

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

November 16, 2004

In Reply Refer To:  
6500 (WO-230) P

EMS TRANSMISSION 11/16/2004  
Instruction Memorandum No. 2005-024  
Expires: 09/30/2006

**To:** AFO and WO Officials

**From:** Director

**Subject:** National Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy

**Program Areas:** Multiple programs

**Purposes:** Issuance of Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy (National Sage-grouse Strategy) and required action items: (1) guidance for addressing sagebrush habitat conservation in land use plans under action item 1.3.1 in the National Sage-grouse Strategy, and (2) guidance for the management of sagebrush plant communities for sage-grouse conservation under action item 1.4.1 in the National Sage-grouse Strategy.

**Policy/Action:** Issuance of BLM's National Sage-grouse Strategy. As part of BLM's ongoing commitment to support cooperative conservation of sage-grouse and sagebrush habitats on public lands under our administration, we have completed and are issuing for immediate use, a comprehensive national strategy. BLM State Directors and associated Field Offices will immediately implement the National Sage-grouse Strategy and actions described in this memorandum according to the specified time frame. The National Sage-grouse Strategy is consistent with cooperative sage-grouse conservation planning efforts led by the states through their respective state wildlife management agencies and fully recognizes state leadership and responsibility in managing resident wildlife species.

**Background:** The BLM manages more sage-grouse habitat than any other entity and as a result has a key role in the conservation of the species and its habitat. Approximately half of all remaining sage-grouse habitat is under BLM administration. It is critical we continue with our ongoing conservation efforts. The BLM must also continue to implement new actions to reduce the risk to sage-grouse populations and to conserve sage-grouse habitat. One of BLM's highest priorities is to implement the National Sage-grouse Strategy on BLM-managed lands and related conservation actions in a consistent and effective manner. All State Directors and Field Managers will note their areas of responsibility in the National Sage-grouse Strategy and take appropriate actions to ensure immediate implementation.

**National Sage-grouse Strategy:** The National Sage-grouse Strategy is the framework to address the conservation of sage-grouse and risk to sagebrush habitats on lands and activities administered by the BLM. The document identifies the resources and actions to be included in individual BLM State Office strategies and/or plans and outlines methods to address the risk to sage-grouse and sagebrush habitats at various scales. The Strategy provides for a comprehensive national approach, while providing for local solutions to address the range-wide variability and complexity of managing sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat. The National Sage-grouse Strategy also addresses the essential need to work with state wildlife agencies, state governments, and local interests, while achieving national level conservation goals. BLM's National Sage-grouse Strategy is designed to deliver a substantial Federal contribution to cooperative conservation efforts that are being led by state wildlife agencies throughout the range of greater sage-grouse in the West.

The vision of the BLM's National Sage-grouse Strategy is to manage public lands to maintain, enhance, and restore sage-

grouse habitats while providing for other appropriate uses of BLM-administered public lands.

The following four goals guide BLM's implementation of the National Sage-grouse Strategy:

- 1) improve the effectiveness of the management framework for addressing conservation needs of sage-grouse on lands administered by the BLM;
- 2) increase knowledge and understanding of resource conditions and priorities for habitat maintenance and restoration;
- 3) expand partnerships, available research, and information that support effective management of sage-grouse habitat, and;
- 4) ensure leadership and resources are adequate to implement national and state- level sage-grouse habitat conservation strategies and/or plans.

**Guidance for Addressing Sagebrush Habitat Conservation in Land Use Plans:** This document is action 1.3.1 under the National Sage-grouse Strategy and is mandatory guidance to BLM planning teams. It requires that impacts to sagebrush habitat and sagebrush-dependent wildlife species (including sage-grouse) be analyzed and considered in BLM land use planning efforts for the public lands with sage-grouse/sagebrush habitats located within the planning area. Planning teams will use this guidance in planning areas with sage-grouse habitat for land use planning efforts in progress (to the fullest extent practicable), new planning starts, and plan amendments. This land use plan guidance may be supplemented, as appropriate, with additional information from completed state or local-level sage-grouse strategies or plans.

**Guidance for the Management of Sagebrush Plant Communities for Sage-grouse Conservation:** This document is action 1.4.1 under the National Sage-grouse Strategy and serves as guidance on managing, restoring and enhancing sagebrush habitat on BLM-administered public lands. It also describes management practices (Best Management Practices and Suggested Management Practices) designed to support and promote the range-wide conservation of sagebrush habitats for sage-grouse and other sagebrush-dependent wildlife species on public lands administered by the BLM. BLM State Offices and associated Field Offices are to use this guidance until the Bureau and its partners (1) finalize and adopt the BLM State Office level strategies and/or state wildlife agency-led sage-grouse conservation plans; and/or (2) incorporate specific sage-grouse habitat objectives and conservation measures, developed collaboratively with local Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) groups, into appropriate BLM planning documents. This guidance may be modified through the collaborative process in each state to best fit local and regional conditions and to reflect ongoing efforts to complete state-level strategies.

#### **Actions:**

1. In cooperation with State Wildlife Agencies, review all existing land use plans to determine the adequacy in addressing the threats to sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat as identified in the WAFWA Conservation Assessment. This will include land use allocations, land health and condition objectives, and mitigations for all program activities.
2. Identify and prioritize land use plan amendments or land use plan revisions based upon the outcome of action item number 1 and the level of threats to sage-grouse. A report outlining which BLM plans and programs within the state(s) need updating, and which plans are adequate must be submitted to the Director by February 1, 2005. Each State Director must, by April 1, 2005, develop a process and schedule to update deficient land use plans to adequately address sage-grouse and sagebrush conservation needs. Schedules developed by the State Directors will be incorporated into the BLM 10-year planning schedule by the end of April 2005 in order to emphasize and accelerate these plans as a Bureau-wide priority.
3. Issues and alternatives evaluated in the NEPA process for land use plan updates, amendments or revisions must analyze threats identified in the WAFWA Conservation Assessment (see the attached Planning Guidance 1.3.1). The goal is to have all plans updated by 2015.
4. Initiate collaborative discussions and dialogue with the local WAFWA working groups and other partners to develop objectives, management actions, and mitigation specific to the high priority planning area(s) in your state(s). Include the best available science (e.g. Miller and Eddleman, Connelly guidelines, Birds of the Sagebrush Sea, etc.), Best Management Practices, locally available data, and other guidelines and information appropriate to sage-grouse and its

habitat.

5. An annual report detailing actions taken to implement the BLM National Sage-grouse Strategy shall be submitted to the Assistant Director (WO-200) by September 1 of 2005, 2006 and 2007. Most importantly, we want to know how the specific actions you are taking are improving sage-grouse habitat and/or sage-grouse populations.

**Time Frame:** This IM is in effect upon issuance.

**Budget Impact:** There will be a budget impact to most BLM programs because of increased emphasis on the analysis of sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat conservation in land use plans, on-the-ground conservation initiated through plan implementation, and higher priority project planning and implementation actions. Budget development issues for the budget out-years will be assessed and developed.

**Manual/Handbook Sections Affected:** None

**Coordination:** This IM reflects the input of individuals in different resource groups at all levels of the Bureau. The Fish, Wildlife and Botany Group (WO-230) has the lead for the effort.

**Contact:** E. Dwight Fielder, Group Manager, WO-230, at (202) 452-7761, Cal McCluskey, Wildlife Biologist, at (208) 373-4042, Eric Lawton, Wildlife Biologist, at (202) 452-7760, or Scott Florence, Senior Planner (for planning guidance only) at (202) 452-5151.

Signed by:  
Kathleen Clarke  
Director

Authenticated by:  
Barbara J. Brown  
Policy & Records Group, WO-560

### 3 Attachments

- [1 - BLM National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy \(25 pp\)](#)
- [2 - Guidance for Addressing Sagebrush Habitat Conservation in Land Use Plans \(10 pp\)](#)
- [3 - Guidance for the Management of Sagebrush Plant Communities for Sage-grouse Conservation \(33 pp\)](#)

**Bureau of Land Management**  
**National Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy**

**U.S. Department of the Interior**

**November 2004**

**Bureau of Land Management**  
**National Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Purpose	4
III.	Other Sage-Grouse Related Programs, Initiatives and Efforts	5
IV.	Overview of Sage-Grouse; Population and Life History and Threats to Sage-Grouse Habitat	6
V.	Guiding Principles	7
VI.	Vision, Goals, Strategies and Actions	9
VII.	Progress Reporting	16
VIII.	Authorities and Responsibilities	16
IX.	Literature Relevant to the BLM Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy	20

## I. Introduction

BLM developed this National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy (National Sage-grouse Strategy) to guide future actions for conserving sage-grouse and associated sagebrush habitats and to enhance BLM's ongoing conservation efforts. The National Sage-grouse Strategy provides a framework for future conservation efforts by setting out broad goals and specific actions to meet the goals. For each action that BLM will take, the National Sage-grouse Strategy explains what the action is, when the action will be taken and who will be the responsible official or office for completing the action. Integral to the National Sage-grouse Strategy are various guidance documents that will help BLM ensure that it successfully incorporates sage-grouse conservation measures into all of its ongoing programs and activities, including land use planning, grazing and mineral leasing, and other programs.

BLM designed this National Sage-grouse Strategy around four main goals. Associated with each goal are specific strategies and actions that BLM will undertake to meet the goal. The four goals are:

- 1) Improve the effectiveness of the management framework for addressing conservation needs of sage-grouse on lands administered by the BLM.
- 2) Increase understanding of resource conditions in order to prioritize habitat maintenance and restoration.
- 3) Expand partnerships, available research and information that support effective management of sage-grouse habitat.
- 4) Ensure leadership and resources are adequate to continue ongoing conservation efforts and implement national and state-level sage-grouse habitat conservation strategies and/or plans.

BLM is not a newcomer to sage-grouse conservation. As the land manager of almost half of the remaining sagebrush habitat, BLM plays a key role in conserving sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat. BLM has been taking actions for years on its own and as an active partner in state and local led efforts that have benefited the species and associated habitats. For example, in July 2000, BLM signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA), the U.S. Forest Service (FS), and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) that provided for state and local cooperation to coordinate planning, habitat and population mapping, and evaluation and restoration of sage-grouse populations. However, conservation of sage-grouse habitat is complex. Effective conservation strategies must occur at a variety of scales, with a variety of partners (state, local and tribal governments), and be integrated into the daily activities of the BLM land management mission. Conservation of sage-grouse requires national level policy, national and local program commitment, and local and regional knowledge and support.

Sections I through IV contain background information about sage-grouse population and life history, habitat requirements, and threats or risks potentially affecting the species. The information comes from a large body of published scientific literature, which is provided in Section IX. Sections V through VII detail the guiding principles, goals, strategies, and actions that provide the fundamental themes and guidance for preparing and implementing national and

state-level strategies. Additional information on progress reporting and a list of major authorities used by the BLM in carrying out conservation efforts are provided in Sections VIII-IX.

## **II. Purpose**

The purpose of this comprehensive National Sage-grouse Strategy is to set goals and objectives, assemble guidance and resource materials, and provide a comprehensive management direction for the BLM's contributions to the on-going multi-state sage-grouse conservation effort in cooperation with the WAFWA.

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (1976) (FLPMA) provides the basic authority for BLM's multiple use management of all resources on the public lands. One of the BLM's many responsibilities under FLPMA is to manage public lands for the benefit of wildlife species and the ecosystems upon which they depend. However, habitat management is one of many provisions of the multiple-use mandate outlined in FLPMA. Because conserving sagebrush habitats involves managing many other public land uses, this National Sage-grouse Strategy includes guidance and existing regulations for a variety of BLM-administered programs. FLPMA gave BLM the legal authority and mandate to manage and regulate the uses on the public lands "so that their various resource values are utilized in a combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people" (Section 103 (c)). Consistency and coordination in identifying and addressing threats to sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat in context of the multitude of programs that BLM manages is required. Addressing these threats throughout the range of the sage-grouse is critical to achieving the mandate of FLPMA and threat reduction, mitigation, and elimination to sage-grouse and sagebrush habitats.

In July 2000, WAFWA, FS, FWS and BLM signed an MOU that provides for Federal, state and local cooperation to coordinate planning, habitat and population mapping, and evaluation and restoration of sage-grouse populations. In July 2002, WAFWA agreed to develop a Conservation Assessment (CA) for sage-grouse and sage-grouse habitat to be completed in two distinct phases. Phase 1 is a range-wide assessment of sage-grouse populations and habitat status, trends and threats across eleven Western states. It was completed in June 2004. Phase 2, a range-wide implementation plan, will outline specific actions for the conservation of sage-grouse and sage-grouse habitats. Phase 2 is scheduled for completion in mid to late 2005.

As an active partner in Federal, state and local sage-grouse conservation planning efforts and as the primary Federal manager of sage-grouse habitat, the BLM is in a key position to contribute to sage-grouse habitat conservation from the range-wide geographic scale to the local level. This National Sage-grouse Strategy will strengthen Federal, state and local efforts by addressing habitat needs and trends on the BLM-managed lands and by ensuring that sage-grouse habitat needs are addressed in BLM land use plans and through actions carried out at the site specific level. Implementation of BLM's National Sage-grouse Strategy and the state-level Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategies will complement and expand the ongoing efforts to conserve sagebrush ecosystems on public lands administered by the BLM for the benefit of sage-grouse and other wildlife species.

### III. Other Sage-Grouse Related Programs, Initiatives and Efforts

BLM program actions described in this National Sage-grouse Strategy focus on achieving coordinated conservation efforts on BLM-administered public land and are consistent with and support the following on-going efforts:

- 1) Conservation Planning Framework Team: The 2000 MOU between BLM, FWS, FS and WAFWA established a Conservation Planning Framework Team consisting of four (4) representatives from WAFWA member agencies (U.S. only) and one (1) each from BLM, FS, and FWS. The Team is responsible for developing the range-wide conservation planning framework, making recommendations and providing guidance to working groups on the contents of state and local conservation plans.
- 2) Nevada Ad Hoc Working Group: In 1999, the BLM, FS, FWS, and the Nevada Department of Wildlife formed an ad hoc working group to coordinate the development of planning tools and other resources to facilitate conservation of species of concern throughout the sagebrush biome.

The working group adopted a regional, multi-scale approach to conservation and restoration in the sagebrush biome in an attempt to manage overall efforts more effectively. Prototype processes and projects of regional importance are being developed or planned for the Great Basin, Columbia Plateau, Wyoming Basin, Northern Great Plains, and the Utah/Colorado Plateau. This approach will provide better information about sage-grouse and sagebrush habitats and improve conservation planning by prioritizing areas where conservation activities are most likely to be successful using existing and projected resources.

- 3) SageMap: Regional Science Based Assessments: As a result of the ad-hoc working group's efforts, in 2002 the BLM, in cooperation with the FS, Pacific Northwest Research Station, and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Biological Resources Division, Snake River Field Station (SRFS), developed science-based procedures that use existing information to conduct regional sagebrush habitat assessments for species of concern. The procedures are made available to the public through the USGS SageMap website and were used to develop the prototype Great Basin assessment. Information from that assessment is being used in support of sage-grouse conservation planning and the Great Basin Restoration Initiative (GBRI). These procedures are also being used to conduct or support prototype assessments in the Wyoming Basin.
- 4) SageMap Query and Data Analysis Modeling: The SageMap project, conducted by SRFS, is identifying and collecting spatial data layers needed to research and manage sage-grouse and shrubsteppe systems. The data sets, which can be queried, viewed, and downloaded from an FTP site, are important for understanding and managing shrubsteppe lands and associated wildlife. SageMap was created to share and disseminate information on sagebrush management, especially among resource managers and researchers interested in available literature and data from research within the sagebrush biome. SageMap contains over 3,000 data sets and currently is the most comprehensive source of spatial data related to sagebrush and associated studies in North America.
- 5) Great Basin Restoration Initiative: The GBRI was initiated by BLM in response to widespread habitat losses in the Great Basin from wildfires and other causes. Concern over the loss of habitats for sage-grouse and other sagebrush-dependent species was a significant and important factor in how GBRI evolved.

- 6) Plant Conservation Alliance: The Plant Conservation Alliance (PCA) is a public/private partnership among 10 Federal agencies and more than 200 non-Federal cooperators. In accord with Congressional direction, the PCA (through BLM) is leading an interagency native-plant material-development program for use in restoration and rehabilitation efforts on Federal lands. Funds have been provided for development of appropriate native plant materials within sagebrush ecosystems. This is critical to the development of seed sources for restoring native plant communities within sagebrush ecosystems.
- 7) Supportive BLM Programs: Numerous BLM programs, plans or initiatives provide additional guidance and resources to conserve and/or restore sagebrush and sage-grouse habitats as described in this National Sage-grouse Strategy. These include:
  - Department of the Interior (DOI) and BLM Strategic Plans
  - 95 BLM Land Use Plans covering the current occupied range of sage-grouse
  - Healthy Forests Initiative
  - BLM Special Status Species – Manual 6840
  - BLM 1601 Handbook Appendix C – *Land Use Planning, Special Status Species*
  - National Fire Plan – 10-year Implementation Plan
  - BLM Standards for Rangeland Health Handbook (H-4180-1)

#### **IV. Overview of Sage-Grouse; Population and Life History and Threats to Sage-Grouse Habitat**

Sage-grouse historically inhabited much of the sagebrush-dominated ecosystems of North America. Today, sage-grouse population abundance and extent have declined throughout most of their historical range. Population dynamics of sage-grouse are marked by strong cyclic behavior; however, in the last 30 years, the peak in the cycle of bird numbers has declined. Adult survival is high but is offset by low juvenile survival, resulting in low productivity. Habitat requirements for sage-grouse vary greatly depending on the season and life-history stage. Key habitat components include adequate canopy cover of tall grasses and medium height shrubs for nesting, abundant forbs and insects for brood rearing, and availability of herbaceous riparian species for late growing-season foraging.

