting units. Therefore, since BpS will be used to identify broad landscape patterns of dominant vegetation, these inconsistencies will only have a minor impact on the percent sagebrush availability calculation.

LANDFIRE BpS data are not designed to be used at a local level. In reporting the percent sagebrush statistic for the various reporting units, the uncertainty of the percent sagebrush will increase as the size of the reporting unit gets smaller. LANDFIRE data should never be used at the pixel level (30 square meters) for any reporting. The smallest geographic extent use of the data for this purpose is at the PAC level and for the smallest PACs the initial percent sagebrush remaining estimate will have greater uncertainties compared with the much larger PACs.

Tracking

BLM and Forest Service will analyze and monitor sagebrush availability (Measure 1) on a bi-annual basis and it will be used to inform effectiveness monitoring and initiate adaptive management actions as necessary. The 2010 estimate of sagebrush availability will serve as the base year. An updated estimate for 2012 will be reported in 2014 after all datasets become available. The 2012 estimate will capture changes attributable to fire, agriculture, and urban development. Subsequent updates will always include new fire and agricultural data and new urban data when available. Restoration data that meets criteria of adding sagebrush areas back into the sagebrush base layer will be factored in as data allows. There will be a two year lag (approximately) between estimate generation and data use/availability (e.g., the 2014 sagebrush availability will be included in the 2016 estimate).

Future Plans

Geospatial data used to generate the sagebrush base layer will be available through BLM's EGIS Web Portal and Geospatial Gateway or through the authoritative data source. Legacy datasets will be preserved, so that trends may be calculated. Additionally, accuracy assessment data for all source datasets will be provided on the portal either spatially, where applicable, or through the metadata. Accuracy assessment information was deemed vital to share to help users understand the limitation of the sagebrush estimates and will be summarized spatially by map zone and included in the Portal.

LANDFIRE plans to begin a remapping effort in 2015. This remapping has the potential to greatly improve overall quality of the data products primarily through the use of higher quality remote sensing datasets. Additionally, BLM and the Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium (MRLC) are working to improve the accuracy of vegetation map products for broad and mid-scale analyses through the Grass/Shrub mapping effort in partnership with the MRLC. The Grass/Shrub mapping effort applies the Wyoming multi-scale sagebrush habitat methodology (Homer et al. 2009) to spatially depict fractional percent cover estimates for five components range and west-wide. These five components are percent cover of sagebrush vegetation, percent bare ground, percent herbaceous vegetation (grass and forbs combined), annual vegetation, and percent shrubs. One of the benefits of the design of these fractional cover maps is that they facilitate monitoring "with-in" class variation (e.g., examination of declining trend in sagebrush cover for individual pixels). This "with-in" class variation can serve as one indicator of sagebrush quality that cannot be derived from LANDFIRE's EVT information. The Grass/Shrub effort is not a substitute for fine scale monitoring, but will leverage fine scale data to support the validation of the mapping products. An evaluation will be conducted to determine if either dataset is of great enough quality to warrant replacing the existing sagebrush layers. The earliest possible date for this evaluation will not occur until 2018 or 2019 depending on data availability.

D.2.2.2 Habitat Degradation Monitoring (Measure 2)

The measure of habitat degradation will be calculated by combining the footprints of threats identified in **Table D.2**. The footprint is defined as the direct area of influence of "active" energy and infrastructure

and is used as a surrogate for human activity. Thus, the footprint of habitat degradation per GRSG area will be calculated. Although these analyses will try to summarize results at the aforementioned meaningful landscape units, some may be too small to appropriately report the metrics and may be combined (smaller populations, PACs within a population, etc.). Data sources for each threat are found in **Table D.6**, Geospatial Data Sources for Habitat Degradation (Measure 2). Specific assumptions (inclusion criteria for data, width/area assumptions for point and line features, etc.) and methodology for each threat, and the combined measure are detailed below. All datasets will be updated annually to monitor broad and mid-scale year-to-year changes and to calculate trends in habitat degradation to inform adaptive management. A 5-year summary report will be available to the USFWS.

Table D.6
Geospatial Data Sources for Habitat Degradation (Measure 2)

USFWS Listing Decision Threat	Data Source	Direct Area of Influence
Agriculture	National Agriculture Statistics Service	Polygon Area
Urbanization	USGS Percent Imperviousness	Polygon Area
Wildfire	Geospatial Multi-Agency Coordination Group; Monitoring Trends in Burn Severity	Polygon Area
Conifer encroachment	LANDFIRE	Polygon Area
Energy (oil and gas wells and development facilities)	IHS; BLM (AFMSS)	5 ac (2.0 ha)
Energy (reclaimed site degradation)	IHS; BLM (AFMSS)	3 ac (1.2 ha)
Energy (coal mines)	BLM & FS data; Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	Polygon Area
Energy (wind towers)	Federal Aviation Administration	3 ac (1.2 ha)
Energy (solar fields)	Argonne National Laboratory	Polygon Area
Energy (geothermal)	Argonne National Laboratory	Polygon Area or 5 ac (2.0 ha)
Mining (active locatable, leasable, and salable developments)	InfoMine	Polygon Area or 5 ac (2.0 ha)
Infrastructure (roads)	ESRI StreetMap Premium	40.7-240.2 ft. (12.4-73.2 m)
Infrastructure (railroads)	Federal Railroad Administration	30.8 ft. (9.4 m)
Infrastructure (power lines)	Platts Transmission Lines	100-250 ft. (30.5-76.2 m)
Infrastructure (communication towers)	Federal Communications Commission	2.5 ac (1.0 ha)
Infrastructure (other vertical structures)	Federal Aviation Administration	2.5 ac (1.0 ha)

Habitat Degradation Datasets and Assumptions:

Energy (oil and gas wells and development facilities)

This dataset will be a compilation of two oil and gas well databases: the proprietary IHS Enerdeq® database and the BLM Automated Fluid Minerals Support System (AFMSS) database (AFMSS data will be

used to supplement the IHS data). Point data from wells active within the last ten years from IHS and producing wells from AFMSS will be considered as a 5 acre (2.0 ha) footprint (BLM WO 2014) centered on the well point. Plugged and abandoned wells will be removed, though only if the date of well abandonment was prior to the first day of the reporting year (i.e., for the 2010 reporting year a well must be plugged and abandoned by December 31, 2009 to be removed).

