

Jodie Delavan	Pat Deibert	Lynn Gemlo	Jeff Dillon
Dolores Weisbaum	Betsey Herrmann	Terry Quesinberry	Lief Wiechman
Ron Baxter	Jay Martini	Terry Ireland	Kevin Shelley
Alex Schubert	Jessie Gonzales	Creed Clayton	

**Topic: Non-renewable energy –**

General overview of plans

**WY** – unique as are incorporating WY Governor's core area strategy – 5% disturbance cap, 1/640 acres density, 0.6 NSO, noise restrictions, etc. We are in general supportive, but still waiting on Adaptive Management information.

- Most applies to new leases, but the old disturbances contribute to disturbance cap

**CO** – PPH – new leases are NSO, may be some limits on existing rights (e.g. timing limitation for drilling and fracking) – we may recommend limitations on producing pads to minimize human activity. Cap is 5% disturbance (all anthropogenic) – only for PPH – and only applies to sagebrush habitats (not non-habitat). Will be asking for minimum 0.6 mile buffer around leks, regardless of habitat. Pat recommended encouraging scrapping the only sagebrush habitats. Concern that there are several leks outside priority and may want to request additional restrictions for those specific areas. May ask for a disturbance cap for important leks outside PPH within 4 miles of a lek.

- Change protections to sage-grouse habitats not sagebrush habitats. Where the habitats border non-habitat put buffer on a lek to minimize disturbance to the lek. Buffer of 0.6 miles.
- No limit on the number of disturbances per section (is in NV and WY). NSO for new pads, but not for existing leases so could develop those at high densities. WY averages the disturbance to 1 per section, so disturbance can be concentrated in one section, but over the entire area the density averages to 1/640.
- Different cap for wildfire (30%) from NTT report.

**NV** – disturbance cap for energy (both renewable and non-renewable) is NTT

- Noise limits apply 10 dB above ambient (20 to 24) (near lek), and apply noise shields in other seasonal habitats
- Most of alternatives follow NTT (or close)
- Preferred alternative is NSO in PPH; state alternative says if 5% exceeded then have to do a special plan for minimization and mitigation.
- Allow geophysical exploration within PPH for resource development outside of PGH. Are seasonal restrictions on this.
- Do have a disturbance level and density restriction.

**SD** – NSO for all non-renewables (both surface and sub-surface), minimal issue for BLM

**ND** – NSO on all non-leased areas within PPH. For existing leases that expire revert to non-leased restrictions; for leased areas – manage to minimize fragmentation.

- 49 dB noise restrictions at ¼ mile from lek (temporal and seasonal restrictions); managing to minimize surface water; manage linear ROWs to minimize disturbance.
- All qualitative, little quantification.
- Need to minimally recommend quantitative restrictions (percent disturbance cap and density limit) Also for SD.
- 3% restriction in other alternatives
- Noise levels are too high – ambient is 20 to 24, so limit should be no more than 10 more than that. Should not be cumulative, so the second company in wouldn't include the noise created by the first company as ambient.
- But sound is non-linear – not additive but may be exponential
- How to consider frequency? Different frequencies may have more impact at the same decibel level

**UT** – all alternatives meet COT report objectives

- One alternative - All leases within 4 miles of lek will have NSO.
- State alternative doesn't meet COT objectives for energy development, but includes a 1-mile buffer around leks (for unleased areas)

**OR** – 3% cap in preferred cap within 4 miles of leks in PPMA, with NSO; areas near PPMA would have CSU

- Tall structure restrictions (preferred)
- Timing restrictions for all seasonal habitats (preferred)
- Close adherence with NTT for preferred alternative.
- Not a huge issue in OR

**General Recommendations:** (resulting from conversation)

Noise - limit to no more than 10 dB above ambient or no more than a max of 34 dB

Geophysical exploration –should minimally have seasonal restrictions and protections for protecting the vegetation (don't crush all the sagebrush).

Need a density threshold (consider the WY strategy of an average threshold – e.g. on average have 1/640 – so could have 10 acres with 10 disturbances in one acre and none in the rest – concentrates the disturbance and may leave larger blocks of undisturbed habitat).

Need to have a mechanism that quantifies and tracks the levels of disturbance and density

Need to have a disturbance threshold unless NSO gets to that for both existing (undeveloped) leases AND new leases.

Consider buy back of leases in PPH?

Dealing with exception processes allowing development on a case by case basis – need to review those criteria to make sure they are consistent with the COT. (maybe discuss exceptions/waivers as own topic on future call)

Lynn will send out the Blickley and Patricelli papers to group.

**Next Call:** October 3 as few folks around September 26. Topic is renewable energy