

ERRATA SHEET

Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation for the Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Sub-Region Proposed RMPA / Final EIS Errata Sheet

Draft Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement

Introduction

On December 10, 2018, the Bureau of Land Management Noticed in the Federal Register (83 FR 63525) the availability of Draft Resource Management Plan Amendment (RMPS) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation for the Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Sub-Region. Soon after publishing the document, the BLM identified inconsistencies with Appendix A (Proposed RMP Amendment with Management Goals, Objectives, and Decisions). Appendix B (Required Design Features) and Appendix C (The Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat Management Strategy) of the Final EIS. The BLM has modified these appendices to better align these documents with the alternatives of the Proposed RMPA, as well as BLM and Department of Interior (DOI) policies regarding compensatory mitigation. These modifications do not substantially change the alternatives in the Proposed RMPA/Final EIS or the analysis of effects on the human environment. In conjunction with these modified Draft Appendices, this errata describes specific changes made to Appendix A and Appendix C since the December 10, 2018 publication.

Text added to the Draft Appendix A and Draft Appendix C is in blue font. Text removed from the Draft Appendix A and Draft Appendix C is shown in blue font with a strikethrough.

Table 1. Appendix A

Appendix A: Proposed RMP Amendment with Management Goals, Objectives, and Decisions	
Page and Action Number Original Draft Appendix A	Draft Appendix A Revisions
A-3 / MO 16	The habitat objectives (see Tables 2-2 and 2-3) will be part of the Greater Sage-Grouse habitat assessment to be used during land health evaluations (see Monitoring Framework in 2018 Proposed RMPA Appendix C D). These habitat objectives are not obtainable on every acre within the designated Greater Sage-Grouse habitat management areas. Therefore, the determination on whether the objectives have been met will be based on the specific site's ecological ability to meet the desired condition identified in the table.
A-4 / MD GMD 10	Apply all appropriate RDFs (Proposed 2018 RMPA Appendix B) as mandatory Stipulations/COA/Terms and Conditions within PHMA for all program areas as applicable.
A-6 / MD GMD 23	Existing RMP decisions, pertaining to non-Greater Sage-grouse resources , will be retained unless vacated or modified by decisions in this ARMPA. Where more restrictive land use allocations or decisions are made in existing RMPs, those more restrictive land use allocations or decisions will remain in effect and will not be

	amended by this ARMPA. Where inconsistencies between the 2015 ARMPA and this 2018 Proposed RMP Amendment arise, the 2018 Proposed RMP Amendment decisions apply.
A-6 / MD GMD 25	BLM planning units (Districts), in coordination with the USFWS and relevant state agencies, will complete and continue to update Greater Sage-Grouse Landscape Wildfire & Invasive Species Habitat Assessments to prioritize at-risk habitats, and identify fuels management, preparedness, suppression and restoration priorities necessary to maintain sagebrush habitat to support interconnecting Greater Sage-Grouse populations. These assessments and subsequent assessment updates will also be a coordinated effort with an interdisciplinary team to take into account other Greater Sage-Grouse priorities identified in this plan. 2015 ARPMA Appendix L describes a minimal framework example and suggested approach for this assessment. Implementation actions will be tiered to the Local (District) Greater Sage-Grouse Landscape Wildfire & Invasive Species Assessment using the best available science related to the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse. In coordination with the USFWS and relevant state agencies, the BLM planning units (Districts) will identify annual treatment needs for wildfire and invasive species management as identified in local unit-level Landscape Wildfire and Invasive Species Assessments. Annual treatment needs will be coordinated across state/regional scales and across jurisdictional boundaries for long-term conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse. These landscape assessment implementation efforts will be reviewed annually with appropriate USFWS and state agency personnel.
A-7 / MD SSS 1	Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows: The BLM, in coordination with the State of Wyoming and its agencies, other local partners and stakeholders, will establish monitoring framework (2018 Proposed RMPA Appendix C) for Greater Sage-Grouse populations and habitat that will be incorporated into individual project approvals, including small and in-house projects, as appropriate and necessary. Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above: Casper RMP: Bates Hole and Fish Creek/Willow Creek: The areas will have priority for vegetation treatments to improve Greater Sage-Grouse habitats and for vegetation monitoring to ensure residual herbaceous vegetation is maintained for nesting cover on public lands.
A-8 / MD SSS 4	In all Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, when authorizing third-party actions in designated Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, the BLM will seek to achieve the planning-level Greater Sage-Grouse management goals and objectives through implementation of mitigation and management actions, consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law. Under this Proposed Plan Amendment, management would be consistent with the Greater Sage-Grouse goals and objectives, and in conformance with BLM Manual 6840, Special Status Species Management. In accordance with BLM Manual 6840, the BLM will undertake planning decisions, actions and authorizations “to minimize or eliminate threats affecting the status of [Greater Sage-Grouse] or to improve the condition of [Greater Sage-Grouse] habitat” across the planning area.

	<p>Accordingly, before authorizing third-party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation, the BLM will complete the following steps, in alignment with the Governor of Wyoming’s Executive Order 2015-4 (July 29, 2015):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work jointly with the WGFD to evaluate projects and recommend mitigation in the form of avoidance and minimization. 2. The WGFD will determine if the State requires or recommends any additional mitigation – including compensatory mitigation – under State regulations, policies, or programs related to the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse. 3. Incorporate state required or recommended mitigation into the BLM’s NEPA decision-making process, if the WGFD determines that compensatory mitigation is required to address impacts to GRSB habitat as a part of State policy or authorization, or if a proponent voluntarily offers mitigation. 4. Analyze whether the compensatory mitigation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • achieves measurable outcomes for Greater Sage-Grouse habitat function on a landscape scale as determined by WGFD that are at least equal to the lost or degraded values in accordance with the Governor of Wyoming’s Executive Order 2015-4. • provides benefits that are in place for at least the duration of the impacts • accounts for a level of risk that the mitigation action may fail or not persist for the full duration of the impact 5. Ensure mitigation outcomes are consistent with the State of Wyoming’s mitigation strategy and principles outlined in 2018 Proposed RMPA Appendix C, The Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat Management Strategy. <p>The BLM has determined that compensatory mitigation must be voluntary unless required by other applicable law and in recognition that State authorities may also require compensatory mitigation (IM 2019-018 2018-093, Compensatory Mitigation, December 6 July 24, 2018). Therefore, consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law, when authorizing third-party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation, the BLM will consider voluntary compensatory mitigation actions only as a component of compliance with a State mitigation plan, program, or authority, or when offered voluntarily by a project proponent.</p> <p>Project-specific analysis will be necessary to determine how a compensatory mitigation proposal addresses impacts from a proposed action. The BLM will cooperate with the State to determine appropriate project design and alignment with State policies and requirements, including those regarding compensatory mitigation. When the BLM is considering compensatory mitigation as a component of the project proponent’s submission or based on a mitigation requirement from the State, the BLM’s NEPA analysis would evaluate the need to avoid or minimize impacts of the proposed project and achieve the goals and objectives of this RMPA. The BLM will defer to the appropriate State authority to quantify habitat offsets, durability, and other aspects used to determine the recommended compensatory mitigation action.</p> <p>Remove the phrase “net conservation gain” from all management actions across all RMPs and appendices, including in reference to MD REC 2.</p>
--	--

A-10 / MD SSS 5	Greater Sage-Grouse leks inside PHMA: Surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities will be prohibited on or within a 0.6-mile radius of the perimeter of occupied Greater Sage-Grouse leks (Map 2-8). The authorized officer may grant an exception on a case-by-case basis subject to appropriate site-specific analysis, mitigation requirements, and consultation with the State of Wyoming and consistent with the applicable State management strategy (currently Governor of Wyoming's Executive Order 2015-4) (see MD SSS 4). The AO may grant an exception if an environmental record of review determines that the action, as proposed or conditioned, will not impair the function or utility of the site for the current or subsequent seasonal habitat, life-history, or behavioral needs of Greater Sage-Grouse.
A-10 / MD SSS 6	Greater Sage-Grouse leks outside PHMA: Surface occupancy and surface-disturbing activities will be prohibited on or within a 0.25-mile radius of the perimeter of occupied Greater Sage-Grouse leks (Map 2-8). The authorized officer may grant an exception on a case-by-case basis subject to appropriate site-specific analysis, mitigation requirements, and consultation with the State of Wyoming and consistent with the applicable State management strategy (currently Governor of Wyoming's Executive Order 2015-4)(see MD SSS 4). The AO may grant an exception if an environmental record of review determines that the action, as proposed or conditioned, will not impair the function or utility of the site for the current or subsequent seasonal habitat, life-history, or behavioral needs of Greater Sage-Grouse.
A-10 / MD SSS 7	Greater Sage-Grouse breeding, nesting, and early brood-rearing habitat inside PHMA (core only): Surface-disturbing and/or disruptive activities will be prohibited from March 15–June 30 to protect Greater Sage-Grouse breeding, nesting, and early brood rearing habitat. This timing limitation will be applied throughout the PHMA (core only). Activities in unsuitable habitats will be evaluated under the exception and modification criteria and shall be allowed on a case by case basis. The authorized officer may grant an exception on a case-by-case basis subject to appropriate site-specific analysis, mitigation requirements, and consultation with the State of Wyoming and consistent with the applicable State management strategy (currently Governor of Wyoming's Executive Order 2015-4) (see MD SSS 4). Where credible data support different timeframes for this seasonal restriction, dates may be expanded by up to 14 days prior to or subsequent to the above dates, but not both.
A-10 / MD SSS 8	Greater Sage-Grouse breeding, nesting, and early brood-rearing habitat inside PHMA (connectivity only): Surface-disturbing and/or disruptive activities will be prohibited within PHMA (connectivity only) from March 15–June 30 to protect breeding, nesting, and early brood-rearing habitats within 4 miles of the lek or lek perimeter of any occupied Greater Sage-Grouse lek within identified PHMA (connectivity only). This timing limitation will be applied throughout the PHMA (connectivity only). Activities in unsuitable habitats will be evaluated under the exception and modification criteria and may be allowed on a case-by-case basis. The authorized officer may grant an exception on a case-by-case basis subject to appropriate site-specific analysis, mitigation requirements, and consultation with the State of Wyoming and consistent with the applicable State management strategy (currently Governor of Wyoming's Executive Order 2015-4) (see MD SSS 4). Where credible data support different timeframes for this seasonal restriction, dates can be shifted by 14 days prior or subsequent to the above dates, but not both.

