

We considered several resources to identify and prioritize threats (and associated conservation actions/metrics) including the FWS 2010 listing review, COT report, and the Near Term Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Action Plan.

The Near Term Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Action Plan was developed to evaluate risks to sage-grouse populations, identify conservation measures that address those risks, discuss the expected outcomes, and identify the resources needed to accomplish those conservation measures and prioritize those actions.

Comment [DP1]: This document was created by WAFWA for the Governor's Task Force. Its fine as a reference, but this paragraph seems to imply that it is the primary reference used. It is also a 40,000 foot view of the threats. So I suggest deleting to remove any sense of being a primary source, and because our RD's should know what it is.

Using the resources identified above, and with the CED as an aid, we narrowed prioritized the our focus to the following top 5 threats, which represent significant threats facing sage-sage grouse and which represent the greatest risk to sagebrush-steppe habitats.: Fire, Invasives, Conifer Encroachment, Ag Conversion, and Oil and Gas. The remaining threats were prioritized by their severity, scope and imminence. As these threats and were given a lower priority because they were are not widespread and, therefore, we believe that they can be more effectively addressed locally.

Comment [DP2]: This confused me – when I first read it I thought this meant we would only cover the top 5 threats. Then we discussed the remaining threats below. If my suggested edit doesn't capture the meaning please feel free to change or dis-regard.

The summary table is meant to provide management with an overview of the threats addressed, the associated conservation actions, priority level recommendations, and outlines the barriers and/or scientific uncertainty associated with both the threats and the conservation actions identified to ameliorate those threats. The utility of specific conservation measures are site specific and will depend on the geographic location. Rather than assigning values to specific actions, we focused on the prioritization of threats, which were ranked into 3 tiers: Substantial-imminent (high); moderate-imminent (medium); and localized-substantial (low). We caution that the ranking presented here should not be used out of context and the rankings we assigned reflect their status for this exercise only.

Comment [DP3]: If this comes from the NTCAP than we should cite it.