

USFWS BLM RMP Alternative Review Matrix (7/15/13)  
BLM Plan: HiLine DRMP/DEIS  
Program Area: All  
GSG Population(s): Northern Montana

Issue <sup>1</sup>	Conservation Objective from COT Report	Conservation Measures / Options from COT Report	Preliminary Assessment of Proposed Action Consistency with COT Report <sup>2,3,4</sup>					
			Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D	Alternative E	Comments
PACs	Retain sage-grouse habitats within PACs <i>(pertains to PAC designation; actions below this line are evaluated independent of PAC designation for each Alternative)</i>	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	No PPA (no PACS): N	PPA and Grassland Bird/SG PA designated (ACECs): Y?	PPA and Grassland Bird/SG PA designated: Y?	No PPA (no PACS): N	PPA and Grassland Bird/SG PA designated: Y?	Should provide maps comparing PPA and Grassland Bird/GSG PA to FWP Core / PACs
	If PACs are lost to catastrophic events, implement appropriate restoration efforts	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	No PPA (no PACS): N; App. D (PPA/PA) NA: N; App. M (PPA/PA): NA: N	App. D (PPA/PA): Y?; App. M (PPA/PA): P*	App. D (PPA/PA): Y?; App. M (PPA/PA): P*	No PPA (no PACS): N; App. D (PPA/PA) NA: N; App. M (PPA/PA): NA: N	App. D (PPA/PA): Y?; App. M (PPA/PA): P*	
	Restore and rehabilitate degraded sage-grouse habitat within PACS.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	No PPA (no PACS): N; App. M (PPA/PA): NA: N	App. M (PPA/PA): P*	App. M (PPA/PA): P*	No PPA (no PACS): N; App. M (PPA/PA): NA: N	App. M (PPA/PA): P*	Mechanisms triggering actions to improve SB/SG habitats in PPA/PA under "Other Wildlife" in App M are not stated and should be clarified.
	Identify areas and habitats outside of PACs which may be necessary to maintain viability of sage-grouse. If development or vegetation manipulation activities outside of PACs are proposed, the project proponent should work with federal, state or local agencies and interested stakeholders to ensure consistency with sage-grouse habitat needs.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	No PPA (no PACS): N; General measures inadequate: N	See GH measures under all threats	See GH measures under all threats; In GH, minimize fragmentation of intact SG habitat: Y;	No PPA (no PACS): N; See GH measures under all threats; In GH, minimize fragmentation of intact SG habitat: Y	See GH measures under all threats	PAC/core area strategy not employed in Alts A and D; measures that remain are inconsistent with landscape-scale SG conservation approach.
	Re-evaluate the status of PACs and adjacent sage-grouse habitat at least once every 5-years, or when important new information becomes available.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed in DEIS; not rated; should be addressed in EIS.
	Actively pursue opportunities to increase occupancy and connectivity between PACs.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	N	In GH, emphasize rest/rehab of SB to facilitate connectivity: Y; In GH, enhance SG habitat N. of Milk River: Y	In GH, emphasize rest/rehab of SB to facilitate connectivity: Y; In GH, enhance SG habitat N. of Milk River: Y	N	Designate SG Restoration Area: Y; In GH, emphasize rest/rehab of SB to facilitate connectivity: Y; In GH, manage SB to meet GSG requirements: Y?	For Alt E in EIS, Ch 2 does not include SB enhancement N of the Milk River, but does in Ch. 4. Need to clarify which is correct. Unclear as to what is proposed in restoration area. Protective measures in RA also unclear.