No single factor can be identified as the cause of declines in sage-grouse populations. Since settlement of the West began, numerous activities have adversely affected the number of birds and the amount, distribution, and quality of sagebrush habitats. Historically, sagebrush-dominated vegetation was one of the most widespread habitats in the country. However, the majority of sagebrush ecosystems were lost or altered in some way by human activities and naturally occurring events. Some examples are large-scale conversions to cultivated croplands or pastures, altered fire frequencies resulting in conifer invasion at higher elevations and annual grass invasion at lower elevations, livestock grazing, herbicide use, mineral and energy development, and recreational activities related to urban growth and increased human populations. In many cases, the extent and significance of these effects or how sage-grouse populations will respond over time to cumulative effects caused by historical uses coupled with new activities is still unknown. Currently, the risk to sage-grouse comes from multiple sources across multiple scales. Thus, the BLM National Sage-grouse Strategy is comprehensive in its approach and address the risk to sage-grouse and habitat at appropriate scales.

A more detailed treatment of life history, threats and risks to sage-grouse is contained in the *Conservation Assessment of Greater Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Habitats* (Connelly, et al.

2004) produced by WAFWA and available at <http://sagemap.wr.usgs.gov/>.

## V. Guiding Principles

The National Sage-grouse Strategy is the framework for conserving and managing sage-grouse habitats on lands administered by the BLM. In addition, this National Sage-grouse Strategy serves as the umbrella for BLM state-level strategies, which have been or are being developed in cooperation with state wildlife agencies and partners.

The following principles are the foundation of the National Sage-grouse Strategy.

- **Cooperative Integrated Approach:** The BLM recognizes the states' role in sage-grouse conservation planning as described in the 2000 MOU. The BLM National Sage-grouse Strategy complements state-led sage-grouse conservation planning efforts and provides consistent guidance for integration of range-wide, state and local-level conservation actions into existing BLM programs. This cooperation and coordination will ensure appropriate actions are identified at the appropriate scale for conserving sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat.
- **BLM's Roles as the Key Federal Sagebrush Habitat Manager:** Approximately half of the remaining sage-grouse habitat is under BLM jurisdiction and management; therefore, BLM land plays a significant role in the conservation of sage-grouse and other sagebrush-dependent wildlife species.
- **Best Available Science:** The BLM will use the best available science and other relevant information to develop conservation efforts for sage-grouse and sagebrush habitats.
- **Comprehensive Strategy:** Planned actions carried out under this National Sage-grouse Strategy will be fully consistent with laws, regulations, and policies.
- **Interdisciplinary Integrated Approach:** The use of interdisciplinary teams and specific analysis at the local and regional levels are key to the success of sage-grouse and sagebrush conservation.
- **National Goals, Local Solutions:** This National Sage-grouse Strategy contains clearly defined goals and measurable tasks. BLM land use plans will be an essential component in implementing local solutions and sage-grouse and sagebrush conservation. These plans will use science and information at the local and state level with input from agency partners, scientists and other planning participants to develop appropriate solutions at the appropriate scale.
- **Strategic Implementation:** Development and implementation of this National Sage-grouse Strategy is consistent with, and supports implementation of the Department of the Interior (DOI) Strategic Plans Resource Protection mission under the pillars of partnerships and management.
- **Land Use Plan Based:** BLM land use plans and associated implementation plans are the principal mechanisms for making decisions and conducting on the ground actions to conserve and restore sage-grouse habitats for lands administered by the BLM. Land use plans will be updated and amended when and where appropriate, to adequately

address sage-grouse and sagebrush conservation needs through full public participation.

- **Rangeland Health Program Based:** BLM Standards for Rangeland Health are the primary tool for evaluating the condition of sage-grouse and sagebrush habitats. BLM Resource Advisory Councils (RACs) will be consulted as additional program guidelines are developed.
- **Cooperative Conservation:** Communication, cooperation, and consultation among state and Federal agencies, tribes, stakeholders, BLM RAC's within states, and the conservation community are essential for achieving successful conservation results. Partnerships both inside and outside the BLM will be fostered at every opportunity and every organizational level.
- **Supportive to Current Initiatives:** The BLM will capitalize on existing national or regional initiatives, such as the GBRI, Seeds of Success, Partnership Against Weeds, and the Plant Conservation Alliance, that benefit sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat.
- **Open Collaborative Approach:** The BLM will collaborate and share, as appropriate and authorized all information that is pertinent and useful in conserving sage-grouse and sage-grouse habitat.
- **Adaptive:** The Bureau is committed to sage-grouse and sagebrush conservation and will continue to adjust and adapt our National Sage-grouse Strategy as new information, science and monitoring results evaluate effectiveness over time.
- **Implementation Commitment:** Successful implementation of this National Sage-grouse Strategy requires a long-term commitment from BLM managers and staff across all programs and at every level of the organization.

## VI. Vision, Goals, Strategies, and Actions

**Vision: Manage BLM-administered public land to maintain, enhance and restore sagebrush habitats while ensuring multiple use and sustained yield goals of FLPMA.**

The following table identifies the Goals, Strategies, Actions, Responsible Party, and Deadline for each Action.

**Goal 1: Set forth the management framework for addressing conservation of sage-grouse on lands administered by the BLM.**

**Strategy 1.1: Provide needed coordinated policies and program direction at the National and the BLM State and Field Office levels.**

Actions	Responsibilities	Deadline
1.1.1 Issue direction on completion of state-level strategies and BLM plans.	Director, WO-230 (Lead), WO-210 (Co-lead)	November 2004
1.1.2 Complete BLM coordination on State agency led strategies and/or plans.	State Directors	Ongoing, with final state submissions July 2005.
1.1.3 Issue off-site habitat mitigation policy. Identify limitations and opportunities for funding and implementation across programs.	WO-300 (Lead); WO-200 (Co-lead)	March 2005
1.1.4 Develop a resource guide to enhance partnership involvement in sage-grouse conservation efforts.	Director, WO-200, WO-300, WO-800	October 2004, Completed
1.1.5 Revise or develop fire management plans for each state to include sage-grouse habitat management guidance.	State Directors	October 2004
1.1.6 Report to the Director on progress towards implementation of this strategy.	WO-200 (Lead) (National Sage-grouse Strategy) State Directors (State-level strategies)	September 1, 2005, 2006, 2007

**Strategy 1.2: Establish and maintain a data base to describe and track conservation efforts in sagebrush habitats.**

Actions	Responsibilities	Deadline
1.2.1 Gather initial information on conservation effort from all states with current sage-grouse populations.	WO-200 (Lead), WO-300, WO-880	July 2004, Completed
1.2.2 Support the information gathered with a data base that allows assemblage across state lines and queries.	WO-200 (Lead), WO-300, WO-880, NSTC	July 2004, Completed
1.2.3 Expand the data base to include sagebrush habitat in states without current sage-grouse populations.	WO-880 (Lead), WO-200, WO-300	December 2005

**Strategy 1.3: Provide guidance to ensure integration of sage-grouse habitat conservation measures for actions provided through the management in land use planning process.**

Actions	Responsibilities	Deadline
1.3.1 Issue guidance to ensure land use plans and plan amendments adequately address sage-grouse habitat conservation needs.	Director, WO-200 (Lead)	October 2004, Completed
1.3.2 Develop standard terminology for sage-grouse habitats (e.g., stronghold areas, breeding, etc.) for consistent future use.	WO-200 (Lead), NSTC	January 2005
1.3.3 Complete preparation of Southeast Oregon RMP case history for applying multi-scale information.	WO-230 (Lead), DSDs, NSTC	March 2005
1.3.4 Develop a process and schedule to update deficient land use plans to address sage-grouse needs.	State Directors, WO-210	April 2005
1.3.5 Develop process for use of broad-, mid- and fine-scale assessments in land use planning efforts and incorporate into planning guidance.	WO-200 (Lead), NSTC	October 2005

**Strategy 1.4: Issue mandatory guidance on management of sagebrush habitat for sage-grouse conservation.**

Actions	Responsibilities	Deadline
1.4.1 Develop and issue "Guidance for the Management of Sagebrush Plant Communities for Sage-Grouse Conservation." National guidance must be adaptable to local variability provided sage-grouse conservation goals are maintained or enhanced by the local adaptations.	Director, WO-230 (lead)	October 2004, Completed
1.4.2 Develop additional management guidance as needed, to address specific future conservation needs.	WO-200 (Lead) and Fire	Ongoing
1.4.3 Develop and issue livestock grazing BMPs to restore, maintain or enhance the quality of sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat.	WO-220 (Lead), WO-200	December 2004
1.4.4 Develop and issue BMPs for oil and gas development.	WO-300 (Lead), WO-200	June 2004, Completed, WO-2004-194

**Goal 2: Enhance knowledge of resource conditions and priorities in order to support habitat maintenance and restoration efforts.**

**Strategy 2.1: Complete and maintain eco-regional assessments of sagebrush and sage-grouse habitats across the sagebrush biome.**

Actions	Responsibilities	Deadline
2.1.1 Develop national spatial data sets for multi-scale assessments.	WO-200 (Lead), WO-300, State Directors, NSTC	September 2006
2.1.2 Complete ecoregional assessments of the Wyoming Basin, Northern Great Plains, Colorado Plateau, and complete habitat connectivity analysis.	NSTC (Lead), WO-230, State Directors	September 2006  November 2006 for connectivity analysis
2.1.3 Update ecoregional assessments for the Columbia Basin and Great Basin.	WO-230 (Lead), State Directors	September 2008
2.1.4 Complete state-level mapping of sage-grouse/sagebrush habitats and disturbance regimes.	State Directors (Lead), NSTC	May 2004, Completed
2.1.5 Participate in preparation of the WAFWA range-wide sage-grouse conservation assessment phase I and phase II.	WO-230 (Lead), State Directors	June 2004, phase I completed  Phase II, 2005

**Strategy 2.2: Provide a consistent and scientifically based approach for collection and use of monitoring data for sagebrush habitats, sage-grouse and other components of the sagebrush community.**

Actions	Responsibilities	Deadline
2.2.1 Develop, cooperatively with our partners, appropriate monitoring strategies and protocols at the appropriate scale for sage-grouse habitat in conjunction with the development of the range-wide conservation action plan.	WO-200 (Lead)	August 2005
2.2.2 Develop, cooperatively with our partners, a sage-grouse habitat assessment methodology in conjunction with development of the range-wide conservation action plan.	WO-200	November 2005

Actions	Responsibilities	Deadline
2.2.3 Incorporate the sage-grouse habitat assessment framework into the land health assessment process for evaluating indicators of healthy rangelands.	WO-200	December 2006
2.2.4 In conjunction with the development of the range-wide conservation action plan, issue guidance for collecting fine-scale monitoring and assessment information and incorporating requirements into implementation projects and plans.	WO-200 (Lead), NSTC	April 2005

**Strategy 2.3: Identify, prioritize and facilitate needed research to develop relevant information for sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat conservation in coordination with WAFWA.**

Actions	Responsibilities	Deadline
2.3.1 In cooperation with partners, establish an national interagency, interdisciplinary technical team to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• receive research questions from local and regional managers and working groups;</li> <li>• sort priority information needs and identify sources of research information (e.g. West Nile virus); and</li> <li>• serve as clearinghouse for research funding proposals.</li> </ul>	WO-200	July 2005

**Goal 3: Expand partnerships, available research, and information that support effective management of sage-grouse and sagebrush habitats.**

**Strategy 3.1: Maintain, develop and expand partnerships to promote cooperation and support for all activities associated with sage-grouse and sagebrush conservation.**

Actions	Responsibilities	Deadline
3.1.1 Participate in the local, regional and national conservation efforts established under the agreement with Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.	State Directors; WO-200	Ongoing
3.1.2 Expand partnerships at all levels to support development and implementation of the National Sage-grouse Strategy.	Director, State Directors, Field Managers	Ongoing
3.1.3 Maintain and expand state and local partnerships to implement the tasks outlined in the cooperatively developed state-level strategies and/or plans.	State Directors, Field Managers	Ongoing

**Strategy 3.2: Effectively communicate throughout BLM and with current and prospective partners on steps BLM will take to conserve sage-grouse and sage-grouse and sagebrush habitats.**

Actions	Responsibilities	Deadline
3.2.1 Complete a communications plan for the National Sage-grouse Strategy, including internal and external audiences.	WO-610 (Lead), WO-200, WO-300, WO-880	August 2004, Completed and Ongoing
3.2.2 Complete a communications plan for state-level sage-grouse strategies/plans, including internal and external audiences. Ensure that the BLM National, State and Field Office communication strategies support the comprehensive National Sage-grouse Strategy and ensure each level of the BLM organization knows how their strategies implement goals and enhance sage-grouse and sagebrush conservation goals.	State Directors (Lead), Public Affairs, Field Managers	December 2004

**Strategy 3.3: Facilitate the collection, transfer and sharing of information among all BLM partners and cooperators, as well as BLM program personnel.**

Actions	Responsibilities	Deadline
3.3.1 Continuously improve interagency data and mapping efforts such as SageMap	WO-200 (lead)	Ongoing
3.3.2 Improve web-based tools available to support sagebrush conservation efforts (e.g. links to literature, project and studies maps, decision support models)	WO-200 (lead)	2005; Ongoing
3.3.3 Develop and distribute publications that support field-level conservation efforts	WO-200 (lead)	Ongoing; 2005 and beyond
3.3.4 Develop minimum standards for data collection, data dictionary and reporting at state, regional and national levels that are compatible with data developed by state agencies and other partners	WO-200 (Lead), WO-880	December 2006
3.3.5 Provide training to ensure Bureau-wide understanding of sage-grouse habitat requirements and Best Management Practices (BMPs) across all disciplines	WO-230 (Lead), NTC	December 2005
3.3.6 Host a biennial workshop with partners to share understanding and knowledge of sagebrush ecology and management, including use of BMPs	WO-200	Biennial
3.3.7 Identify cooperative funding and/or other mechanisms for data collection, reporting and dissemination related to sagebrush and sage-grouse habitats	WO-200	November 2004
3.3.8 Enhance and accelerate, through partnerships, technical and scientific support to the field for sagebrush conservation efforts	WO-200/WO-170	June 2005

**Goal 4: Ensure leadership and resources are adequate to implement national and state-level sage-grouse and sagebrush habitat conservation strategies and/or plans.**

**Strategy 4.1: Develop BLM state-level strategies and/or plans for sage-grouse and sagebrush conservation on BLM-administered public lands.**

Actions	Responsibilities	Deadline
4.1.1 Establish BLM state-level interdisciplinary teams to prepare strategies.	State Directors (Lead), Field Managers	Ongoing; November 2004
4.1.2 Consult with States, RACs, Councils, tribes, other agencies, stakeholders, and interested publics in preparation of draft BLM state-level strategy/plan.	State Directors (Lead), Field Managers	Ongoing; annual meetings
4.1.3 Incorporate sage-grouse/sagebrush conservation measures into all applicable land use plans.	State Directors (Lead), Field Managers	Ongoing, as scheduled per Action 1.3.4

**Strategy 4.2: Formulate budgets necessary to support continued implementation of the National Sage-grouse Strategy.**

Actions	Responsibilities	Deadline
4.2.1 Prioritize needs for sage-grouse and sagebrush conservation in Strategic Budget Plan (FY+2).	Director, State Directors, Field Committee and the Budget Strategy Team	Ongoing; annual
4.2.2 Include priority needs for sage-grouse and sagebrush conservation in Budget Justifications (FY+1).	State Directors, Field Managers, WO-200, WO-300, WO-800 (Lead)	Ongoing; annual
4.2.3 Prioritize needs for sage-grouse and sagebrush conservation in Annual Work Plan.	State Directors, Field Managers, WO-200, WO-300, WO-800 (Lead)	Ongoing; annual
4.2.4 Give priority to sage-grouse and sagebrush conservation in CCS, CCI and NFWF funding proposals.	State Directors, Field Managers, WO-200	Ongoing; annual

## **VII. Progress Reporting**

Implementation of the actions outlined in this BLM National Sage-grouse Strategy and the cooperative state agency led sage-grouse habitat conservation strategies will be monitored and progress reported to the Director annually. The effectiveness of implementing actions outlined in both the national and state strategies will require an assessment process that includes ‘before and after’ project evaluation of habitat conditions. This assessment process is currently being developed (see Action 2.2.2). The assessment process will be incorporated into BLM’s land health assessment process for evaluating indicators of healthy rangelands.

## **VIII. Authorities and Responsibilities**

The BLM has broad authority to manage the public lands. BLM management of the public lands is guided by Federal laws, regulations, policies and handbooks. Collectively, these frame BLM’s “regulatory mechanisms” for sage-grouse conservation as discussed in Section 4 of the Endangered Species Act. Many of these authorities have a bearing on sage-grouse conservation, but only the most relevant ones are discussed below.

### **1) Laws**

Several major Federal laws provide the authority and framework for this National Sage-grouse Strategy:

#### **Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), as amended**

This is the primary Federal law governing most land uses on BLM-administered lands. It directs BLM to develop and maintain land use plans based on inventories of these lands and the resources they support. Among other things, this Act gave fish and wildlife resources equal standing with the other traditional public uses of BLM-administered lands. Section 102(a)(8) states: “The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States that the public lands be managed in a manner that will....provide food and habitat for fish and wildlife....”

#### **National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 1969, Title II (42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), as amended**

NEPA requires that land-management planning be conducted in the public arena, using an interdisciplinary process for evaluating and disclosing resource information that considers physical, cultural, and biological resources in conjunction with social and economic factors to explore alternatives; consider impacts, including cumulative impacts; mitigate impacts; and decide appropriate public land uses.

#### **Public Rangelands Improvement Act 1978, Title II (43 U.S.C. 1901 *et seq.*), as amended**

The Public Rangelands Improvement Act provides that “[e]xcept where the land use planning process required pursuant to Section 202 of [FLPMA] determines otherwise or the Secretary determines, and sets forth his reasons for this determination, that grazing uses should be discontinued (either temporarily or permanently) on certain lands, the

goal of ...management shall be to improve the range conditions of the public rangelands so that they become as productive as feasible in accordance with the rangeland management objectives established through the land use planning process, and consistent with the values and objectives listed in sections 2(a) and (b)(2) of this Act.”

**Sikes Act of 1974, Title II (16 U.S.C. 670 et seq.), as amended**

This Act directs the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to, in cooperation with the State agencies, develop plans to “... develop, maintain, and coordinate programs for the conservation and rehabilitation of wildlife, fish and game. Such conservation and rehabilitation programs shall include, but not be limited to, specific habitat improvement projects, and related activities and adequate protection for species considered threatened or endangered.”

