| Issue | Applies To | Where to incorporate | Language |
|---|---|---|---|
| Land Retention<br>*WY and CO see comments on the additional drop-in language sheet* | All ADPPs | Section 2.6.2, Lands and Realty – Land Tenure | Include drop-in language:<br><br>*"Lands classified as priority habitat and general habitat (or habitat classification appropriate for the sub-region) for Greater Sage-Grouse will be retained in federal management unless: (1) the agency can demonstrate that disposal of the lands will provide a net conservation gain to the Greater Sage-Grouse or (2) the agency can demonstrate that the disposal of the lands will have no direct or indirect adverse impact on conservation of the Greater Sage-Grouse."* |
| Conifer Removal | All ADPPs | Section 2.6.2, Vegetation – Conifer Encroachment | Include drop-in language:<br><br><u>For Great Basin</u><br>*"Remove conifers encroaching into sagebrush habitats. Prioritize treatments closest to occupied sage-grouse habitats and near occupied leks, and where juniper encroachment is phase 1 or phase 2. Use of site-specific analysis and tools like VDDT and the FIAT report (Chambers et. al., 2014) will help refine the location for specific areas to be treated."*<br><br><u>For Rocky Mountain</u><br>*"Remove conifers encroaching into sagebrush habitats. Prioritize treatments closest to occupied sage-grouse habitats and near occupied leks, and where juniper encroachment is phase 1 or phase 2. Use of site-specific analysis and principles like those included in the FIAT report (Chambers et. al., 2014) and other ongoing modeling efforts to address conifer encroachment will help refine the location for specific priority areas to be treated."* |
| TTM Temp Closures | All ADPPs | Section 2.6.2, Comprehensive Trails and Travel Management | Include drop-in language:<br><br>*"In PHMA and GHMA, temporary closures will be considered in accordance with 43 CFR subpart 8364 (Closures and Restrictions); 43 CFR subpart 8351 (Designated National Area); 43 CFR subpart 6302 (Use of Wilderness Areas, Prohibited Acts, and Penalties); 43 CFR subpart 8341 (Conditions of Use).*<br><br>*Temporary closure or restriction orders under these authorities are enacted at the discretion of the authorized officer to resolve management conflicts and protect persons, property, and public lands and resources. Where an authorized officer determines that off-highway vehicles are causing or will cause considerable adverse effects upon soil, vegetation, wildlife, wildlife habitat, cultural resources, historical resources, threatened or endangered species, wilderness suitability, other authorized uses, or other resources, the affected areas shall be immediately closed to the type(s) of vehicle causing the adverse effect until the adverse effects are eliminated and measures implemented to prevent recurrence. (43 CFR 8341.2) A closure or restriction order should be considered only after other management strategies and alternatives have been explored. The duration of temporary closure or restriction orders should be limited to 24 months or less; however, certain situations may require longer closures and/or iterative temporary closures. This may include closure of routes or areas."* |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Recreation Facilities | All ADPPs | Section 2.6.2, Recreation and Visitor Services | Include drop-in language:<br><br>*"In PHMA, do not construct new recreation facilities (e.g., campgrounds, trails, trailheads, staging areas) unless the development would have a net conservation gain to GRSG habitat (such as concentrating recreation, diverting use away from critical areas, etc.), or unless the development is required for visitor health and safety or resource protection."* |
| WH&B | Utah, Oregon, Nevada, Idaho ADPPs | Section 2.6.2, Wild Horses and Burros | Include drop-in language (Oregon, Nevada, Idaho will include language highlighted in yellow prioritizing WHB management actions in SFAs) :<br><br>*"Management Action 1: Manage herd management areas (HMAs) in GRSG habitat within established AML ranges to achieve and maintain GRSG habitat objectives (Table 2-X).*<br><br>*Management Action 2: Complete rangeland health assessments for HMAs containing GRSG habitat using an interdisciplinary team of specialists (e.g. range, wildlife, and riparian). The priorities for conducting assessments are:*<br>*1. HMAs containing SFA;*<br>*2. HMAs containing PHMA;*<br>*3. HMAs containing only GHMA;*<br>*4. HMAs containing sagebrush habitat outside of PHMA, IHMA. and GHMA mapped habitat;*<br>*5. HMAs without GRSG habitat.*<br><br>*Management Action 3: Prioritize gathers and population growth suppression techniques in HMAs in GRSG habitat, unless removals are necessary in other areas to address higher priority environmental issues, including herd health impacts. Place higher priority on Herd Areas not allocated as Herd Management Areas and occupied by wild horses and burros in SFAs followed by PHMA, as these areas are to be managed for zero wild horses and burros.*<br><br>*Management Action 4: In SFAs and PHMA outside of SFA, assess and adjust AMLs through the NEPA process within HMAs when wild horses or burros are identified as a significant causal factor in not meeting land health standards, even if current AML is not being exceeded .*<br><br>*Management Action 5: In SFAs and PHMA outside of SFA, monitor the effects of WHB use in relation to GRSG seasonal habitat objectives on an annual basis to help determine future management actions.*<br><br>*Management Action 6: Develop or amend herd management area plans (HMAPs) to incorporate GRSG habitat objectives and management considerations for all HMAs within GRSG habitat, with emphasis placed on SFAs and other PHMAs.