	Maintain or improve existing habitat conditions in areas adjacent to burned habitat.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed in DEIS; not rated; should be addressed in EIS.
Fire - L	Retain and restore healthy native sagebrush communities within greater sage-grouse range	Restrict or contain fire within the normal range of fire activity (assuming a healthy native perennial sagebrush community), including size and frequency, as defined by the best available science.	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed in DEIS; not rated; should be addressed in EIS.
		Eliminate intentional fires in sagebrush habitats, including prescribed burning of breeding and winter habitats.	Primarily Class B: N; No assured SG consideration in land treatments: N	3% surf. dist. objective: Y; Prescribed fire considered: N; Primarily Class C in PPA/PA: N; In PPA/PA, only land treatments that benefit SG/grassland birds allowed: Y? App. D (PPA/PA): N; App. M (PPA/PA): N	Prescribed fire considered: N; Primarily Class C in PPA/PA: N; In PPA/PA, only land treatments that benefit SG allowed: Y? App. D (PPA/PA): N; App. M (PPA/PA): N	Prescribed fire considered: N; Primarily Class C in important SG habitat: N; No assured SG consideration in land treatments: N	Prescribed fire considered: N; Primarily Class C in north PPA/PA, Class B in south PPA/PA: N; In PPA/PA, only land treatments that benefit or do not adversely affect SG allowed: Y? App. D (PPA/PA): N; App. M (PPA/PA): N	Prescribed fire not eliminated under any alternative. EIS needs to provide more rationale for this. Service developing additional guidance regarding fire / invasives.
		Design and implement restoration of burned sagebrush habitats to allow for natural succession to healthy native sagebrush plant communities.	App. D (PPA/PA) NA: N; App. M (PPA/PA): NA: N	App. D (PPA/PA): Y?; App. M (PPA/PA): P*	App. D (PPA/PA): Y?; App. M (PPA/PA): P*	App. D (PPA/PA) NA: N; App. M (PPA/PA): NA: N	App. D (PPA/PA): Y?; App. M (PPA/PA): P*	
		Implement monitoring programs for restoration activities. To ensure success, monitoring must continue until restoration is complete, with sufficient commitments to make adequate corrections to management efforts if needed.	App. D (PPA/PA) NA: N; App. M (PPA/PA): NA: N	App. D (PPA/PA): U; App. M (PPA/PA): U	App. D (PPA/PA): U; App. M (PPA/PA): U	App. D (PPA/PA) NA: N; App. M (PPA/PA): NA: N	App. D (PPA/PA): U; App. M (PPA/PA): U	Monitoring commitments are unclear and should be clarified.
		Immediately suppress fire in all sagebrush habitats.	U	App. M (PPA/PA): P*	App. M (PPA/PA): P*	U	App. M (PPA/PA): P*	
		Which (if any) of Options 1a - d were applied?	a?	App. M (PPA/PA): a*, b*, c*	App. M (PPA/PA): a*, b*, c*	a?	App. M (PPA/PA): a*, b*, c*	
		Which (if any) of Options 2a - j were applied?	c?, e?	App. M (PPA/PA); b*, c*, d*, e*, f*, i*	App. M (PPA/PA); b*, c*, d*, e*, f*, i*	c?, e?	App. M (PPA/PA); b*, c*, d*, e*, f*, i*	
		Which (if any) of Options 3a - e were applied?	None	App. D (PPA/PA): b, c, d, e; App. M (PPA/PA): b*, c*, d*, e*	App. D (PPA/PA): b, c, d, e; App. M (PPA/PA): b*, c*, d*, e*	None	App. D (PPA/PA): b, c, d, e; App. M (PPA/PA): b*, c*, d*, e*	
		Was Option 4 (IM 2011-138) applied?	Y? (no PPA)	Y	Y	Y? (no PPA)	Y	IM 2013-128 is implemented
Non-native, Invasive Plant Species - Weeds/Annual Grasses - L	Maintain and restore healthy, native sagebrush communities	Retain all remaining large intact sagebrush patches, particularly at low elevations.	See all other threats	See all other threats	See all other threats	See all other threats	See all other threats	