A-10 / MD SSS 9	<p>Greater Sage-Grouse breeding, nesting, and early brood-rearing habitat outside PHMA: Surface-disturbing and/or disruptive activities will be prohibited from March 15—June 30 to protect Greater Sage-Grouse breeding, nesting, and early brood rearing habitat within 2 miles of the lek or lek perimeter of an occupied lek located outside PHMA. Activities in unsuitable habitats will be evaluated under the exceptions and modification criteria and shall be allowed on a case by case basis. The authorized officer may grant an exception on a case-by-case basis subject to appropriate site-specific analysis, mitigation requirements, and consultation with the State of Wyoming and consistent with the applicable State management strategy (currently Governor of Wyoming’s Executive Order 2015-4) (see MD SSS 4). Where credible data support different timeframes for this seasonal restriction, dates may be expanded up to 14 days prior to or subsequent to the above dates but not both</p>
A-11 / MD SSS 10	<p>Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Concentration Areas: Surface-disturbing and/or disruptive actives in Greater Sage-Grouse winter concentration areas would be prohibited from December 1—March 14. Activities in unsuitable habitats within PHMA would be evaluated under the exception and modification criteria and could be allowed on a case-by-case basis. The authorized officer may grant an exception on a case-by-case basis subject to appropriate site-specific analysis, mitigation requirements, and consultation with the State of Wyoming and consistent with the applicable State management strategy (currently Governor of Wyoming’s Executive Order 2015-4) (see MD SSS 4).-Protection of additional mapped winter concentration areas in GHMA would be implemented where winter concentration areas are identified as supporting populations of Greater Sage-Grouse that attend leks within PHMA (core only) mapped and designated by the State of Wyoming. Appropriate seasonal timing restrictions and habitat protection measures would be considered and evaluated on consultation with the WGFD in all identified winter concentration areas.</p>
A-11 / MD SSS 12	<p>Within PHMA (core only), new project noise levels, either individual or cumulative, should not exceed 10 dBA (as measured by L50) above baseline noise at the perimeter of the lek from 6:00 pm to 8:00 am during the breeding breeding season (March 1–May 15). These measures would be considered at the site-specific project level where and when appropriate. The authorized officer may grant an exception on a case-by-case basis subject to appropriate site-specific analysis, mitigation requirements, and consultation with the State of Wyoming and consistent with the applicable State management strategy (currently Governor of Wyoming’s Executive Order 2015-4) (see MD SSS 4). In coordination with the State State of Wyoming, specific noise protocols for measurement and implementation will be developed as additional research and information emerges.</p>
A-11 / MD SSS 13	<p>The Greater Sage-Grouse adaptive management plan (Wyoming RMP 2015 Amendment ARMPA Appendix C D) provides a means of addressing and responding to unintended negative impacts on Greater Sage-Grouse, and its habitat will be addressed before consequences become severe or irreversible. The Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse ARMPA will include the requirement for projects requiring an EIS to develop adaptive management strategies in support of the population management objectives for Greater Sage-Grouse set by the State of Wyoming. Wyoming ADPPs will include an adaptive management plan, as reviewed by the BLM WO, Solicitor’s Office, and USFWS, which includes: Upon determination that a hard trigger is tripped, the BLM will immediately defer issuance</p>

	<p>of discretionary authorizations for new actions for a period of 90 days. In addition, within 14 days of a determination, the AMWG will convene to develop an interim response strategy and initiate an assessment to determine the causal factors. The AMWG would define a process to review and reverse adaptive management actions once the identified causal factor is resolved (e.g., returning to previous management once objectives of interim management strategy have been met). Adaptive management triggers are essential for identifying when potential management changes are needed in order to continue meeting Greater Sage-Grouse conservation objectives. With respect to Greater Sage-Grouse, all regulatory entities in Wyoming, including the BLM, use soft and hard triggers. Soft and hard triggers are focused on three metrics: 1) number of active leks, 2) acres of available habitat, and 3) population trends based on annual lek counts.</p> <p>In making amendments to this plan, the BLM will coordinate with the USFWS as the BLM continues to meet its objective of conserving, enhancing, and restoring Greater Sage-Grouse habitat by reducing, minimizing, or eliminating threats to that habitat. The hard and soft trigger data will be analyzed as soon as it becomes available after the signing of the ROD and then at a minimum, analyzed annually thereafter.</p> <p><u>Soft Triggers:</u></p> <p>Soft triggers are indicators that management or specific activities may not be achieving the intended results of conservation action or that unanticipated changes to populations or habitats have occurred that have the potential to place habitats or populations at risk. The soft trigger is any deviation from normal trends in habitat or population in any given year. Metrics include, but are not limited to, annual lek counts, wing counts, aerial surveys, habitat monitoring, and DDCT evaluations. BLM field offices, with the assistance of their respective land and resource management plan implementation groups, local WGFD offices, and local Greater Sage-Grouse working groups, will evaluate the metrics with the AMWG on an annual basis. For population metrics, normal population trends are calculated as the 5-year running mean of annual population counts. The purpose of these strategies is to address localized Greater Sage-Grouse population and habitat changes by providing the framework in which management will change if monitoring identifies negative population and habitat anomalies in order to avoid crossing a hard trigger threshold.</p> <p><u>Hard Triggers:</u></p> <p>Hard triggers are indicators that management is not achieving desired conservation results. Hard triggers will be considered a catastrophic indicator that the species is not responding to conservation actions, or that a larger-scale impact or set of impacts is having a negative effect. Within the range of normal population variables (5-year running mean of annual population counts), hard triggers shall be determined to take effect when two of the three metrics exceeds 60 percent of normal variability for the area under management in a single year, or when any of the three metrics exceeds 40 percent of normal variability for a 3-year time period within a 5-year range of analysis. A minimum of 3 consecutive years in a 5-year period is used to determine trends (i.e., Y1-2-3, Y2-3-4, Y3-4-5).</p>
A-12 to A-13 / MD VEG 3	<p>Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows: For vegetation treatments in sagebrush within PHMA, refer to 2015 ARMPA Appendix H, WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-Grouse (WGFD 2011, as updated) and BLM Washington Office Instruction</p>

	<p>Memorandum 2013-128 (Sage-grouse Conservation Related to Wildland Fire and Fuels Management). These recommended protocols will be used in determining whether proposed treatment constitutes a “disturbance” that will contribute toward the 5 percent threshold within PHMA maintenance. Additionally, these protocols will be used to determine whether the proposed treatment configuration is expected to have neutral or beneficial impacts for PHMA (core only) populations or if they represent additional habitat loss or fragmentation.</p> <p>Treatments to enhance sagebrush/grasslands habitat for Greater Sage-Grouse will be evaluated based on habitat quality and the functionality/use of treated habitats post-treatment.</p> <p>The BLM will work collaboratively with partners at the state and local level to maintain and enhance Greater Sage-Grouse habitats. Seasonal restriction would be applied, as needed, for implementing fuels management treatments according to the type of seasonal habitat present.</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Green River RMP:</p> <p>Prescribed burns generally will be conducted in areas having greater than 35 percent sagebrush composition, 20 percent desirable grass composition, and greater than 10 inches of precipitation. Other vegetation manipulation methods will be considered on a case-by-case basis depending on objectives and cost benefits.</p> <p>Casper RMP:</p> <p>Decision 4053: The areas (Bates Hole and Fish Creek/Willow Creek) will have priority for vegetative treatments to improve Greater Sage-Grouse habitats and for vegetation monitoring to ensure residual herbaceous vegetation is maintained for nesting cover on public lands.</p>
A-13 / MD VEG 5	<p>Reclamation of surface disturbances in PHMA will be consistent with the Wyoming Reclamation Policy (BLM 2009a), vegetation objectives (Tables 2-2 and 2-3), and 2015 ARMPA Appendix M. A monitoring plan will be developed for each restoration or reclamation project and will report progress and changes in resource condition.</p>
A-15 to A-17 / MD FIRE 1	<p>Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows: For Wildland Fire Management, the protection of human life is the single, overriding priority. Setting priorities among protecting human communities and community infrastructure, other property and improvements, and natural and cultural resources will be done based on the values to be protected, human health and safety, and the costs of protection. The goal is to restore, enhance, and maintain areas suitable for Greater Sage-Grouse. Greater Sage-Grouse habitat (GHMA) will be prioritized commensurate with local fire plans, property values and other important habitat to be protected, with the goal to restore, enhance, and maintain areas suitable for Greater Sage-Grouse.</p> <p>PHMA (and Priority Areas for Conservation, if so determined by individual RMP efforts) will be the highest priority for conservation and protection during fire operations and fuels management decision-making. The PHMA will be viewed as more valuable than GHMA when priorities are established. When suppression resources are widely available, maximum efforts will be placed on limiting fire growth in GHMA polygons as well. These priority areas will be further refined following completion of the Greater Sage-Grouse Landscape Wildfire and Invasive Species Habitat Assessments described in 2015 ARMPA Appendix L.</p>