*<br><br>*Management Action 7: Consider removals or exclusion of WHB during or immediately following emergency* |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *situations (such as fire, floods, and drought) to facilitate meeting GRSG habitat objectives where HMAs overlap with GRSG habitat.*<br><br>*<u>Management Action 8:</u> When conducting NEPA analysis for wild horse/burro management activities, water developments, or other rangeland improvements for wild horses, address the direct and indirect effects to GRSG populations and habitat. Implement any water developments or rangeland improvements using the criteria identified for domestic livestock.*<br><br>*<u>Management Action 9:</u> Coordinate with professionals from other federal and state agencies, researchers at universities, and others to utilize and evaluate new management tools (e.g., population growth suppression, inventory techniques, and telemetry) for implementing the WHB program."* |
| Split Estate | All ADPPs | Section 2.6.2, Fluid Minerals | Include drop-in language:<br><br>*"Where the federal government owns the mineral estate in PHMAs and GHMAs, and the surface is in non-federal ownership, apply the same stipulations, COAs, and/or conservation measures and RDFs applied if the mineral estate is developed on BLM-administered lands in that management area, to the maximum extent permissible under existing authorities, and in coordination with the landowner."*<br><br>*"Where the federal government owns the surface and the mineral estate is in non-federal ownership in PHMA and GHMA, apply appropriate surface use COAs, stipulations, and mineral RDFs through ROW grants or other surface management instruments, to the maximum extent permissible under existing authorities, in coordination with the mineral estate owner/lessee."* |
| Technical/ Economically Feasible | All ADPPs | Glossary | Include drop-in language:<br><br>*"Actions that are practical or feasible from the technical and economic standpoint and using common sense, rather than simply desirable from the standpoint of the applicant. It is the BLM's sole responsibility to determine what actions are technically and economically feasible. The BLM will consider whether implementation of the proposed action is likely given past and current practice and technology; this consideration does not necessarily require a cost-benefit analysis or speculation about an applicant's costs and profit."* (Modified from the CEQ's 40 Most Asked Questions and BLM NEPA Handbook, Section 6.6.3) |
| RDFs | All ADPPs | Appendix, Glossary | Insert as introductory text in the RDF Appendix, and as an entry in the glossary under "Required Design Feature"<br><br>*Required Design Features (RDFs) are required for certain activities in all GRSG habitat. RDFs establish the minimum specifications for certain activities to help mitigate adverse impacts. However, the applicability and overall effectiveness of each RDF cannot be fully assessed until the project level when the project location and design are known. Because of site-specific circumstances, some RDFs may not apply to some projects (e.g., a resource is not present on a given site) and/or may require slight variations (e.g., a larger or smaller protective area). All variations in RDFs would require that at least one of the following be demonstrated in the NEPA analysis associated with the project/activity:*<br>• *A specific RDF is documented to not be applicable to the site-specific conditions of the project/activity* |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *(e.g.due to site limitations or engineering considerations). Economic considerations, such as increased costs, do not necessarily require that an RDF be varied or rendered inapplicable;*<br>• *An alternative RDF is determined to provide equal or better protection for GRSG or its habitat;*<br>• *A specific RDF will provide no additional protection to GRSG or its habitat.* |
| PACs/COT | All ADPPs | Chapter 1 (exact location TBD, will vary for each ADPP) | Include drop-in language:<br><br>***Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Objectives: Priority Areas for Conservation and how they correlate with Priority and General Habitat Management Areas***<br><br>*In 2012, the Director of the USFWS asked the Conservation Objectives Team (COT), consisting of state and USFWS representatives, to produce recommendations regarding the degree to which the threats need to be reduced or ameliorated to conserve GRSG so that it would no longer be in danger of extinction or likely to become in danger of extinction in the foreseeable future. The COT Report (USFWS 2013a) provides objectives based upon the best scientific and commercial data available at the time of its release. The BLM/FS planning decisions analyzed in the LUP/EISs are intended to ameliorate threats identified in the COT report and to reverse the trends in habitat condition. The COT Report can be viewed online at the following address:*<br><br>*http://www.fws.gov/mountain-prairie/species/birds/sagegrouse/COT/COT-Report-with-Dear-Interested-Reader-Letter.pdf*<br><br>*The highest level objective in the COT Report is identified as meeting the objectives of WAFWA's 2006 GRSG Comprehensive Strategy of "reversing negative population trends and achieving a neutral or positive population trend."*<br><br>*The COT Report provides a WAFWA Management Zone and Population Risk Assessment. The report identifies localized threats from sagebrush elimination, fire, conifer encroachment, weed and annual grass invasion, mining, free-roaming wild horses and burros, urbanization, and widespread threats from energy development, infrastructure, grazing, and recreation (USFWS 2013a, p. 18).*<br><br>*Key areas across the landscape that are considered "necessary to maintain redundant, representative, and resilient populations" are identified within the COT Report. The USFWS in concert with the respective state wildlife management agencies identified these key areas as Priority Areas for Conservation (PACs).*<br><br>*Within the [insert name of planning area here], the PACs consist of a total _____ acres. Under the Proposed Plan, the PACs are comprised of _____acres of PHMA managed by the BLM/FS, _____acres of GHMA managed by the BLM/FS, and _____acres of non-habitat managed by the BLM/FS [adapt to each particular ADPP, such as include IHMA in Idaho and "other mapped habitat" in Nevada].* |