		Reduce or eliminate disturbances that promote the spread of these invasive species.	No assured SG consideration in land treatments: N; See all other threats. EIS indicates this alt is 3rd highest impact.	3% surf. dist. objective: Y; In PPA/PH, only land treatments that benefit SG/grassland birds allowed: Y; See all other threats. EIS indicates this alt is lowest impact.	In PPA/PH, only land treatments that benefit SG allowed: Y; See all other threats. EIS indicates this alt is 4th highest impact.	No assured SG consideration in land treatments: N; See all other threats. EIS indicates this alt is highest impact.	In PPA/PH, only land treatments that benefit or do not adversely affect SG allowed: Y; See all other threats. EIS indicates this alt is 2nd highest impact.	For all alts, EIS states "it is not known if control efforts would be able to minimize impacts to wildlife habitat."
		Monitor and control invasive vegetation post-wildfire for at least three years.	App. D (PPA/PA) NA: N;	App. D: Y? (up to 3)	App. D: Y? (up to 3)	App. D (PPA/PA) NA: N;	App. D: Y? (up to 3)	Recommend commitment to monitor for at least 3 years
		Require best management practices for construction projects in and adjacent to sagebrush habitats to prevent invasion.	Y	Y; App. M: P*	Y; App. M: P*	Y	Y; App. M: P*	For all alts, EIS states "it is not known if control efforts would be able to minimize impacts to wildlife habitat."
		Restore altered ecosystems such that non-native invasive plants are reduced to levels that do not put the area at risk of conversion if a catastrophic event were to occur.	Not specifically addressed; App. J: N;	Not specifically addressed; App. J: N; App M: P*	Not specifically addressed; App. J: N; App M: P*	Not specifically addressed; App. J: N;	Not specifically addressed; App. J: N; App M: P*	Not specifically addressed in DEIS; not rated; should be addressed in EIS.
Energy Development - Y	Energy development should be designed to insure that it will not impinge upon stable or increasing greater sage-grouse population trends	Avoid energy development <b>in PACs</b> . Identify areas where leasing is not acceptable, or not acceptable without stipulations for surface occupancy that maintains SG habitats.	No PACS. WE allowed (BMPs):N; O&G new leasing/explor. - App. E.4: N; .25 mi buff: N, winter TLS 12/1-5/15:Y?; App. M NA:N	WE excluded in PPA/PA: Y; O&G new leasing/explor. Closed in PPA/PA: Y; all nest habitat-closed:Y, all winter habitat closed:Y; App. M (PPA/PA) NA:Y; O&G new leasing/explor. in GH - closed w/in 2 mi leks, App. E.2/E.5 (GH): U; App. M (GH): P*	WE excluded in PPA/PA: Y; O&G new leasing/explor. CSU / 1 dist/mi <sup>2</sup> limit in PPA/PA: U; all winter TLS 12/1-5/15: Y?; App. M (PPA/PA): P* O&G new leasing/explor. in GH - 1 mi lek NSO, nest habitat BMPs, App. E.2/E.5 (GH): U; App. M (GH): P*	No PACS. WE allowed (BMPs):N; O&G new leasing/explor. - 0.6 mi lek NSO: N; nest habitat TLS 1 mi lek buff 3/1-6/15: U, winter TLS 12/1-3/31: N; App. E.2/E.5 (GH): U; App. M (PPA/PA) NA:N; App. M (GH): N	WE excluded in PPA/PA: Y; O&G new leasing/explor. NSO in PPA/PA: Y?; all winter TLS 12/1-3/31: U; App. M (PPA/PA): P*; O&G new leasing/explor. in GH - 1 mi lek NSO, nest habitat CSU/plan; App. E.2/E.5 (GH): U; App. M (GH): P*	EIS Ch 4 transposed parts of Alts C and E for Oil & Gas; no ratings assigned to table cells. Unspecified what approach (avoidance?) is proposed for Wind Energy in GH (Alts. B, C, E). Also, no specific Wind Energy SG BMPs are provided - general BMPs are referenced in App C. The EIS should reference the FWS 2012 Land-based Wind Energy Guidelines. Geothermal Energy not specifically addressed in Ch 4.
		<p>If avoidance is not possible <b>in PACs</b> due to pre-existing valid rights, adjacent development, or split estate issues, development should only occur in <b>non-habitat areas</b>, including all appurtenant structures, with an <b>adequate buffer</b> that is sufficient to preclude impacts to sage-grouse habitat from noise, and other human activities.</p> <p>If development must occur <b>in sage-grouse habitats</b> due to existing rights and lack of reasonable alternative avoidance measures, the development should occur in the <b>least suitable habitat</b> for sage-grouse and be designed to ensure at a minimum that there are <b>no detectable declines</b> in sage-grouse population trends (see row below and COT report for measures to facilitate this).</p>	No PACS. O&G existing leasing/explor. - App. E.4: N; .25 mi buff: N, winter TLS 12/1-5/15:Y?;WE allowed (BMPs):N; App. M NA:N	3% surf. dist. objective: Y; O&G exist. leasing/explor. in PPA / PA/GH - App. E.2/E.5: U; Appendix M: P*	O&G exist. leasing/explor. in PPA / PA/GH - App. E.2/E.5: U; Appendix M: P*	No PACS. O&G exist. leasing/explor. - App. E.2/E.5 (PPA/PA) NA:N; App. E.2/E.5 (GH): U; Appendix M (PPA/PA) NA:N; Appendix M (GH):N	O&G exist. leasing/explor. in PPA / PA/GH - App. E.2/E.5: U; Appendix M: P*	App. E BMPs / App. M measures relationship (heirachy?) unclear. Also unclear if App M measures apply to WE (outside of PPA/PA). Unclear how Alt. B 3% surf. disturbance objective would be met/implemented.

