

## BLM/FS information:

The conservation measures include both restrictions on land uses and programs that affect GRSG, as well as measures to reduce and mitigate impacts arising from BLM and FS programs and authorized uses. The LUPs also include a rangewide monitoring strategy and an adaptive management strategy. A timeline of important events in the development of a BLM/FS sage-grouse landscape conservation strategy and LUPs is provided in Table xx.

Table xx. Timeline of important events in the development of a rangewide sage-grouse conservation strategy on BLM and FS lands.

Date	Event
March 23, 2010	FWS issues its 12-month finding indicated listing the greater sage-grouse is warranted, but precluded by higher priority listing actions. One of the key components of that decision was the lack of adequate regulatory mechanisms to conserve sage-grouse.
August 22, 2011	BLM published a planning strategy charter to outline the steps necessary to develop new or revised regulatory mechanisms, through RMPs, to conserve and restore the greater sage-grouse and its habitat on BLM-administered lands on a rangewide basis over the long term <sup>1</sup> . This charter established a National Policy Team (NPT), a National Technical Team (NTT), Regional Management Teams (RMT), and other teams and sideboards to lay the groundwork for revising or amending RMPs.
December 9, 2011	BLM and FS issue a joint notice of intent to address sage-grouse in management plans across their range. This included 68 BLM planning areas and 9 FS LRMPs (6 BLM RMPs had already begun a programmatic EIS specific to sage-grouse prior to this NOI; total at this point was 83 planning areas undergoing amendment or revision). The notice indicates that the range will be divided into two broad planning regions, an eastern and western region.
December 21, 2011	The Sage-grouse Technical Team publishes “A Report on National Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures” — also known as the NTT Report. The technical report provided recommended conservation measures for priority habitats for BLM to consider in its planning process.
December 27, 2011	The BLM Washington Office released Instructional Memorandum (IM) 2012-044, which directed all planning efforts across the GRSG range to consider all applicable conservation measures when revising or amending RMPs in GRSG habitat, including measures in the NTT report.
February 10, 2012	The FS adds 11 National Forests to its notice of intent to address sage-grouse in their management plans. This brings the total to 98 planning

---

<sup>1</sup> Management Zone VI (Washington State) was left off of this rangewide planning effort given the limited amount of BLM ownership in that area. Planning efforts to include sage-grouse conservation efforts in MZ VI are underway but are scheduled to be completed later than the rest of the BLM planning efforts.

Date	Event
	areas undergoing revision to include sage-grouse conservation measures. BLM renames its eastern and western regions of the sage-grouse planning areas, the Rocky Mountain (eastern) and Great Basin (western) regions.
August 6, 2012	The FS adopts a new National Forest System land management planning rule. Includes a requirement to ensure species' viability on each of its forests, grasslands, and prairies.
February 22, 2013	BLM releases Lander (Wyoming) proposed RMP and Final EIS.
May - November 2013	Draft EISs are published including several alternatives. Includes alternatives proposed by each State, environmental groups, an alternative based on the NTT report, and a BLM/FS alternative that attempts to balance several of the other alternatives.
June 3, 2013	USGS, in cooperation with BLM, publishes the Baseline Environmental Report (BER) for greater sage-grouse. The report summarizes the science, activities, programs, and policies that affect greater sage-grouse and was intended to better inform rangewide conservation planning efforts.
April 26, 2014	The NPT issues direction to all planning areas to incorporate consistent management of preliminary priority and preliminary general habitat for sage-grouse. Includes land-use allocations, monitoring, adaptive management, disturbance calculations, and mitigation.
May 21, 2014	Forest Service publishes a notice of intent to amend the Dakota Prairie Grasslands LRMP to incorporate sage-grouse conservation measures.
October 27, 2014	The FWS sends a letter and maps to the BLM identifying sage-grouse "strongholds." These were provided at the request of BLM to identify a subset of priority habitats, "most vital to the species persistence" where FWS recommended "the strongest levels of protection."
November 21, 2014	USGS, at the request of the Department of Interior, publishes a review of conservation buffer distances for greater sage-grouse.
January 30, 2015	The NPT issues planning-area specific direction on development in highly important landscapes (strongholds), mitigation, mapping, calculating disturbance, adaptive management, lek buffers. In addition, the guidance provided several conservation measures to address specific threats.
February 6, 2015	BLM HQ provides "drop-in" language to be included in all plans to ensure consistency in key areas of the planning efforts.
TBD	Final EISs published
TBD	Records of Decision Signed