Additional Measure: Reclaimed Energy-related Degradation

This dataset will include those wells that have been plugged and abandoned in an effort to measure energy-related degradation that has been reclaimed but not necessary fully restored to GRS habitat. This measure will establish a baseline by using wells that have been plugged and abandoned within the last ten years from the IHS and AFMSS datasets. Time lags for lek attendance in response to infrastructure have been documented to be delayed by 2-10 years from energy development activities (Harju et al. 2010), while reclamation actions may require two or more years from the Final Abandonment Notice. Sagebrush seedling establishment may take six or more years from the point of seeding, depending on variables such as annual precipitation, annual temperature, and soil type and depth (Pyke 2011). This ten-year period is conservative, assuming some level of habitat improvement ten years after plugging. However, research by Hemstrom et al. (2002) proposes an even longer period of greater than 100 years for recovery of sagebrush habitats even with active restoration approaches. Direct area of influence will be considered 3 acres (1.2 ha) (J. Perry, personal communication February 12, 2014). This additional layer/measure could be used at the broad and mid-scale to identify areas where sagebrush habitat and/or potential sagebrush habitat is likely still degraded and where further investigation at the fine or site-scale would be warranted to: (1) quantify the level of reclamation already conducted, and (2) evaluate the amount of restoration still required (for sagebrush habitat recovery). At a particular level (e.g., population, PACs), these areas and the reclamation efforts/success could be used to inform reclamation standards associated with future developments. Once these areas have transitioned from reclamation standards to meeting *restoration* standards, they can be added back into the sagebrush availability layer using the same methodology as described for adding restoration treatment areas lost to fire and agriculture conversion (see **Sagebrush Restoration Updates** section). This dataset will be updated annually with new plugged and abandoned well from the IHS dataset.

Energy (coal mines)

Currently there is no comprehensive dataset available that identifies the footprint of active coal mining across all jurisdictions. Therefore, point and polygon datasets will be used each year to identify coal mining locations. Data sources will be identified and evaluated annually and will include at a minimum: BLM coal lease polygons, US Energy Information Administration mine occurrence points, US Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSMRE) coal mining permit polygons (as available), and USGS Mineral Resources Data System (MRDS) mine occurrence points. These data will inform where active coal mining may be occurring. Aerial imagery will then be used to manually digitize active coal mining surface disturbance in or near these known occurrence areas. While the date of aerial imagery varies by scale, the most current data available from ESRI and/or Google will be utilized to locate (generally at 1:50,000 and below) and digitize (generally at 1:10,000 and below) active coal mine footprints. Coal mine location data source and imagery date will be documented for each digitized coal footprint polygon at the time of creation. Sub-surface facility locations (polygon or point location as available) will also be collected, if available, and included in density calculations, and added to the active surface activity layer as appropriate (if actual footprint can be located).

Energy (wind energy facilities)

This dataset will be a subset of the Federal Aviation Administration Digital Obstacles point file to include points where “Type_” = “WINDMILL”. Direct area of influence of these point features will be measured by converting to a polygon dataset of three acres (1.2 ha) centered on each tower point (BLM Wind Energy Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, 2005). Additionally, we will use Platts Power Plants and Generating Units database for transformer stations associated with wind energy sites.

Energy (solar energy facilities)

This dataset will include solar plants in existence or under construction as compiled with the proprietary Platts in the Power Plants and Generating Units database. The point data will be buffered to represent a three acre (1.2 ha) direct area of influence.

Energy (geothermal energy facilities)

This dataset will include geothermal plants in existence or under construction as compiled with the proprietary I.H.S and Platts (Power Plants and Generating Units) databases. The point data will be buffered to represent a three acre (1.2 ha) direct area of influence.

Mining (active developments; locatable, leasable, saleable)

This dataset will include active mining locations as compiled with the proprietary InfoMine® database. Other data sources will be evaluated as they are identified or become available. The point data will be buffered to represent a five acre (2.0 ha) direct area of influence, unless actual surface disturbance is available.

Infrastructure (roads)

This dataset will be compiled from the proprietary ESRI® StreetMap Premium for ArcGIS. Dataset features that will be used are: Interstates, Major Roads, and Surface Streets to capture most paved and “crowned and ditched” roads while not including “two-track” and 4-wheel-drive routes. These minor roads, while not included in our broad and mid-scale monitoring, may support a volume of traffic that can have deleterious effects to GRSG leks. It may be appropriate to consider the frequency and type of use of roads in a NEPA analysis for a proposed project. This fine/project scale analysis will require more site-specific data than is identified in this monitoring framework. The direct influence area for roads will be represented by 240.2 feet, 84.0 feet, and 40.7 feet (73.2 meters, 25.6 meters, and 12.4 meters) total widths centered on the line feature for Interstates, Major Roads, and Surface Streets respectively (Knick et al. 2011). The most current dataset will be used for each monitoring update. *Note: this is a related but different dataset as was used in the Summary of Science, Activities, Programs, and Policies That Influence the Rangeland Conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse (Manier et al., 2013). Individual BLM and Forest Service planning units may utilize different roads layers for fine and site scale monitoring.*

Infrastructure (railroads)

This dataset will be a compilation of Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) Rail Lines of the USA dataset. Non-abandoned rail lines will be used; abandoned rail lines will not be used. The direct influence area for railroads will be represented by a 30.8 feet (9.4 meters) total width (Knick et al. 2011) centered on non-abandoned railroad line feature.

Infrastructure (power lines)

This line dataset will be a compilation from EV Energy Map, Platts/Global Energy of transmission lines, substations, electric power generation plants, and energy distribution control facilities. Linear features in

the dataset attributed as “buried” will be removed from the disturbance calculation. Only “In Service” lines will be used, not “Proposed” lines. Direct area of influence will be determined by the kilovolt designation: 1-199 kilovolts (100 feet; 30.5 meters), 200-399 kilovolts (150 feet; 45.7 meters), 500-699 kilovolts (200 feet; 61.0 meters), and 700-or greater kilovolts (250 feet; 76.2 meters) based on average right-of-way and structure widths.

Infrastructure (communication towers)

This point dataset will be compiled from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) communication towers point file; all duplicate points will be removed. It will be converted to a polygon dataset by using a direct area of influence of 2.47 acres (1.0 ha) centered on each communication tower point (Knick et al. 2011).

Infrastructure (other vertical structures)

This point dataset will be compiled from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Digital Obstacles point file. Points where “Type_” = “WINDMILL” will be removed. Duplicate points from the FCC communication towers point file will be removed. Remaining features will be converted to a polygon dataset using a direct area of influence of 2.47 acres (1.0 ha) centered on each vertical structure point (Knick et al. 2011).