**Wild Horse and Burro Act of 1971 (16 U.S.C. 1331), as amended**

The Wild Horse and Burro Act gives BLM statutory authority for management of wild horses and burros and responsibility to provide for a thriving ecological balance on public rangelands. At 43 CFR 4700.0-6 is the policy of the BLM that: “Wild horses and burros shall be managed as self-sustaining populations of healthy animals in balance with other uses and the productive capacity of their habitat.”

**2) Regulations**

Once a law is enacted, the administering Federal agency promulgates rules and regulations, as appropriate, to guide implementation. These regulations set the framework for national policy and can in some instances provide implementation direction. Regulations are a very important “regulatory mechanism” for administering land uses on public lands. For the BLM, there are several sets of regulations associated with implementing FLPMA and other laws. Most of the regulations that may affect BLM guidance on sage-grouse management are found in 43 CFR, although some, such as the Council on Environmental Quality regulations, are found in other portions of the CFR.

**43 CFR Subpart C, Minerals Management 3000 Series,**

The Minerals Management regulations contain regulatory authority for BLM operations, enforcement and reclamation of mineral actions on public lands.

**43 CFR Subpart 4120, Grazing Management**

The Grazing Management regulations contain the regulatory authority for grazing administration, use authorizations, permit terms, and conditions for achieving resource-condition objectives. Subparts 4140-4170 outline prohibited acts, enforcement, and penalties. Subpart 4180 is an example of how regulations provide direction for sage-grouse conservation. Within the scope of these grazing regulations, are included specific direction to the BLM State Directors to develop standards that among other things would address:

(43 CFR 4180.2(d)):

(4) Habitat for endangered, threatened, proposed, candidate, or special status species; and (5) Habitat quality for native plant and animal populations and communities.

In addition, Subpart 4180.2(e) requires development of guidelines to address:

(9) Restoring, maintaining or enhancing habitats of Federal proposed, Federal candidate, and other special status species to promote their conservation.

### **43 CFR 4180, Fundamentals of Rangeland Health**

The Fundamentals of Rangeland Health require the BLM to develop, in consultation with Resource Advisory Councils, rangeland health standards. The Fundamentals of Rangeland Health combine the basic precepts of physical function and biological health with elements of law relating to water quality and plant and animal populations and communities to provide the basis for the standards for land health.

### **3) BLM National Policy Guidance**

National policy guidance further defines or clarifies how laws and regulations will be administered. This direction comes either in the form of a policy statement or as manuals or handbooks. National policy establishes what basic policy is to be achieved. BLM State and local policies can provide more specific guidance on how the national policy objectives are to be accomplished. BLM State and local field offices have discretion to adapt national policy to local situations, but do not have authority to override national policy for local situations.

Policies are particularly useful in avoiding conflicts with laws and regulations. Federal agency policies concerning sensitive species are a good example. The ESA only applies to proposed and listed species and designated or proposed critical habitat, but it is in the interest of the Federal government, consistent with other laws such as FLPMA, to conserve sensitive species with the intent to avoid a need to list. There are no regulations associated with FLPMA that specifically address fish and wildlife management or, more specifically, conservation of sensitive species at risk of being listed in the future. Agency policy provides this direction for sensitive species conservation and fills this regulatory gap. Two main sets of policy guidance currently provide direction for sage-grouse conservation efforts.

### **BLM Special Status Species Management – Manual 6840**

Policy guidance for sage-grouse habitat conservation is summarized in this manual. It provides national-level policy direction, consistent with appropriate laws, for the conservation of special-status species of animals and plants and the ecosystems on which they depend. *Conservation* in this National Sage-grouse Strategy, and consistent with 6840 policy, means the use of all methods and procedures necessary to improve the condition of special status species and their habitats to a point where their special status recognition is no longer warranted.

## **Land Use Planning Handbook - H-1601-1**

All program actions (allocations, authorizations, objectives, standards, conditions and implementation priorities) taken on the public land are guided by land use plans. These plans ensure that the public lands are managed in accordance with the intent of Congress as stated in FLPMA (43 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield. The BLM Land Use Planning Handbook provides more detailed direction for land use planning consistent with planning regulations found in 43 CFR 1600.

The Handbook states that, as required by FLPMA, the public lands must be managed in a manner that protects the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resource, and archaeological values; that, where appropriate, will preserve and protect certain public lands in their natural condition; that will provide food and habitat for fish and wildlife and domestic animals; and that will provide for outdoor recreation and human occupancy and use by encouraging collaboration and public participation throughout the planning process. In addition, the public lands must be managed in a manner that recognizes the nation's need for domestic sources of minerals, food, timber, and fiber from the public lands.

Land use plans are the primary mechanisms for guiding BLM program activities. Land use plans guide management actions on public lands in the planning area. Land use plan decisions establish goals and objectives for resource management,; measures needed to achieve these desired future conditions, and the parameters for using BLM-administered public land. These plans identify lands that are open or available for certain uses, including any applicable restrictions, and lands that are closed to certain uses.

## IX. Literature Relevant to the BLM Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy

- Anonymous. 1997. Gunnison sage grouse conservation plan. Gunnison Basin, Colorado. Bureau of Land Management, Gunnison, Colorado. 108 p.
- Apa, A. D. 1998. Habitat use and movements of sympatric sage and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse in southeastern Idaho. Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Idaho, Moscow.
- Asher, J. 1994. Crushing the wilderness spirit: Alien plant invasions. Unpublished report on file with: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Oregon State Office, P.O. Box 2965, Portland, Oregon 97201.
- Autenrieth, R. E. 1981. Sage grouse management in Idaho Wildlife Bulletin Number 9. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Boise. 239 p.
- Baker, H.G. 1986. Patterns of plant invasion in North America. Mooney, H.A. and J.A. Drake, editors, Ecology of biological invasions of North America and Hawaii. Springer-Verlag, New York. 44-57.
- Barnett, J. F., and J. A. Crawford. 1994. Pre-laying nutrition of sage grouse hens in Oregon. Journal of Range Management. 47:114-118.
- Barney, M.A., and N. C. Frischknecht. 1974. Vegetation changes following fire in the pinyon-juniper type of west-central Utah. Journal of Range Management 27:91-96.
- Bay, K. G. 1989. Writing rules of progress - A look at oil and gas development in the midwest. Proceedings of the 43<sup>rd</sup> Midwest Fish and Wildlife Conference. Wichita, KS. 8 p.
- Bazzaz, F.A. 1986. Life history of colonizing plants: Some demographic, genetic, and physiological features. H.A. and J.A. Drake, editors, Ecology of biological invasions of North America and Hawaii. Springer-Verlag, New York. 96-110.
- Beck, J. L., and D. L. Mitchell. 2000. Influences of livestock grazing on sage grouse habitat. Wildlife Society Bulletin 28:993-1002.
- Beck, T. D. I. 1977. Sage grouse flock characteristics and habitat selection during winter. Journal of Wildlife Management 41:18-26.
- Beck, T. D. I. 1975. Attributes of a wintering population of sage grouse, North Park, Colorado. M.S. thesis. Colorado State University, Fort Collins. 49 p.
- Bergerud, A. T. 1988. Population ecology of North American grouse. A.T. Bergerud and M. W. Gratson, eds. *Adaptive strategies and population ecology of northern grouse*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis. 578-648.
- Berry, J. D., and R. L. Eng. 1985. Interseasonal movements and fidelity to seasonal use areas by female sage grouse. Journal of Wildlife Management 49:237-240.
- Blus, L. J., C. S. Staley, C. J. Henny, G. W. Pendleton, T. H. Craig, E. H. Craig, and D. K. Halford. 1989. Effects of organophosphorus insecticides on sage grouse in southeastern Idaho. Journal of Wildlife Management 53:1139-1146.
- Braun, C. E. 1986. Changes in sage grouse lek counts with advent of surface coal mining. Proceedings of Issues and Technology in the Management of Impacted Western Wildlife. Thorne Ecological Institute. 2:227-231.
- Braun, C. E. 1987. Current issues in sage-grouse management. Proceedings, Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. 67:134-144.
- Braun, C. E. 1998. Sage grouse declines in western North America: what are the problems? Proceedings of the Western Association of State Fish and Wildlife Agencies. 78:139-156.
- Braun, C. E., O. O. Oedekoven, and C. L. Aldridge. 2002. Oil and Gas development in western North America: effects on sagebrush steppe avifauna with particular emphasis on sage-grouse. Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference: in press.

- Call, M. W., and C. Maser. 1985. Wildlife habitats in managed rangelandsBthe Great Basin of southeastern Oregon. Sage Grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*). U. S. Forest Service, General Technical Report PNW-GTR-187. 31 p.
- Coggins, K. A. 1998. Sage grouse habitat use during the breeding season on Hart Mountain National Antelope Refuge. M.S. thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis. 61 p.
- Connelly, J. W., Jr. 1982. An ecological study of sage grouse in southeastern Idaho. Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University, Pullman. 84 p.
- Connelly, J. W., and L. J. Blus. 1991. Effects of pesticides on upland game: a review of herbicides and organophosphate and carbamate insecticides. M. Marsh, editor. Proceedings, Pesticides in Natural Systems - how can their effects be monitored? U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Seattle, Washington. 92-97.
- Connelly, J. W., and C. E. Braun. 1997. Long-term changes in sage grouse *Centrocercus urophasianus* populations in western North America. *Wildlife Biology* 3:123-128.
- Connelly, J. W., and O. D. Markham. 1983. Movements and radionuclide concentrations of sage grouse in southeastern Idaho. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 47:169-177.
- Connelly, J. W., W. J. Arthur, and O. D. Markham. 1981. Sage grouse leks on recently disturbed sites. *Journal of Range Management* 52:153-154.
- Connelly, J. W., H. W. Browsers, and R. J. Gates. 1988. Seasonal movements of sage grouse in southeastern Idaho. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 52:116-122.
- Connelly, J. W., W. L. Wakkinen, A. D. Apa, and K. P. Reese. 1991. Sage grouse use of nest sites in southeastern Idaho. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 55:521-524.
- Connelly, J. W., R. A. Fischer, A. D. Apa, K. P. Reese, and W. L. Wakkinen. 1993. Renesting of sage grouse in southeastern Idaho. *Condor* 95:1041-1043.
- Connelly, J. W., K. P. Reese, W. L. Wakkinen, M. D. Robertson, and R. A. Fischer. 1994. Sage grouse ecology report. Idaho Department of Fish and Game Job Completion Report. W-160-R-19. Subproject 9. 91 p.
- Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines for management of sage grouse populations and habitats. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 28(4): 967-985.
- 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.
- Cottam, W. P. and G. Stewart. 1940. Plant succession as a result of grazing and of meadow desiccation by erosion since settlement in 1892. *Journal of Forestry* 38: 613-626.
- Dalke, P. D., D. B. Pyrah, D. C. Stanton, J. E. Crawford, and E. F. Schlatterer. 1963. Ecology, productivity, and management of sage grouse in Idaho. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 27:810-841.
- Delong, A. K., J. A. Crawford, and D. C. Delong, Jr. 1995. Relationships between vegetational structure and predation of artificial sage grouse nests. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 59:88-92.
- DePuit, E. J., and J. G. Coenenberg. 1979. Methods for establishment of native plant communities on top soiled coal strip-mine spoils in the northern Great Plains. *Reclamation Review* 2:75-83.
- Drut, M. S., W. H. Pyle, and J. A. Crawford. 1994. Diets and food selection of sage grouse chicks in Oregon. *Journal of Range Management* 47:90-93.
- Drut, M. S., W. H. Pyle, and J. A. Crawford. 1994. Diets and food selection of sage grouse chicks in Oregon. *Journal of Range Management* 47:90-93.
- Eddleman, L. E. 1987. Establishment of western juniper in central Oregon. R. L. Everett, compiler. ProceedingsBpinyon-juniper conference 1986, U.S. Forest Service General Technical Report INT-GTR-215. Intermountain Research Station, Ogden, Utah. 255-259.

- Edelmann, F. B., M. J. Ulliman, M. J. Wisdom, K. P. Reese, and J. W. Connelly. 1998. Assessing habitat quality using population fitness parameters: a remote sensing/GIS-based habitat-explicit population model for sage grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*). Technical Report 25. Idaho Forest, Wildlife and Range Experiment Station, Moscow.
- Edminster, F. C. 1954. American game birds of field and forest. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, New York, USA.
- Ellis, K. L. 1987. Effects of a new transmission line on breeding male sage grouse at a lek in northwestern Utah. Abstract in J. Roberson, editor. Transactions of the 15<sup>th</sup> Sage Grouse Committee. Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, July 1987, Midway, Utah. 28-30.
- Eng, R. L. 1963. Observations on the breeding biology of male sage grouse. Journal of Wildlife Management 27:841-846.
- Eng, R. L., and P. Schladweiler. 1972. Sage grouse winter movements and habitat use in central Montana. Journal of Wildlife Management 36:141-146.
- Enyeart, G. 1956. Responses of sage grouse to grass reseeding in the Pines area, Garfield County, Utah. M.S. thesis, Utah State Agricultural College, Logan. 55 p.
- Fischer, R. A. 1994. The effects of prescribed fire on the ecology of migratory sage grouse in southeastern Idaho.
- Fischer, R. A., A. D. Apa, W. L. Wakkinen, K. P. Reese, and J. W. Connelly. 1993. Nesting-area fidelity of sage-grouse in southeastern Idaho. Condor 95: 1038-1041.
- Fischer, R. A., K. P. Reese, and J. W. Connelly. 1996a. An investigation on fire effects within xeric sage grouse brood habitat. Journal of Range Management 49:194-198.
- Fischer, R. A., K. P. Reese, and J. W. Connelly. 1996b. Influence of vegetal moisture content and nest fate on timing of female sage grouse migration. Condor 98:868-872.
- Fischer, R. A., K. P. Reese, and J. W. Connelly. 1997. Effects of prescribed fire on movements of female sage grouse from breeding to summer ranges. Wilson Bulletin 109:82-91.
- Gates, R. J. 1983. Sage grouse, lagomorph, and pronghorn use of a sagebrush grassland burn site on the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory. M. S. thesis, Montana State University, Bozeman. 135 p.
- Gates, R. J. 1985. Observations of the formation of a sage grouse lek. Wilson Bulletin 97:219-221.
- Gill, R. B. 1965. Distribution and abundance of a population of sage grouse in North Park, Colorado. M. S. thesis, Colorado State University, Fort Collins. 187 p.
- Gray, G. M. 1967. An ecological study of sage grouse broods with reference to nesting movements, food habits and sagebrush strip spraying in the Medicine Lodge drainage, Clark County, Idaho. M.S. thesis, University of Idaho, Moscow. 200 p.
- Gregg, M. A. 1991. Use and selection of nesting habitat by sage grouse in Oregon. M.S. thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis. 46 p.
- Gregg, M. A., J. A. Crawford, M. S. Drut, and A. K. DeLong. 1994. Vegetational cover and predation of sage grouse nests in Oregon. Journal of Wildlife Management 58:162-166.
- Hanf, J. M., P. A. Schmidt, and E. B. Groshens. 1994. Sage grouse in the high desert of central Oregon: results of a study, 1988-1993. U. S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management Series P-SG-01, Prineville, OR. 56 p.
- Heath, B. J., R. Straw, S. H. Anderson, and J. Lawson. 1998. Sage grouse productivity, survival, and seasonal habitat among 3 ranches with different livestock grazing, predator control, and harvest management practices. Completion Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department. 66 p.
- Higby, L. W. 1969. A summary of the Longs Creek sagebrush control project. Proceedings Biennial Western States Sage Grouse Workshop. 6:164-168.

- Hill, E. F., R. G. Heath, J. W. Spann, and J. D. Williams. 1975. Lethal dietary toxicities of environmental pollutants to birds. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Special Scientific Report No. 191. Washington, D.C. 61 p.
- Holloran, M. J. 1999. Sage grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) seasonal habitat use near Casper, Wyoming. M.S. thesis, University of Wyoming, Laramie. 130 p.
- Hupp, J. W. and C. E. Braun. 1989. Topographic distribution of sage grouse foraging in winter. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 53:823-829.
- Johnson, G. D. and M. S. Boyce. 1990. Feeding trials with insects in the diet of sage grouse chicks. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 54(1) 89-91.
- Johnson, G. D., and M. S. Boyce. 1991. Survival, growth, and reproduction of captive-reared sage grouse. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 19:88-93.
- Keister, G. P., and M. J. Willis. 1986. Habitat selection and success of sage grouse hens while nesting and brooding. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Progress Report W-87-R-2, Subproject 285, Portland.
- Klebenow, D. A. 1969. Sage grouse nesting and brood habitat in Idaho. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 33:649-661.
- Klebenow, D. A. and G. M. Gray. 1968. Food habitats of juvenile sage grouse. *Journal of Range Management* 21:80-83.
- Klebenow, D. A. 1982. Livestock grazing interactions with sage grouse. J. M. Peek and P. D. Dalke, editors. *Wildlife-livestock relationships symposium: Proceedings 10*. University of Idaho, College of Forestry, Wildlife, and Range. Moscow. 113-123.
- Klebenow, D. A. 1985. Habitat management for sage grouse in Nevada. *World Pheasant Association Journal* 21:80-83.
- Lyon, A. G. 2000. The potential effects of natural gas development on sage grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) near Pinedale, Wyoming. M. S. thesis, University of Wyoming, Laramie. 120 p.
- Mack, R. N. and J. N. Thompson 1982. Evolution in steppe with few large, hoofed mammals. *American Naturalist* 119:757-773.
- Mack, R.N. 1986. Alien plant invasion into the Intermountain West: A case history. Mooney, H.A. and J.A. Drake, editors, *Ecology of biological invasions of North America and Hawaii*. Springer-Verlag, New York. 191-213
- Martin, N. S. 1970. Sagebrush control related to habitat and sage grouse occurrence. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 34:313-320.
- Miller, R.F., and J.A. Rose. 1995. Historic expansion of *Juniperus occidentalis* (western juniper) in southeastern Oregon. *Great Basin Naturalist* 55:37-45.
- Oakleaf, R. J. 1971. The relationship of sage grouse to upland meadows in Nevada. Nevada Department of Fish and Game and the Renewable Resources Center, University of Nevada, Reno. W-48-2. 64 p.
- Patterson, R. L. 1952. *The sage grouse in Wyoming*. Sage Books, Inc. Denver, CO. 341 p.
- Pellant, M. 1990. The cheatgrass-wildfire cycle--are there any solutions? In: McArthur, E. Durant; Romney, Evan M.; Smith, Stanley D; Tueller, Paul T. , comps. *Proceedings -- symposium on cheatgrass invasion, shrub die-off, and other aspects of shrub biology and management: 1989 April 5-7; Las Vegas, NV*. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-276. Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station: 11-17.
- Pellant, M. 1996. Use of indicators to qualitatively assess rangeland health. *Rangelands in a Sustainable Biosphere*. (Ed. N.E. West), Proc. 5th International Rangeland Congress. Society for Range Management. Denver, CO. 434-435