	<p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP:</p> <p>Appropriate management response will be used on all wildfires in the planning area. Full protection strategies and tactics will be used in the following areas:</p> <p>Wildland Urban Interface (WUI)</p> <p>Wildland industrial interface</p> <p>Developed recreation sites</p> <p>Developed electronics sites of all types.</p> <p>In all other areas appropriate management response (AMR) strategies and tactics will be determined by (but not limited to) the following:</p> <p>Firefighter and public safety</p> <p>Resource values at risk</p> <p>Proximity to private land</p> <p>Firefighting resource availability. Tactical constraints follow:</p> <p>The use of retardant within 300 feet of surface water (standing or running) is prohibited.</p> <p>No trees are to be cut during suppression activities within 200 yards of an identified bald eagle roost. No heavy equipment will be used within the following areas, except when human safety is at risk:</p> <p>Areas of cultural resource sensitivity</p> <p>Riparian/wetland habitats</p> <p>Big game crucial winter range habitats</p> <p>Greater Sage-Grouse leks</p> <p>Areas of highly erosive soils.</p> <p>In areas not identified as full protection, heavy equipment usage will be limited to existing roads and trails or immediately adjacent to them.</p> <p>Kemmerer RMP:</p> <p>In areas of high-density urban and (or) industrial interface with intermingled BLM-administered lands, suppression objectives will follow the AMR in an approved fire management plan for the planning area to provide first for human health and safety, while minimizing loss of property and threats to other surface owners. Generally, wildland fires are suppressed in these areas. In areas of low-density urban and (or) industrial interface where BLM-administered lands occur in large contiguous blocks, fire suppression objectives will follow the AMR in an approved fire management plan for the planning area to provide first for human health and safety, while allowing for achievement of resource objectives.</p> <p>Newcastle RMP:</p> <p>Full suppression will be used on fires endangering human life or that spread to within 0.25 miles of state or private lands, structures and facilities, oil and gas fields, important riparian habitat, or other sensitive resources. All wildfires will be evaluated to determine the need for rehabilitation or restoration measures.</p> <p>Restoration of burned areas will be by natural succession unless a special need is identified to prevent further resource damage.</p> <p>Pinedale RMP:</p> <p>Wildland fire mitigation and fuels activities will be managed to provide for firefighter and public safety as a first priority. Public lands within intermixed land</p>
--	---

	<p>ownership areas will be managed in association with the adjoining and nearby private and state lands.</p> <p>Areas of mixed land ownership, communities at risk as identified in the Federal Register, Volume 66, Number 160, 2001 (Antelope Run, Beaver Creek area, Boulder, Cottonwood Creek, Daniel, Forty Rod, Hoback Ranches, New Fork, Pinedale, Pocket Creek, and Upper Green); urban and industrial interface areas; and areas containing high-priority resource values have high priority for response to wildland fires and/or for fuels reduction and mitigation. Wildland fire suppression activities will be based on the AMR.</p> <p>Rawlins RMP: A high priority for fire management activities will be given to areas identified as communities at risk, industrial interface areas, and areas containing resource values considered high priority within the RMP planning area.</p> <p>Green River RMP: Wildfire suppression will emphasize AMR. Immediate control actions will be used only in cases of arson, direct threat to public safety, or a strong potential threaten structural property.</p> <p>Fire suppression actions will be based on achieving the most efficient control and allowing historical acres burned to increase. Activity plans will be developed for designated fire management areas defining specific parameters for all fire occurrences.</p> <p>JMH CAP: Appropriate management response to protect the basin big sagebrush/lemon scurfpea plant communities will be applied.</p> <p>Wildland and prescribed fires will be managed in all vegetation types to maintain or improve biological diversity and the overall health of the public lands. In particular, plant species and age class diversity will be a priority; thus, AMR for all wildland fires will be identified and implemented depending on the resources and management objectives for the area.</p> <p>Suppression techniques and hazardous fuels reduction activities will be identified to reduce wildland fire severity and occurrence on portions of the landscape where fire causes undesirable changes in plant community composition and structure. A site-specific analysis will be prepared for sensitive resource areas, such as special status plant species sites, heritage sites, historic trails, and areas of critical environmental concern (ACECs), to determine the type of fire suppression activity that will be acceptable. Fire equipment and fire suppression techniques, such as vegetation clearing, will be limited to existing roads and trails in special status plant species habitat. As appropriate, the Fire Management Plan will be updated to reflect the appropriate suppression activity in sensitive resource areas.</p>
A-17 to A -18 / MD FIRE 2	<p>In PHMA, fuels treatments will be designed and implemented with an emphasis on protecting existing sagebrush ecosystems and enhancing and protecting future sagebrush ecosystems (refer to WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-grouse [WGFD 2011, as updated]) and 2015 ARMPA Appendix H.</p> <p>These recommended protocols will be used in determining whether proposed treatment constitutes a “disturbance” that will contribute toward the 5 percent threshold for habitat maintenance.</p> <p>Fuel treatments will be designed through an interdisciplinary process to expand, enhance, maintain, and protect Greater Sage-Grouse habitat. Green strips (using</p>

	<p>native fire resistant/resilient species) and/or fuel breaks will be used, where appropriate, to protect seeding efforts from subsequent fire events.</p> <p>In coordination with the USFWS and relevant state agencies, BLM planning units (Districts) with large blocks of Greater Sage-Grouse habitat will develop, using the assessment process described in 2015 ARMPA Appendix L, a fuels management strategy which considers an up-to-date fuels profile, land use plan direction, current and potential habitat fragmentation, sagebrush and Greater Sage-Grouse ecological factors, and active vegetation management steps to provide critical breaks in fuel continuity, where appropriate. When developing this strategy, planning units will consider the risk of increased habitat fragmentation from a proposed action versus the risk of large scale fragmentation posed by wildfires if the action is not taken. Utilizing an interdisciplinary approach, a full range of fuel reduction techniques will be available. Fuel reduction techniques such as grazing, prescribed fire, chemical, biological, and mechanical treatments will be acceptable.</p> <p>Upon project completion, fuels projects will be monitored and managed to ensure long-term success, including persistence of seeded species and/or other treatment components. Invasive vegetation post-treatment will be controlled.</p> <p>Wildfire prevention plans will be developed that explain the resource value of Greater Sage-Grouse habitat and include fire prevention messages and actions to reduce human-caused ignitions.</p>
A-18 to A-19 / MD FIRE 3	<p>Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>For fuels management, the BLM will consider multiple tools for fuels reduction and will analyze in NEPA compliance documentation before electing to implement prescribed fire in PHMA.</p> <p>If prescribed fire is used in Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, the NEPA analysis for the Burn Plan will address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why alternative techniques were not selected as a viable options How Greater Sage-Grouse goals and objectives will be met by its use How the COT (Conservation Objectives Team) report objectives will be addressed and met <p>A risk assessment to address how potential threats to Greater Sage-Grouse habitat will be minimized.</p> <p>Prescribed fire as a vegetation or fuels treatment shall only be considered after the NEPA analysis for the Burn Plan has addressed the four bullets outlined above.</p> <p>Prescribed fire can be used to meet specific fuels objectives that protect Greater Sage-Grouse habitat in PHMA (e.g., creation of fuel breaks that disrupt the fuel continuity across the landscape in stands where annual invasive grasses are a minor component in the understory, burning slash piles from conifer reduction treatments, used as a component with other treatment methods to combat annual grasses and restore native plant communities).</p> <p>Prescribed fire in known winter range shall only be considered after the NEPA analysis for the Burn Plan has addressed the four bullets outlined above. Any prescribed fire in winter habitat will need to be designed to strategically reduce wildfire risk around and/or in the winter range and designed to protect winter range habitat quality. Refer to 2015 ARMPA Appendix H, WGFD Protocols for Treating Sagebrush to Benefit Sage-grouse (WGFD 2011, as updated) and BLM Washington Office Instruction Memorandum 2013-128. If prescribed fire activities are not in</p>

	<p>compliance with these protocols, the treatment will be considered a PHMA disturbance.</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP: Use prescribed burning to achieve measurable 5th-order watershed objectives from (1) other resources, including, but not limited to, forestry, wildlife, range, vegetation, and watershed; (2) the reduction of hazardous fuels; and (3) the introduction of fire into fire-adapted ecosystems.</p> <p>Green River RMP/JMH CAP: Prescribed fire will generally be the preferred method of vegetation manipulation to convert decadent stands of brushland to grasslands and to stimulate sprouting of old, decadent aspen stands and/or shrub species. Prescribed burns are preferred in areas having greater than 35 percent sagebrush composition, 20 percent desirable grass composition, and greater than 10 inches of precipitation.</p> <p>Rawlins RMP: Fuel treatments, including prescribed fire, mechanical, chemical, and biological treatments will be used for fuels reduction and to meet other multiple-use resource objectives, including returning fire to its natural role in the ecosystem. WUIs and communities at risk will receive priority for fuels reduction.</p>
A-28 / MD Mineral Resources (MR) 1 Fluid Minerals (Unleased Estate)	<p>Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>The BLM will allow oil and gas leasing consistent and subject to the leasing stipulations analyzed in the timing, distance, disturbance, and density restrictions sections (Map 2-2) (see MD SSS 4 5 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12, see also Wyoming RMP 2015 ARMPA Amendment Appendix A B – Fluid Mineral Stipulations). Ensure that leasing activities in PHMA comply with Greater Sage-Grouse resource management plan decisions and remain in compliance with laws, regulations and policy.</p> <p>Fluid mineral leasing will be allowed in PHMA (core only), except in areas that are closed to leasing due to the need to protect other sensitive resources.</p>
A-28 to A-29 / MD MR 2 Fluid Minerals (Unleased Estate)	<p>Fluid Minerals (Unleased Estate)</p> <p>Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>Geophysical exploration projects that are designed to minimize habitat fragmentation within PHMA will be allowed, except where prohibited or restricted by existing RMP decisions, and in conformance with timing and distances Management Decisions (see MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12) (see Decisions MD SSS 5 through MD SSS 10).</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP: The blocks of public land identified as mapped in the Casper Field Office GIS database will be managed to retain intact blocks of native vegetation (192,550 acres, of which 131,880 acres are BLM-administered surface). In these areas, the following restrictions apply: These blocks are (1) unavailable for oil and gas leasing, and (2) a geophysical operation on public surface for the life of the plan. Activities for existing oil and</p>