The new Forest Service LRMPs were developed under the 2012 planning regulations (77 FR 21162) that represented a significant shift from the 1982 regulations. According to the Forest Service, the 2012 planning regulations were intended to: "...ensure that plans respond to the requirements of land management that the Agency faces today, including the need to provide sustainable benefits, services, and uses, including recreation; the need for forest restoration and conservation, watershed protections, and wildlife conservation; and the need for sound resource

management under changing conditions.” (77 FR 21163). These new planning regulations included a requirement that all plans include a determination as to whether the plans provide the ecological conditions necessary to: contribute to the recovery of federally listed threatened or endangered species, conserve proposed and candidate species (e.g., the greater sage-grouse), and maintain a viable population of each species of conservation concern within the plan area (36 C.F.R. §219.9). If the responsible official determines that the plan components required above are insufficient to provide such ecological conditions, then additional, species-specific plan components, including standards or guidelines, must be included in the plan to provide such ecological conditions in the plan area. This new viability standard is being considered in all of the revised and amended Forest Service LRMPs (see **Regulatory Mechanisms** section, below).

## FWS

The refuges with the most modeled breeding distribution, leks, or individual sage-grouse are: Charles M. Russell NWR and UL Bend NWR (MZ I), Seedskadee NWR (MZ II), Cokeville Meadows NWR (MZ II), Sheldon-Hart Mountain NWRC (MZ V), and Clear Lake NWR (MZ V). Of these refuges, CCPs have been completed for Seedskadee (2002), Charles M. Russell NWR and UL Bend NWR CCP (2012), Sheldon CCP (2012), and Cokeville Meadows NWR (2014). CCPs are underway for Hart Mountain NWR and Clear Lake NWR. In addition, Clear Lake NWR was a partner to the development of a 2008 Sage-grouse Conservation and Recovery Strategy for the Devil’s Garden/Clear Lake Population Management Unit in NE California (Clear Lake Sage-Grouse Working Group 2008). All of the completed CCPs include sage-grouse specific conservation objectives and management direction (see **Regulatory Mechanisms** section, below).

**Table xx. Summary of National Wildlife Refuge System lands known to be used by sage-grouse. Source of lek data and population estimates (USFWS unpublished report 2012), unless otherwise noted.**

Refuge	MZ	Modeled Breeding Distribution		# of Leks	Population Estimate
		Acres	% of MZ		
Charles M. Russell NWR and UL Bend NWR	I	115,226	1	40 <sup>a</sup>	Unk - Highest single morning count was 168
Bowdoin NWRC	I	0	0	0	Unk –Individuals regularly sighted at some units
Red Rock Lakes NWR	I	7,858	<1	2	Unk
Seedskadee NWR	II	0	0	0	500-1,000, seasonally (wet meadow habitat)
National Elk Refuge	II	7,967	<1	Unk	25-50
Arapaho NWRC	II	16,913	<1	1	Unk
Cokeville Meadows NWR	II	4,646	<1	Unk	200-300
Ruby Lake NWR	III	8,287	<1	Unk	60
Sheldon-Hart Mountain NWRC	V	204,132	9	132 <sup>b</sup>	2,780 <sup>b</sup>
Malheur NWR	V	2	<1	0	Unk - Occasional sightings
Clear Lake NWR	V	6,413	<1	Unk	200

<sup>a</sup> Total recorded since 1974

<sup>b</sup> Source: Collins (2013, 2014).

## **DOD**

Eight military installations have confirmed sage-grouse presence, six of which are under the control of the Army: Yakima Training Center (Washington), Dugway Proving Ground (Utah), Sheridan Training Area (Wyo.), Camp Guernsey (Wyo.), Hawthorne Army Depot (Nev.), and the Toole Army Depot (Utah). Two Air Force Bases (AFB) manage for known populations: Nellis AFB in Nevada and Mountain Home AFB, which administers the Saylor Creek and Juniper Butte Ranges in Idaho (U.S. Department of Defense and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2006). With the exception of MZ VI, DoD lands represent less than 0.5% of the land within the range of sage-grouse within each MZ. Within MZ VI, the Joint Lewis-McChord Yakima Training Center (JBLM YTC), formerly called the Yakima Training Center, makes up 11.8% of the range of sage-grouse in MZ VI and 17.1 of the distribution of sage-grouse in that MZ.