- Pellant, M., and S. B. Monsen. 1993. Rehabilitation on public rangelands in Idaho, USA: a change in emphasis from grass monocultures. *Proceedings of the International Grassland Congress* 17:778-779.
- Petersen, B. E. 1980. Breeding and nesting ecology of female sage grouse in North Park, Colorado. M.S. thesis, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO. 86 p.
- Peterson, J. G. 1970. The food habits and summer distribution of juvenile sage grouse in central Montana. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 34:147-155.
- Quigley, T.M., and S.J. Arbelbide, technical editors. 1997. Volume II of: An assessment of ecosystem components in the interior Columbia Basin and portions of the Klamath and Great Basins. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-405. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR.
- Rasmussen, D. I., and L. A. Griner. 1938. Life history and management studies of sage grouse in Utah, with special reference to nesting and feeding habitats. *Transactions of the North American Wildlife Conference* 3:852-864.
- Redente, E. F., T. B. Doerr, C. E. Grygiel, and M. E. Biondini. 1984. Vegetation establishment and succession on disturbed soils in northwest Colorado. *Reclamation and Revegetation Research* 3:153-165.
- Remington, T. E., and C. E. Braun. 1985. Sage grouse food selection in winter, North Park, Colorado. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 49:1055-1061.
- Robertson, M. D. 1991. Winter ecology of migratory sage grouse and associated effects of Prescribed fire in southeastern Idaho. M.S. thesis, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID. 88 p.
- Rowland, M. M., M. J. Wisdom. 2002. Research problem analysis for greater sage-grouse in Oregon. Final report. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife; U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Oregon/Washington State Office; and U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. 75 p.
- Savage, D. E. 1969. Relation of sage grouse to upland meadows in Nevada. Nevada Fish and Game Commission Job Completion Report, Project W-39-R-9. Job 12. Reno. 101 p.
- Schroeder, M. A. 1997. Unusually high reproductive effort by sage grouse in a fragmented habitat in north-central Washington. *Condor* 99:933-941.
- Schroeder, M. A., J. R. Young and C. E. Braun. 1999. Sage Grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*). In *The Birds of North America*, No. 425 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.
- Schuman, G. E., F. Rauzi, and D.T. Booth. 1982. Production and competition of crested wheatgrass-native grass mixtures. *Agronomy Journal* 74:23-26.
- Skoog, F. E., F. T. Cowan, and K. Messenger. 1965. Ultra-low-volume aerial spraying of dieldrin and malathion for rangeland grasshopper control. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 66:1267-1268.
- Sveum, C. M., J. A. Crawford, and W. D. Edge. 1998. Use and selection of brood-rearing habitat by sage grouse in south central Washington. *Great Basin Naturalist* 58:344-351.
- Swenson, J. E. 1986. Differential survival by sex in juvenile sage grouse and gray partridge. *Ornis Scandinavica* 17:14-17.
- Swenson, J. E., C. A. Simmons, and C. D. Eustace. 1987. Decrease of sage grouse *Centrocercus urophasianus* after ploughing of sagebrush steppe. *Biological Conservation* 41:125-132.
- Thurow, T. L., and C. A. Taylor. 1999. The role of drought in range management. *Journal of Range Management* 52:413-419.
- Trueblood, R. W. 1954. The effect of grass reseeding in sagebrush lands on sage grouse populations. M.S. thesis, Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, UT.

- Tyser, R.W., and C.H. Key. 1988. Spotted knapweed in natural area fescue grasslands: An ecological assessment. *Northwest Science* 62:151-160.
- USDI, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2004. Connelly, J. C., S. T. Knick, M. A. Schroeder and S. J. Stiver. Conservation Assessment of Greater Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Habitats.
- USDI, Bureau of Land Management. 2003. Fish, Wildlife, Botany and Special Status Species Program Evaluation: Final Report on Evaluation Findings and Recommendations for Action Plan Development. March 31, 2003. 52 p.
- USDI and USDA 1995. Federal wildland fire management policy and program review. 45 p.
- Valentine, J. F. 1990. Grazing management. Academic Press, Incorporated. San Diego, CA. 553 p.
- Wakkinen, W. L. 1990. Nest site characteristics and spring-summer movements of migratory sage grouse in southeastern Idaho. M. S. thesis, University of Idaho, Moscow. 57 p.
- Wakkinen, W. L., K. P. Reese, and J. W. Connelly. 1992. Sage grouse nest locations in relation to leks. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 56:381-383.
- Wallestad, R. O. 1971. Summer movements and habitat use by sage grouse broods in central Montana. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 35:129-136.
- Wallestad, R. O. 1975. Life history and habitat requirements of sage grouse in central Montana. Montana Fish and Game Department Technical Bulletin. 66 p.
- Wallestad, R. O., and D. B. Pyrah. 1974. M Wallestad, R. O., and D. B. Pyrah. 1974. Movement and nesting of sage grouse hens in central Montana. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 38:630-633.
- Wallestad, R. O., and P. Schladweiler. 1974. Breeding season movements and habitat selection of male sage grouse. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 38:634-637.
- Wallestad, R. O., J. G. Peterson, and R. L. Eng. 1975. Foods of adult sage grouse in central Montana. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 39:628-630.
- Wambolt, C. L., A. J. Harp, B. L. Welch, N. Shaw, J. W. Connelly, K. P. Reese, C. E. Braun, D., A. Klebenow, E. D. McArthur, J. G. Thompson, L. A. Torell, and J. A. Tanaka. 2002. Conservation of greater sage-grouse on public lands in the western U.S.: implications of recovery and management policies. Policy Analysis Center for Western Public Lands, Policy Paper SG-02-02. Caldwell, Idaho. 41 p.
- West, N. E. 1999. Managing for biodiversity of rangelands. W. W. Collins and C. O. Qualset, editors. *Biodiversity in agroecosystems*. CRC, Boca Raton, Florida. 101-126.
- Whisenant, S. G. 1990. Changing fire frequencies of Idaho's Snake River plains: ecological and management implications. E. D. McArthur, E. M. Romney, S. D. Smith, and P. T. Tueller. (Comps.) Proc.- Symposium on cheatgrass invasion, shrub die off, and other aspects of shrub biology and management. April 5-7, 1989. Las Vegas, NV. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-276. U.U. Dep. Of Agr., For. Service, Intermountain Res. Stat. Ogden, UT. 4-10.
- Wisdom, M. J., R. S. Holthausen, B. C. Wales, D. C. Lee, C. D. Hargis, V. A. Saab, W. J. Hann, T. D. Rich, M. M. Rowland, W. J. Murphy, and M. R. Eames. 2000. Source habitats for terrestrial vertebrates of focus in the interior Columbia Basin: Broad-scale trends and management implications. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-485. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR.
- Willis, M. J., G. P. Keister, Jr. 1984. Sage grouse ecology (research plan - 1984). Unpublished file report. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Research, Portland.
- Wright, H.A., L.F. Neuenschwander, and C.M. Britton. 1979. The role and use of fire in sagebrush-grass and pinyon-juniper plant communities: A state-of-the-art review. General Technical Report INT-GTR-58. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station, Ogden, UT.
- Zablan, M. A. 1993. Evaluation of sage grouse banding program in North Park, Colorado. M.S. thesis, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO. 59 p.

**Bureau of Land Management**  
**National Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy**

**1.3.1 Guidance for Addressing Sagebrush Habitat Conservation  
in BLM Land Use Plans**

**U.S. Department of the Interior**

**November 2004**

## **Guidance for Addressing Sagebrush Habitat Conservation in BLM Land Use Plans**

This guidance is intended to help BLM planning teams include sagebrush habitat and sagebrush-dependent wildlife species (including sage-grouse) considerations in BLM land use planning efforts. Planning teams should use this guidance in planning areas with sagebrush habitat for land use plans in progress (to the extent practicable for plans well underway), new planning starts and plan amendments. This guidance may be supplemented, as appropriate, with additional information from completed State- or local-level sage-grouse strategies or plans.

Pursuant to the BLM Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy (Action 1.3.4), each State Director must, by April 2005, develop a process and schedule to update deficient land use plans to adequately address sage-grouse and sagebrush conservation needs. BLM state-level conservation strategies and/or plans should continue to be developed in concert with state agency-led efforts consistent with mutually agreed-upon schedules.

This guidance focuses on sagebrush habitat as a whole rather than on sage-grouse or other individual species because it is important to plan for the conservation of habitat for all wildlife species. It is also BLM policy to consider all special status species in planning (§6840.02B). This should assist in the conservation of species and reduce the need for listings under the Endangered Species Act.

This guidance describes how planning teams can incorporate sagebrush considerations into each of the basic steps involved in preparing a land use plan and associated NEPA analyses as listed below:

1. Prepare to Plan
2. Conduct Scoping
  - a. Issue Statement
  - b. Planning Criteria
3. Analyze the Management Situation
4. Develop Alternatives
  - a. Goals and Objectives
  - b. Allowable Uses and Management Actions
5. Estimate Effects of Alternatives

### **1. Prepare to Plan**

IM 2001-038 (Development/Approval of Preparation Plans for New Planning Starts) lists the items that a preparation plan should include. Listed below are select components of the preparation plan where planning teams should address sagebrush habitat and associated wildlife species (including sage-grouse):

- Anticipated planning issues and management concerns (see step 2.a below);
- Preliminary planning criteria and outstanding questions that must be addressed to support management decisions (see step 2.b below);
- Available data and data collection/format standards employed;
- Known or anticipated data gaps; and

- Data standards, work-month costs, staffing and skill requirements, and estimated time-frames needed to establish an integrated, automated geospatial database for filling in data gaps.

## 2. Conduct Scoping

### a. Issue Statement

Land use plans should include an issue statement that (1) describes the status of sagebrush-obligate species such as sage-grouse and (2) identifies the need to allocate land uses and identify management activities to help conserve sagebrush habitat and sagebrush-obligate species on BLM-administered lands.

### b. Planning Criteria

Planning criteria should be based on federal laws, regulations and policies that guide land management decisions that affect the conservation of sagebrush habitat and sagebrush-obligate species on BLM-administered land (43 CFR 1610.4-2).

Listed below are the most significant federal laws, regulations and policies upon which such criteria may be based (see Attachment 1 for a summary of these items).

- Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA)
- Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*)
- Sikes Act of 1974, Title II (16 U.S.C. 670g *et seq.*), as amended
- 43 CFR 1610 (Planning regulations)
- 43 CFR 4180 (Rangeland Health Standards)
- BLM Rangeland Health Standards Handbook (H-4180-1)
- BLM Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1)
- BLM Manual 6840 - Special Status Species Management

It is recommended that planning teams also consider the information below in developing planning criteria, as they deal specifically with sage-grouse considerations.

- Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) Conservation Assessment of Greater Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Habitats (Connelly et al., 2004)
- State and local sage-grouse conservation plans
- Relevant local and regional data relative to sage-grouse and other sagebrush-dependent wildlife species
- Relevant scientific literature, such as the WAFWA Guidelines for Management of Sage-grouse Populations and Habitats (Connelly et al, 2000)
- Other appropriate information

Planning teams may also want to consider 50 CFR Chapter IV – the Fish and Wildlife Service Policy for the Evaluation of Conservation Efforts when Making Listing Decisions (PECE). This policy provides a framework and criteria for evaluating conservation efforts that have not yet been implemented or have not yet demonstrated effectiveness.

### **3. Analyze the Management Situation**

The Analysis of the Management Situation (AMS) should describe the following information about sagebrush habitat and sagebrush-obligate species (including sage-grouse) in the planning area:

- Decisions from all applicable planning documents (Resource Management Plans, plan amendments, etc) that are affecting or could affect sagebrush habitat.
- The importance of the planning area to habitat for sagebrush-obligate species from a regional perspective. For example, state whether any portion of the habitat is part of a sage-grouse stronghold within the state.
- Current condition and extent of habitat for sagebrush-obligate species.
- Areas of highest priority for protecting, maintaining and restoring sagebrush habitat. Consider the size, condition, and connectivity of habitat areas when identifying priority areas. Emphasize habitat for sagebrush-obligate species when identifying priority areas for sagebrush as a whole.
- Trends of habitat condition and extent for sagebrush-obligate species.
- Indicators or criteria that will be used to evaluate the effects of the alternatives.
- Management opportunities to respond to identified issues or conflicts (that could be arrayed in a range of alternatives).

Use maps and other materials from State wildlife agencies, BLM, and/or other sources to gather information about the importance of the planning area to sagebrush-obligate species (including sage-grouse) from a regional perspective and the current condition and extent of sagebrush habitat. Most BLM States have completed or are in process of completing “broad resolution” maps of sage-grouse habitat. IM 2004-136 also addresses this task. These maps display vegetative cover and its current or potential utility to sage-grouse, and are therefore useful information sources regarding sage-grouse habitat.

The broad resolution maps may not provide information about the specific locations and conditions of seasonal sage-grouse habitats (breeding, nesting/early brood rearing, late brood-rearing and wintering). Use available local maps to describe the seasonal habitats within the planning area. If seasonal habitat information is not available at present, prepare maps at the planning area scale according to guidelines in state strategies (if completed) or BLM’s Guidance for the Management of Sagebrush Plant Communities for Sage-grouse Conservation (if state strategies are not completed), in partnership with State wildlife agencies.

## 4. Develop Alternatives

The alternatives should identify and evaluate reasonable, feasible and effective options for conserving sagebrush habitats and associated species in accordance with BLM's multiple-use mandate in FLPMA.

Ensure that each alternative contains considerations for sagebrush habitat conservation by (1) developing one or more goals related to sagebrush habitat with emphasis on sage-grouse habitat that will apply to all alternatives, (2) including objectives in each alternative that pertain to the goals, and (3) identifying allowable uses or management actions to achieve the objectives. This method will ensure that all alternatives, including the preferred alternative, will include sagebrush and sage-grouse habitat considerations.

Evaluate different levels of sagebrush (and associated sage-grouse) habitat conservation in the range of alternatives. The amount of sagebrush and sage-grouse conservation will vary as the alternatives respond to other resource concerns or demands. The evaluation of different levels of habitat conservation will help determine which combination represents the best balance of sagebrush and sage-grouse habitat conservation and resource use over the long term.

Describe and analyze at least one alternative that maximizes conservation of sagebrush habitat (emphasizing special status species habitat) through objectives, land use plan decisions and management direction. This alternative may or may not be designated as the Preferred Alternative.

### a. Goals and Objectives

Develop planning goals for protection/maintenance and restoration/rehabilitation of sagebrush habitat. Write objectives for each alternative that will achieve the goals to different degrees. Some objectives can be the same across some or all of the alternatives. For example, two alternatives may have the objective of initiating restoration/rehabilitating X percent of potential habitat by 2015, and another alternative may have the objective of initiating restoration/rehabilitating Y percent of potential habitat by 2015.

Listed below are recommended goals for the protection/maintenance and restoration/rehabilitation of sagebrush habitat. These goals may need to be modified for a given planning area based on the information that is available about the location and extent of sagebrush habitat and sagebrush-obligate species (especially sage-grouse) populations.

#### **Protection/maintenance goal** (focus on currently occupied high-priority habitat)

- Sustain the integrity of the sagebrush biome to provide the amount, continuity, and quality of habitat that is necessary to maintain sustainable populations of sage-grouse and other species by achieving the following results:

1. Maintain large patches of high quality sagebrush habitats, with emphasis on patches occupied by sage-grouse.
2. Maintain connections between sagebrush habitats, with emphasis on connections between habitats occupied by sage-grouse.

### **Restoration/rehabilitation goal**

- Identify the amount of habitat that should undergo restoration and/or rehabilitation during the life of the plan and initiate restoration and/or rehabilitation by achieving the following results:
  1. Reconnect large patches of sagebrush habitat with emphasis on reconnecting patches occupied by stronghold and isolated populations of sage-grouse.
  2. Enlarge the size of patches of sagebrush habitats with emphasis on patches occupied by sage-grouse.

### **b. Allowable Uses and Management Actions**

Set forth allowable uses and management actions in the plan to accomplish the objectives. Identify actions for protection/maintenance and restoration/rehabilitation to conserve sagebrush habitat with an emphasis on habitat for sage-grouse and other sagebrush-obligate species.

Include prescriptions, standards, and other mitigation measures to help protect/maintain and restore/rehabilitate sagebrush habitat according to the Suggested Management Practices section of BLM's Guidelines for the Management of Sagebrush Plant Communities for Sage-Grouse Conservation. Suggested Management Practices are provided for the maintenance and restoration of sagebrush vegetative communities that have been lost, fragmented, or are intact but of diminished quality. The Suggested Management Practices are cross-referenced to a variety of land management activities which could affect sagebrush communities.

See Attachment 2 for sample stipulations that could be included in land use plans.

## **5. Estimate Effects of Alternatives**

Describe the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to sagebrush habitat and associated sage-grouse habitat (current occupied habitat and potential restoration/rehabilitation areas). Describe also impacts to populations of sage-grouse and other significant sagebrush-obligate species (if applicable). Quantify the impacts to the extent possible (e.g., Alternative A would allow for X miles of new roads or cause X acres of surface disturbance or X acres of sagebrush habitat loss in current sage-grouse habitat).

## Attachment 1

### Reference Materials for Planning Criteria for Sagebrush Habitat

Listed below are summaries of federal laws, regulations and policies that guide land management decisions affecting sagebrush habitat. The excerpts provided support and/or influence consideration of sagebrush and sage-grouse habitat in land use planning efforts. These should be considered in developing planning criteria in BLM land use plans, as appropriate.