	<p>gas leases are managed intensively (see Appendix U of the Casper RMP). Existing leases will be allowed to expire and not be renewed.</p> <p>Within these blocks, a withdrawal from the operation of the public land laws, including the mining laws will be pursued.</p> <p>These blocks are closed to mineral material disposal. Existing permits will be allowed to expire without renewal or expansion.</p> <p>These blocks are not open to wind/renewable energy development.</p> <p>These blocks remain open to livestock grazing.</p> <p>All allowed surface-disturbing activities within the designated blocks are subject to a Controlled Surface Use restriction, minimizing surface disturbance to meet management objectives. Decision 4024</p> <p>The North Platte River Special Recreation Management Area will continue to be open to oil and gas leasing and geophysical operations. Decision 7039</p> <p>The area is unavailable for oil and gas leasing and geophysical exploration is not allowed. Decision 7047</p> <p>The MA is unavailable for new oil and gas leasing. No geophysical operations will be allowed on public surface.</p> <p>Activities on existing leases will be managed intensively to meet the objectives of the MA (see Appendix U of the Casper RMP – Intensive Management). To minimize surface-disturbing activities, oil and gas exploration and development will use directional drilling techniques and well twinning whenever practicable. Decision 7059</p> <p>The Red Wall/Gray Wall complex is located entirely within the South Bighorns/Red Wall Management Area and is unavailable for new oil and gas leasing. No geophysical operations will be allowed on public surface. Activities on existing leases will be intensively managed to meet the objectives of the MA (see Appendix U of the Casper RMP– Intensive Management). To minimize surface-disturbing activities, oil and gas exploration and development will use directional drilling techniques and well twinning whenever practicable. Decision 7063</p> <p>Those lands currently open to oil and gas leasing will continue to be open to geophysical operations. Those lands open to oil and gas leasing, but subject to a NSO restriction, may be open to geophysical operations should site specific NEPA analysis disclose a finding of no significant impact. No geophysical operations are allowed in areas closed for oil and gas leasing. Decision 2019</p> <p>Kemmerer RMP:</p> <p>Allow for geophysical exploration on lands throughout the planning area subject to identified conditions of approval.</p> <p>Newcastle RMP:</p> <p>Surface-disturbing and disruptive activities associated with all types of minerals exploration and development and with geophysical exploration will be subject to appropriate mitigation measures determined through, but not limited to, use of MD SSS 4 the Wyoming BLM Mitigation Guidelines.</p> <p>Pinedale RMP:</p> <p>Vehicle-based geophysical activities will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The use of surface and/or aboveground (Poulter shot) explosive charges for geophysical exploration will be assessed case by case.</p> <p>Geophysical projects, including projects proposed in areas with an NSO restriction, will be analyzed and mitigation developed on a case-by-case basis.</p>
--	--

	<p>Geophysical activities that are considered casual use actions are allowed within 0.25 miles of active Greater Sage-Grouse leks provided that: Operations are conducted on designated roads and trails. Operations during the breeding season (March 1 through May 15) are conducted between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. A 150-foot wide strip of undisturbed sagebrush is maintained around the perimeter of the lek for hiding and escape cover.</p> <p>Rawlins RMP: All lands open to oil and gas leasing consideration will also be open to geophysical exploration, subject to appropriate resource surveys, surface protection measures, adequate bonding, and adherence to State of Wyoming standards for geophysical operations. Vehicular use for “necessary tasks” (as defined in the glossary), such as geophysical exploration including project survey and layout, will be permitted except where specifically prohibited (e.g., some SD/MAs).</p> <p>Green River RMP: Geophysical exploration (vehicles and detonation) activities will be prohibited within 0.5 miles of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature. Areas of sensitive heritage resources and geologic features, such as Boars Tusk, White Mountain Petroglyphs, special status plant species, wilderness study areas (WSAs), and historic trails, will remain closed. Receiver lines may be laid using foot traffic within these areas. Exceptions to these restrictions may be granted on a case-by-case basis subject to appropriate site-specific analysis and mitigation requirements. The remainder of the planning area will be open to geophysical exploration, with application of appropriate mitigation. Rights-of-way limitations in the planning area apply to on- and off-road vehicle traffic used for geophysical activities. Exploration activities will be allowed in sensitive resource areas only if they can be performed with acceptable mitigation of impacts.</p> <p>JMH CAP: Geophysical exploration (vehicles and detonation) activities will be prohibited within 0.5 miles of the Pinnacles Geologic Feature. Areas of sensitive heritage resources and geologic features, such as Boars Tusk, White Mountain Petroglyphs, special status plant species, WSAs, and historic trails, will remain closed. Receiver lines may be laid using foot traffic within these areas. Exceptions to these restrictions may be granted on a case-by-case basis subject to appropriate site-specific analysis and mitigation requirements. The remainder of the planning area will be open to geophysical exploration, with application of appropriate mitigation. ROW limitations in the planning area apply to on- and off-road vehicle traffic used for geophysical activities. Exploration activities will be allowed in sensitive resource areas only if they can be performed with acceptable mitigation of impacts.</p>
A-30 / MD MR 3 Fluid Minerals, Leased Estate	<p>Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows: In cases where federal oil and gas leases have been issued with stipulations varying from those in 2018 Proposed RMPA Appendix A B for the protection of Greater Sage-Grouse or their habitats, as provided in the applicable RMP decision, as revised or amended, their inclusion as APD COAs will be considered when approving exploration and development activities through completion of the</p>

	<p>environmental record of review (43 CFR 3162.5 and 36 CFR 228.108), including appropriate documentation of compliance with NEPA.</p> <p>Overall consideration shall be given to minimizing the impact on Greater Sage-Grouse through a project design that avoids, minimizes, reduces, rectifies, and/or adequately compensates for direct and indirect impacts on PHMA or use and includes applicable and technical COAs (see MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12). Selection and application of these measures shall be based on current science and research on the effects on important breeding, nesting, brood-rearing, and wintering areas. For proposed operations in PHMA, the Surface Use Plan of Operations (see 43CFR 3162.3-1(f)) shall address, at a minimum, the anticipated noise, density and amount of disturbance, mechanical movement (e.g., pump jacks), permanent and temporary facilities, traffic, phases of development over time, off-site mitigation, and expected periods of use associated with the proposed project. Seasonal habitats or project features related to potential Greater Sage-Grouse impacts that are not addressed in the Surface Use Plan of Operations based on site-specific or project-specific considerations shall be noted in the project file, along with a rationale for not including them.</p> <p>In this process the BLM will evaluate, among other things:</p> <p>Whether the conservation measure is “reasonable” (43 CFR 3101.1-2) and consistent with valid existing rights</p> <p>Whether the action is in conformance with the approved LUP; and the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>The BLM will work with project proponents in these situations to promote measurable Greater Sage-Grouse conservation objectives such as, but not limited to, consolidation of project related infrastructure to reduce habitat fragmentation and loss and to promote effective conservation of seasonal habitats and PHMA (connectivity only) that support population management objectives set by the state. The BLM will continue to work with project proponents and the WGFD to site their projects in locations that meet the purpose and need for their project, but have been determined to contain the least sensitive habitats (based on vegetation, topography, or other habitat features) and resources whether inside or outside of PHMA (utilizing DDCT analysis process). Valid existing rights will be recognized and respected.</p> <p>For Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p><u>Kemmerer RMP:</u></p> <p>Choose and implement appropriate mitigation in a timely manner to minimize decreases in habitat function.</p> <p>Utilize appropriate voluntary off-site compensatory mitigation to reduce impacts. This will be necessary if (1) all on-site mitigation has been accomplished and adverse effects have not been mitigated; or (2) if on-site mitigation is not feasible.</p> <p><u>Pinedale RMP:</u></p> <p>Off-site mitigation proposed by oil and gas or other operators can be considered and analyzed in future environmental documents as mitigation for proposed activities within the planning area. Proposed off-site mitigation will be described and analyzed for effectiveness in detail on a project-specific basis. Off-site mitigation will conform to requirements in the Pinedale RMP regarding the order of use of mitigation methods, stipulations applied to off-site mitigation measures, and priority order for mitigating resource impacts on-site or off-site.</p> <p><u>Green River RMP:</u></p>
--	--