		Which (if any) of Measure 3a - 3e were applied?	Alt A: None; App. E.4: None; App. M NA:None	Alt B: a (3% dist. objective)?; App E.2/E.5: a?, e?; App. M: a*, b*, c*, e*	Alt C: a; App E.2/E.5: a?, e?; App. M: a*, b*, c*, e*	Alt D: None; App E.2/E.5 (GH only): e?; App. M (GH only): c?	Alt E: None?; App E.2/E.5: a?, e?; App. M: a*, b*, c*, e*	
Sagebrush Removal / Elimination - L	Avoid SB removal or manipulation in greater sage-grouse breeding or wintering habitats	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	Prescribed burns considered: N; No assuredGSG consideration in land treatments: N; App. M NA:N	3% surf. dist. objective: Y; Prescribed burns considered: N; In PPA/PA, only land treatments that benefit SG/grassland birds allowed: Y; App. M (PPA/PA/GH): P*	Prescribed burns considered: N; In PPA/PA, only land treatments that benefit SG/grassland birds allowed: Y; App. M (PPA/PA/GH): P*	Prescribed burns considered: N; No assured SG consideration in land treatments: N; App. M (GH): U	Prescribed burns considered: N; In PPA/PA, only land treatments that benefit SG/grassland birds allowed: Y; App. M (PPA/PA/GH): P*	For Alts B, C, and E App M allows no fire treatment in winter range other than to reduce wildfire risk or enhance/maintain habitat quality.
Grazing - Y	Conduct grazing management for all ungulates in a manner consistent with local ecological conditions that maintains of restores healthy sagebrush shrub and native perennial grass and forb communities and conserves the essential habitat components for greater sage-grouse (shrub and nesting cover). Areas which do not currently meet this standard should be managed to restore these components. Adequate monitoring of grazing strategies and their results, with necessary changes in strategies, is essential to ensuring that desired ecological conditions and greater sage-grouse response are achieved. Livestock and wild ungulate numbers must be managed at levels that allow native sagebrush vegetative communities to minimally achieve Proper Functioning Conditions (PFC; for riparian areas) or Rangeland Health Standards (RHS; uplands).	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	No SG objectives:U; No prioritization for assessment related to SG habitat:N; No assured SG consideration in land treatments: N; No GSG hot season grazing considerations:N; App. M NA:N	Develop & apply SG objectives: Y?; Prioritize assessment related to SG habitat:Y; In PPA/PA, only land treatments that benefit SG/grassland birds allowed: Y; Hot season grazing reduced in PPA/PA riparian: Y; "Consider" incorp. of GSG objectives in GH: U; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	Develop & apply SG objectives: Y?; Prioritize assessment related to SG habitat:Y; In PPA/PA, only land treatments that benefit SG allowed: Y; No SG hot season grazing considerations:N; "Consider" incorp. of GSG objectives in GH: U; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	No SG objectives:U; No prioritization for assessment related to SG habitat:N; No assured SG consideration in land treatments: N; No SG hot season grazing considerations:N; Appendix M (GH?): N	Develop & apply SG objectives: Y?; Prioritize assessment related to SG habitat:Y; In PPA/PA, only land treatments that benefit or do not adversely affect SG allowed: Y; Hot season grazing reduced in PPA/PA riparian: Y; "Consider" incorp. of SG objectives in GH: U; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	SG objectives not yet developed for any alt; timeline for development, reassessment of land health standards, and processing grazing permit renewals should be specified. App M does provide objectives / recommendations from several sources - need to clarify that these will be applied until local objectives developed.
		Which (if any) of Options 1 - 5 were applied?	Alt A: 1, 4; App. M NA:None	Alt B: 1?, 3?, 4, 5; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): 1*, 3*, 4*, 5*	Alt C: 1?, 3?, 4, 5; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): 1*, 3*, 4*, 5*	Alt D: 1, 4; Appendix M (GH): None	Alt E: 1?, 3?, 4, 5; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): 1*, 3*, 4*, 5*	
Range Management Structures (no ratings)	Avoid or reduce the impact of RMS on greater sage-grouse	Range management structures should be designed and placed to be neutral or beneficial to sage-grouse.	Tank ramps: Y; App. M NA:N	Tank ramps: Y; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	Tank ramps: Y; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	Tank ramps: Y; Appendix M (GH):N	Tank ramps: Y; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	No West Nile measures?