#### **Federal Land Policy & Management Act (FLPMA) of 1976, (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)**

Sec.102. [43 U.S.C. 1701], Declaration of Policy. (a) The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States that: (8) the public lands be managed in a manner that will protect the quality of scientific, scenic, historical, ecological, environmental, air and atmospheric, water resource, and archeological values; that, where appropriate, will preserve and protect certain public lands in their natural condition; that will provide food and habitat for fish and wildlife and domestic animals; and that will provide for outdoor recreation and human occupancy and use.

#### **Sikes Act of 1974, Title II (16 U.S.C. 670g et seq.), as amended**

This Act directs the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to, in cooperation with the State agencies, develop plans to “develop, maintain, and coordinate programs for the conservation and rehabilitation of wildlife, fish and game. Such conservation and rehabilitation programs shall include, but not limited to, specific habitat improvement projects, and related activities and adequate protection for species considered threatened or endangered.”

#### **43 CFR 1610 - Planning regulations**

**Sec. 1610.4-3 Inventory data and information collection.** (a) The District or [Field] manager shall arrange for resource, environmental, social, economic and institutional data and information to be collected, or assembled if already available. New information and inventory data collection will emphasize significant issues and decisions with the greatest potential impact. Inventory data and information shall be collected in a manner that aids application in the planning process, including subsequent monitoring requirements.

**Sec. 1610.4-4 Analysis of the management situation.** The District or [Field] Manager shall analyze the inventory data and other information available to determine the ability of the resource area to respond to identified issues and opportunities...

**Sec. 1610.7-2 Designation of areas of critical environmental concern.** Areas having potential for Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) designation and protection management shall be identified and considered throughout the resource management planning process...(a) The inventory data shall be analyzed to determine whether there are areas containing resources, values, systems or processes or hazards eligible for further consideration for designation as an ACEC. In order to be a potential ACEC, both of the following criteria shall be met:

(1) Relevance. There shall be present a significant historic, cultural, or scenic value; a fish or wildlife resource or other natural system or process; or natural hazard.

(2) Importance. The above described value...shall have substantial significance and values...

### **43 CFR 4180 – Rangeland Health Standards**

The regulations at 43 CFR 4180.1(d) require the management of rangelands so that “habitats are, or are making significant progress toward being, restored or maintained for Federal threatened and endangered species, Federal Proposed,...and other special status species.”

### **BLM Rangeland Health Standards Handbook (H-4180-1)**

BLM’s 4180 Handbook expands upon the 4180 regulations to state that standards apply to all ecosystems falling under BLM management (not just rangelands) and all activities managed by BLM (not just livestock grazing). BLM developed Land Health Standards in each state to define minimum resource conditions that must be achieved and maintained to meet the four fundamentals of rangeland health described in 43 CFR 4180.1.

**BLM’s Land Use Planning Handbook (H-1601-1)** – *Note: this handbook is currently under revision. Asterisks indicate places where wording may change according to the draft revised version of the handbook from April 2004.*

Appendix C of this handbook states that RMP decisions...

- Should identify strategies\* and\* decisions to conserve and recover special status species.
- Should identify actions and area-wide use restrictions needed to achieve desired population and habitat conditions.
- Should be sufficiently detailed to protect\*/enhance habitat pending development of implementation-level plans.
- May include stipulations or criteria that would apply to implementation actions.
- Should be consistent with approved conservation agreements (CAs), biological opinions (BOs), etc.

Appendix C also states that implementation decisions should...

- Identify programmatic and site-specific actions to implement Land Use Plan (LUP)\* decisions.
- Include an implementation schedule.\*

## **BLM Manual 6840 - Special Status Species Management**

The 6840 Manual provides for BLM to implement management plans that conserve candidate and Bureau-sensitive species and their habitats, and to ensure that actions authorized, funded, or carried out by the BLM do not contribute to the need for the species to become listed under the provisions of the Endangered Species Act.

Attachment 2

**Oil and Gas Leasing Stipulations (RMP Format - Example)**

The table below includes sample stipulations for No Surface Occupancy (NSO) and Timing Limitation (TL) that could benefit sage-grouse habitat conservation. Consider including stipulations such as these in land use plan revisions or amendments.

Type of Stipulation	Protected Resource	RMP Acres Affected (Approx.)	Stipulation Description
NSO	Greater Sage-grouse Leks  [CODE XXX]	[insert total RMP NSO acres for Sage-grouse]	<p>STIPULATION: Greater Sage-grouse Leks. This area encompasses sage-grouse leks. Surface Occupancy is not allowed within [insert distance] of identified lek sites.</p> <p>Purpose: To protect lek and nesting habitat within [insert distance] of active leks. (XXXXX RMP, Page XX)</p> <p>EXCEPTION: The Field Manager may grant an exception if an environmental analysis determines that the action, as proposed or conditioned, would not impair the function or utility of the site for current or subsequent reproductive display, including day time loafing/staging activities.</p> <p>MODIFICATION: The Field Manager may modify in extent, or substitute with a timing limitation, if an environmental analysis finds that a portion of the NSO area is nonessential to site utility or function, or that the proposed action could be conditioned so as not to impair the function or utility of the site for current or subsequent reproductive display, including day time loafing/staging activities. The stipulation may also be modified if the proponent, BLM, State wildlife agency, and where necessary, other affected interests, negotiate compensation or mitigation that satisfactorily offsets anticipated impacts to sage-grouse breeding activities and/or habitats.</p> <p>WAIVER: This stipulation may be waived, if after consulting with the State wildlife agency, it is determined that the site has been permanently abandoned or unoccupied for a minimum of __ years; site conditions have changed such that there is no reasonable likelihood of site occupation for a subsequent minimum period of __ years.</p>
TL	Greater Sage-grouse Nesting Habitat Associated with Leks  [CODE XXX]	[insert total RMP TL acres for Sage-grouse]	<p>STIPULATION: Sage-grouse Nesting Habitat. This area encompasses suitable sage-grouse nesting habitat associated with individual leks. No new surface use is allowed (exploration, construction, and drilling), within [insert distance] of identified leks from [insert date] through [insert date]. This stipulation does not apply to operation and maintenance of existing production facilities and roads.</p> <p>PURPOSE: To protect sage-grouse nesting activities associated with individual leks on sagebrush vegetation types. (XXXXX RMP, Page XX)</p> <p>EXCEPTION: The Field Manager may grant an exception if an environmental analysis determines that the action, as proposed or conditioned so as not to affect nest attendance, egg, chick survival, or nesting success. An exception could also be granted if the proponent, BLM, and State wildlife agency and where necessary, other affected interests, negotiate compensation or mitigation that would satisfactorily offset the anticipated losses of nesting habitat or nesting activities. Actions designed to enhance the long-term utility or availability of suitable sage-grouse habitat may be exempted from this timing limitation.</p> <p>MODIFICATION: The Field Manager may modify the size and shape of the Timing Limitation area if an environmental analysis indicates the actual habitat suitability for nesting is greater or less than the [insert distance] radius. Timeframes may be modified based on studies documenting local periods of actual use.</p> <p>WAIVER: This stipulation may be waived, if after consulting with the State wildlife agency, it is determined that the described lands are incapable of serving the long-term requirements of sage-grouse nesting habitat and that these ranges no longer warrant consideration as components of sage-grouse nesting habitat.</p>

**Bureau of Land Management**  
**National Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy**

**1.4.1 Guidance for the Management of Sagebrush Plant  
Communities for Sage-Grouse Conservation**

**U.S. Department of the Interior**

**November 2004**

# **GUIDANCE FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF SAGEBRUSH PLANT COMMUNITIES FOR SAGE-GROUSE CONSERVATION**

## **1) Introduction**

### **a) Purpose**

This document serves as guidance on managing, restoring and enhancing sagebrush habitat on public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). This guidance only applies until BLM State or local-level guidance is developed, or until specific sage-grouse conservation measures are incorporated into BLM land use plans. In July 2000, the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the U.S. Forest Service (FS), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and BLM. This MOU established state wildlife agencies as the lead for state and local conservation planning efforts for sage-grouse. In July 2002, WAFWA approved a proposal to develop a Conservation Assessment (CA) for sage-grouse and sage-grouse habitat to be completed in two distinct phases. Phase 1 is an assessment of sage-grouse populations and habitat status throughout their range across eleven western states. It was completed in June 2004. Phase 2, a range-wide plan for the conservation of sage-grouse and sage-grouse habitats, is scheduled for completion in 2005. BLM will consider guidance in these documents when developing strategies and plans in accordance with the MOU.

This guidance is designed to support and promote the range-wide conservation of sagebrush habitats for sage-grouse and other sagebrush-obligate wildlife species on public lands administered by the BLM. BLM States and associated Field Offices will utilize this guidance until the Bureau and its partners (1) finalize and adopt the BLM State-Level Strategies and/or state wildlife agency-led Sage-grouse Conservation Plans, and/or (2) incorporate sage-grouse habitat objectives and conservation measures into appropriate planning documents. This guidance may be modified through collaborative processes in each state in order to better fit local and regional conditions and to reflect ongoing efforts to complete state-level strategies. This guidance may not apply where locally-specific guidance has already been developed by BLM using the best available science.

Land management decisions on public lands managed by BLM will continue to be made at the state or local planning levels in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and other applicable laws and regulations. BLM designed this guidance to focus on conserving the habitat of sage-grouse (and by extension other wildlife species requiring sagebrush habitat) since wildlife populations, predator control, and hunting are primarily regulated by state or other Federal agencies. This guidance complements the Standards for Rangeland Health that were developed by the BLM Resource Advisory Councils in most western states.

It summarizes the current sage-grouse situation and describes the development of the guidance, the guidance itself, and the application of the guidance. This guidance only

applies to land management decisions and use authorizations over which BLM has administrative authorities and responsibilities.

## **b) Development of Guidance**

The following BLM documents were referred to during the development of this guidance:

- **2000 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with:** 1) WAFWA, 2) FS, 3) FWS and 4) BLM.
- **BLM Manual 6840 - Special Status Species Management.** The 6840 manual provides for BLM to implement management plans that conserve candidate and Bureau-sensitive species and their habitats, and to ensure that actions authorized, funded, or carried out by the BLM do not contribute to the need for the species to become listed under the provisions of the Endangered Species Act.
- **BLM Standards for Rangeland Health.** The regulations at 43 CFR 4180 require the management of rangelands so that “habitats are, or are making significant progress toward being restored or maintained for Federal threatened and endangered species, Federal Proposed ... and other special status species.” BLM’s 4180 Handbook (Standards for Rangeland Health) and 1601 Handbook (Land Use Planning) expand upon the 4180 regulations to state policy that standards apply to all ecosystems falling under BLM management (not just rangelands) and all activities managed by BLM (not just livestock grazing). BLM adopted Standards for Rangeland Health in each state to promote the maintenance or attainment of rangeland health as defined in the four fundamentals of rangeland health in 43 CFR 4180.1.
- **Fluid Minerals Best Management Practices.** The Fluid Minerals Group in the BLM WO has developed new program direction and a menu of Best Management Practices for this program. The Best Management Practices have been incorporated into this guidance and can be found at <http://www.blm.gov/bmp/>.

This guidance will be amended or periodically updated to reflect either new information or new policies, such as the development and issuance of program-specific Best Management Practices. For example, BMPs for wind energy are currently being developed in the Wind Energy Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. These BMPs will be adopted by reference when completed.

Many of the management actions described in this document (see “Suggested Management Practices” section) were derived from initial efforts by an interagency, interdisciplinary team in Oregon in 2000 to address the decline of sage-grouse habitat and populations. Since 2000, a number of resource specialists have revised the Oregon guidance to incorporate suggested management practices for application to all

BLM States with sage-grouse habitat where state conservation plans have not yet been approved and adopted by BLM, or where specific sage-grouse conservation measures have not been incorporated into BLM land use plans. This national-level guidance incorporates the best available science on landscape processes, sage-grouse seasonal habitats and sage-grouse life history into guidance to manage, restore and enhance sagebrush habitat.

### **c) Application of Guidance**

This guidance applies only to BLM-administered public lands until either BLM State or local-level guidance is issued or locally-specific conservation measures are incorporated into BLM land use plans. In accordance with the 2000 MOU between BLM, Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service and WAFWA, BLM will consider the WAFWA Guidelines, state and local conservation plans, and other appropriate information in the development of plans and guidelines. During this interim period, this guidance provides a mechanism for Field Offices, in cooperation with other partners and cooperators, to proactively maintain, enhance and/or restore sagebrush habitats that are important to sage-grouse and other sagebrush-dependent wildlife species.

This guidance encourages the application of scientific knowledge, anecdotal information, and professional judgment of local BLM personnel, state wildlife agency biologists and local sage-grouse working groups to manage and restore sagebrush habitats. Available state, regional and local information about the condition and distribution of sage-grouse and their habitats will help managers select appropriate management practices to solve local habitat problems. This guidance should be adapted to local situations and site-specific conditions, and management decisions should be made in full consideration of social, environmental and economic consequences, consistent with the BLM mission.

## **2) Current Sagebrush and Sage-Grouse Situation**

This section is intended to give the reader a general understanding of the current situation concerning sage-grouse and the sagebrush ecosystems upon which they depend. For a more complete treatment of the subject, the reader should consult the *Conservation Assessment of Greater Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Habitats* (Connelly et al. 2004) which was recently completed by WAFWA and is available at <http://sagemap.wr.usgs.gov/>. This document contains a thorough discussion of population status and trends, population ecology and characteristics, habitat characteristics, sagebrush ecosystem dynamics, sagebrush ecosystem status and trends, and other information concerning impacts to the species.

### **a) Sagebrush Plant Communities**

#### **i) General characteristics**

The entire sagebrush region in the western United States was estimated to historically cover 155.5 million acres (Kuchler 1970). Today, the sagebrush biome that supports

sage-grouse is estimated to cover 119 million acres (Connelly et al. 2004). Sagebrush covers much of the Great Basin and Wyoming Basin and reaches into the Snake River Plain, Columbia Basin, the Colorado Plateau, the state of Montana, southwestern Colorado, northern Arizona and New Mexico. Though sage-grouse are the most widely distributed species of conservation concern in the sagebrush biome, not all sagebrush is sage-grouse habitat.

Many species and subspecies of sagebrush grow in the Western United States from semi-desert lowlands to subalpine meadows. The species big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*) predominates, and has five known subspecies (West 1988; Kartesz 1994). It is important to differentiate between sagebrush species and subspecies in order to classify and understand ecological sites, palatability to livestock and wildlife, response to fire, and management responses. Although our management requires this type of information, for many birds the subspecies of sagebrush is less important than its height, density, cover, and patchiness.

There are a wide variety of plant communities within the sagebrush biome due to spatial variability associated with soil, climate, topography, and other physical processes (Tisdale and Hironaka 1981; West 1988). Natural and human-induced disturbances (fire, drought, etc.) also play a role. There is also a large variation in plant community dynamics through time. The spatial and temporal variability associated with sagebrush community dynamics complicates the management and monitoring of this resource. Grassy openings, springs, seeps, moist meadows, riparian stream sides, pinyon and/or juniper woodlands, aspen stands, and rock outcrops also add to the sagebrush mosaic, and these habitats support a broad diversity of wildlife species.

Usually a single species of sagebrush is dominant or co-dominant in a community, but understory plant diversity and composition differ greatly depending on soils, climatic conditions, and past management. Canopy cover of sagebrush communities is extremely variable depending on the sagebrush species or subspecies, elapsed time since a disturbance such as wildfire, age of the stand, and management treatments. In big sagebrush types, cover may range from 5 to 30 percent on some sites (Dealy et al. 1981). Localized sites within mountain big sagebrush communities may exceed 30 percent canopy cover.

Biological soil crust is an integral and usually overlooked component of some sagebrush communities. Biological soil crust (also known as “cryptogamic crust,” “microbiotic crust,” or “cryptogamic soil”) is a microfloral community composed of blue-green algae, bacteria, fungi, mosses, and lichens. The diversity and function of biological crust communities are not well understood (St. Clair et al. 1993).

## **ii) Historic plant communities/conditions**

A basic understanding of historical sagebrush ecosystems provides insight into the evolution of the connection between habitat and wildlife such as sage-grouse. Early explorers of the Intermountain West encountered a landscape dominated by shrubs and

found grasslands chiefly limited to hillsides and moist valley bottoms (Vale 1975). Big sagebrush was widespread and dominant and the range of sagebrush plant communities was about the same as it is today. With the introduction of domestic livestock in the late 1800s, the palatable understory species were greatly reduced, increasing the dominance of the less palatable sagebrush (Tisdale and Hironaka 1981, West 1988). Other studies also suggest that fire suppression and heavy grazing contributed to the invasion of junipers and other conifers in some sagebrush areas (Miller and Eddleman 2000, Tisdale and Hironaka 1981).

Jackrabbits, cottontails, and rodents were the major herbivores in the region. The cyclic population explosions of jackrabbits may have had a periodic and significant impact on local plant communities (Yensen 1980, Young 1994). Sage-grouse also had an effect on sagebrush and understory plants as did the periodic infestations of grasshoppers and crickets (Yensen 1980). Miller and others (1994) suggest that large herbivores were present in the sagebrush ecosystems, but their influence on vegetation was not significant because of low population densities.

Fires in pre-settlement times were probably patchy and smaller than recent fires creating a patchwork of young and old sagebrush stands across the landscape, interspersed with grassland openings, wet meadows, and other shrub communities. Pre-settlement fire intervals have been estimated at 15 to 25 years in wetter regions (mountain big sagebrush areas), and 60 to 110 years in the more arid sagebrush steppe where Wyoming big sagebrush dominates (Miller and Eddleman 2000, Tisdale and Hironaka 1981, Whisenant 1990). On more productive mountain big sagebrush and Wyoming big sagebrush plant communities, fires were frequent enough to limit establishment of conifers (Tisdale and Hironaka 1981).

Big sagebrush does not resprout after a fire; big sagebrush stands are replenished by wind-dispersed seed from adjacent unburned stands or seeds in the soil. Most sagebrush seeds fall within 3 feet of the shrub canopy, although wind can disperse seeds up to 90 feet (Meyer 1994), so the rate of big sagebrush recolonization in a burn depends on the distance from a seed source and the amount and viability of seed in the soil. Depending on the species and the size of a burn, sagebrush can reestablish itself within five years of a burn, but a return to a full pre-burn community (density and cover of sagebrush) cover can take 15 to 30 years (Bunting 1984, Miller and Rose 1999).