	<p>Development actions will be analyzed on a case-by-case basis to identify mitigation needs to meet RMP objectives, provide for resource protection, and provide for logical development. Limitations on the amount, sequence, timing, or level of development may occur. This may result in transportation planning and in limitations in the number of roads and drill pads, or deferring development in some areas until other areas have been restored to previous uses.</p> <p><u>JMH CAP:</u> COAs attached to an APD will be based on site-specific NEPA or other analysis and will establish specific, necessary mitigation measures not covered by stipulations for resource and environmental protection. Some areas will need more intensive mitigation measures to protect sensitive resources and provide for public health and safety. These intensive mitigation measures or COAs will mostly apply to areas with overlapping sensitive resources (e.g., Areas 2 and 3). Examples of intensive mitigation that can apply to all activities based on site-specific analysis include off-site placement of facilities, remote control monitoring, restricted or prohibited surface use including road construction, multiple wells from a single pad, central tank batteries/facilities, and pipelines and power lines concentrated in specific areas. In addition, refer to Section 3.12.3 for additional mitigation measures that may apply as part of the transportation plan.</p>
A-32 / MD MR 4	<p>Within PHMA, field offices will work with project proponents (including those within BLM) to site their projects in locations that minimize impacts on sensitive resources (see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12).</p>
A-32 / MD MR 5	<p>Master Development Plans will be considered and encouraged for projects involving multiple proposed disturbances within PHMA (see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12).</p>
A-32 / MD MR 6	<p>Within PHMA, unitization will be encouraged as a means of minimizing adverse impacts on Greater Sage-Grouse to reduce fragmentation and surface-disturbing and disruptive activities (see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12).</p>
A-32 / MD MR 7	<p>The BLM shall closely examine the applicability of categorical exclusions in PHMA and GHMA. If extraordinary circumstances review is applicable, the BLM shall determine whether those circumstances exist. For proposed actions in PHMA, determine whether a categorical exclusion is applicable and if so, closely examine the extraordinary circumstances, if applicable, to determine whether one or more exists that will require preparation of a NEPA analysis. If a categorical exclusion applies, and no extraordinary circumstances exist, determine whether preparing a NEPA analysis will help inform decision making (see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12).</p>
A-32 / MD MR 8	<p>Federal Regulations, 43 CFR 3104.1 requires that a bond be furnished before any drilling or surface disturbance activities begin. The lessee, sublessee or the operator must furnish a surety or personal bond in the amount of at least \$10,000 to ensure compliance with all the lease terms, including protection of the environment. With the consent of the surety and principal, the operator may use the bond of another party, such as the lessee. Each time there is a new operator, that operator must notify the BLM that he/she is the responsible operator, giving the particulars of the bond under which he/she will operate. The BLM can require an increase in a bond amount any time conditions warrant such an increase.</p> <p>A reclamation bond will be required on all projects that is commensurate with the scope, scale, size of the project within PHMA. Partial bonding may be appropriate depending on these factors.</p>

	(see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12)
A-32 / MD MR 9	<p>Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>Produced water from coalbed natural gas wells will be treated and disposed of in collaboration and consistent with the requirements of the state, and RDFs specified in Management Action 10 (see 2018 Proposed RMPA Appendix B).</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Pinedale RMP:</p> <p>Produced water from coalbed natural gas wells will be treated and disposed of in collaboration and consistent with the requirements of the state.</p> <p>(see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12)</p>
A-33 / MD MR 10	<p>Specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, within PHMA (core only), all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>Where the federal government owns the mineral estate, and the surface is in nonfederal ownership, apply the same stipulations, COAs, and/or conservation measures and RDFs applied if the mineral estate is developed on BLM-administered lands in that management area, to the maximum extent permissible under existing authorities, and in coordination with the landowner (see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12).</p> <p>Within PHMA (non-core only) and outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Pinedale RMP:</p> <p>BLM-permitted actions on split estate lands are subject to the same stipulations as leased federal mineral estate on federal surface lands, provided the stipulations do not adversely affect the surface owner's land use or actions. Exceptions to surface development restrictions may be granted if requested or agreed to by the surface owner.</p>
A-33 / MD MR 11	<p>Within PHMA where the federal government owns the surface and the mineral estate is in nonfederal ownership, apply appropriate surface use COAs, stipulations, and mineral RDFs through ROW grants or other surface management instruments, to the maximum extent permissible under existing authorities, in coordination with the mineral estate owner/lessee (see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12).</p>
A-34 / MD MR 12	<p>Locatable Minerals</p> <p>Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>252,160 acres within SFAs (see MD SSS 14 for identification of SFAs) will be recommended for withdrawal from the General Mining Act of 1872, subject to valid existing rights. A total of approximately 21,251,690 acres are open to locatable mineral location and entry (Map 2-3). Operators may be requested to submit modifications to the accepted notice or approved plan of operations so that the operations minimally impact PHMA. The AO may convey to the operator suggested conservation measures, based on the notice or plan level operations and the geographic area of those operations (also called the project area which is defined in 43 CFR 3809.5 and 36 CFR 228.3).</p> <p>These suggested conservation measures include measures that support the overall goals and objectives of the core population area strategy, though measures listed for</p>

	<p>protection of Greater Sage-Grouse breeding, nesting, brood- rearing, and wintering may not be reasonable or applicable to the BLM’s determination of whether the proposed operations will cause unnecessary or undue degradation under 43 CFR 3809.5 and 36 CFR 228.3. The request containing the suggested conservation measures must make clear that the operator’s compliance is not mandatory. Notices or Plans of Operation, or modifications thereto, submitted following the issuance of this guidance: As part of the 15-day completeness review of notices [or modifications thereto] and 30-day completeness review of plans of operations [or modifications thereto], the proposed project area(s) where exploration, development, mining, access and reclamation will take place shall be reviewed for overlap of PHMA in the corporate GIS database. If there is overlap, the BLM AO may notify the operator of ways that they may minimize impacts on PHMA and request the operator to amend its notice or plan to include such measures. The request to amend the submitted notice or plan of operations must make clear that the operator’s compliance is not mandatory and that including such measures is not a requirement for completeness of either the notice or a plan of operations, nor is it a condition of acceptance of the notice or approval of the plan of operations. (see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12) For values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect: 1,785,230 acres are withdrawn from mineral entry for the protection of sensitive resources.</p>
A-34 / MD MR 13	<p>Salable Minerals PHMA will be open to mineral material exploration, sales, and free use permits, except in areas that are unavailable due to the need to protect other resource values. All salable mineral activities within PHMA will be considered, provided they can be completed in compliance within surface occupancy, seasonal restrictions, and disturbance and density stipulations (Map 2-4 and MD SSS 2, 3, 4 through 10 and 12) 5 through 10) analyzed through the DDCT process.</p>
A-34 / MD MR 14	<p>Salable Minerals Within PHMA closure and restoration of salable mineral pits no longer in use will be considered to meet Greater Sage-Grouse habitat conservation objectives (see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12). Emphasis will be given to reclamation/restoration of PHMA as a viable long term goal to improve Greater Sage-Grouse habitat.</p>
A-35 / MD MR 15	<p>Nonenergy Leasable Minerals Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows: All nonenergy leasable mineral activities will be considered in PHMA, provided that the activities can be completed in compliance with all occupancy, timing, density and disturbance restrictions (Map 2-5) (see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12). Exploration licenses and prospecting permits will be considered with appropriate mitigating measures. Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above: Portions of PHMA will be unavailable for leasing in accordance with existing RMP decisions for resource values other than Greater Sage-Grouse. Kemmerer RMP:</p>

	<p>Sodium: All public lands (outside of the Raymond Mountain WSA and exceptions identified below) within the planning area are available for sodium leasing consideration. Exploration for sodium will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Limited surface occupancy criteria contained in the Sodium Mineral Development Environmental Assessment will be applied on a case-by-case basis. No new sodium leases or exploration licenses may be issued on lands within the Raymond Mountain WSA. No new sodium exploration and leasing will be considered for Rock Creek/Tunp and Bear River Divide management areas.</p> <p>Phosphate: All public lands (outside of the Raymond Mountain WSA and exceptions identified below) within the planning area are available for phosphate leasing consideration. Exploration for phosphate will be considered on a case-by-case basis. No new phosphate exploration and leasing will be considered for Rock Creek/Tunp and Bear River Divide management areas.</p> <p>Pinedale RMP: Should interest in other leasable minerals materialize in the future, leasing will be considered on a case-by- case basis, and the RMP will be amended as appropriate and necessary. The same surface disturbance restrictions will be used in analyzing leasing proposals and determining the issuance of any leases (for example, geothermal steam, coal, sodium, oil shale, and phosphate).</p> <p>Green River RMP/JMH CAP: The known sodium leasing area is open to exploration and consideration for leasing and developments, but is closed to prospecting permits. The remainder of the planning area is open to sodium prospecting except for areas that are closed to mineral leasing, surface mining, or mechanical prospecting type activities (areas closed to drilling, off road vehicle use, and explosive charges). Sodium (trona) leasing will be considered on a case-by-case basis, and is subject to the same conditional requirements as oil and gas and coal, and the general management direction applied in this RMP.</p>
A-35 to A-36 / MD MR 16	<p>Solid Leasable Minerals</p> <p>Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>At the time an application for a new coal lease or lease modification is submitted to the BLM, the BLM will determine whether the lease application area is "unsuitable" for all or certain coal mining methods pursuant to 43 CFR 3461.5 (see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12). PHMA is essential habitat for maintaining Greater Sage-Grouse for purposes of the suitability criteria set forth at 43 CFR 3461.5(o)(1). The BLM will also consider that USFWS has found “the core area strategy...if implemented by all landowners via regulatory mechanisms, would provide adequate protection for Greater Sage-Grouse and their habitats in the state” when considering leasing coal in PHMA under the criteria set for at 43 CFR 3461.5(o)(1).</p> <p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP: If coal development potential is shown to exist, all BLM-administered lands outside the Coal Development Potential Area (CDPA) will be considered for coal leasing, unless specifically closed to mineral leasing. The coal-screening process will be completed on all newly identified lands having coal development potential.</p>