Other developed rights-of-ways

Currently no additional data sources for other rights-of-ways have been identified; roads, power lines, railroads, pipelines, and other known linear features are represented in categories above. Our newly purchased IHS data does contain pipeline information, but further investigation is needed to determine if the dataset is comprehensive. If additional features representing human activities are identified, they will be added to monitoring reports using similar assumptions to the threats above.

Habitat Degradation Threat Combination and Calculation

The threats targeted for measuring human activity from **Table D.2**, will be converted to direct area of influence polygons as described for each threat above. These threat polygon layers will be combined and features dissolved to create one overall polygon layer representing footprints of active human activity in the range of GRSG. However, individual datasets will be preserved to ascertain which types of threats may be contributing to overall habitat degradation. Percentages will be calculated as follows: This measure has been divided into three sub-measures to describe habitat degradation on the landscape:

Measure 2a) Footprint by landscape unit: Divide area of the active/direct footprint within a GRSG area by the total area of the GRSG area. (percent disturbance in landscape unit)

Measure 2b) Active/direct footprint by historic sagebrush potential: Divide area of the active footprint that coincides with areas with historic sagebrush potential (BpS calculation from habitat availability) within a given landscape unit by the total area with sagebrush potential within the landscape unit. (percent disturbance on potential historic sagebrush in landscape unit)

Measure 2c) Active/direct footprint by current sagebrush: Divide area of the active footprint that coincides with areas of existing sagebrush (EVT calculation from habitat availability) within a given landscape unit by the total area that is current sagebrush within the landscape unit. (percent disturbance on current sagebrush in landscape unit)

D.2.2.3 Density of Energy and Mining (Measure 3)

The measure of density of energy and mining will be calculated by combining the locations of threats identified in **Table D.2**. This will provide an estimate of intensity of human activity or intensity of habitat degradation. The number of energy facilities and mining locations will be summed and divided by the area of meaningful landscape units to calculate density of these activities. Data sources for each threat are found in **Table D.6**. Specific assumptions (inclusion criteria for data, width/area assumptions for point and line features, etc.) and methodology for each threat, and the combined measure are detailed below. All datasets will be updated annually to monitor broad and mid-scale year-to-year changes and 5-year (or longer) trends in habitat degradation.

Density of Energy and Mining Datasets and Assumptions:

Energy (oil and gas wells and development facilities)

[See **Section D.2.2.2**]

Energy (coal mines)

[See **Section D.2.2.2**]

Energy (wind towers)

[See **Section D.2.2.2**]

Energy (solar energy facilities)

[See **Section D.2.2.2**]

Energy (geothermal energy facilities)

[See **Section D.2.2.2**]

Mining (active developments; locatable, leasable, saleable)

[See **Section D.2.2.2**]

Density of Energy and Mining Threat Combination and Calculation:

Datasets for energy and mining will be collected in two primary forms: point locations (e.g. wells) and polygon areas (e.g. surface coal mining). The following rule set will be used to calculate density for meaningful landscape units including standard grids and per polygon:

1. Point locations will be preserved; no additional points will be removed beyond the methodology described above. Energy facilities in close proximity (an oil well close to a wind tower) will be retained.
2. Polygons will not be merged, nor features further dissolved. Thus, overlapping facilities will be retained, such that each individual threat will be a separate polygon data input for the density calculation.
3. The analysis unit (polygon or 640 acre section in a grid) will be the basis for counting the number of mining or energy facilities per unit area. Within the analysis unit all point features will be summed, and any individual polygons will be counted as one (e.g.; a coal mine will be counted as one facility within population). Where polygon features overlap multiple units (polygons or pixels), the facility will be counted as one in each unit where the polygon

- occurs (e.g. a polygon crossing multiple 640 acre sections would be counted as one in each 640 acre section for a density per 640 acre section calculation).
4. In methodologies with different sized units (e.g. MZs, populations, etc.) raw counts will be converted to densities by dividing by the total area of the unit. Typically this will be measured as facilities per 640 acres.
 5. For uniform grids, raw facility counts will be reported. Typically this number will also be converted to facilities per 640 acres.
 6. Reporting may include summaries beyond the simple ones above. Zonal statistics may be used to smooth smaller grids to help with display and conveying information about areas within meaningful landscape units that have high energy and/or mining activity.
 7. Additional statistics for each defined unit may also include adjusting the area to only include area with the historic potential for sagebrush (BpS) or areas currently sagebrush (EVT).

Key habitat degradation individual datasets and threat combination datasets will be available through BLM's EGIS Web Portal and Geospatial Gateway. Legacy datasets will be preserved, so that trends may be calculated.

D.2.3 Population (Demographics) Monitoring

State wildlife management agencies are responsible for monitoring GRSG populations within their respective states. WAFWA will coordinate this collection of annual population data by state agencies. These data will be made available to BLM and Forest Service through the Sage-grouse Implementation Memorandum of Understanding (2013) signed by WAFWA, BLM, Forest Service, NRCS, USGS, Farm Service Agency, and USFWS. An amendment to the MOU (2014) will outline a process, timeline, and responsibilities for regular data sharing of GRSG population and/or habitat information. The Landscape Conservation Management and Analysis Portal (LC MAP) will be used as the instrument for state wildlife agencies to annually submit population data and analyses that will be accessed by the BLM through a data sharing agreement. Population areas were refined from the COT report by individual state wildlife agencies to create a consistent naming nomenclature for future data analyses. These population data will be used for analysis at the applicable scale to supplement habitat effectiveness monitoring of management actions and inform the adaptive management responses.

D.2.4 Effectiveness Monitoring

Effectiveness monitoring will provide the information to evaluate BLM and Forest Service actions to reach the objective of the planning strategy (BLM Instruction Memorandum 2012-044), to conserve GRSG populations and its habitat, and the objectives in this Utah Greater Sage-Grouse LUPA/EIS. Effectiveness monitoring methods described here will encompass multiple larger scales, from areas as large as the WAFWA MZ to the scale of this LUP. Effectiveness information used for these larger scale evaluations includes all-lands in the area of interest regardless of surface ownership/ management and will help inform where finer scale evaluations are needed such as population areas smaller than a LUP or PACs within a LUP (described in **Section D.3**). The information will also include the trend of disturbance within these areas of interest which informs the need to initiate adaptive management responses as described in this Utah Greater Sage-Grouse LUPA/EIS.

Effectiveness monitoring reported for these larger areas provides the context to then conduct effectiveness monitoring at finer scales and helps focus scarce resources to areas experiencing habitat

loss, degradation, or population declines. These large area evaluations would not exclude the need for concurrent finer scale evaluations where habitat or population anomalies have been identified through some other means.