The U.S. Department of Defense (DoD), with the assistance of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the states, is responsible under the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a-670f, as amended) for carrying out programs and implementing management strategies to conserve and protect biological resources on its lands. Because military lands and waters often are protected from human access and impact, they contain some of our nation's most significant remaining large tracts of land with valuable natural resources. Congress established the Sikes Act in 1960 to manage these lands for wildlife conservation and human access. The Sikes Act was amended in 1997 to develop and implement mutually agreed upon Integrated Natural Resource Management Plans (INRMPs) through voluntary cooperative agreements between the DoD installation, FWS, and the respective state fish and wildlife agencies.

INRMPs are planning documents that allow DoD installations to implement landscape-level management of their natural resources while coordinating with various stakeholders. They help ensure military operations and natural resources conservation are integrated and consistent with stewardship and legal requirements. Management of greater sage-grouse and its habitat at JBLM YTC is dictated by management direction described in their Western Sage Grouse Management Plan (1998 ENRD YTC), which is tiered to their Cultural and Natural Resource Management Plan (CNRMP) (2002 ENRD YTC), combined with changes contained in the Fort Lewis Army Growth and Force Structure Realignment Record of Decision (2011) (also known as "Grow The Army" or GTA). The 2002 CNRMP is currently being updated into a newer Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan, but is not yet final. Provisions in the draft INRMP that offset threats for JBLM YTC are provided in the **Military Activities** and **Regulatory Mechanisms** sections, below.

## **DOE**

The INL developed a Sage-grouse Conservation Framework in cooperation with the State of Idaho, Sage-grouse local working groups, and FWS. The Conservation Framework designates a Sage-grouse Conservation Area (SGCA) and associated conservation measures that address threats to GRSG on the INL. The SGCA encompasses 326,229 acres or approximately 57 percent of the INEL lands, protecting 74 % of the breeding males. We worked with INEL to formalize this Conservation Framework in a Candidate Conservation Agreement, which was

completed in October 2014. While there are minor differences in conservation measures from those proposed in the Idaho and Southwest Montana Subregional EIS, the INL CCA ensures that there will be consistent conservation outcomes where INL jurisdiction ends and BLM jurisdiction begins. The CCA also employs monitoring methods, and adaptive management strategies similar to those described in the BLM's RMPs, and includes a commitment to retain greater than 80 percent of the sagebrush cover within the SGCA.

## Wilderness

Lands under various federal ownerships (e.g., BLM land, National Forests, National Parks and Monuments, or USFWS refuges) can be designated wilderness under The Wilderness Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-777 (16 U.S.C. 1131-1136)). According to The Wilderness Act, a wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his works dominate the landscape, is recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; (3) has at least five thousand acres of land or is of sufficient size as to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and (4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value. With limited exceptions, and subject to existing private rights, wilderness designations prohibit development, commercial operations, roads, and use of motorized equipment.

## Wilderness Study Areas

Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) contain undeveloped lands that retain their primeval character without human habitation, and are managed to preserve their natural character until congress acts to either designate these lands as wilderness or remove the protective management. The BLM is required by Congress to manage each WSA consistent with the direction provided in Section 603(c) of FLPMA (commonly called the "Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (or IMP)). In general, BLM is required to maintain the wilderness characteristics of each WSA until Congress decides whether it should either be designated as wilderness or should be released for other purposes.

The guidance for managing each WSA is provided in the IMP Manual (8550, July 5, 1995). The general management standard is that the suitability of the WSAs for preservation as wilderness must not be impaired. Valid existing rights are recognized, and grandfathered uses such as grazing and mineral uses are allowed but restricted to the same manner and degree as on the date FLPMA was approved. While many activities are allowed within WSAs, some have specific restrictions. For example, recreation vehicle use off existing travel routes and issuing new mineral leases are not allowed. Most primitive recreation activities are allowed and are encouraged. These include hiking and camping, backpacking, fishing and hunting, rock hounding, boating (with or without motors), horseback riding, and the use of pack animals.