		Structures that are currently contributing to negative impacts to either sage-grouse or their habitats should be removed or modified to remove the threat.	Tank ramps: Y; App. M NA:N	Tank ramps: Y; Exist improvements evaluated/modified:Y; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	Tank ramps: Y; Exist improvements evaluated/modified:Y; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	Tank ramps: Y; Appendix M (GH):N	Tank ramps: Y; Exist improvements evaluated/modified:Y; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	
FR Equid Management (NA in Montana)	Protect sage-grouse from the negative influences of grazing by free roaming equids.	Develop, implement, and enforce adequate regulatory mechanisms to protect sage-grouse habitat from negative influences of grazing by free-roaming equids.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
		Manage free-roaming equids at levels that allow native sagebrush vegetative communities to minimally achieve PFC (for riparian areas) or RHS (for uplands).	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Pinyon-juniper Expansion / Conifers - N	Remove pinyon-juniper from areas of sagebrush that are most likely to support greater sage-grouse (post-removal) at a rate at least equal to the rate of p-j incursion	No conservation measures specified. Is conservation objective addressed applying locally-derived measures?	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed	Not specifically addressed in DEIS; not rated; should be addressed in EIS.
		Which (if any) of Options 1 - 4 were applied?	None	None	None	None	None	
Agricultural Conversion - L	Avoid further loss of sagebrush habitat for agricultural activities (both animal and plant production) and prioritize restoration. In areas where taking agricultural lands out of production has benefited GSG, the programs supporting these actions should be targeted and continued (e.g., CRP/SAFE). Threat amelioration activities should, at a minimum, be prioritized within PACS, but should be considered in all greater sage-grouse habitats.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	No assured SG consideration in land treatments: N; App. M NA:N; Consult w/FWP on veg treatment projects: U	3% surf. dist. objective: Y; In PPA/PA, only land treatments that benefit SG/grassland birds allowed: Y; App. M (PPA/PA/GH): P*; Consult w/FWP on veg treatment projects: U	In PPA/PA, only land treatments that benefit SG/grassland birds allowed: Y; App. M (PPA/PA/GH): P*; Consult w/FWP on veg treatment projects: U	No assured SG consideration in land treatments: N; App. M (GH): U; Consult w/FWP on veg treatment projects: U	In PPA/PA, only land treatments that benefit SG/grassland birds allowed: Y; App. M (PPA/PA/GH): P*; Consult w/FWP on veg treatment projects: U	Recommend that agricultural conversion of SB on BLM lands be specifically addressed (prohibited) in EIS and Appendix M. EIS does not specify that FWP concurrence is required prior to proceeding with treatments, but should.
		Which (if any) of Options 1 - 4 were applied?	None - NA?	None - NA?	None - NA?	None - NA?	None - NA?	
Mining - N	Maintain stable to increasing greater sage-grouse populations and no net loss of greater sage-grouse habitats in areas affected by mining	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	Open to leasible/salable minerals: N; App. M NA:N	3% surf. dist. objective: Y; Rec for mineral entry withdrawal: Y; Closed to leasible/salable minerals: Y; Limited to exist. mineral disposal permits: Y; App. M (PPA/PA/GH): p*	Rec for mineral entry withdrawal: Y; Closed to leasible/salable minerals: Y; Limited to exist. mineral disposal permits: Y; App. M (PPA/PA/GH): p*	Open to leasible/salable minerals: N; App. M (GH): U	Mineral sales allowed w/ "plan": U; Closed to leasible materials: Y; Withdrawal evaluated at project level: U; App. M (PPA/PA/GH): P*	
		Which (if any) of Options 1 - 4 were applied?	Alt. A: None; App. M NA: None	Alt B: 1; App. M (PPA/PA ): 3*, 4*	Alt C: 1; App. M (PPA/PA ): 3*, 4*	Alt. D: None; App. M (GH): None	Alt E: 1?; App. M (PPA/PA ): 3*, 4*	