To determine the effectiveness of the GRSG planning strategy, the BLM and Forest Service will evaluate the answers to the following questions and prepare a broad and mid-scale effectiveness report:

1. Sagebrush Availability and Condition:
 - a. What is the amount of sagebrush availability and the change in the amount and condition of sagebrush?
 - b. What is the existing amount of sagebrush on the landscape and the change in the amount relative to the pre Euro-American historical distribution of sagebrush (BpS)?
 - c. What is the trend and condition of the indicators describing sagebrush characteristics important to GRSG?
2. Habitat Degradation and Intensity of Activities:
 - a. What is the amount of habitat degradation and the change in that amount?
 - b. What is the intensity of activities and the change in the intensity?
 - c. What is the amount of reclaimed energy-related degradation and the change in the amount?
3. What is the population estimation of GRSG and the change in the population estimation?
4. How are the BLM and Forest Service contributing to changes in the amount of sagebrush?
5. How are the BLM and Forest Service contributing to disturbance?

The compilation of broad and mid-scale data (and population trends as available) into an effectiveness monitoring report will occur on a 5-year reporting schedule, which may be accelerated to respond to critical emerging issues (in consultation with USFWS and state wildlife agencies). In addition, effectiveness monitoring results will be used to identify emerging issues and research needs and will be consistent with and inform the BLM and the Forest Service adaptive management strategy (see “Adaptive Management” section of the EIS).

To determine the effectiveness of the GRSG objectives of this Utah Greater Sage-Grouse LUPA/EIS, the BLM and Forest Service will evaluate the answers to the following questions and prepare a plan effectiveness report:

1. Is this plan meeting the GRSG habitat objectives?
2. Are GRSG areas within the land use plan meeting, or making progress towards meeting, land health standards, including the Special Status Species/ wildlife habitat standard?
3. Is the plan meeting the disturbance objective(s) within GRSG areas?
4. Are the GRSG populations within this plan boundary and within the GRSG areas increasing, stable, or declining?

The effectiveness monitoring report for this LUP will occur on a 5-year reporting schedule (see **Attachment A**) or more often if habitat or population anomalies identify the need for an evaluation to facilitate adaptive management or respond to critical emerging issues. Data will be made available through the BLM's EGIS Web Portal and the Geospatial Gateway.

Methods: At the broad and mid- biological scales (PACs and above) the BLM and the Forest Service will summarize the vegetation, disturbance, and population data (when available). Although the analysis will try to summarize results for PACs within each GRSG population, some populations may be too small to appropriately report the metrics and may need to be combined to provide an estimate with an acceptable level of accuracy or they will be flagged for more intensive monitoring by the appropriate landowner or agency. The BLM and Forest Service will then analyze monitoring data to detect the trend in the amount of sagebrush; the condition of the vegetation in the GRSG areas (MacKinnon et al. 2011); the trend in the amount of disturbance; the change in disturbed areas due to successful restoration; and the amount of new disturbance the BLM or Forest Service has permitted. This information could be supplemented with population data to understand the correlation between habitat and PACs within a population when population data are available. This overall effectiveness evaluation must consider the lag effect response of populations to habitat changes (Garton et al. 2011).

Calculating Question 1, Planning Strategy Effectiveness: The amount of sagebrush available in the large area of interest will utilize the information from Measure 1a (Section B1, Sagebrush Availability) and calculate the change from the 2012 Baseline to the end date of the reporting period. To calculate the change in the amount of sagebrush on the landscape to compare with the historical areas with potential to support sagebrush, the information from Measure 1b (**Section D.2.2.1, Sagebrush Availability**) will be utilized. To calculate the trend in the condition of sagebrush at the mid-scale, three sources of data will be utilized: the BLM Grass/ Shrub mapping effort (**Section D.2.2.1, Future Plans**); the results from the calculation of the landscape indicators such as patch size (described below); and the BLM Landscape Monitoring Framework (LMF) and GRSG intensification effort (also described below). The LMF and GRSG intensification effort data is collected in a statistical sampling framework that allows calculation of indicator values at multiple scales.

Beyond the importance of sagebrush availability to GRSG, the mix of sagebrush patches on the landscape at the broad and mid-scale provides the life requisite of space for GRSG dispersal needs (see the HAF). The configuration of sagebrush habitat patches and the land cover or land use between the habitat patches at the broad and mid-scales also defines suitability. There are three significant habitat indicators that influence habitat use, dispersal and movement across populations: the size and number of habitat patches, the connectivity of habitat patches (linkage areas), and habitat fragmentation (scope of unsuitable and non-habitats between habitat patches). The most appropriate commercial software to measure patch dynamics, connectivity, and fragmentation at the broad and mid-scales will be utilized using the same data layers derived for sagebrush availability.

The BLM initiated the LMF in 2011 in cooperation with NRCS. The objective of the LMF effort is to provide non-biased estimates of vegetation and soil condition and trend using a statistically balanced sample design across BLM lands. Recognizing that GRSG populations are more resilient where the sagebrush plant community has certain characteristics unique to a particular life stage of GRSG (Knick and Connelly 2011; Stiver et al. 2015 *In Press*), a group of GRSG habitat and sagebrush plant community subject matter experts identified those vegetation indicators collected at LMF sampling points that

inform GRSG habitat needs. The experts represented BLM, USFWS, WAFWA, NRCS, ARS, state wildlife agencies, and academia. The common indicators that were identified include: species composition, foliar cover, height of the tallest sagebrush and herbaceous plant, intercanopy gap, percent of invasive species, sagebrush shape, and bare ground. To increase the precision of estimates of sagebrush conditions within the range of GRSG, additional plot locations in occupied GRSG habitat (Sage-grouse Intensification) were added in 2013. The common indicators are also collected on sampling locations in the NRCS Rangeland Monitoring Survey.

The Sage-grouse Intensification baseline data will be collected over a five year period and an annual Sage-grouse Intensification report will be prepared describing the status of the indicators. Beginning in year six, the annual status report will be accompanied with a trend report which will be available on an annual basis thereafter contingent upon continuation of the current monitoring budget. This information, in combination with the Grass/Shrub mapping information, the mid-scale habitat suitability indicator measures, and the sagebrush availability information will be used to answer Question 1 of the Planning Strategy Effectiveness Report.

