

From: [Mary Flanderka](#)
To: [Amanda Withroder](#); [Amanda Withroder](#); [Barb Sahl](#); [Barb Sahl](#); [Bill DiRienzo](#); [Bill Gerhart](#); [Bill Gerhart](#); [Bob Budd](#); [Bob Budd](#); [Brian - Casper Wy Jensen](#); [Cain, Steven \(Steve\)](#); [Chris Wichmann](#); [Chris Wichmann](#); [Chris Wichmann](#); [Craig Smith](#); [Darrell Zlomke](#); [Darrell Zlomke](#); [Dennis Saville@blm.gov](#); [Domenic Bravo](#); [Domenic Bravo](#); [Ian Tator](#); [Jason Fearneyhough](#); [Jason Fearneyhough](#); [Jennifer Morton](#); [Jerimiah Rieman](#); [Laura Yetter](#); [Lynn Gemlo](#); [Mark Sattelberg@fws.gov](#); [Mary Flanderka](#); [Milward Simpson](#); [Milward Simpson](#); [Misty Hays](#); [Nephi Cole](#); [Nicholas Graf](#); [patrick tyrrell](#); [Randy Wiggins](#); [Stephenson, John](#); [Susan Child](#); [Thomas Hart](#); [Thomas Hart](#); [Tim Byer](#); [Tom Christiansen](#); [tyler_abbott@fws.gov](#)
Subject: Attachment A Mtg 3 Prep
Date: Tuesday, February 24, 2015 6:12:07 PM
Attachments: [Attachment A 3 PREP.docx](#)

Hi, Same thing!

--

Mary Flanderka
WGFD
Habitat Protection Supervisor
5400 Bishop Blvd.
307-777-4587
307-290-0069
mary.flanderka@wyo.gov



E-Mail to and from me, in connection with the transaction of public business, is subject to the Wyoming Public Records Act and may be disclosed to third parties.

ATTACHMENT A

Definition of Greater Sage-Grouse Core Populations Areas

Goal: The goal of establishing ‘core population areas’ and associated management actions is to address Greater Sage-Grouse management from a conservation biology perspective that identifies the most productive populations and habitat that meet all life history needs. (Conservation Objectives Team Report, Objective 1 & 2)

The Wyoming “Core Population Area Strategy” is based on a pyramid of an avoidance and below threshold minimization approach (cite TNC development by design publication here).

This requires that entities considering actions that are detrimental to greater sage-grouse as specified in this Executive Order explicitly demonstrate that those actions cannot be feasibly accomplished outside of Core Population Area(s). Only in instances where impacts must occur in Core Population Areas will that potential be entertained. This maximizes protections for both greater sage-grouse and sagebrush ecosystem.

In the event that detrimental actions that exceed the minimization thresholds must be considered in Core Population Areas, those actions must occur in non-greater sage-grouse habitat as specified in this Executive ~~Order~~ unless the entities considering those actions explicitly demonstrate that sage-grouse habitat cannot be avoided. ~~This results in disturbance within Core Population Areas, but no net loss of habitat.~~

~~In the event that D~~ detrimental actions ~~must that are proposed to be located~~be considered in greater sage-grouse habitats in Core Population Areas, ~~the level of surface disturbance~~ must be limited to less than 5% disturbance of the total DDCT assessment area and ultimately the Core Population Area and cannot average more than one impact site per section (640 acres) of the total of DDCT sage-grouse assessment habitats important for the population of sage-grouse influenced by the action. These thresholds are inclusive of the conditions existing within the landscape where impacts are being considered.

The Core Area Strategy is supposed to be both the Avoidance and the Minimization aspects of our “(CEO) Mitigation Hierarchy”. There are two more levels before Compensatory Mitigation, Rectification and Reduce or eliminate over time. Under NEPA, we would examine these two additional layers before assuming that compensatory mitigation is necessary. If reasonably foreseeable impacts remain after the first four parts of the mitigation, then the parties to the SGEO may seek compensation for some or all of the residual effects. We would warrant compensatory mitigation by completing analysis and arriving at residual effects AND at residual effects that are designated as those that warrant compensation. It seems predecisional to make this leap here after failure of only the “avoid” and “minimize” pieces of the hierarchy.