Recreation - L	In areas subjected to recreational activities, maintain healthy native SB communities based on local ecological conditions and with consideration of drought conditions, and manage direct and indirect human disturbance (including noise) to avoid interruption of normal greater sage-grouse behavior.	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	Rec / SG effects not addressed: U; No TM planning prioritization for SG habitat: N; App. M NA:N	Rec / SG effects not addressed: U; TM planning prioritized in PPA/PA: Y; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	Rec / SG effects not addressed: U; No TM planning prioritization for SG habitat: N; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	Rec / SG effects not addressed: U; No TM planning prioritization for SG habitat: N; Appendix M (GH?): U	Rec / SG effects not addressed: U; TM planning prioritized in PPA/PA: Y; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	Rec / SG effects not specifically addressed for any alternative in the DEIS - analysis should be added.
		Which (if any) of Options 1 - 2 were applied?	None	Alt B: 1?, 2?, Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): 1*	Alt C: 1?, 2?, Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): 1*	Alt D: 1?, 2?, Appendix M (GH): U	Alt E: 1?, 2?, Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): 1*	
Ex-Urban Development / Urbanization - N	Limit urban and exurban development in greater sage-grouse habitats and maintain intact native sagebrush communities	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	Not specifically addressed.	Not specifically addressed.3% surf. dist. objective: Y;	Not specifically addressed.	Not specifically addressed.	Not specifically addressed.	Not specifically addressed in DEIS; not rated; should be addressed in EIS.
		Which (if any) of Options 1 - 5 were applied?	None	Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): 3*	Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): 3*	Appendix M (GH): 3*	Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): 3*	
Infrastructure - Y	Avoid development of infrastructure within PACs	No new development of infrastructure within PACs. Designated, but not yet developed infrastructure corridors should be re-located outside of PACs unless it can be demonstrated that these corridors will have no impacts on the maintenance of neutral or positive sage-grouse population trends or habitats. New infrastructure should be avoided where individual state plans have identified key connectivity corridors outside of PACs.	No PACS, exclusion or avoidance: N; No TM planning prioritization for SG habitat: N; No corridors: N; APLIC standards for powerlines: Y; App. M NA:N	3% surf. dist. objective: Y; New ROW excluded in PPA/PA, winter range avoided:Y; Designated corridors "encouraged": U; TM planning prioritized in PPA/PA: Y; SG riparian habitats (GH) avoidance areas: Y; APLIC standards for powerlines: Y; Bury all new powerlines w/in 1 mi of leks (GH): Y; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	New ROW avoided in PPA/PA and winter range:Y?; Designated corridors "encouraged": U; No TM planning prioritization for SG habitat: N; No riparian avoidance in GH: N; APLIC standards for powerlines: Y; Bury all new powerlines w/in 1 mi of leks (GH): Y; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	No PACS, exclusion or avoidance: N; No TM planning prioritization for SG habitat: N; No corridors: N; No riparian avoidance in GH: N; APLIC standards for powerlines: Y; Fit all powerlines w/in 1 mi of leks (GH) w/ anti-perch: Y; Appendix M (GH?): U	New ROW avoided in PPA/PA and winter range:Y?; Designated corridors "encouraged": U; New road const. limited to re-alignments or min standards (to access valid exist rights): U; TM planning prioritized in PPA/PA: Y; SG riparian habitats (GH) avoidance areas: Y; APLIC standards for powerlines: Y; Bury all new powerlines w/in 1 mi of leks (GH): Y; Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): P*	Maps should depict proposed corridors relative to PPAs / PAs. Relationship between App C BMPs and App M SG measures is unclear. Need to include measures specific to stand-alone pipeline and cell tower projects in Appendix M if "avoidance" alternatives are selected.
		Where state sage-grouse management plans provide an effective strategy for infrastructure those strategies should be implemented. In all other situations the conservation options in the COT report should be considered.	State plan in process	State plan in process	State plan in process	State plan in process	State plan in process	Selected alt should be consistent with the revised MT state plan, when completed, or provide measures for achieving consistency.
		Which (if any) of Options 1 - 10 were applied?	None	Alt B: 1, 2a?, 5, Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): 4*, 5*, 6*, 10*	Alt C: 1?, 2a?, 5, Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): 4*, 5*, 6*, 10*	Alt D: 6; Appendix M (GH): 5*	Alt E: 1?, 2a?, 5, Appendix M (PPA/PA and GH): 4*, 5*, 6*, 10*	Need to include measures specific to stand-alone pipeline and cell tower projects in Appendix M if "avoidance" alternatives are selected.
Fences (no ratings)	Minimize the impact of fences on greater sage-grouse populations	No conservation measures specified. Are locally-derived actions/measures consistent with conservation objective?	Mark new, mark/remove existing fence: Y?	Mark new, mark/remove existing fence: Y?	Mark new, mark/remove existing fence: Y?	Mark new, mark/remove existing fence: Y?	Mark new, mark/remove existing fence: Y?	