Calculating Question 2, Planning Strategy Effectiveness: The amount of habitat degradation and the intensity of the activities in the area of interest will utilize the information from Measures 2 and 3 (**Section D.2.2.2, Habitat Degradation**). The amount of reclaimed energy-related degradation will be collected by the FO on plugged and abandoned and oil/gas well sites. The data will demonstrate that the reclaimed sites have yet to meet the habitat restoration objectives for GRSG habitat. This information, in combination with the amount of habitat degradation, will be used to answer Question 2 of the Planning Strategy Effectiveness Report.

Calculating Question 3, Planning Strategy Effectiveness: The change in GRSG estimated populations will be calculated from data provided by the state wildlife agencies, when available. This population data (**Section D.2.3, Population (Demographics) Monitoring**) will be used to answer Question 3 of the Planning Strategy Effectiveness Report.

Calculating Question 4, Planning Strategy Effectiveness: The estimated contribution by the BLM or the Forest Service to the change in the amount of sagebrush in the area of interest will utilize the information from Measure 1a (**Section D.2.2.1, Sagebrush Availability**). This measure is derived from the national data sets that remove sagebrush (**Table D.2**). To determine the relative contribution of the BLM and Forest Service management, the current Surface Management Agency geospatial data layer will be used to differentiate the amount of change for each management agency for this measure in area of interest. This information will be used to answer Question 4 of the Planning Strategy Effectiveness Report.

Calculating Question 5, Planning Strategy Effectiveness: The estimated contribution by the BLM or the Forest Service to the change in the amount of disturbance in the area of interest will utilize the information from Measure 2a (**Section D.2.2.2, Habitat Degradation, Percent**) and Measure 3 **Section D.2.2.2, Habitat Degradation, Intensity**). These measures are all derived from the national disturbance data sets that degrade habitat (**Table D.2**). To determine the relative contribution of the BLM and Forest Service management, the current Surface Management Agency geospatial data layer will be used to differentiate the amount of change for each management agency for these two measures in area of interests. This information will be used to answer Question 5 of the Planning Strategy Effectiveness Report.

Answering the five questions that determine the effectiveness of the BLM and Forest Service Planning Strategy will identify areas that appear to be meeting the objectives of the strategy and will facilitate identification of population areas for more detailed analysis. Conceptually, if the broad scale monitoring identifies increasing sagebrush availability and improving vegetation conditions, decreasing disturbance, and a stable or increasing population for the area of interest, there is evidence the objectives of the Planning Strategy to maintain populations and their habitats have been met. Conversely, where information indicates sagebrush is decreasing and vegetation conditions are degrading, disturbance in GRSG areas is increasing, and populations are declining relative to the baseline, there is evidence the objectives of the Planning Strategy are not being achieved. This would likely result in a more detailed analysis and could be the basis for implementing more restrictive adaptive management measures.

At the Land Use Plan area, the BLM and the Forest Service will summarize the vegetation, disturbance, and population data to determine if the LUP is meeting the plan objectives. Effectiveness information used for these evaluations includes BLM and Forest Service surface management areas and will help inform where finer scale evaluations are needed such as seasonal habitats, corridors, or linkage areas. The information should also include the trend of disturbance within the GRSG areas which informs the need to initiate adaptive management responses as described in this Utah Greater Sage-Grouse LUPA/EIS.

Calculating Question 1, Land Use Plan Effectiveness: The condition of vegetation and the allotments meeting Land Health Standards in GRSG areas will both be used as part of the determination of the effectiveness of the LUP in meeting the vegetation objectives in GRSG habitat set forth in this LUP. The collection of this data will be the responsibility of the Field Office/Ranger District. In order for this data to be consistent and comparable, common indicators, consistent methods, and a nonbiased sampling framework should be implemented following the principles in the AIM Strategy (Toevs et al. 2011; BLM TN 440 BLM Core Indicators and Methods), in the BLM Technical Reference Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health (Pellant et al. 2005), and the HAF (Stiver et al. 2015 *In Press*) or other approved WAFWA MZ consistent guidance to measure and monitor GRSG habitats. The analysis of this information will be used to answer Question 1 of the Land Use Plan Effectiveness Report.

Calculating Question 2, Land Use Plan Effectiveness: The amount of habitat disturbance in GRSG areas identified in this LUP will be used as part of the determination of the effectiveness of the LUP in meeting the disturbance objectives set forth in this LUP. National data sets can be used to calculate the amount of disturbance, but Field Office data will likely increase the accuracy of this estimate. This information will be used to answer Question 2 of the Land Use Plan Effectiveness Report.

Calculating Question 3, Land Use Plan Effectiveness: The change in estimated GRSG populations will be calculated from data provided by the state wildlife agencies, when available and will part of the determination of effectiveness. This population data (**Section D.2.3**) will be used to answer Question 3 of the Land Use Plan Effectiveness Report.

Results of the effectiveness monitoring process for the land use plan will be used to inform the need for finer scales investigations, initiate Adaptive Management actions as described in **Appendix I**, initiate causation determination, and/ or determine if changes to management decisions are warranted. The measures used at the broad and mid-scales will provide a suite of characteristics from which the effectiveness of the adaptive management strategy will be evaluated.

D.3 FINE AND SITE SCALES

Fine scale (third order) habitat selected by GRSG is described as the physical and geographic area within home ranges including breeding, summer, and winter periods. At this level, habitat suitability monitoring should address factors that affect GRSG use of, and movements between, seasonal use areas. The habitat monitoring at fine and site scale (fourth order) should focus on indicators to describe seasonal home ranges for GRSG associated with a lek, or lek group within a population or subpopulation area. Fine and site scale monitoring should inform LUP effectiveness monitoring (see **Section D.2.4**) and the hard and soft triggers identified in the Adaptive Management section of the land use plan.

Site-scale habitat selected by GRSG is described as the more detailed vegetation characteristics of seasonal habitats. Habitat suitability characteristics include canopy cover and height of sagebrush and the associated understory vegetation as well as vegetation associated with riparian areas, wet meadows, and other mesic habitats adjacent to sagebrush that may support GRSG habitat needs during different stages in their annual cycle.

As described in the Conclusion (**Section D.4**), details and application of monitoring at the fine and site scales will be described in the implementation-level monitoring plan of the Utah Greater Sage-Grouse LUPA/EIS. The need for fine and site-scale specific habitat monitoring will vary by area depending on proposed projects, existing conditions, habitat variability, threats, and land health. Examples of fine and site-scale monitoring include: habitat vegetation monitoring to assess current habitat conditions; monitoring and evaluating the success of projects targeting GRSG habitat enhancement and/or restoration; and habitat disturbance monitoring to provide localized disturbance measures to inform proposed project review and potential mitigation for project impacts. Monitoring plans should incorporate the principles outlined in the BLM AIM Strategy (Toevs et al. 2011) and AIM-Monitoring: A Component of the Assessment, Inventory, and Monitoring Strategy (Taylor et al. *in press*). Approved monitoring methods are:

- BLM Core Terrestrial Indicators and Methods, (MacKinnon et al. 2011)
- BLM Technical Reference Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health (Pellant et al. 2005); and
- Sage-Grouse HAF.