	<p>All BLM-administered lands within the CDPA identified in the 2001 Buffalo RMP maintenance action are acceptable for further consideration for coal leasing. The only exceptions are those lands determined unacceptable within the area or those lands that fall within PHMA. The coal unsuitability criteria are re- evaluated whenever new coal lease applications are received.</p> <p>Kemmerer RMP: Process new coal lease applications by using the coal screening process. The coal screening process results will determine which lands may be available for further consideration for coal leasing and development. Appropriate NEPA analysis will be required prior to leasing. Federal land within the proposed Haystack project area outside of the PHMA is determined acceptable for further consideration for coal leasing and development. No coal LBAs will be considered for Rock Creek/Tunp and Bear River Divide management areas.</p> <p>Pinedale RMP: Decisions on lands acceptable for leasing consideration for coal development will be made after an application is received and the coal screening process is conducted.</p> <p>Rawlins RMP: Federal coal lease applications will be accepted only on those federal coal lands with development potential identified as suitable for further leasing consideration after application of the coal unsuitability criteria (the above-mentioned approximately 51,250 acres and 2,318.7 million tons of surface minable federal coal).</p> <p>Green River RMP/JMH CAP: Federal coal lands within the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential area (about 422,000 acres) are open to further consideration for coal leasing and development (i.e., new competitive leasing, emergency leasing, lease modifications, and exchange proposals, under the Federal Coal Management Program) with appropriate and necessary conditions and requirements for protection of other land and resource values and uses.</p>
A-36 to A-37 / MD MR 17	<p>Solid Leasable Minerals Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows: Upon receipt of a coal lease application proposing underground mining methods that include surface operations and impacts within PHMA, Criterion 15 will be applied and the area will be identified as suitable for further coal leasing consideration after consultation with the state and, where applicable, surface management agency to determine that all or certain stipulated methods of coal mining will not have a significant long-term impact on Greater Sage-Grouse. Stipulated methods may include, but not limited to, underground mining methods with no placement of surface facilities except for purposes of health and human safety.</p> <p>Unsuitability is not applied to underground operations without surface impacts (43 CFR 3461.1) This will be consistent with IM WY-2012-019 says that the BLM will assess potential impacts on Greater Sage-Grouse through the NEPA process, and that the state regulatory agency will apply this mitigation, as well as protective measures consistent with the state policy for solid leasable mining action at the permitting stage (see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12).</p>

	<p>Outside of PHMA and/or for values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP: If coal development potential is shown to exist, all BLM-administered lands outside the CDPA will be considered for coal leasing, unless specifically closed to mineral leasing. The coal-screening process will be completed on all newly identified lands having coal development potential.</p> <p>All BLM-administered lands within the CDPA identified in the 2001 Buffalo RMP maintenance action are acceptable for further consideration for coal leasing. The only exceptions are those lands determined unacceptable within the area. The coal unsuitability criteria are re-evaluated whenever new coal lease applications are received.</p> <p>Kemmerer RMP: Process new coal lease applications by using the coal screening process. The coal screening process results will determine which lands may be available for further consideration for coal leasing and development. Appropriate NEPA analysis will be required prior to leasing. Federal land within the proposed Haystack project area is determined acceptable for further consideration for coal leasing and development. No coal LBAs will be considered for Rock Creek/Tunp and Bear River Divide management areas.</p> <p>Pinedale RMP: Decisions on lands acceptable for leasing consideration for coal development will be made after an application is received and the coal screening process is conducted.</p> <p>Rawlins RMP: Federal coal lease applications will be accepted only on those federal coal lands with development potential identified as suitable for further leasing consideration after application of the coal unsuitability criteria (the above-mentioned approximately 51,250 acres and 2,318.7 million tons of surface minable federal coal).</p> <p>Green River RMP/JMH CAP: Federal coal lands within the Coal Occurrence and Development Potential area (about 422,000 acres) are open to further consideration for coal leasing and development (i.e., new competitive leasing, emergency leasing, lease modifications, and exchange proposals, under the Federal Coal Management Program) with appropriate and necessary conditions and requirements for protection of other land and resource values and uses.</p>
A-37 / MD MR 18	<p>Coal exploration activities will be allowed in PHMA if they can be completed in compliance to surface occupancy and disturbance and density stipulations analyzed through the DDCT process (see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12).</p>
A-38 / MD MR 19	<p>Exceptions to lease stipulations, COA, and terms and conditions: Exceptions waivers, and modifications to lease stipulations, COAs, and terms and conditions, for Greater Sage-Grouse will continue to be considered on a case-by-case basis consistent with approved LUPs and other BLM policy and regulations as they relate to exceptions within PHMA and GHMA (see also MD SSS 4 through MD SSS 10 and MD SSS 12).</p>

A-38 / MD Lands and Realty (LR) 1	<p>Land Use Authorizations</p> <p>Specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>PHMA will be managed as ROW avoidance areas for new ROW or Special Use Authorization (SUA) permits (Map 2-7).</p> <p>Within PHMA where new ROWs/SUAs are necessary, new ROWs/SUAs will be located within designated RMP corridors or adjacent to existing ROWs/SUAs where technically feasible. Subject to valid existing rights including nonfederal land inholdings, required new ROWs/SUAs will be located adjacent to existing ROWs/SUAs or where it best minimizes Greater Sage-Grouse impacts. Consider the likelihood of development of not-yet-constructed surface-disturbing activities, as defined in Table 2 of the Monitoring Framework (2018 Proposed RMPA Appendix C D of the 2015 ROD/ARMPA) under valid existing rights.</p> <p>For values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect:</p> <p>Portions of PHMA will be managed as ROW exclusion areas in accordance with existing RMP decisions for resource values other than Greater Sage-Grouse.</p>
A-39 to A-42 / MD LR 3	<p>Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>New Transmission Lines (greater than 115 kV):</p> <p>New transmission lines greater than 115 kV in PHMA (core only) will be allowed only (1) within the 2-mile wide transmission line route through PHMA (core only) population areas in south-central and southwestern Wyoming (Attachment 1 from EO 2015-4); (2) when located within 0.5 miles or less of an existing 115 kV or greater transmission line constructed prior to 2008; or (3) in designated RMP corridors authorized for aboveground transmission lines. Transmission lines routed using one or more of the three criteria listed above will not be counted against the DDCT 5 percent disturbance cap. New transmission lines greater than 115 kV proposed outside of these areas will be considered where it can be demonstrated that declines in Greater Sage-Grouse populations can be avoided through project design and/or mitigation. These projects will be subject to the density and disturbance restrictions for PHMA.</p> <p>Construction of new transmission lines will adhere to the restrictions associated with conducting activities within PHMA.</p> <p>Review of transmission line proposals will incorporate the Framework for Sage-grouse Impacts Analysis for Interstate Transmission Lines and other appropriate documents consistent with the three routing criteria described above.</p> <p>New projects within PHMA that may require future utility lines, including distribution and transmission lines or pipelines, will include the proposed utility lines in their DDCT as part of the proposed disturbance. Lines permitted but not located in the above mentioned routes or a designated corridor will be counted toward the 5 percent disturbance calculation (line disturbance is equal to the anticipated construction footprint or construction ROW width multiplied by length and includes all access roads, staging areas, and other surface disturbance associated with construction outside of the construction ROW).</p> <p>New Electric Distribution Lines (less than 115 kV):</p> <p>New electric distribution lines will be buried where feasible and economically feasible. If not economically feasible, distribution lines may be authorized when effectively designed/mitigated to protect Greater Sage-Grouse and the AO</p>

	<p>determines that overhead installation is the action alternative with the fewest adverse impacts while still meeting the project need. Agricultural and residential lines will be considered to be adequately mitigated for Greater Sage-Grouse if constructed at least 0.6 miles from the lek perimeter with appropriate timing constraints and constructed to the latest APLIC guidance. These ROW authorizations will be subject to approval by the State Director.</p> <p>Priority Transmission Lines:</p> <p>PHMA are designated as avoidance areas for high voltage transmission line and pipeline ROWs, except for the transmission projects specifically identified below. All authorizations in these areas, other than the following identified projects, must comply with the conservation measures outlined in this proposed plan, including the RDF and avoidance criteria presented in 2018 Proposed RMPA Appendix B of this document. The BLM is currently processing an application for Gateway South, Gateway West, and TransWest Express and the NEPA review for these projects is well underway. The BLM is analyzing Greater Sage-Grouse mitigation measures through the project's NEPA review process.</p> <p>Pipelines:</p> <p>New pipelines through PHMA will be allowed: (1) within an RMP corridor currently authorized for that use or designated through future RMP amendments; or (2) constructed in or adjacent to existing utilities (buried and aboveground) or roads. Pipelines constructed in RMP corridors or adjacent to existing utilities or roads will require completion of a DDCT analysis for baseline data collection but the project is not required to meet the threshold of 5 percent. However, within 6 months of the completion of construction, the project proponent will provide the AO with as-built drawings so that total disturbance within core area can be calculated annually.</p> <p>The following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP:</p> <p>No new corridor designations will be made in Bates Hole. When placement of a major ROW facility within a designated corridor is not possible, and for smaller ROW and other linear facilities, placement will be adjacent to existing facilities or disturbances. Cross-country placement of ROW and other linear facilities will be allowed only when placement in a designated corridor or adjacent to an existing facility is not practical or feasible. The extent of all surface disturbances will be minimized.</p> <p>No new corridors will be established in the Sand Hills Management Area; ROWs will be allowed when management objectives for the area can still be achieved. All currently designated corridors will be maintained. All special restrictions that apply to types of use/facilities on the corridors will be removed, except as noted for the Oregon Trail Road ROW Corridor, Segment A. The corridors include 351,020 acres, of which 94,580 acres are federal surface. The widths/size of designated corridors will not change. Special restrictions applying to types of use/facilities on the corridors will be removed on a case-by-case basis. Existing corridors include:</p> <p>Oregon Trail Road Corridor, Segment A Oregon Trail Road Corridor, Segment B Oregon Trail Road Corridor, Segment C Poison Spider/Gas Hills Road Corridor Highway 20-26 Corridor</p>
--	--