#### **b) General Overview of Existing Conditions and Threats to Sagebrush Habitats**

The sources and magnitude of impacts to sagebrush habitats have increased over time on public lands. The *Conservation Assessment of Greater Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Habitats* (CA) produced by WAFWA addresses questions about the magnitude of these impacts (Connelly et al. 2004). The CA provides a more detailed and up-to-date assessment than what is provided in this document. However, the CA should not be used as a substitute for more specific local or regional analysis.

Greater sage-grouse populations have declined throughout North America by 33 percent over the past 30 to 40 years and have been extirpated in four states and one Canadian province. Since settlement of the West began, numerous activities have adversely affected the number of birds and the amount, distribution, and quality of sagebrush habitats. Historically sagebrush-dominated vegetation was one of the most widespread habitats in the country. However, the majority of sagebrush ecosystems have been lost or altered in some way by human activities and naturally-occurring events. No single factor can be identified as the cause of declines in sage-grouse populations.

Altered fire regimes are believed to be the single, most important, negative influence on sage-grouse habitat in the western portion of the species' ranges. Repeated wildfires, fueled by the invasive annual cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*) and other exotic species, alter vast acres of sage-grouse habitat in the Great Basin, Columbia Plateau, and other ecoregions of the West. Cheatgrass alters fire frequency from historic intervals of 30 to 110 years to shorter cycles of five years or less (Whisenant 1990). Sagebrush does not re-establish under frequent fire cycles. This situation increases the potential for large fires, carrying a threat for additional cheatgrass invasion onto adjacent areas not yet dominated by cheatgrass. Native sagebrush communities may not reestablish under this fire regime and conditions favorable to sage-grouse may not be available in the future in these areas.

On more mesic sagebrush sites where cheatgrass is not a threat, fire return intervals have been lengthened resulting in increased conifer expansion into sagebrush habitats. As conifers expand into sagebrush communities, contiguous sagebrush stands are reduced in size and diverse grasses and forbs used by sage-grouse are diminished. Increased livestock grazing in the late 1800s and early 1900s contributed to a reduction in fuels that could carry fire, thereby decreasing fire frequency and contributing to accelerated conifer woodland invasion into sagebrush associations. Fire suppression policies generally lengthen fire-return intervals in conifer-dominated habitats allowing for increased cover densities. Subtle climatic shifts toward warmer and drier conditions have also been identified as a potential causal factor to the encroachment of pinyon-juniper woodlands into the sagebrush plant communities (Crawford et al. 2004).

Although cheatgrass proliferation is widespread, increases in other invasive plants and noxious weeds pose a significant threat to sagebrush habitats. In 1996, the spread of invasive species and noxious weeds was estimated to be at least 2,300 acres per day on BLM public land alone (BLM 1996).

Within the Interior Columbia River Basin, sagebrush and bunchgrass cover types experienced greater losses than any other habitat and will probably continue to decline with the cumulative impacts of present land uses (Saab and Rich 1997, citing Hann et al. 1997). Some activities, such as large-scale conversion of sagebrush to cultivated croplands or pastures, are still of concern but less common today than in the past. Disposal of BLM public land has also removed sagebrush habitat from Federal

ownership, which has resulted in loss or fragmentation if that land was converted to other purposes, such as row-crops agriculture or landfills.

Seeding of introduced wheatgrass monocultures has been reduced and seed mixtures now include more native species. Past seedings of nonnative species have reduced the value of areas as sage-grouse habitat and slowed the natural recovery process of sagebrush. Livestock grazing impacts on habitat have been reduced as management of public lands has improved. However, livestock impacts on the composition and diversity of habitat and the impacts of management structures (fences, water developments, salt placement, etc.) and present livestock management or grazing practices may continue to be a source of concern in some locations.

In some areas, issuance of rights-of-way, energy development, and recreational activities have caused a reduction in suitable habitat and increased habitat fragmentation. The extent of fragmentation or total area lost rarely has been linked to specific land uses (Dobler et al. 1996, Hann et al. 1997, Knick and Rotenberry 1997) and cumulative effects have not been estimated over the large geographic extent of sagebrush. The wide geographic distribution of sagebrush in maps depicting only a dominant cover type cannot fully illustrate the presence or condition of available habitats across the range of sagebrush communities. With the reduction in sagebrush habitats, periodic drought may intensify impacts to the integrity of sagebrush plant communities particularly if changes in land use activities are not adjusted accordingly.

In summary, the changes in and threats to sagebrush habitat described above all contribute to the decline of sage-grouse and other wildlife species dependent on sagebrush ecosystems.

### **3) Sage-Grouse Biology and Habitat Requirements**

The greater sage-grouse is the largest North American grouse species. They are relatively long-lived birds, typically living for four to five years. Because they lack a gizzard sage-grouse can only eat soft foods. Sage-grouse depend on a variety of sagebrush habitats throughout their life cycle. Sage-grouse are particularly dependent on subspecies of sagebrush: 1) Wyoming big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata wyomingensis*), 2) mountain big sagebrush (*A. t. vaseyana*), and 3) basin big sagebrush (*A. t. tridentata*). Other sagebrush species such as low sagebrush (*A. arbuscula*), fringed sagebrush (*A. frigida*) and silver sagebrush (*A. cana*) are also used, but to a lesser degree. The type and condition of sagebrush communities affects habitat use by sage-grouse populations (Connelly et al. 2000), although sage-grouse generally show strong site loyalty to historically used areas. (Fisher et al. 1993).

Connelly et al. (2000) provides a good overview of the different habitat needs of sage-grouse at different seasons of the year. This publication also provides guidelines for habitat management including information on protective buffer distances for leks, sagebrush and herbaceous cover and structure specifications, and seeding recommendations. These quantitative specifications are not included in this guidance in

order to promote development of local, site-specific prescriptions; however, the Connelly and colleagues (2000) publication may serve as a good starting point in developing local management, enhancement and restoration guidelines. Another good reference document for this type of information is “Birds in a Sagebrush Sea” (1999) published by the Partners in Flight, Western Working Group.

There are four major seasonal habitats: breeding, summer-late brood rearing, fall, and winter (Connelly et al. 2000).

### **a) Breeding (includes leks, nesting and early-brood rearing activities)**

#### **i) Leks**

Leks are sites where sage-grouse engage in courtship displays and mating and are often referred to as “strutting grounds.” Leks are generally open areas with short vegetation, exposed knolls, or rocky and windswept ridges. They range in size from less than one acre to over 100 acres and can support from several to hundreds of males. Some leks are used for many years. Leks can be formed opportunistically at sites within or adjacent to nesting habitat, or females may travel more than 13 miles after mating to nest (Connelly et al. 2000). Therefore, the availability of lek sites is usually not considered to be a limiting factor for sage-grouse.

Breeding usually occurs March through mid-May during early morning hours. However, the lekking and breeding period varies based upon, latitude, geographic location and climatic conditions. Leks are often surrounded by sagebrush stands with good shrub cover where sage-grouse nesting occurs.

#### **ii) Nesting**

Most sage-grouse nests are located under sagebrush plants that provide overhead cover. Females nesting under plants other than sagebrush are less successful in hatching their clutch. Sagebrush canopy cover in the preferred nesting areas ranges from 15 to 30 percent (Connelly et al. 2000). Grass and forb cover at nest sites provide a combination of visual, physical, and scent barriers to predators. Sage-grouse nests are simple ground scrapes that are sometimes lined with feathers and vegetation. Clutch size ranges from 6 to 13 eggs. Nest success can range from 12 to 86 percent and is relatively low compared to other prairie grouse species.

#### **iii) Early Brood-rearing**

The first few weeks after hatch are considered an early brood-rearing period. Hens with chicks often spend time relatively close to the nest site, but movements of up to one mile are documented. An abundance of insects, especially ants and beetles, and native forbs enhances chick survival during early brood rearing. Chicks begin to fly at two to three weeks of age. Broods remain together for up to 12 weeks. Most juvenile mortality occurs during nesting and the juvenile’s flightless stage, and is due primarily to

predation or severe weather conditions (Schroeder et al. 1999). Predation mortality can increase as concealment cover is diminished. Additionally juvenile survival is tied to the availability of insects. Insects provide the chicks with the necessary protein they need to develop (Drut 1994).

#### **iv) Summer-Late Brood-Rearing and Fall**

Late brood rearing habitats, used from summer into fall, usually have less dense sagebrush canopy than nesting habitats and generally a higher proportion of grasses and forbs in the understory. The diet of chicks consists of forbs and insects, and therefore diverse plant communities with abundant insects are especially important for nutritional purposes. As vegetation becomes desiccated in summer and fall, especially in dry years, sage-grouse move to areas that provide more palatable vegetation. They may migrate to higher elevations that receive additional summer moisture, concentrate along riparian habitats or, where available, utilize hay fields adjacent to sagebrush habitats to feed on green vegetation.

Sage-grouse may migrate only a short distance, not at all, or as much as 100 miles between seasonal uses (Schroeder et al. 1999). Their movements from late brood-rearing areas to winter habitat are dependent on weather conditions and snow cover and may involve travel across areas of unsuitable habitat during their migrations (Connelly et al. 2000). However, due to their dependence on sagebrush, they are rarely found outside of this habitat type.

#### **v) Winter**

During winter, sage-grouse feed almost exclusively on sagebrush leaves and buds. Sagebrush density can be highly variable on winter habitats, but typically sage-grouse select big sagebrush stands with plants at least 10 to 12 inches above snow. They tend to use the same wintering areas year after year.

### **4) Sagebrush Conservation Goal**

BLM's goal is to:

***Sustain or reestablish the integrity of the sagebrush biome to provide the amount, continuity, and quality of habitat that is necessary to maintain sustainable populations of sage-grouse and other sagebrush-dependent wildlife species.***

### **5) Sagebrush and Sage-Grouse Issues**

An estimated 50 percent of the sagebrush biome is still dominated by sagebrush. An unknown amount of this area still supports adequate vegetation structure and diversity to meet sage-grouse habitat needs. Some of this sagebrush habitat is contiguous over

large parts of the landscape with minimal fragmentation and with a healthy understory of native species that support viable sage-grouse populations. Some of these sagebrush communities also meet BLM's Standards for Rangeland Health and support multiple uses including recreation, livestock grazing, wild horses and burros, wilderness values, etc. The priority in these areas is to continue the existing good management that has maintained these habitats over the years. Management may need to be fine-tuned to accomplish this goal. Natural disturbance regimes (e.g., fires) may need to be periodically applied at the appropriate scale to maintain these current good conditions. This guidance provides practices that managers can apply in these healthy sagebrush communities to maintain or enhance these areas as good sage-grouse and other wildlife habitat.

In other parts of the sagebrush biome, habitat for sage-grouse and other wildlife species has been impacted by a variety of factors (human impacts, altered disturbance regimes, invasive species, etc.) resulting in loss, fragmentation and/or a reduction in the quality of habitat. These three habitat issues provide the framework for the Suggested Management Practices (SMPs) that follow, which have been developed to maintain, enhance or restore sagebrush habitat where BLM State or local strategies have not been developed, or specific sage-grouse conservation measures have not been incorporated into BLM land use plans.

The distinction is not immediately clear between: habitat loss, habitat fragmentation, and reduced habitat quality. It is a continuum that sometimes defies definition as it relates to some of the SMPs in this guidance. For example, habitat loss is distinguished from habitat fragmentation by the scope of the loss and shape of the loss (fragmentation is more linear or patchy), and from reduced habitat quality which is focused on the relative proportion of vegetation components within existing habitat. The relationships, interactions and significance related to habitat loss, habitat fragmentation and changes in habitat quality will vary by region, locality and site. Therefore, users of this guidance should not focus on the issue categories as much as on the local and regional application of the SMPs.

### **a) Habitat Loss**

Habitat loss occurs in areas where both structure (vertical height and horizontal cover) of sagebrush and the diversity of plant species in the understory have been greatly reduced in a relatively large area, resulting in poor sage-grouse habitat, or where the habitat in its entirety has been eliminated. Examples of habitat loss include, but are not limited to, areas where wildfires burn in plant communities and invasive species significantly increase in the post-fire environment (e.g., cheatgrass), historic sagebrush habitat that has been converted to agricultural or human habitation uses, or disturbances resulting from large, open pit mining operations. Wildfires in healthy sagebrush communities temporarily change plant composition, but do not result in a permanent loss of habitat. Other smaller habitat loss areas (e.g., drill pads, roads, recreation facilities, powerlines, etc.) are considered under habitat fragmentation.

## **b) Habitat Fragmentation**

On a broader scale, intact, functioning sagebrush communities may exist (e.g., good habitat continuity) but are interrupted or fragmented by structures, small disturbances, and transportation systems (and the noise associated with them at certain times of the year). These disturbances are generally linear or patchy when compared to larger areas of habitat loss caused by wildfires or agricultural conversion. Sometimes the fragmentation is not caused by the structure but by the use of, or potentially the presence of, the structure. For example, powerlines often fragment sagebrush landscapes because raptor predation of sage-grouse is increased due to the perches provided by the power poles. While large, spatially-extensive areas of lost habitat are easily identified as being a problem for sage-grouse, levels of acceptable fragmentation of sage-grouse habitat are not as easily established.

The consequences of fragmentation to sage-grouse vary, but can include the competition for fewer suitable nesting sites, reduced food supplies, the isolation of breeding habitat from brood-rearing areas and leks from nesting habitat. Such outcomes may lead to lower reproduction rates for sage-grouse and other wildlife species that use this habitat for all or part of their life cycle. At this time there are no minimum or optimum sizes of habitat patches known to be “best” for sage-grouse and other sagebrush associated species, however, larger patches are more desirable than small isolated patches.

## **c) Reduced Habitat Quality**

Quality habitat for sage-grouse includes a diverse plant community (relative to the potential of the site) with appropriate vegetation heights and structure. Appropriate quality habitat for sage-grouse also varies by season. For example, on winter range, sagebrush is the key species upon which to focus management or restoration. Conversely, in spring brood-rearing habitat, understory diversity (with the associated insects) as well as sagebrush overstory are both required. An example of reduced habitat quality is an area that burned and recovered to a mixed stand of invasive and native herbaceous species with minimal sagebrush cover, or an area that has not burned but shows a decline in herbaceous understory.

It is important that the seasonal habitat requirements of sage-grouse (see sage-grouse biology section) be evaluated before instituting management changes or restoration treatments. Changes in current management or implementation of less intensive treatments (thinning sagebrush, changing herbivore use period or intensity to improve understory species vigor, etc.) are examples of SMPs that may be used to improve habitat quality relative to sage-grouse seasonal habitat needs.

## **6) Suggested Management Practices (SMPs)**

SMPs are management or restoration activities, restrictions or treatments that are designed to maintain, enhance or restore sagebrush habitats. SMPs are intended to

stimulate creative and appropriate solutions for local issues surrounding the management and restoration of sagebrush habitat. Although SMPs focus on sage-grouse, they also apply more generically to other sagebrush-dependent wildlife species.

Applications of SMPs should always be considered at a larger spatial scale than the management action being considered. The context of the project relative to administrative boundaries and surrounding habitat condition should be included in the prioritization and implementation process for management or restoration activities. The potential for the local site to produce distinctive types, amounts and composition of vegetation is another important factor that influences treatment design and prioritization.

SMPs are divided into two categories; those that will **maintain** and those that will **restore or enhance** sagebrush habitats. Maintenance of habitat includes practices or treatments that minimize unwanted disturbances while maintaining the integrity of sagebrush communities and the values associated with them. These sagebrush stands have not crossed a threshold that requires expensive restoration of plant species. Reestablishment of sagebrush habitat may include restoration and enhancement treatments to reestablish habitat components that have been lost, reduced or suppressed. Generally some type of vegetation treatment followed by reseedling is required to move sagebrush plant communities that have lost important vegetation components back across a threshold to a functioning condition.

The differences in maintenance and restoration/enhancement approaches can be illustrated using a sagebrush plant community with juniper encroachment. Maintenance activities that may be used to slow juniper encroachment may include changing livestock grazing management to minimize impacts on herbaceous species that compete with the juniper. Another maintenance approach is to eliminate the juniper by mechanical removal, chemical control or prescribed burning. Besides implementing appropriate post treatment management, no further treatments would be necessary as understory species would recover. If juniper encroachment was not controlled and understory species (sagebrush and herbaceous species) were lost, restoration or enhancement would be required. The first step would be to remove or reduce the juniper followed by reseedling of desirable plants. In this case, an ecological threshold has been crossed necessitating more extensive and expensive treatments than in the maintenance example.

#### **a) SMPs Common to all Issues**

##### **i) Maintain Habitat**

- Base management decisions on monitoring and/or other appropriate information that provides plant and soil response with respect to land uses, development impacts, weather, wildlife use, insects and other environmental factors. Monitoring should be implemented and results should be applied in an adaptive management process to adjust maintenance strategies or treatments on similar projects conducted in the future. Appropriate spatial scales should be considered when developing monitoring strategies.

- Aggressively pursue the control of invasive species, especially noxious plants, in a timely manner. Small islands of invasive species can be treated more cost effectively than extensive acreages. Maintain the vigor of native species and minimize soil disturbance in areas where invasive species are a threat.
- Encourage vehicle use on established roads and trails or confine use to areas established specifically for off-road use to minimize impacts to sage-grouse habitat. Off-road vehicle use can cause significant disturbance to sagebrush habitat and sage-grouse, particularly when use extends into key areas where there are known leks, brood-rearing or winter sage-grouse habitat.
- Consider sage-grouse seasonal habitat needs in developing strategies and implementing treatments to maintain sagebrush habitat. Evaluate direct impacts from vegetation, dust, noise, human contact in the assessment process. Not all activities or the impacts of these activities are detrimental to sage-grouse or their seasonal habitats.
- Explore the use of conservation easements and the acquisition (through purchase, donation or exchange) of valuable sagebrush habitat, to maintain, replace or increase habitat. Any BLM program can purchase conservation easements. Federal Land Transition Facilitation Act (Baca II) and Land and Water Conservation Funds can be used to acquire both fee-title and conservation easements.