Other state-specific disturbance tracking models include: the BLM Wyoming Density and Disturbance Calculation Tool⁵; and the BLM White River Data Management System (WRDMS) in development with the USGS. Population monitoring data (in cooperation with state wildlife agencies) should be included during evaluation of the effectiveness of actions taken at the fine and site scales.

Fine and site scale GRSG habitat suitability indicators for seasonal habitats are identified in the HAF. The HAF has incorporated the Connelly et al. (2000) GRSG guidelines as well as many of the core indicators in the assessment, inventory and monitoring (AIM) strategy (Toevs et al. 2011). There may be a need to develop adjustments to height and cover or other site suitability values described in the HAF and any such adjustments should be ecologically defensible. However, to foster consistency, adjustments to site suitability values at the local scale should be avoided unless there is strong, scientific justification for

⁵ <http://ddct.wygisc.org/>

doing so and that justification should be provided. WAFWA MZ adjustments must be supported by regional plant productivity and habitat data for the floristic province. If adjustments are made to the site scale indicators they must be made using data from the appropriate seasonal habitat designation (breeding/nesting, brood-rearing, winter) collected from GRSG studies found in the relevant area and peer reviewed by the appropriate wildlife management agency(s) and researchers.

When conducting land health assessments, at a minimum, the BLM should follow Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health (Pellant et al. 2005) and the BLM Core Terrestrial Indicators and Methods, (MacKinnon et al. 2011). If the assessment is being conducted in GRSG areas, the BLM should collect additional data to inform the HAF indicators that have not been collected using the above methods. Implementation of the principles outlined in the AIM strategy will allow the data to be used to generate unbiased estimates of condition across the area of interest; facilitate consistent data collection and roll-up analysis among management units; will be useful to provide consistent data to inform the classification and interpretation of imagery; and will provide condition and trend of the indicators describing sagebrush characteristics important to GRSG habitat (see **Section D.2.4**).

D.4 CONCLUSION

This Greater Sage-grouse Monitoring Framework was developed for all of the Final Environmental Impact Statements involved in the GRSG planning effort. As such, it describes the monitoring activities at the broad and mid-scales and sets the stage for BLM and Forest Service to collaborate with partners/other agencies to develop the Utah Greater Sage-Grouse LUPA/EIS Monitoring Plan using this Greater Sage-grouse Monitoring Framework as a guide.

D.5 THE GREATER SAGE-GROUSE DISTURBANCE AND MONITORING SUB-TEAM MEMBERSHIP

Gordon Toevs (BLM -WO)	Robin Sell (BLM-CO)
Duane Dippon (BLM-WO)	Paul Makela (BLM-ID)
Frank Quamen (BLM-NOC)	Renee Chi (BLM-UT)
David Wood (BLM-NOC)	Sandra Brewer (BLM-NV)
Vicki Herren (BLM-NOC)	Glenn Frederick (BLM-OR)
Matt Bobo (BLM-NOC)	Robert Skorkowsky (Forest Service)
Michael “Sherm” Karl (BLM-NOC)	Dalinda Damm (Forest Service)
Emily Kachergis (BLM-NOC)	Rob Mickelsen (Forest Service)
Doug Havlina (BLM-NIFC)	Tim Love (Forest Service)
Mike Pellant (BLM-GBRI)	Pam Bode (Forest Service)
John Carlson (BLM-MT)	Lief Wiechman (USFWS)
Jenny Morton (BLM -WY)	Lara Juliusson (USFWS)

D.6 LITERATURE CITED

- Baruch-Mordo, S., J. S. Evans, J. P. Severson, D. E. Naugle, J. D. Maestas, J. M. Kiesecker, M. J. Falkowski, C. A. Hagen, and K. P. Reese. 2013. Saving sage-grouse from the trees: a proactive solution to reducing a key threat to a candidate species. *Biological Conservation* 167:233-241.
- Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines to manage Sage Grouse populations and their habitats. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 28:967-985.
- Connelly, J. W., K. P. Reese, and M. A. Schroeder. 2003. Monitoring of Greater Sage-grouse habitats and populations. University of Idaho Station College of Natural Resources Experiment Station Bulletin 80. University of Idaho, Moscow, ID.
- Connelly, J. W., S. T. Knick, M. A. Schroeder, and S. J. Stiver. 2004. Conservation assessment of greater sage-grouse and sagebrush habitats. Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, unpublished report, Cheyenne, Wyoming, USA. http://sagemap.wr.usgs.gov/docs/Greater_Sage-grouse_Conservation_Assessment_060404.pdf.
- Davies, K. W., C. S. Boyd, J. L. Beck, J. D. Bates, T. J. Svejcar, and M. A. Gregg. 2011. Saving the sagebrush sea: an ecosystem conservation plan for big sagebrush plant communities. *Biological Conservation* 144:2573-2584.
- Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; 12-month findings for petitions to list the greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) as threatened or endangered. Proposed Rule. 75 Fed. Reg. 13910 (March 23, 2010).
- Fry, J., G. Xian, S. Jin, J. Dewitz, C. Homer, L. Yang, C. Barnes, N. Herold, and I. Wickham. 2011. Completion of the 2006 National Land Cover Database for the Conterminous United States, PE&RS, Vol. 77(9):858-864.
- Garton, E. O., J. W. Connelly, J. S. Horne, C. A. Hagen, A. Moser, and M. Schroeder. 2011. Greater sage-grouse population dynamics and probability of persistence. Pp. 293 – 382 in S.T. Knick and J.W. Connelly (editors). *Greater Sage-Grouse: ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats*. Studies in Avian biology (vol. 38). University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Grove, A. J., C. L. Wambolt, and M. R. Frisina. 2005. Douglas-fir's effect on mountain big sagebrush wildlife habitats. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 33:74-80.
- Gruell, G. E., J. K. Brown, and C. L. Bushey. 1986. Prescribed fire opportunities in grasslands invaded by Douglas-fir: state-of-the-art guidelines. General Technical Report INT-198. US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Ogden, UT. 19 p.
- Harju, S. M., M. R. Dzialak, R. C. Taylor, L. D. Hayden-Wing, and J. B. Winstead. 2010. Thresholds and time lags in effects of energy development on Greater Sage-Grouse populations. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 74:437-448.