	<p>Wyoming Highway 259/U.S. 87 Corridor Wyoming Highway 387 Corridor Lost Cabin-Arminto Road Corridor RMP Change No. 2012-03, including the West-Wide Energy Corridor Cabin Creek Corridor Existing Oregon Trail Road ROW Corridor, Segment A. Oregon Trail Road ROW Corridor, Segment A allows additional ROW facilities provided they are subsurface, surface, or low profile developments. ROW facilities that introduce visual intrusions on the skyline along the corridor will not be allowed. Special restrictions applying to types of use/facilities on the corridors will be removed on a case-by-case basis, and a new corridor, to be called the Cabin Creek Corridor, will be designated.</p> <p>Future Corridor Adjustments and New Corridor Designations: Future corridor adjustments and new corridor designations will be made only when facility placement within an existing designated corridor is incompatible, unfeasible, or impractical and when the environmental consequences can be adequately mitigated. Problems of technical compatibility between facilities and spacing of facilities in corridors will be solved on a case-by-case basis. Special restrictions applying to types of use/facilities on the corridors will be removed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>South Bighorns/Red Wall Management Area: No corridors will be designated; however, ROWs will be allowed on a case-by-case basis when management objectives for the area can still be achieved.</p> <p>Kemmerer RMP: Utility corridors will be designated, based on use (i.e., power lines, pipelines, and fiber optic lines). Preferred utility corridors will be 2 miles wide (width will be determined based on resource values) and designated as follows, but variances will be allowed based on application where conflicts with other resources were minimal or can be mitigated through resource-specific stipulations: High-voltage power line corridors will be established north of and parallel to I-80, and along Wyoming State Highway 89 from the junction of I-80 and the Wyoming state line. Fiber optic and low-voltage power line corridors will be located along currently established road systems (e.g., interstate or state highways and paved county roads).</p> <p>Newcastle RMP: Utility/transportation systems will be located adjacent to existing utility/transportation systems whenever practical. Areas to be avoided for new facility placement and routes will be identified on a case-by-case basis, rather than attempting to establish utility corridors.</p> <p>Pinedale RMP: Utility facilities will be restricted to existing routes and designated corridors where practicable, including environmental and socioeconomic considerations. Corridor routes include U.S. Highways 189 and 191 and State Highways 189, 191, 350, 351, 352, 353, and 354. New corridors may be established as oil and gas fields are developed.</p> <p>Rawlins RMP: All BLM-administered lands, except WSA and some SD/MAs (including ACEC/Special Interest Areas), will be open to consideration for placement of utility</p>
--	--

	<p>ROW systems. Each utility ROW will be located adjacent to existing facilities, when possible. Areas with important or sensitive resource values will be avoided. Existing major transportation and utility ROW routes will be designated corridors. However, major transportation routes within the planning area that are located east of the Carbon County-Albany County line will not be considered for ROW corridor designation because of the scattered public land ownership pattern in the area. All corridors will be designated for power lines (aboveground and buried), telephone lines, and fiber optic lines.</p> <p>Specific proposals will require site-specific environmental analysis and compliance with established permitting processes.</p> <p>Activities generally excluded from ROW corridors include mineral materials disposal, range and wildlife habitat improvements involving surface disturbance and facility construction, campgrounds, and public recreation facilities and other facilities that will attract public use.</p> <p>ROW facilities will not be placed adjacent to each other if issues with safety or incompatibility or resource conflicts were identified. The designated width, allowable uses, and excluded uses for each corridor may be modified during implementation of the Approved RMP.</p> <p>Green River RMP:</p> <p>Areas designated as utility windows will be preferred locations for future grants. Five windows have been identified: 2 east-west, 3 north-south. Other areas will be considered for rights-of-way on a case-by-case basis. Windows 0.5 miles in width have been identified for the placement of utilities. The northern east-west window will be for underground facilities only, and the southern east-west window will be for both above and below ground facilities. A 0.5-mile wide north-south window on the west side of Flaming Gorge, a window south along Highway 430, and a north-south window along the east side of Flaming Gorge have been identified for above and below ground utilities.</p> <p>JMH CAP:</p> <p>The planning area, with the exception of defined exclusion and avoidance areas, will be open to considering grants of rights-of-way if area objectives can be met. Exclusion areas are closed to rights-of-way. Avoidance and special management areas not identified as exclusion areas will be open to consideration only after site-specific analysis demonstrates area objectives can be met (see glossary) in Greater Sage-Grouse potential nesting habitat.</p>
A-42 / MD LR 4	<p>Within PHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>Maintenance/replacement of existing structures will be allowed subject to valid and existing rights. Upgrades will be considered, subject to mandatory RDFs (2018 Proposed RMPA Appendix B).</p> <p>Existing guy wires shall be removed or appropriately marked with bird flight diverters to make them more visible to Greater Sage-Grouse in flight. Power lines (distribution and transmission) will be designed to minimize wildlife-related impacts and constructed to the latest APLIC standards.</p> <p>Outside of PHMA the following RMP decisions remain in effect:</p> <p>Kemmerer RMP:</p> <p>New utility lines will be buried or BLM-approved anti-perch devices will be installed on all new utility lines within sagebrush and/or semiarid shrub-dominated</p>

	habitats, unless NEPA analysis shows little or no impact without burial or modification.
A-43 / MD LR 7	<p>Within PHMA and GHMA, specific to management for Greater Sage-Grouse, all RMPs are amended as follows:</p> <p>Lands classified as PHMA for Greater Sage-Grouse will be retained in federal management unless: (1) the agency can demonstrate that disposal of the lands, including land exchanges, that disposal of the parcel is in the public's best interest will provide a net conservation gain to the Greater Sage-Grouse or (2) the agency can demonstrate that the disposal of the lands, including land exchanges, will have no direct or indirect adverse impact on conservation of the Greater Sage-Grouse. Exceptions will be considered where there is mixed ownership and land exchanges will allow for additional or more contiguous federal ownership patterns within PHMA.</p> <p>For PHMA with minority federal ownership, an additional, effective mitigation agreement will be included for any disposal of federal land. As a final preservation measure, consideration shall be given to pursuing a permanent conservation easement.</p> <p>For lands in GHMA that are identified for disposal, the BLM will only dispose of such lands consistent with the goals and objectives of this plan, including, but not limited to, the RMP goal to conserve, recover, and enhance Greater Sage-Grouse habitat on a landscape scale.</p> <p>For values other than Greater Sage-Grouse, the following RMP decisions remain in effect with the modification described above:</p> <p>Casper RMP:</p> <p>224,830 acres of public lands are identified as potentially suitable for disposal. At the implementation stage, site-specific analysis with public participation will be conducted. Based on the analysis and public comments received, a determination will be made on whether disposal of the parcel is in the public's best interest. If it is not in the public's best interest, the parcel will be retained in public ownership.</p> <p>Restricted Disposal – dispose of 5,450 acres on a restricted basis.</p> <p>Allow land-use authorizations under FLPMA Section 302(b) leases and permits to meet public demand.</p> <p>Evaluate on a case-by-case basis as proposals are presented. Potential lease and permit areas may include, but are not limited to the following:</p> <p>Areas where there are documented or existing trespass facilities that can be resolved by an authorization under this section</p> <p>Areas along major highways where developments may facilitate public needs</p> <p>Areas in or adjacent to residential, agricultural, commercial, or industrial developments. The BLM will pursue acquisition of lands and interest in lands in the South Bighorns/Red Wall area.</p>
A-45 / MD REC 2	<p>Construction of recreation facilities within PHMA must conform with the avoidance and minimization measures of this plan. If it is determined that these conservation measures are inadequate for the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse, the BLM will consider require and ensure compensatory mitigation consistent with the applicable State management strategy (currently Governor of Wyoming's Executive Order 2015-4 (see also MD SSS 4) that provides a net conservation gain to the species.</p>

<p>A-48 / Compensatory Mitigation</p>	<p>In all Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, when authorizing third-party actions in designated Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, the BLM will seek to achieve the planning-level Greater Sage-Grouse management goals and objectives through implementation of mitigation and management actions, consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law. Under this Proposed Plan Amendment, management would be consistent with the Greater Sage-Grouse goals and objectives, and in conformance with BLM Manual 6840, Special Status Species Management. In accordance with BLM Manual 6840, the BLM will undertake planning decisions, actions and authorizations “to minimize or eliminate threats affecting the status of [Greater Sage-Grouse] or to improve the condition of [Greater Sage-Grouse] habitat” across the planning area.</p> <p>Accordingly, before authorizing third-party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation, the BLM will complete the following steps, in alignment with the Governor of Wyoming’s Executive Order 2015-4 (July 29, 2015):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work jointly with the WGFD to evaluate projects and recommend mitigation in the form of avoidance and minimization. 2. The WGFD will determine if the State requires or recommends any additional mitigation – including compensatory mitigation – under State regulations, policies, or programs related to the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse. 3. Incorporate state required or recommended mitigation into the BLM’s NEPA decision-making process, if the WGFD determines that compensatory mitigation is required to address impacts to GRSG habitat as a part of State policy or authorization, or if a proponent voluntarily offers mitigation. 4. Analyze whether the compensatory mitigation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • achieves measurable outcomes for Greater Sage-Grouse habitat function on a landscape scale as determined by WGFD that are at least equal to the lost or degraded values in accordance with the Governor of Wyoming’s Executive Order 2015-4. • provides benefits that are in place for at least the duration of the impacts • accounts for a level of risk that the mitigation action may fail or not persist for the full duration of the impact 5. Ensure mitigation outcomes are consistent with the State of Wyoming’s mitigation strategy and principles outlined in 2018 Proposed RMPA Appendix C, The Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat Management Strategy <p>The BLM has determined that compensatory mitigation must be voluntary unless required by other applicable law and in recognition that State authorities may also require compensatory mitigation (IM 2019-0188-093, Compensatory Mitigation, July 24December 6, 2018). Therefore, consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law, when authorizing third-party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation, the BLM will consider voluntary compensatory mitigation actions only as a component of compliance with a State mitigation plan, program, or authority, or when offered voluntarily by a project proponent.</p> <p>Project-specific analysis will be necessary to determine how a compensatory mitigation proposal addresses impacts from a proposed action. The BLM will cooperate with the State to determine appropriate project design and alignment with State policies and requirements, including those regarding compensatory mitigation. When the BLM is considering compensatory mitigation as a component</p>
--	---