## **ii) Restore and Enhance Habitat**

- Base management decisions on monitoring and/or other appropriate information that provides plant and soil response with respect to land uses, development impacts, weather, wildlife use, insects and other environmental factors. Monitoring should be implemented and results should be applied in an adaptive management process to adjust maintenance strategies or treatments on similar projects conducted in the future. Appropriate spatial scales should be considered when developing monitoring strategies.
- Control invasive species with herbicides, biological control agents, burning and/or mechanical techniques. Reseed native plant species, when available and/or appropriate, to restore desired plant communities. Native perennial plant communities are generally the desired goal although desirable non-native species may be used in some degraded situations.
- Encourage vehicle use of established roads and trails or confine use to areas established specifically for off-road use to minimize impacts to areas restored to sagebrush habitat. Implement appropriate exclusion periods until restoration goals are met. Many land uses (off-road vehicle, livestock, wild

horse and burros, etc.) can cause significant impacts to areas restored to native or other desirable plants.

- Consider sage-grouse seasonal habitat needs in developing strategies and implementing treatments to restore sagebrush habitat. Evaluate direct impacts from vegetation, dust, noise, human contact in the assessment process. Not all activities nor the impacts of these activities are detrimental to sage-grouse or their seasonal habitats.
- Focus project design and approval on avoiding or minimizing habitat degradation, or restoring areas that have been degraded (on-site mitigation). Measures to mitigate impacts at off-site locations could be considered to offset unavoidable sage-grouse habitat alteration and losses. Mitigation could also be used to offset sage-grouse habitat loss that is not a result of human activities. The effects of fragmentation and habitat loss should be weighed against the value of mitigation. Mitigation cannot always replace the quality or location of crucial habitat. BLM's authority to require off-site mitigation is limited. However, mitigation on a case-by-case basis may be implemented or negotiated with willing project proponents. Mitigation actions should be considered in the following priority: 1) replacing habitats with similar habitats (in-kind/off-site mitigation), and 2) replacing habitats with other appropriate habitats, when similar habitats are not available (out-of-kind/off-site mitigation). Mitigation should occur within or adjacent to occupied or restored habitats. Off-site mitigation should eliminate, reduce, or directly alleviate impacts to sage-grouse habitat.

The SMPs for Habitat Loss, Habitat Fragmentation, and Habitat Quality are numbered consecutively to facilitate use of Attachment 1. Attachment 1 contains a crosswalk between the SMPs and the BLM programs relevant to the conservation of sage-grouse.

## **b) Habitat Loss SMPs**

### **i) Maintain Habitat**

1. Develop cooperative agreements with other land owners to maintain sagebrush patches within developed lands (housing developments, croplands, business developments etc.).
2. Avoid the impact of construction and operations by not placing mines, oil and gas and geothermal drilling sites and facilities, roads, and mineral material disposal sites in or next to sensitive habitats such as sage-grouse leks, nesting, early brood-rearing, breeding, and wintering habitat. When habitat loss cannot be avoided, stipulations, conditions of approval, or mitigating measures should be developed to reduce impacts on sage-grouse habitats.

3. Whenever feasible and environmentally preferred, avoid surface occupancy by roads, livestock management facilities, well pads, powerlines, fences, or other structures adjacent to occupied leks, i.e., those leks attended by 2 or more males in at least 2 of the previous 5 years (Connelly et al. 2000). Protection of sage-grouse leks from disturbance during mating season is important for successful reproduction. Reproductive success is increased by minimizing disturbances to habitat when constructing, improving or maintaining roads. Signage, including OHV designations, identifying and/or protecting sensitive areas should be considered. Dust abatement measures should be employed.

4. Locate or construct facilities such as oil and gas compressor stations so that the noise from the station does not disturb grouse activities at the lek. Installing mufflers and baffle panels, berm the station (where invasive weeds are not an issue), or placing restrictions on how close these facilities can be located to leks, nesting and early brood-rearing habitat should be considered. New recreational facilities such as campgrounds should also be located so that the noise does not disturb grouse activities at the lek. Construction and/or maintenance should be scheduled to minimize conflicts with any known leks. Sage-grouse are sensitive to noise levels from all activities during early evening and morning hours when strutting occurs during March and April, so actions to reduce noise levels during these periods should be taken.

5. Reduce habitat loss associated with mineral exploration and development by consolidating facilities as much as possible. The possibility of burying utility and flow lines beneath or along roads, centralizing tank batteries, and drilling multiple wells from a single location should be considered.

6. Design and construct mineral exploration and development operations so as to disturb the smallest footprint practical on the landscape while meeting all safety requirements. Where feasible, consider mowing of parking and storage areas on portions of oil and gas well drilling locations rather than stripping the topsoil and vegetation from the entire location, and the use of two-track trails to conduct exploration activities. Minimize traffic by limiting public vehicular access in new development areas, use remote monitoring of production facilities, encourage car-pooling and the use of buses, and encourage operator-enforced speed limits to reduce dust, noise, and potential collisions with sage-grouse so as to reduce habitat impacts. Consider using stakeless geophysical exploration activities to reduce vehicle traffic in sagebrush habitat.

7. Plan and construct mining and mineral development activities, to the degree possible given State water rights, to minimize disturbances that would result in alterations to springs and riparian habitat. Sage-grouse can be impacted by the loss of surface water. Alternative water sources should be developed to replace natural sources that have been negatively affected or destroyed during these development activities. Water storage impoundments should be designed to avoid or minimize loss or degradation of sage-grouse habitat. Water storage impoundments should be

monitored and treated to prevent mosquito breeding (and the associated spread of West Nile Virus). Evaporation, reserve, work over, and production pits should also be designed with adequate fencing/netting or other protective features to reduce mortality of sage-grouse due to drowning or entrapment.

8. Carefully consider impacts to sage-grouse and their habitats when reviewing requests for exceptions, waivers, or modifications to lease stipulations or evaluating requests for waivers of Conditions of Approval. These requests occur from time to time in approved mining, oil and gas, geothermal exploration and development plans, mineral material disposal operations, and other realty actions.

9. Evaluate land exchanges, acquisitions and disposals to determine if important sage-grouse habitat would be impacted or whether the BLM would be acquiring important sage-grouse habitat.

10. Evaluate proposed agricultural leases, range improvements, recreational special use permits and habitat improvement projects to determine if sage-grouse and their habitats would be impacted.

11. Conduct fire management activities to minimize overall wildfire size and frequency in sagebrush plant communities where sage-grouse habitat objectives will not be met if a fire occurs. Wildfire suppression in sagebrush habitat with an understory of invasive, annual species is crucial. Prioritization of suppression actions should take into account the value and rarity of sagebrush habitat and sage-grouse. Retain unburned areas, including interior islands and patches, of sagebrush unless there are compelling safety, private property, resource protection, or control objectives at risk. Burnout operations in areas where there are no threats to human life, private property or other important resources identified in land management plans should be minimized in crucial sage-grouse habitats as identified in land and fire management plans.

12. Annually update Fire Management Plans to incorporate new sagebrush habitat information as well as fire suppression priorities in sagebrush habitats. Objectives for the management of sagebrush ecosystems should be incorporated into Fire Management Plans and provided to initial attack personnel at the beginning of each fire season.

13. Provide Fire Management Plans to the Incident Management Team. The Field Office should provide Resource Advisors to assist the Incident Commander or Incident Management Teams in developing timely fire suppression priorities in crucial sage-grouse habitat.

14. Evaluate impacts on sage-grouse habitat in areas where wildland fire use for resource benefits may be implemented. Also consider the interval since last fire, fire size and past plant community response to burning during this process.

15. Establish fuels treatment projects at strategic locations to minimize size of wildfires and limit further loss of sagebrush. Fuels treatment may include the use of greenstrips (strips of fire resistant vegetation) to help reduce the spread of wildfires into sagebrush communities.

16. Use prescriptive livestock grazing, where appropriate, to reduce annual grass production and the spread of wildfire into sagebrush communities. Timing of grazing and effects on residual native plants need to be carefully evaluated.

## **ii) Habitat Restoration and Enhancement**

17. Consider removal of conifers (e.g., cutting, burning, chaining, etc.) where they have encroached upon sage-grouse habitat. Areas of dense conifers (pinyon pine, juniper, ponderosa pine, Douglas fir) may require cutting or chaining to reestablish sagebrush plant communities (prescribed fire may not be feasible given the lack of understory and high woody fuel loads). Sites selected for cutting or chaining should have conifers that have established after the early to mid-1800s. Sites should also have evidence of past sagebrush plant communities as evidenced by residual native plants or soils that support a rangeland not a woodland ecological site. Cutting and chaining may occur as a single treatment or a preparatory treatment for prescribed burning. Post-treatment seeding will probably be required in areas where residual, herbaceous vegetation is inadequate to recover once the conifer competition is removed.

18. Impacts to sage-grouse habitat can be minimized by quickly initiating restoration practices after surface disturbance activities such as mining and oil and gas production. Steps such as recontouring, respreading topsoil, revegetating all disturbed areas not needed for well or mine production, including cuts, fills, borrow ditches, and well pads up to the production facilities are suggested. Additionally, allowing room for the setup of workover rigs, and allowing future setup and parking on the top of new vegetation will minimize the need for future disturbances. The use of native species of shrubs, forbs, and grasses in seed mixes appropriate for each ecological site will also enhance habitat value or sage-grouse.

19. Evaluate (e.g., monitor) burned areas for up to three years post-fire and continue management restrictions until the recovering or seeded plant community reflects the desired condition. Length of time required will be dependent on inherent site productivity and local climatic patterns. Drier sagebrush plant communities may take longer than three years to reach desired condition. Periodic drought cycles may also increase the time necessary to reach the desired condition.

20. Reclaim unnecessary or redundant roads and facilities by removing surfacing material, reestablishing the original contour, spreading topsoil, and seeding to restore habitat.

21. Utilize the Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation program to apply appropriate post-wildfire treatments (livestock and/or recreation exclusion, reseeding, erosion control structures, etc.) within sage-grouse habitat. Use of native species is encouraged dependent on cost, availability and chance for success. Seed mixtures should be designed to reestablish important seasonal habitat components for sage-grouse. For example, forbs should be emphasized for early and late brood-rearing areas, leks should not be reseeded with plants that change the vegetation height previously found on the lek.

### **c) Habitat Fragmentation SMPs**

#### **i) Maintain Habitat Connectivity**

22. Install anti-perching devices on existing or new powerlines in occupied sage-grouse habitat, or habitat identified for restoration, to minimize raptor use of these poles. When monitoring indicates that existing powerlines are contributing to sage-grouse decline, managers are encouraged to work with right-of-way holders to install anti-perching devices on existing lines in these situations. Some initial monitoring studies suggest that sage-grouse will avoid suitable habitat adjacent to overhead power lines if predators use the power poles for perching. Predation of sage-grouse would be reduced if it is feasible to bury powerlines in sage-grouse habitat.

23. Encourage placement of new utility developments (power lines, pipelines, etc.) and transportation routes in existing utility or transportation corridors to minimize fragmentation of sage-grouse habitat. If corridors do not exist, consider consolidating utility lines, pipelines, and other structures along the same new route (e.g., at one location) that least impacts sagebrush habitat.

24. Place new roads where construction activity and use is concentrated and does not impact critical areas such as leks, nesting, early brood-rearing, and winter habitat riparian areas, springs and wetlands. Predesigning a road system (and pipeline collection system) for the entire area will ensure the minimum impact to resource values. An increase in the number of roads increases habitat fragmentation, stress and sage-grouse displacement to less suitable habitats. Roads can create barriers to movement/dispersal, increased levels of disturbance (adjacent to suitable habitat), increased mortality (road kills), and reduced habitat suitability (within patch microclimate effects), and may increase susceptibility to predation. The type, intensity and volume of traffic, the road surface, and the type and structure of adjacent vegetation are all factors that contribute to impacts imposed by roads on sage-grouse and their habitat.

25. Manage existing road use to decrease the level of disturbance during critical periods such as breeding (lek use) by implementing seasonal or daily use schedules, by limiting traffic volume, and/or by posting speed limits.

26. Locate new structures associated with recreation (picnic areas, campgrounds, wildlife viewing sites, dispersed recreation sites, kiosks and parking lots) and livestock management facilities (corrals, water pipelines and tanks/troughs, exclosures, etc.) away from crucial breeding, brood-rearing and winter areas; or manage disturbance with seasonal or daily timing restrictions. Construction of recreational-related facilities (kiosks, toilets, signs, etc.) that provide avian perches should be avoided unless they include mitigating features such as perch guards. Manage use at established structures/developments to reduce impacts to sage-grouse during critical periods of their life cycle.

27. Design and locate the placement of fences for livestock, wildlife, wild horse and burro, recreation and developed site protection so as not to disturb important sage-grouse habitat areas. Poorly placed or improperly designed fences can provide perches for raptors and cause mortality of birds that fly into wires. Increasing the visibility of new fences can reduce hazards to flying sage-grouse. Impacts of livestock congregation against fences and its effect on sage-grouse habitat near leks, nesting, and wintering areas should be considered.

28. Design wind energy facilities to reduce habitat fragmentation and mortality to sage-grouse. Tubular tower designs to reduce raptor perches and noise reduction to minimize disturbance to nesting birds are encouraged. Design criteria for these projects should include minimizing the facility footprint (including the road network required to service the generators) in sage-grouse habitat. Best Management Practices (BMP) for wind energy are currently being developed in the Wind Energy Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. The BMPs that address the conservation of sage-grouse and their habitat are adopted by reference.

29. Manage dispersed recreation activities like hiking, mountain biking, and horseback riding to minimize impacts to vegetation and sage-grouse in sensitive sage-grouse habitat areas. Keeping these users on established trails will minimize impacts to sage-grouse habitat and activities.

30. Consider seasonal closures to protect priority sage-grouse habitat if other alternatives will not achieve desired objectives.

## **ii) Restore Habitat Connectivity**

31. Reclaim unused roads and facilities by reseeding sagebrush, shrubs, and native grasses and forbs to help improve sage-grouse habitat and reduce weed invasion.

32. Encourage vegetative restoration along roads, rights-of-way, on well pads, and at existing facilities where habitat needs for sage-grouse are not currently met.

33. Require successful seeding of appropriate vegetation on any new disturbance associated with mineral and energy facility developments, livestock management

facilities, and recreation facilities.

34. Restore small areas dominated by invasive species with desirable vegetation to minimize fragmentation of habitat.

**d) Habitat Quality SMPs**

**i) Maintain Habitat Quality**

35. Where good habitat quality exists, maintain current management practices considering plant composition and soil type.

36. Use grazing practices that promote the growth and persistence of native shrubs, grasses and forbs needed by sage-grouse for seasonal food and concealment. Grazing practices include changing season of use, numbers of livestock, grazing intensity, distribution of livestock use, and type of livestock (sheep, cattle or horses). Altering season of grazing may help to favor perennial plants in areas where native perennials and cheatgrass occur together in the plant community. Vegetation structure (height) should be managed so as to provide adequate cover for sage-grouse during the nesting period.

37. Change mineral supplement and/or watering locations to move domestic livestock to desired areas. However, any change in location of supplement or watering location should consider potential effects to sage-grouse habitat.

38. Maintain an appropriate management level (AML) of wild horse and burro numbers to minimize detrimental effects on sage-grouse habitat. Where wild horse grazing detrimentally affects sage-grouse habitat, reassess wild horse numbers and reduce them, if necessary.

39. Coordinate with state wildlife agencies where wildlife use detrimentally affects sage-grouse habitat quality. This coordination is especially important after large-scale disturbances such as wildfires.

40. Construct and maintain water developments at key locations in sage-grouse habitat. Install or retrofit water developments with wildlife escape ramps. Water developments and “guzzlers” can improve sage-grouse summer habitats.

41. Maintain seeps, springs, wet meadows, and riparian vegetation in a functional and diverse condition for young sage-grouse and other species that depend on forbs and insects associated with these areas. Consider fencing if vegetation associated with these wet areas can not be maintained with current livestock, wildlife or wild horse and burro use and the impacts of the fence are outweighed by the improved habitat quality.

42. Maintain sagebrush and understory diversity (relative to site potential) adjacent to crucial seasonal sage-grouse habitats unless such removal is necessary to achieve sage-grouse habitat management objectives. For example, thinning small patches of dense sagebrush may increase desirable forbs in early brood-rearing habitat.

43. Encourage the use of insecticide baits and natural pathogens instead of broad-spectrum insecticides where insect control is required. Improper use of pesticides to control insect outbreaks can result in a reduction of food resources for sage-grouse, particularly nesting females and chicks. While the Animal and Plant Inspection Service (APHIS) is responsible for controlling these insects on public lands, the BLM should recommend avoidance areas as well as the type of treatment. Target pest control toward key problem areas, and schedule applications to be effective in minimum doses. Broadcast spraying should generally be avoided in favor of ground applications to minimize drift into non-target areas. Avoid applying pesticides to sage-grouse breeding habitat during the brood-rearing season (mid-May through mid-July) to reduce the loss of food supply to chicks and avoid the chance of secondary poisoning.

44. Grazing use should be adjusted during extended drought periods. Consider transitioning back to pre-drought use when drought conditions have ended. Vegetation composition and vigor is slow to recover when drought and herbivore use are not in balance.

## **ii) Restoration and Enhancement of Habitat Quality**

45. Reduce the density of conifers that have encroached into but do not yet dominate sagebrush plant communities. Site selection should be based on proximity to occupied habitat, site potential, herbaceous invasive species, or other factors that affect the potential for sagebrush plant communities to be reestablished.

46. Where other grazing management options are not achieving, or cannot achieve, the desired objectives, a short-term option may be livestock exclusion. Temporary exclusion can provide the plant community the opportunity to progress toward a point where grazing can again be reintroduced once desired conditions are reached. Removing livestock may not reverse the condition of severely altered habitats and often must be combined with reseeding and other rehabilitation methods to restore appropriate sagebrush habitat.

47. Restore lost riparian and wetland plant species diversity and structure by replanting appropriate species near crucial sage-grouse habitat.

48. Create small openings in continuous or dense sagebrush to create a mosaic of multiple age classes and associated understory diversity across the landscape to benefit many sagebrush-dependent species. Factors that will help to determine the mosaic are soil types, topography, aspect, climate and local weather patterns, and current and potential plant communities. Care should be exercised to ensure that

the understory does not contain invasive species that will become dominant with the removal of the sagebrush overstory.

Without careful consideration and knowledge of the species for which the treatment is designed, habitats can be fragmented and generalist species that compete with sagebrush-dependant species could be increased. Treatments should be designed to improve a deficient condition within the community (e.g. poor cover of herbaceous understory).