		Which (if any) of Options 1 - 3 were applied?	Alt. A: 2?; App. M NA: None	Alt B: 2?; Appendix M (PPA/PA): 2*	Alt C: 2?; Appendix M (PPA/PA): 2*	Alt D: 2?; Appendix M (GH): None	Alt E: 2?; Appendix M (PPA/PA): 2*	
--	--	---	--------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--

<u><sup>1</sup>Threat Ratings from COT Report</u>	<u><sup>2</sup>Subjective Consistency (with COT Report) Rating Continuum</u>
Y: Pres. and Widespread	High Concern &/or Very Low Consistency
L: Pres. and Localized	↑
N: Not Known to be Pres.	↑
NA	Lower Concern &/or Higher Consistency
	NA

<sup>3</sup>Action Abbreviations

ACEC = Area of Critical Environmental Concern  
BMPs = Best Management Practices  
FWP = Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks  
GH = Sage-Grouse Habitat - General Habitat Areas  
O&G = Oil & Gas

PA = Grassland Bird / Sage-Grouse Habitat - Priority Areas  
PPA = Sage-Grouse Habitat - Protection Priority Areas  
RA = Sage-Grouse Habitat - Restoration Areas  
SG = Sage-Grouse  
TM = Travel Management/Off-Highway Vehicle  
WE = Wind Energy

<sup>4</sup>Other Abbreviations

COT = Conservation Objectives Team  
N = No, action appears to be inconsistent with COT Report objective  
NA = Not Applicable  
PAC = Priority Areas for Conservation  
P\* or #\* = Potentially consistent with COT Report objective if specifically applied to meet EIS/RMP SG Purpose & Need, Goals, and Objectives  
U = Unknown / unclear from EIS as to whether action is consistent with Cot Report objective  
Y = Yes, action appears to be consistent with COT Report objective