- Hemstrom, M. A., M. J. Wisdom, M. M. Rowland, B. Wales, W. J. Hann, and R. A. Gravenmier. 2002. Sagebrush-steppe vegetation dynamics and potential for restoration in the Interior Columbia Basin, USA. *Conservation Biology* 16:1243-1255.
- Homer, C. G., C. L. Aldridge, D. K. Meyer, M. J. Coan, and Z. H. Bowen. 2009. Multiscale sagebrush rangeland habitat modeling in southwest Wyoming: US Geological Survey Open-File Report 2008–1027, 14 p.
- Johnson, D. H. 1980. The comparison of usage and availability measurements for evaluating resource preference. *Ecology* 61:65-71.
- Knick, S. T., and J. W. Connelly (editors). 2011. Greater Sage-Grouse: ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats. *Studies in Avian Biology Series* (vol. 38), University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.
- Knick, S. T., and S. E. Hanser. 2011. Connecting pattern and process in greater sage-grouse populations and sagebrush landscapes, pages 383-405 in: Knick, S.T. and J.W. Connelly (editors), Greater sage-grouse: ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats. *Studies in Avian Biology* No. 38. Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, CA. 646 p.
- Knick, S. T., S. E. Hanser, R. F. Miller, D. A. Pyke, M. J. Wisdom, S. P. Finn, E. T. Rinkes, and C. J. Henny. 2011. Ecological influence and pathways of land use in sagebrush, pages 203-251 in: Knick, S.T. and J.W. Connelly (editors), Greater sage-grouse: ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats. *Studies in Avian Biology* No. 38. Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, CA. 646 p.
- LANDFIRE. 2006. National existing vegetation type layer. USDI Geological Survey. <http://gisdata.usgs.net/website/lanfire/> (21 August 2009).
- Leu, M., and S. E. Hanser. 2011. Influences of the human footprint on sagebrush landscape patterns: implications for sage-grouse conservation, pages 253-271 in: Knick, S. T. and J. W. Connelly (editors), Greater sage-grouse: ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats. *Studies in Avian Biology* No. 38, Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, CA. 646 p.
- MacKinnon, W. C., J. W. Karl, G. R. Toevs, J. J. Taylor, M. Karl, C. S. Spurrier, and J. E. Herrick. 2011. BLM core terrestrial indicators and methods. Tech Note 440. US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, National Operations Center, Denver, CO.
- Manier, D. J., D. J. A Wood, Z. H. Bowen, R. M. Donovan, M. J. Holloran, L. M. Juliusson, K. S. Mayne, S. J. Oyler-McCance, F. R. Quamen, D. J. Saher, and A. J. Titolo 2013. Summary of science, activities, programs, and policies that influence the rangewide conservation of greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*): US Geological Survey Open-File Report 2013–1098, 170 pp.
- NatureServe. 2011. International Ecological Classification Standard: Terrestrial Ecological Classifications. NatureServe Central Databases. Arlington, VA, USA. Data current as of 31 July 2011.

- Pellant, M., P. Shaver, D. A. Pyke, and J. E. Herrick. 2005. Interpreting indicators of rangeland health, version 4. Technical Reference 1734-6. US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, National Science and Technology Center, Denver, CO. BLM/WO/ST-00/001+1734/REV05. 122 pp.
- Pyke, D. A. 2011. Restoring and rehabilitating sagebrush habitats. Pp. 531-548 in S. T. Knick and J. W. Connelly (editors). Greater sage-grouse: ecology and conservation of a landscape species and its habitats. Studies in Avian Biology 38. University of California Press. Berkeley, CA.
- Schroeder, M. A., C. L. Aldridge, A. D. Apa, J. R. Bohne, C. E. Braun, S. D. Bunnell, J. W. Connelly, P. A. Deibert, S. C. Gardner, M. A. Hilliard, G. D. Kobriger, S. M. McAdam, C. W. McCarthy, J. J. McCarthy, D. L. Mitchell, E. V. Rickerson, and S. J. Stiver. 2004. Distribution of sage-grouse in North America. *Condor* 106: 363-376.
- Stiver, S. J., A. D. Apa, J. R. Bohne, S. D. Bunnell, P. A. Deibert, S. C. Gardner, M. A. Hilliard, C. W. McCarthy, and M. A. Schroeder. 2006. Greater sage-grouse comprehensive conservation strategy. Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. Unpublished report. Cheyenne, WY, USA. <http://www.wafwa.org/documents/pdf/GreaterSage-grouseConservationStrategy2006.pdf>
- Stiver, S. J., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance, and J. W. Karl. 2015. In Press. Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework: A Multi-scale Habitat Assessment Tool. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Technical Reference 6710-1. US Bureau of Land Management, Denver, Colorado.
- Taylor, J., E. J. Kachergis, G. Toevs, J. Karl, M. Bobo, M. Karl, S. Miller, and C. Spurrier. *In press*. AIM-Monitoring: A Component of the Assessment, Inventory, and Monitoring Strategy. US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, National Operations Center, Denver, CO.
- Toevs, G. R., J. J. Taylor, C. S. Spurrier, W. C. MacKinnon, M. R. Bobo. 2011. Bureau of Land Management Assessment, Inventory, and Monitoring Strategy: for integrated renewable resources management. US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, National Operations Center, Denver, CO.
- USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service Cropland Data Layer. {YEAR}. Published crop-specific data layer [Online]. Available at <http://nassgeodata.gmu.edu/CropScape/> (accessed {DATE}; verified {DATE}). USDA-NASS, Washington, DC.
- USFWS (United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service). 2013. Greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) conservation objectives: final report. US Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, CO.
- US Department of the Interior. 2004. Bureau of Land Management national sage-grouse habitat conservation strategy. US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Washington, DC.

United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. 2011. BLM Memorandum of Understanding Washington Office 220-2011-02. BLM Washington Office, Washington, DC.

United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. 2013. Greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) conservation objectives: final report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, CO.