## National Monuments

The Antiquities Act of 1906 grants the President authority to designate national monuments in order to protect “objects of historic or scientific interest.” While most national monuments are established by the President, Congress has also occasionally established national monuments protecting natural or historic features. Most monuments are managed by the National Park Service (NPS), however, both Congress and the President have created monuments managed by other agencies.

The overriding management goal for all monuments is protection of the objects described in the proclamations. Monument designation can limit or prohibit land uses, such as development or recreational uses. Limitations or prohibitions may be included in the proclamations themselves, accompanying administration statements, management plans developed by the agencies to govern monument lands, agency policies, or other sources. In general, existing uses of the land that are not precluded by the proclamations, and do not conflict with the purposes of the monument may continue.

Most of these monument proclamations have barred *new* mineral leases, mining claims, prospecting or exploration activities, and oil, gas, and geothermal leases, subject to valid existing rights (Congressional Research Service 2010). This has been accomplished by language to withdraw the lands within the monuments from entry, location, selection, sale, leasing, or other disposition under the public land laws, mining laws, and mineral and geothermal leasing laws. However, other uses have continued at some national monuments – for example, grazing is still permitted on BLM-managed lands in Craters of the Moon National Monument.

### **State**

State lands are subdivided into several categories, including State Trust Lands, State Parks, State Wildlife Areas, all of which have different management goals and objectives. State trust lands are the most common form of state-owned land within the range of sage-grouse. Trust lands are the result of land grants made by the federal government to western states, mostly at the time of statehood, for the purpose of generating revenue to support schools and other public institutions (Culp et al. 2006, p.14). In California and Wyoming neither their enabling acts nor their constitution impose any trust responsibilities on the state, although Wyoming holds its lands in trust pursuant to the direction of the state legislature (Culp et al. 2006, p. 17). The land grants usually consisted of several one-square-mile sections in each township, creating a checkerboard pattern of state trust lands throughout the West (Culp et al. 2006, pp. 4-5; **Figures xx-xx**).

State trust lands in the western U.S. are primarily used for grazing or agriculture (Culp et al. 2006, p. 12). Other uses include: timber harvest, and oil and gas leases (Culp et al. 2006, p. 14). The traditional sole emphasis on maximizing short-term revenues has, in some cases, given way to recognition of non-financial returns (e.g., ecosystem services), that can directly or indirectly provide some protection to natural resources (Loomis 2002, p. 29). However, landscape-scale information on the various uses across state trust land parcels in the western U.S. has not been compiled, so without regulatory mechanisms that explicitly prohibit certain activities, it is not possible to summarize whether threats to sage-grouse and their habitat on these lands have been reduced or ameliorated (see **Regulatory Mechanisms** section, below).

State Wildlife Areas are generally established to protect wildlife habitat but remain available for hunting, fishing and other public enjoyment of wildlife. Congress made it possible to protect these habitats and secure public access with passage of the Pittman-Robertson Act in the late 1930's, which placed a federal manufacturer's excise tax on hunting arms and ammunition. These funds are allocated to each state based on the number of hunting licenses sold and size of the state. Although many areas offer a variety of non-hunting opportunities such as hiking, viewing and fishing, most funding is provided through the federal Pittman-Robertson program financed by hunters and shooting sports enthusiasts.

State Parks management varies by state, but these areas were generally established to protect and restore native ecosystems while providing recreational opportunities.

## **APPENDIX 1-2**

The National BLM/FS planning effort will amend or revise the following Resource Management Plans (RMP) and Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP):

\* indicates plans that are in the process of an amendment or revision but which have an anticipated completion date after September 2015 because they were not part of the national planning effort.

### **Great Basin Region**

#### *California*

- Alturas RMP (2008)
- Eagle Lake RMP (2008)
- Surprise RMP (2008)

#### *Idaho*

- Birds of Prey NCA RMP (2008)
- Bruneau RMP (1983 Bruneau MFP)
- Challis RMP (1999)
- Craters of the Moon NM RMP (2006)
- Four Rivers RMP (revising 1988 Cascade and 1983 Kuna and Bruneau MFPs)
- Jarbidge RMP (1987)
- Lemhi RMP (1987)
- Owyhee RMP (1999)
- Pocatello RMP revision
- Shoshone-Burley RMP revision (revising 1980 Bennett Hills/Timmerman Hills, 1985 Cassia, 1975 Magic, 1985 Monument, 1981 Sun Valley, and 1982 Twin Falls MFPs/RMPs)