| SFA | All ADPPs | Section 1.1.1 (for | Include drop-in language: |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | that have SFA | amendments), will vary for revisions | *"On October 27, 2014, the FWS provided the BLM/FS a memorandum titled "Greater Sage-Grouse: Additional Recommendations to Refine Land Use Allocations in Highly Important Landscapes". The memorandum and associated maps provided by the FWS identify areas that represent recognized "strongholds" for GRSG that have been noted and referenced by the conservation community as having the highest densities of GRSG and other criteria important for the persistence of the species. These areas have been incorporated into the Proposed Plan as Sagebrush Focal Areas (SFA) (Map X), and will be managed as PHMA with the following additional management:*<br>*1) Recommended for withdrawal from the General Mining Act of 1872, subject to valid existing rights.*<br>[Note: item #1 will need to be adjusted for WY to say: *"Recommended for withdrawal from the General Mining Act of 1872, subject to valid existing rights, the lands show in Map Y (x acres)*]<br>*2) Managed as NSO, without waiver, exception, or modification, for fluid mineral leasing.*<br>*3) Prioritized for management and conservation actions in these areas, including, but not limited to review of livestock grazing permits/leases (see livestock grazing section for additional actions)."*<br><br>(b) (5) [redacted] |
| | | Glossary | Include drop-in definition for "Sagebrush Focal Area":<br><br>*"Areas identified by the FWS that that represent recognized "strongholds" for GRSG that have been noted and referenced by the conservation community as having the highest densities of GRSG and other criteria important for the persistence of GRSG."* |
| All Allocations | All ADPPs | Chap 1, Planning Criteria Section | Include drop-in language as a separate planning criterion:<br><br>*"Where more restrictive land use allocations or decisions are made in existing RMPs, those more restrictive land use allocations or decisions will remain in effect and will not be amended by this LUPA."* |
| | | Chap 2, Management Common to All Alternatives | Include drop-in language as a management action common to all alternatives:<br><br>*"Where more restrictive land use allocations or decisions are made in existing RMPs, those more restrictive land use allocations or decisions will remain in effect and will not be amended by this LUPA."* |
| Buffers | All ADPPs except for those in WY | Section 1.1.1 (for amendments), will vary for revisions | Include drop-in language:<br><br>*"On November 21, 2014 the USGS published "Conservation Buffer Distance Estimates for Greater Sage-Grouse—A Review" (USGS 2014). The USGS review provided a compilation and summary of published scientific studies that evaluate the influence of anthropogenic activities and infrastructure on GRSG populations. The BLM has reviewed this information and examined how lek buffer-distances were addressed through land use allocations and other management actions in the Draft [Insert Plan Name]. Based on this review, in undertaking BLM management actions, and consistent with valid and existing rights and applicable law in authorizing third party actions, the he BLM will apply the lek buffer-distances in the USGS Report "Conservation Buffer Distance Estimates for Greater Sage Grouse-A Review (Open File Report 2014-1239)" in both GHMA and PHMA as detailed in [Appendix X]."* . |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mitigation Framework<br>*This is in addition to the language provided on the Additional drop-in language sheet* | All ADPPs | Mitigation Appendix | There was a typo on page 1 of the Mitigation Framework that was distributed on January 30th. At the bottom of the page, the following sentence should be corrected to read:<br><br>*This is also consistent with BLM Manual 6840 – Special Status Species Management, Section .02B, which states "to initiate* ***proactive*** ~~*protective*~~ *conservation measures that reduce or eliminate threats to Bureau sensitive species to minimize the likelihood of the need for listing of these species under the ESA.*<br><br>This corrected sentence accurately quotes BLM Manual 6840. |
| Livestock Grazing | All ADPPs | Section 2.6.2, Livestock Grazing | There was an error in the Livestock Grazing issue direction distributed on January 30th. Under the "Livestock Grazing" issue, the "and/or" needs to be replaced with "and". The revised second bullet point drop-in now reads:<br><br>"*The NEPA analysis for renewals and modifications of livestock grazing permits/leases that include lands within PHMAs will include specific management thresholds based on GRSG Habitat Objectives Table and Land Health Standards (43 CFR 4180.2) and defined responses that will allow the authorizing officer to make adjustments to livestock grazing without conducting additional NEPA."* |
| Introduction of Alternatives | All ADPPs | Section 2.6.1 (for amendments), will vary for revisions | **PENDING:** Consistent language for Chap 2.6.1 that states why the PRMPs changed from what was in the DRMP pref. alternative, and generally explain BLM's approach. This will be distributed on 2/11. |