In the rare event that detrimental actions are not avoidable in Core Population Areas where the 5% surface disturbance and/or the 1 disturbance per section thresholds are surpassed, compensatory mitigation is necessary. It should be noted that these situations ~~will should not~~ result in net loss of habitat and likely reduction in greater sage-grouse populations. Compensatory mitigation should be applied in a descending priority provided that the SGIT ensures that compensatory mitigation measures are sited

where the maximum benefit to the impacted resource, value, or function can be feasible achieved and maintained.

A In many cases, the maximum benefit can be found where there is potential to leverage other conservation –related investments by Federal or non-Federal entities.

, as follows:

1. Implementation of proven methods to reclaim and/or improve local areas within the Core Population Area and/or DDCT.
2. Implementation of proven methods to reclaim and/or improve adjacent areas to the Core Population Area.
3. Implementation of proven methods to reclaim and/or improve remote areas.

Remote mitigation shall only be used when neither local nor adjacent alternatives are not possible. The mitigating entity must explicitly demonstrate that implemented mitigation successfully offsets the impacts incurred in sagebrush habitats and by greater sage-grouse populations.

New data and information is collected and reviewed as necessary by the Governor's Sage-Grouse Implementation Team.

Connectivity Zones are recognized as areas important for maintaining the transmission of genetic material from populations in Wyoming to populations in neighboring states. These corridors have been identified as the most likely dispersal routes of individuals between potentially isolated populations in Wyoming to identified populations in neighboring states. These corridors are important to maintain to reduce the potential of isolating populations in Wyoming where that isolation is more likely to occur across state boundaries rather than within the state. Connectivity corridors are managed to limit anthropogenic development and have been delineated such that they are large enough to increase the likelihood of natural immigration/emigration important for maintaining genetic variability in Wyoming Core Population Areas and to allow migration in some instances.

Designation of 'core population areas' allows development proponents to quickly identify areas of high resource conflict.

The core population areas represent a proactive attempt to identify a set of conservation actions to maintain a viable and connected set of populations before the opportunity to do so is lost (Doherty et al 2011).

The Greater Sage-Grouse Implementation Team (SGIT) and the Local Working Groups utilized biological data in 2007 similar to that used from Doherty et al. (2010, 2011) while avoiding most areas of valid and existing rights to produce the sage-grouse core protection area map for Wyoming (Figure 1). Doherty et al. (2010, 2011) used the kernel density function of sage-grouse leks to develop the core region concept for Greater Sage-Grouse in Wyoming (Figure 1) Core regions in the eastern portion of sage-grouse range, which includes Wyoming, contain 65, 70, 75, 80 and 85% of the breeding population within 5%, 12%, 30%, and 60% of the eastern range of sage-grouse, respectively (Doherty et al. 2011) Doherty et al.'s (2010, 2011) model did not take into account late brood-rearing and wintering life stages

as well as other factors before finalizing delineation (Gamo 2013) **Include 5.3 mile radius Demonstrate with map.** However, during the 2010 revision of core area boundaries in Wyoming, both late brood-rearing and winter use were considered in the process and most were included in resulting product.

Comment [g1]: Use Correct citations

2008 (V.2) - 82% of birds on 23% of the state (I can't find the data down to the tenth)
2010 (V.3) - 83.3% of birds on 24.6% of the state

These protection areas were mapped and labeled as sage-grouse core population areas and encompassed an estimated 82% of the sage-grouse population within the State (Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Cheyenne, (unpublished data) (Gamo 2013). Previous executive orders provided the process for protecting sage-grouse within an area consisting of approximately 24% of the surface land area of the state of Wyoming (Figure 1).

Comment [n2]: Version 1 number

Comment [n3]: This is a version 3 #

The red represents the largest 65% of leks and associated breeding habitat in the state.

70% = red+orange, 75% = red+orange+yellow, 80% = red+orange+yellow+light green, 85% = red+orange+yellow+light green+dark green, 100% = all colors including gray.

The map only represents the proportions (%) of the population, not population trends.

“To ensure continued sustainability of Wyoming’s economy, all efforts to encourage, enhance and prioritize development in non-core acreage shall be made. State & federal agencies, with other relevant stakeholders shall work collaboratively to develop a strategic plan to achieve a beneficial balance between Greater Sage-Grouse protection and Wyoming’s economy. Incentives, prioritization of non-core projects and streamlining permit processes shall be considered.”

Figure 1 (Insert kernel density from Nyssa

Sage-Grouse Core Management Areas Version 3



