

The R- S.A.G.E. mitigation analysis tool (R- SAGE Tool) has multiple functions: Designing high quality mitigation projects that will provide maximum mitigation credits for the applicant, screening proposed individual or categories of mitigation actions for consistency against the principals and technical elements described in the V2P Greater Sage-Grouse Mitigation Framework, and determining available mitigation credits from those actions. The R-SAGE Tool can be used iteratively during V2P Project mitigation design and review phases, to inform and guide modification of proposed mitigation actions to maximize mitigation credits. Mitigation credits will be assigned via the R-SAGE Tool to V2P Project’s proposed mitigation actions, or categories of actions, based on each actions’ consistency with the V2P Framework’s: 1) **Required** principles and technical elements, 2) **Service Area** (as identified and prioritized in Framework section IV.B), 3) **Appropriateness** (how effective, additional, and timely the mitigation action is), and 4) **Guarantees** (how durable the action will be). These measureable principles and technical elements will be used to complete an **Evaluation** of the proposed mitigation action(s) through summing assigned values of each of the former categories and then applying a credit adjustment factor to proposed mitigation action acreages (Credits).

R-S.A.G.E. Analysis		REQUIRED ¹	SERVICE AREA ²	APPROPRIATENESS ²			GUARANTEES ²	EVALUTION		
Action Category	Action Category	Required Principles and Technical Elements: -Landscape planning -Species benefit -Types of compensatory mitigation -Duration (life of project) -Governance -Legal and financial assurances -Reversals -Metrics and accounting approaches -Long term management and monitoring H= Fully meets P=Partially meets L=Does not meet or barely meets	Conservation Priority: Location is consistent with prioritization of service areas H= 1.0 w/in a Washington PAC M = 0.66 w/i a SGMU L = 0.5 w/i a ALI or LI core area	Effectiveness: Likelihood of success H= 1.0 High likelihood of success. M = 0.7. Moderate likelihood of success. L = 0.3. Low likelihood of success.	Additionality: Benefit beyond current and future planned or proposed management or corrective actions H= 1. New action not under any existing or proposed management M = 0.75. Provide funding for an action under existing or proposed management that does not have a reasonable funding mechanism. L = 0.25. Provide supplemental funding for an action under existing or proposed management.	Timeliness: Time from impact until mitigation reaches full benefit Extra Credit – front-loaded implementation before Project impacts = 1.25 credits H= 1.0 1-3 years M = 0.8 3-10 years L = 0.6 > 10years	Durability Assurances that mitigation will not be obviated by ongoing or future management activities or land use practices H= 1.0 strong projected ecological durability M = 0.5 moderate projection for ecological durability L = 0.1 unlikely guarantee that ongoing or future management or land use actions will support and/or protect mitigation action	Summary Ranking (L,M,H) >1 = Full credit plus front-loaded implementation 1= Full credit 0.5 = Moderate credit <0.25 = Low credit	Credit Adjustment Factor Assigned	Reviewers’ Comments and Rationale for Credit Adjustment

R-S.A.G.E. Analysis		REQUIRED ¹	SERVICE AREA ²	APPROPRIATENESS ²			GUARANTEES ²	EVALUATION		
Action Category	Action Category	Required Principles and Technical Elements: -Landscape planning -Species benefit -Types of compensatory mitigation -Duration (life of project) -Governance -Legal and financial assurances -Reversals -Metrics and accounting approaches -Long term management and monitoring H= Fully meets P=Partially meets L=Does not meet or barely meets	Conservation Priority: Location is consistent with prioritization of service areas H= 1.0 w/in a Washington PAC M = 0.66 w/i a SGMU L = 0.5 w/i a ALI or LI core area	Effectiveness: Likelihood of success H= 1.0 High likelihood of success. M = 0.7. Moderate likelihood of success. L = 0.3. Low likelihood of success.	Additionality: Benefit beyond current and future planned or proposed management or corrective actions H= 1. New action not under any existing or proposed management M = 0.75. Provide funding for an action under existing or proposed management that does not have a reasonable funding mechanism. L = 0.25. Provide supplemental funding for an action under existing or proposed management.	Timeliness: Time from impact until mitigation reaches full benefit Extra Credit – front-loaded implementation before Project impacts = 1.25 credits H= 1.0 1-3 years M = 0.8 3-10 years L = 0.6 > 10years	Durability Assurances that mitigation will not be obviated by ongoing or future management activities or land use practices H= 1.0 strong projected ecological durability M = 0.5 moderate projection for ecological durability L = 0.1 unlikely guarantee that ongoing or future management or land use actions will support and/or protect mitigation action	Summary Ranking (L,M,H) >1 = Full credit plus front-loaded implementation 1= Full credit 0.5 = Moderate credit <0.25 = Low credit	Credit Adjustment Factor Assigned	Reviewers’ Comments and Rationale for Credit Adjustment
			Example Questions: -In PAC? -Actions aggregated? -large enough to provide benefits? -equal or greater ecological value area than impact area? -is location impacted by Project?	Example Questions: -is this project located when it can be most effective, regardless of land ownership? -is this project concentrated on or near the Project’s impact zone? -will type, design and location of mitigation result in effective results? -is the project selected based on ease of implementation instead of known reliability and predictability of effectiveness?	Example Questions: -was this action already planned or cleared to be implemented for another purpose? -will action provide much ecological benefit if it already will be accomplished in near-term via existing regulations, policies, conservation programs, and land management plans? -will action result in contribution to conservation, when compared or in addition to current conditions or conditions that are reasonably expected to occur in the future absert the mitigation? -if preservation action, what is “avoided loss” in comparison to existing protections for that parcel ?	Example Questions: -How long will the mitigation take to achieve maturity? -will mitigation be implemented at same time as impacts or before impacts begin to accrue?	Example Questions: -is project placed on lands that will be subject to malleable and uncertain long-term management? -if on public lands, can life-of-project commitments be provided that protect the conservation benefit of the mitigation? -are there adequate legal and financial assurances, including funds for adaptive management to address unexpected results (also see Required mitigation elements)?			

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

V2P Framework included the following Principles and Technical Elements:

¹Required Principles – each mitigation action must fully meet these principles: landscape planning, species benefit, types of compensatory mitigation, duration (life of project), governance, legal and financial assurances, reversals, metrics and accounting, types of mitigation approaches, long term management and monitoring

²Scalable Principles – each mitigation action will have differing consistency with these principles: service area, effectiveness, additionality, timeliness (note: Framework indicated can provide extra credits for accelerated mitigation benefits), durability

Examples of mitigation categories or individual actions that should be assessed using the R-SAGE tool, to get a sense of how we will use the tool and how many credits are available for some common and popular mitigation actions:

- Acquisition of nonfederal land with restoration uplift
- Restoration of BLM or DOD lands
- Juniper removal on nonfederal lands
- Juniper removal on federal lands
- Funding for grazing practice improvement – Federal land with preexisting CCA management commitments in place
- Funding for grazing practice improvement – non-Federal land with preexisting CCAA management commitments in place