- Upper Snake RMP revision (and existing 1983 Big Lost, 1985 Medicine Lodge, 1981 Big Desert, and 1981 Little Lost-Birch Creek MFPs/RMPs)
- Boise National Forest LRMP (2003)
- Curlew National Grassland Management Plan (2002)
- Caribou National Forest Revised LRMP (2003)
- Caribou-Targhee National Forest, Targhee National Forest LRMP (1997)
- Salmon-Challis National Forest, Challis National Forest LRMP (1987)
- Salmon-Challis National Forest, Salmon National Forest LRMP (1988)
- Sawtooth National Forest Revised LRMP (2003)

#### *Montana*

- Dillon RMP (2006)
- Beaverhead-Deerlodge National Forest LRMP (2009)

#### *Nevada*

- Battle Mountain RMP revision (and existing 1997 Tonopah and 1986 Shoshone-Eureka RMPs)
- Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon NCA RMP (2004)
- Carson City RMP revision (and existing 2001 Carson City Consolidated RMP)
- Elko RMP (1987)
- Ely RMP (2008)
- Wells RMP (1985)
- Winnemucca RMP revision (and existing 1982 Paradise-Denio MFP and 1982 Sonoma-Gerlach RMP)
- Humboldt National Forest LRMP (1986)
- Toiyabe National Forest LRMP (1986)

#### *Oregon*

- Andrews RMP (2005)
- Baker RMP revision (and existing 1989 Baker RMP)
- Brothers-LaPine RMP (1989)
- Lakeview RMP amendment (and existing 2003 Lakeview RMP)
- Southeastern Oregon RMP amendment (and existing 2003 Southeastern Oregon RMP)
- Steens RMP (2005)
- Three Rivers RMP (1992)
- Upper Deschutes RMP (2005)

#### *Washington*

- Eastern Washington RMP (revising 1987 Spokane RMP)\*

#### *Utah*

- Box Elder RMP (1986)
- Cedar/Beaver/Garfield/ Antimony RMP (1986)
- Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Management Plan (2000)
- House Range RMP (1987)
- Kanab RMP (2008)



- Park City Management Framework Plan (MFP) (1975)
- Pinyon MFP (1978)
- Pony Express RMP (1990)
- Price RMP (2008)
- Randolph MFP (1980)
- Richfield RMP (2008)
- Salt Lake District Isolated Tracts Planning Analysis (1985)
- Vernal RMP (2008)
- Warm Springs RMP (1987)
- Dixie National Forest LRMP (1986)
- Fishlake National Forest LRMP (1986)
- Uinta National Forest Revised LRMP (2003)
- Wasatch-Cache National Forest Revised LRMP (2003)
- Ashley National Forest LRMP (1986)
- Manti-La Sal National Forest LRMP (1986)

## **Rocky Mountain Region**

### *Wyoming*

- Casper RMP (2007)
- Kemmerer RMP (2010)
- Newcastle RMP (2000)
- Pinedale RMP (2008)
- Rawlins RMP (2008)
- Green River RMP (1997) (being revised under the Rock Springs RMP)
- Bridger-Teton National Forest LRMP (1990)
- Medicine Bow National Forest LRMP (2003)
- Thunder Basin National Grassland LRMP (2002)
- Buffalo RMP (1985)
- Bighorn RMP (2011)
- Lander RMP (1987)

### *Colorado*

- Glenwood Springs RMP (1984)
- Grand Junction RMP (1987)
- Kremmling RMP (1984)
- Little Snake RMP (2011)
- White River RMP (1997)
- Routt National Forest LRMP (1997)

### *Montana*

- Lewiston RMP (amending Judith RMP (1994) and Headwaters RMP (1984))
- Billings and Pompeys Pillar National Monument RMP (amends Billings RMP (1984))
- HiLine RMP (amends Judith Valley Phillips RMP (1994) and West HiLine RMP (1988))
- Miles City RMP (amends Big Dry RMP (1996) and Powder River RMP (1985))

*The Dakotas*

- North Dakota RMP (1988)
- South Dakota RMP (1986)
- Dakota Prairie Grassland LRMP (2001)\*