49. Reintroduction of appropriate fire regimes will help to limit conifer encroachment into the sagebrush plant communities. Prioritization of areas to be burned or mechanically treated should take into account invasive herbaceous species, fire regime and condition class (measure of departure from historic fire regime). A balance should be achieved between treating areas that have significantly departed from historic fire regime (condition class 3) and areas that are functioning within an appropriate fire regime (condition class 1).

50. Seeding may be required in areas where residual perennial vegetation is insufficient to respond following prescribed burning. Minimize seeding with non-native species that may create a continuous perennial grass cover and restrict reestablishment of native vegetation. However, non-native seed may be appropriate on severely degraded sites if native species would not be successful or are not available.

51. Evaluate all wildfires in known sage-grouse habitat to ensure that the appropriate plant species are reseeded relative to site potential and seasonal sage-grouse habitat requirements. Emphasize the use of native species in these seed mixtures and minimize the use of introduced grasses. Make burned sage-grouse habitats a high priority for restoration if funds are limited in the Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Program. If native plant seed is scarce, assign a priority that this seed be reallocated to Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation projects in critical sage-grouse habitat areas. Seeding of non-native species may be necessary in areas where invasive plants dominate or have the potential to dominate the post-fire plant community.

## **7) Steps to Achieve Sagebrush and Sage-grouse Conservation**

Where statewide sage-grouse conservation plans are not yet developed and adopted by BLM, or sage-grouse conservation measures are not incorporated into BLM land use plans, the following five steps should be followed to conserve sagebrush and sage-grouse. The five steps are: map populations and habitat, establish goals for sage-grouse habitat conservation at the local level, select, prioritize, and implement management activities, monitor progress towards goals and objectives, adjust activities to improve progress towards reaching goals and objectives.

Each step is important, and completing all steps will promote conservation of sage-grouse habitat. The implementation of SMPs is where “the rubber meets the road” –

where conservation will actually occur. Therefore, Field Offices should design and implement well conceived treatments on priority areas.

The inventory and mapping of sage-grouse populations and habitats may take several years. In the interim, Field Offices should implement **priority** management practices and restoration treatments while mapping populations and habitat and formulating broader objectives; other practices will require site-specific information. Completing steps 1 and 2 will ultimately influence the selection and implementation of all management practices. The remainder of this section describes each step in detail.

### **a) Map Populations and Habitats**

Field Offices should work cooperatively with state agencies and other partners to survey and map known sage-grouse population and habitat locations at the local level. Partners may have already completed work that BLM can use in its mapping efforts, and BLM should share knowledge with partners as well.

Mapping populations and habitat is crucial to conserving and protecting habitat. The more that is known about the location and quality of sage-grouse populations and habitat, the easier it will be to evaluate, select and prioritize management actions, and the more cost-effective it will be to implement them. In addition, maintaining and updating knowledge of known habitat and potential habitat will establish a baseline for determining habitat loss and restoration over time, and for evaluating the effectiveness of management actions and mitigation measures. Mapping should be accomplished in GIS and used in coordination with mapping efforts performed by state wildlife agencies.

Most management activities require knowledge of populations and habitat. For example, one action for livestock grazing could be coordinating the timing and location of livestock turnout and trailing to avoid concentrations of livestock on leks during the sage-grouse breeding season. This would require knowledge of locations of lek sites. Another action could be installing new power lines within existing power line corridors. This would not require knowledge of populations or habitat because it is in an existing corridor.

Field Office staff can map sage-grouse populations and habitat in a variety of ways. If the staff has already started mapping at the local level and believes their method is effective, they do not necessarily need to adopt the following suggestions.

Listed below are recommended features to map.

#### **➤ Seasonal Habitats**

- Breeding: breeding display sites (leks), nesting areas, and early brood-rearing areas
- Summer-late brood-rearing
- Fall habitats

- Wintering habitats

First, map known habitat, which includes areas that sage-grouse definitely occupy and use at various times of the year. Time permitting, map potential habitat, which refers to the kind of lands, land forms, and plant communities that could, but are not known to, support sage-grouse during breeding, summer and late brood-rearing, fall, or wintering. BLM should consider all documented historical habitats as potential habitat until better information is acquired through state and regional conservation planning efforts.

### ➤ **Populations**

- Migratory or Non-migratory – Determine whether the population is migratory, non-migratory or a combination.
- Source – Populations in which the output of offspring results in a population that exceeds the carrying capacity of the local habitat promoting dispersal.
- Isolated– Relatively small populations, which may be stable or declining, that are isolated by farmlands, forests, grasslands and/or development.

First, map source populations. Second, concentrate on mapping isolated populations. Note, however, that in some locations the isolated populations may be equally important as source populations, as they provide alternative genetic sources. This is true for the Gunnison sage-grouse, for example.

## **b) Establish Goals for Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation at the Local Level**

Establishing goals for the conservation of sage-grouse habitat will help Field Offices select and prioritize management actions. Field Offices should incorporate sage-grouse habitat related goals into land use plan revisions in progress, or into upcoming revisions (see the land use planning guidance for sage-grouse for more information). Field offices not currently undertaking land use plan revisions should amend land use plans to include goals. Recommended goals include the following:

### **i) Goals to Maintain Habitat**

The first priority is to focus on currently occupied, high-priority habitat to maintain and enhance existing sage-grouse habitats (geographic extent and vegetative cover) used during each stage of the life cycle (breeding, summer/late brood rearing, and wintering). These goals should reflect land use plan decisions and consider human activities that disrupt sage-grouse habitats during their seasons of use, particularly during the breeding and winter seasons. In addition undesired habitat modifications such as land tenure adjustments, habitat conversions, road and facility construction, etc. need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Finally, provide management appropriate for natural disturbances (wildland fire, insects, disease, etc.).

### **c) Goals to Restore and Enhance Habitat**

Identify the initial amount and location of low quality or lost habitat that should undergo restoration during the life of the plan and initiate restoration using the following criteria for prioritization:

1. Reconnect occupied habitats.
2. Enlarge occupied habitats.
3. Reconnect stronghold populations with isolated populations.
4. Reconnect isolated populations.

#### **d) Select, Prioritize, and Implement Management Activities**

Field offices should apply SMPs to as many ongoing activities as possible. In addition, Field Offices should include appropriate SMPs in NEPA analyses on new land use or management proposals. Implementing SMPs will promote the conservation of sage-grouse habitat at the landscape level. Field Offices should prioritize activities based on local sage-grouse population and habitat needs, and on available resources.

In addition to prioritizing the activities themselves, Field Offices need to prioritize the locations for implementing SMPs. The following is a recommended prioritization process:

- First, implement activities to conserve **known** habitat, placing the highest priority on the best quality habitats that support the most populations (source populations first, then isolated populations).
- Second, implement activities to conserve **potential** habitat and populations, placing the highest priority on potential habitat that joins known habitat, serves as buffer to high quality known habitat and on the best quality habitats that could support viable populations.

When selecting activities and locations, Field Offices are encouraged to consider the relationship of key and potential habitat to ecological sites. It may be appropriate to group sage-grouse habitats by similar ecological sites and apply the same management activities. In all cases, appropriate monitoring studies are required to determine if project goals are being met.

#### **e) Monitor Progress Towards Goals and Objectives**

All offices should collect, evaluate and share monitoring results on all activities or treatments implemented to maintain or restore sagebrush habitat for sage-grouse. Annual reviews of monitoring are needed to determine progress toward mapping populations and habitat, developing habitat goals, and applying management and restoration actions in sage-grouse habitat.

#### **f) Adjust Activities to Improve Progress Towards Reaching Goals and Objectives**

Field Offices should adjust activities as needed and as quickly as possible to make significant progress in accomplishing sagebrush and sage-grouse habitat conservation goals (e.g., utilize an adaptive management approach). As previously mentioned, applying the SMPs is especially important, because they will promote the conservation of sage-grouse habitat. When activities conflict with habitat objectives, Field Managers should resolve the conflict as soon as possible.

#### **8) Summary**

The guidance to achieve sagebrush and sage-grouse habitat conservation is intended for use during the period until BLM State or local-level guidance is developed and adopted, or until specific sage-grouse conservation measures are incorporated into BLM land use plans. For conservation to be successful, BLM must communicate, consult and cooperate with state wildlife agencies, the public and a variety of stakeholders in implementing this guidance. Proper application of the guidance also requires managers to incorporate local expertise and knowledge, best available science and input from others in tailoring the SMPs in this document to site-specific activities or treatments. In all cases, management should consider local site conditions in context within a broader landscape that has extremely high temporal and spatial variability.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Blaisdell, J. P., R. B. Murray and E. D. McAurthur. 1982. Managing inter-mountain rangelands- sagebrush-grass ranges. USDA, Forest Service General Technical Report INT-134.
- Bunting, S. C. 1984. Fires in sagebrush-grass ecosystems: successional changes. K. Sanders and J. Durham, editors, Rangeland fire effects: a symposium. USDI Bureau of Land Management, Boise, ID. 7-11.
- Bureau of Land Management. 1996. Partners against weeds-an action plan for the Bureau of Land Management. 43 p.
- Braun, C. E. 1998. Sage-grouse declines in western North America: what are the problems? Proceedings of the Western Association of State Fish and Wildlife Agencies 78:139-156.
- Connelly, J.W., and C.E. Braun. 1997. Long-term changes in sage grouse *Centrocercus urophasianus* population in western North America. *Wildlife Biology* 3/4: 123-128.
- Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands and C. E. Braun. 2000. Guidelines for management of sage-grouse populations and habitats. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 28:967-985.
- 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. Cheyene, Wyoming.
- Crawford, J. A., R. O. Olson, N. E. West, J. C. Mosley, M. A. Schroeder, T. D. Whitson, R. F. Miller, M. A. Gregg, and C. S. Boyd. 2004. Synthesis paper - Ecology and management of sage-grouse and sage-grouse habitat. *Journal of Range Management* 57:2-19.
- Dealy, J. E., D. A. Leckenby and D. M. Concannon. 1981. Wildlife habitats in managed rangelands-the Great Basin of southeastern Oregon: plant communities and their importance to wildlife. USDA Forest Service General Technical Report PNW-120.
- Dobler, F. C., J. Eby, C. Perry, S. Richardson, and M. Vander Haegen. 1996. Status of Washington's shrub-steppe ecosystem: extent, ownership, and wildlife/vegetation relationships. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Research Report, Olympia, WA.
- Dobkin, D. S. 1994. Conservation and management of Neotropical migrant landbirds in the northern Rockies and Great Plains. University of Idaho Press, Moscow, ID.

- Drut, M. S., W. H. Pyle, and J. A. Crawford. 1994. *Journal of Range Management* 47:90-93.
- Fischer, R.A., A.D.Apa, W.L. Wakkinen, K.P. Reese, and J.W. Connelly. 1993. Nesting-area fidelity of sage grouse in southeastern Idaho. *Condor* 95:1038-1041.
- Girard, G. L. 1937. Life history, habitats, and food of the sage grouse, *Centrocercus urophasianus* Bonaparte. University of Wyoming, Publication 3, Laramie, USA.
- Hann, W. J., J. L. Lyons, M. G. Karl, P. F. Hessburg, R. E. Keane, D. G. Long, J. P. Menakis, C. H. McNicholl, S. G. Leonard, R. A. Gravenmier and B. G. Smith. 1997. Landscape dynamics of the Basin. T. M. Quigley and S. J. Arbelbiede, technical editors, *An Assessment of ecosystem components in the Interior Columbia River Basin and portions of the Klamath and Great Basins: Vol. II*, USDAA Forest Service, PNW-GTR-405. Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland OR. 339-1055.
- Jensen, M. E. 1989. Soil characteristic of mountainous northeastern Nevada sagebrush community types. *Great Basin Naturalist* 49:469-481.
- Kartesz, J. P. 1994. A synonymized checklist of the vascular flora of the United States, Canada, and Greenland. Timber Press. Portland, OR.
- Knick, S. T., J. T. Rotenberry, and T. J. Zarriello. 1997. Supervised classification of Landsat thematic mapper imagery in a semi-arid rangeland by nonparametric discriminant analysis. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 63:79–86.
- Knick, S. T., D. S. Dobkin, J. T. Rotenberry, M. A. Schroeder, W. M. Vander Hagen, and C. van Riper III. 2003. Teetering on the edge or too late? Conservation and research issues for avifauna of sagebrush habitats. *The Condor* 105:611-634.
- Küchler, A. W. 1970. Potential natural vegetation (map at scale 1:7,500,000). The national atlas of the U.S.A. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC (as cited in West 1988). 90-91.
- Meyer, S. E. 1994. Germination and establishment ecology of big sagebrush: implications for community restoration. S. B. Monson and S. G. Kitchen, editors, *Proceedings: Ecology and management of annual rangelands*. USDA Forest Service General Technical Report INT-GTR313. 244-251.
- Miller, R. F. and L. E. Eddleman. 2000. Spatial and temporal changes of sage-grouse habitat in the sagebrush biome. Oregon State University Agricultural Experiment Station Technical Bulletin 151. 35 p.
- Miller, R. F., T. J. Svejcar and N. E. West. 1994. Implications of livestock grazing in the Intermountain Sagebrush Region: plant composition. M. Vavra, W. A. Laycock and

- R. D. Piper. Ecological Implications of Livestock Herbivory in the West. Society for Range Management. Denver, CO. 101-146.
- Miller, R. F. and J. A. Rose. 1999. Fire history and western juniper encroachment in sagebrush steppe. *Journal of Range Management*. 52:550-559.
- Paige, C., and S. A. Ritter. 1999. Birds in a sagebrush sea: managing sagebrush habitats for bird communities. Partners in Flight Western Working Group, Boise, ID.
- Passey, H. B., W. K. Hugie, E. W. Williams and D. E. Ball. 1982. Relationships between soil, plant community, and climate on rangelands of the Intermountain West. USDA, Soil Conservation Service, Technical Bulletin No. 1669.
- Pielou, E. C. 1991. After the ice age: the return of life to glaciated North America. University of Chicago Press. Chicago, IL.
- Saab, V and T. Rich. 1997. Large-scale conservation assessment for neotropical migratory land birds in the Interior Columbia Basin. USDA Forest Service General Technical Report PNW-GTR-399, Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR.
- Schroeder, M.A., J.R. Young and C.E. Braun. 1999. Sage Grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*). In *The Birds of North America*, No. 425 (A. Poole and F. Gills, eds.). The Birds of North American, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.
- 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. *The Condor*. 106:363–376.
- St. Clair, L. L. and J. R. Johansen. 1993. Introduction to the symposium on soil crust communities. *Great Basin Naturalist*. 53:1-4.
- St. Clair, L. L., J. R. Johansen and S. R. Rushforth. 1993. Lichens of soil crust communities in the Intermountain Areas of the western United States. *Great Basin Naturalist* 53:5-12.
- Tisdale, E. W. 1994. Great Basin region: sagebrush types. T.N. Shiflet ed. *Rangeland Cover Types*. Society for Range Management. Denver, CO. 40-46.
- Tisdale, E. W. and M. Hironaka 1981. The sagebrush-grass ecoregion: a review of the ecological literature. *Forest, Wildlife and Range Experiment Station Contribution No. 209*. University of Idaho, Moscow.
- Vale, T. R. 1975. Presettlement vegetation in the sagebrush-grass area of the Intermountain West. *Journal of Range Management* 28:32-36.

- West, N. E. 1988. Intermountain deserts, shrub steppes and woodlands. M. G. Barbour and W. D. Billings, editors, *North American Terrestrial Vegetation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. 209-230.
- Whisenant, S. G. 1990. Changing fire frequencies on Idaho's Snake River Plains: ecological management implications. E. D. McArthur, E. M. Rommey and P. T. Tueller, editors. *Proceedings of the Symposium on Cheatgrass Invasion, Shrub Die-off and Other Aspects of Shrub Biology and Management*. Las Vegas, NV, USDA Forest Service General Technical Report INT-276. Intermountain Research Station, Ogden, UT. 4-10.
- Williams, G., D. E. Miller and D. H. Miller. 1971. *Peter Kene Ogden's Snake Country Journals: 1827-28 and 1828-1829*. Hudson's Bay record Society, London.
- Yensen, D. 1980. A grazing history of southwestern Idaho with emphasis on the Birds of Prey Study Area. USDI Bureau of Land Management Snake River Birds of Prey Research Project, Boise, ID.
- Young, J. D. 1994. Changes in plant communities in the Great Basin induced by domestic livestock grazing. K. T. Harper, L. L. St. Clair, K. H. Thorne and W. M. Hess, editors, *Natural History of the Colorado Plateau and Great Basin*. University Press, Boulder, CO. 113-123.

**Attachment 1. Matrix to crosswalk SMP's with BLM programs or activities. SMP's on pages 13-15 (SMPs Common to All Issues) apply to all programs and activities in this table.**

SMPs Pages 15-23	BLM Program or Activity						
	Range Mgmt.	Mining	Recreation	Energy	Realty	Wildlife	Fire Mgmt.
1.					X		
2.		X		X			
3.	X	X		X	X		
4.		X	X	X	X		
5.		X		X			
6.		X		X			
7.		X		X			
8.		X		X	X		
9.					X		
10.					X		
11.							X
12.							X
13.							X
14.							X
15.							X
16.	X						X
17.	X						X
18.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
19.							X
20.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
21.							X
22.				X	X		
23.		X		X	X		
24.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
25.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
26.	X		X				
27.	X		X				
28.				X			
29.			X				
30.	X	X	X	X	X		
31.	X	X	X	X	X		X
32.	X	X	X	X	X		X
33.	X	X	X	X	X		
34.	X						X
35.	X						
36.	X						
37.	X						
38.	X						

<b>SMPs</b> Pages 15-23	<b>BLM Program or Activity</b>						
	<b>Range Mgmt.</b>	<b>Mining</b>	<b>Recreation</b>	<b>Energy</b>	<b>Realty</b>	<b>Wildlife</b>	<b>Fire Mgmt.</b>
39.						X	
40.	X					X	
41.	X	X	X	X	X	X	
42.	X						X
43.	X					X	
44.	X						
45.	X						X
46.	X						
47.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
48.	X					X	X
49.							X
50.							X
51.						X	X