ATTACHMENT A: AN OVERVIEW OF MONITORING COMMITMENTS

	Broad and Mid-scales					Fine & Site Scales
	Implementation	Sagebrush Availability	Habitat Degradation	Population	Effectiveness	
<i>How will the data be used?</i>	Tracking and documenting implementation of land use plan decisions and inform adaptive management	Tracking changes in land cover (sagebrush) and inform adaptive management	Tracking changes in disturbance (threats) to GRSG habitat and inform adaptive management	Tracking trends in GRSG populations (and/or leks; as determined by state wildlife agencies) and inform adaptive management	Characterizing the relationship among disturbance, implementation actions, and sagebrush metrics and inform adaptive management	Measuring seasonal habitat, connectivity at the fine scale, and habitat conditions at the site scale, calculating disturbance and inform adaptive management
<i>Who is collecting the data?</i>	BLM FO and Forest Service Forest	NOC and NIFC	National data sets (NOC), BLM FOs and Forest Service Forests as applicable	State wildlife agencies through WAFWA	Comes from other broad and mid-scale monitoring types, analyzed by the NOC	BLM FO and SO, Forest Service Forests and RO (with partners) including disturbance
<i>How often are the data collected, reported and made available to USFWS?</i>	Collected and reported annually; summary every 5 years	Updated and changes reported annually; summary reports every 5 years	Collected and changes reported annually; summary reports every 5 years	State data reported annually per WAFWA MOU; summary reports every 5 years	Collected and reported every 5 years (coincident with LUP evaluations)	Collection and trend analysis ongoing, reported every 5 years or as needed to inform adaptive management
<i>What is the spatial scale?</i>	Summarized by LUP with flexibility for reporting by other units	Summarized by PACs (size dependent) with flexibility for reporting by other units	Summarized by PACs (size dependent) with flexibility for reporting by other units	Summarized by PACs (size dependent) with flexibility for reporting by other units	Summarized by MZ, and LUP with flexibility for reporting by other units (e.g., PAC)	Variable (e.g., projects and seasonal habitats)
<i>What are the potential personnel and budget impacts?</i>	Additional capacity or re-prioritization of ongoing monitoring work and budget realignment	At a minimum, current skills and capacity must be maintained; data mgmt cost are TBD	At a minimum, current skills and capacity must be maintained; data mgmt and data layer purchase cost are TBD	No additional personnel or budget impacts for BLM or Forest Service	Additional capacity or re-prioritization of ongoing monitoring work and budget realignment	Additional capacity or re-prioritization of ongoing monitoring work and budget realignment
<i>Who has primary and secondary responsibilities for reporting?</i>	BLM FO & SO; Forest Service Forest & RO BLM & Forest Service Planning	NOC WO	NOC BLM SO, Forest Service RO & appropriate programs	WAFWA & state wildlife agencies BLM SO, Forest Service RO, NOC	Broad and mid-scale at the NOC, LUP at BLM SO, Forest Service RO	BLM FO & Forest Service Forests BLM SO & Forest Service RO
<i>What new processes/tools are needed?</i>	National implementation data sets and analysis tools	Updates to national land cover data	Data standards and roll-up methods for these data	Standards in population monitoring (WAFWA)	Reporting methodologies	Data standards data storage; and reporting

ATTACHMENT B: LIST OF ALL SAGEBRUSH SPECIES AND SUBSPECIES INCLUDED IN THE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR BUILDING THE EVT AND BPS LAYERS

- *Artemisia arbuscula* subspecies *longicaulis*
- *Artemisia arbuscula* subspecies *longiloba*
- *Artemisia bigelovii*
- *Artemisia nova*
- *Artemisia papposa*
- *Artemisia pygmaea*
- *Artemisia rigida*
- *Artemisia spinescens*
- *Artemisia tripartita* subspecies *rupicola*
- *Artemisia tripartita* subspecies *tripartita*
- *Tanacetum nuttallii*
- *Artemisia cana* subspecies *bolanderi*
- *Artemisia cana* subspecies *cana*
- *Artemisia cana* subspecies *viscidula*
- *Artemisia tridentata* subspecies *wyomingensis*
- *Artemisia tridentata* subspecies *tridentata*
- *Artemisia tridentata* subspecies *vaseyana*
- *Artemisia tridentata* subspecies *spiciformis*
- *Artemisia tridentata* subspecies *xericensis*
- *Artemisia tridentata* variety *pauciflora*
- *Artemisia frigida*
- *Artemisia pedatifida*

ATTACHMENT C: USER AND PRODUCER ACCURACIES FOR AGGREGATED ECOLOGICAL SYSTEMS WITHIN LANDFIRE MAP ZONES

LANDFIRE Map Zone Name	User Accuracy	Producer Accuracy	% of Map Zone within Historic Schroeder
Wyoming Basin	76.9%	90.9%	98.5%
Snake River Plain	68.8%	85.2%	98.4%
Missouri River Plateau	57.7%	100.0%	91.3%
Grand Coulee Basin of the Columbia Plateau	80.0%	80.0%	89.3%
Wyoming Highlands	75.3%	85.9%	88.1%
Western Great Basin	69.3%	75.4%	72.9%
Blue Mountain Region of the Columbia Plateau	85.7%	88.7%	72.7%
Eastern Great Basin	62.7%	80.0%	62.8%
Northwestern Great Plains	76.5%	92.9%	46.3%
Northern Rocky Mountains	72.5%	89.2%	42.5%
Utah High Plateaus	81.8%	78.3%	41.5%
Colorado Plateau	65.3%	76.2%	28.8%
Middle Rocky Mountains	78.6%	73.3%	26.4%
Cascade Mountain Range	57.1%	88.9%	17.3%
Sierra Nevada Mountain Range	0.0%	0.0%	12.3%
Northwestern Rocky Mountains	66.7%	60.0%	7.3%
Southern Rocky Mountains	58.6%	56.7%	7.0%
Northern Cascades	75.0%	75.0%	2.6%
Mogollon Rim	66.7%	100.0%	1.7%
Death Valley Basin	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%

There are two anomalous map zones with 0 percent user and producer accuracies attributable to no available reference data for the ecological systems of interest.

Producer's accuracy is a reference-based accuracy that is computed by looking at the predictions produced for a class and determining the percentage of correct predictions. In other words, if I know that a particular area is sagebrush (I've been out on the ground to check), what is the probability that the digital map will correctly identify that pixel as sagebrush? **Omission Error** equates to excluding a pixel that should have been included in the class (i.e., omission error = 1 - producer's accuracy).

User's accuracy is a map-based accuracy that is computed by looking at the reference data for a class and determining the percentage of correct predictions for these samples. For example, if I select any sagebrush pixel on the classified map, what is the probability that I'll be standing in a sagebrush stand when I visit that pixel location in the field? **Commission Error** equates to including a pixel in a class when it should have been excluded (i.e., commission error = 1 - user's accuracy).