	<p>of the project proponent’s submission or based on a mitigation requirement from the State, the BLM’s NEPA analysis would evaluate the need to avoid or minimize impacts of the proposed project and achieve the goals and objectives of this RMPA. The BLM will defer to the appropriate State authority to quantify habitat offsets, durability, and other aspects used to determine the recommended compensatory mitigation action.</p> <p>Adopt the State of Wyoming’s Greater Sage-Grouse Compensatory Mitigation Framework to the extent consistent with federal law, regulations, and policy. The BLM would follow the NEPA process in determining appropriate avoidance, minimization, and other mitigation measures in accordance with the CEQ mitigation hierarchy as appropriate at the site-specific project level and would defer to the State of Wyoming regarding the applicability, and, if deemed applicable, the determination of compensatory mitigation.</p> <p>Remove the phrase “net conservation gain” from all management actions.</p>
A-51 / Cody and Worland Decisions / Compensatory Mitigation	<p>In all Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, when authorizing third-party actions in designated Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, the BLM will seek to achieve the planning-level Greater Sage-Grouse management goals and objectives through implementation of mitigation and management actions, consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law. Under this Proposed Plan Amendment, management would be consistent with the Greater Sage-Grouse goals and objectives, and in conformance with BLM Manual 6840, Special Status Species Management. In accordance with BLM Manual 6840, the BLM will undertake planning decisions, actions and authorizations “to minimize or eliminate threats affecting the status of [Greater Sage-Grouse] or to improve the condition of [Greater Sage-Grouse] habitat” across the planning area.</p> <p>Accordingly, before authorizing third-party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation, the BLM will complete the following steps, in alignment with the Governor of Wyoming’s Executive Order 2015-4 (July 29, 2015):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work jointly with the WGFD to evaluate projects and recommend mitigation in the form of avoidance and minimization. 2. The WGFD will determine if the State requires or recommends any additional mitigation – including compensatory mitigation – under State regulations, policies, or programs related to the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse. 3. Incorporate state required or recommended mitigation into the BLM’s NEPA decision-making process, if the WGFD determines that compensatory mitigation is required to address impacts to GRSG habitat as a part of State policy or authorization, or if a proponent voluntarily offers mitigation. 4. Analyze whether the compensatory mitigation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • achieves measurable outcomes for Greater Sage-Grouse habitat function on a landscape scale as determined by WGFD that are at least equal to the lost or degraded values in accordance with the Governor of Wyoming’s Executive Order 2015-4. • provides benefits that are in place for at least the duration of the impacts • accounts for a level of risk that the mitigation action may fail or not persist for the full duration of the impact

	<p>5. Ensure mitigation outcomes are consistent with the State of Wyoming’s mitigation strategy and principles outlined in 2018 Proposed RMPA Appendix C, The Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat Management Strategy</p> <p>The BLM has determined that compensatory mitigation must be voluntary unless required by other applicable law and in recognition that State authorities may also require compensatory mitigation (IM 2019-0188-093, Compensatory Mitigation, July 24December 6, 2018). Therefore, consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law, when authorizing third-party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation, the BLM will consider voluntary compensatory mitigation actions only as a component of compliance with a State mitigation plan, program, or authority, or when offered voluntarily by a project proponent.</p> <p>Project-specific analysis will be necessary to determine how a compensatory mitigation proposal addresses impacts from a proposed action. The BLM will cooperate with the State to determine appropriate project design and alignment with State policies and requirements, including those regarding compensatory mitigation. When the BLM is considering compensatory mitigation as a component of the project proponent’s submission or based on a mitigation requirement from the State, the BLM’s NEPA analysis would evaluate the need to avoid or minimize impacts of the proposed project and achieve the goals and objectives of this RMPA. The BLM will defer to the appropriate State authority to quantify habitat offsets, durability, and other aspects used to determine the recommended compensatory mitigation action.</p>
A-51 / Lander Decisions / Compensatory Mitigation	<p>In all Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, when authorizing third-party actions in designated Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, the BLM will seek to achieve the planning-level Greater Sage-Grouse management goals and objectives through implementation of mitigation and management actions, consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law. Under this Proposed Plan Amendment, management would be consistent with the Greater Sage-Grouse goals and objectives, and in conformance with BLM Manual 6840, Special Status Species Management. In accordance with BLM Manual 6840, the BLM will undertake planning decisions, actions and authorizations “to minimize or eliminate threats affecting the status of [Greater Sage-Grouse] or to improve the condition of [Greater Sage-Grouse] habitat” across the planning area.</p> <p>Accordingly, before authorizing third-party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation, the BLM will complete the following steps, in alignment with the Governor of Wyoming’s Executive Order 2015-4 (July 29, 2015):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work jointly with the WGFD to evaluate projects and recommend mitigation in the form of avoidance and minimization. 2. The WGFD will determine if the State requires or recommends any additional mitigation – including compensatory mitigation – under State regulations, policies, or programs related to the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse. 3. Incorporate state required or recommended mitigation into the BLM’s NEPA decision-making process, if the WGFD determines that compensatory mitigation is required to address impacts to GRS habitat as a part of State policy or authorization, or if a proponent voluntarily offers mitigation. 4. Analyze whether the compensatory mitigation:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • achieves measurable outcomes for Greater Sage-Grouse habitat function on a landscape scale as determined by WGFD that are at least equal to the lost or degraded values in accordance with the Governor of Wyoming’s Executive Order 2015-4. • provides benefits that are in place for at least the duration of the impacts • accounts for a level of risk that the mitigation action may fail or not persist for the full duration of the impact <p>5. Ensure mitigation outcomes are consistent with the State of Wyoming’s mitigation strategy and principles outlined in 2018 Proposed RMPA Appendix C, The Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat Management Strategy</p> <p>The BLM has determined that compensatory mitigation must be voluntary unless required by other applicable law and in recognition that State authorities may also require compensatory mitigation (IM 2019-0188-093, Compensatory Mitigation, July 24December 6, 2018). Therefore, consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law, when authorizing third-party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation, the BLM will consider voluntary compensatory mitigation actions only as a component of compliance with a State mitigation plan, program, or authority, or when offered voluntarily by a project proponent.</p> <p>Project-specific analysis will be necessary to determine how a compensatory mitigation proposal addresses impacts from a proposed action. The BLM will cooperate with the State to determine appropriate project design and alignment with State policies and requirements, including those regarding compensatory mitigation. When the BLM is considering compensatory mitigation as a component of the project proponent’s submission or based on a mitigation requirement from the State, the BLM’s NEPA analysis would evaluate the need to avoid or minimize impacts of the proposed project and achieve the goals and objectives of this RMPA. The BLM will defer to the appropriate State authority to quantify habitat offsets, durability, and other aspects used to determine the recommended compensatory mitigation action.</p>
--	--

Table 2. Appendix B

Appendix B: Required Design Features	
Page number Original Draft Appendix B	Draft Appendix B Revisions
B-5	Within PHMA (core only), new project noise levels, either individual or cumulative, should not exceed 10 dBA (as measured by L50) above baseline noise at the perimeter of the lek from 6:00 pm to 8:00 am during the breeding season (March 1–May 15). Limit noise to less than 10 decibels above ambient measures (20–24 dBA) at sunrise at the perimeter of a lek during active lek season (Patricelli et al. 2010; Blickley et al. 2012).
B-5	Require noise shields when drilling during the lek / breeding, nesting, brood-rearing, or wintering season.

Table 3. Appendix C

Appendix C: The Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat Management Strategy

Page Number Original Draft Appendix C	Draft Appendix C Revisions
C-1	<p>The Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments (ARMPA) provides specific goals, objectives, management actions, and required design features for the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse in Wyoming. These are the commitments made to meet the federal agencies’ national policy and direction for the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse in light of the 2010 US Fish and Wildlife Service listing decision as warranted but precluded from listing under the Endangered Species Act. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Through the National Planning Strategy, in coordination with the State of Wyoming-US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has have identified conservation measures, consistent with the Wyoming Executive Order 2015-4, to be included in the Wyoming land use plans as the principal regulatory mechanisms to assure adequate conservation of the Greater Sage-Grouse and its habitat throughout the state on public lands.</p>
C-1	<p>Wyoming has established core population areas to help delineate landscape planning units by distinguishing areas of high biological value. These areas are based on the locations of breeding areas and are intended to help balance Greater Sage-Grouse habitat requirements with demand for energy development (Doherty et al. 2011). The ARMPA is consistent with the Core Area Strategy, but contains additional restrictions to protect other resources, which results in added protections to Greater Sage-Grouse habitat and achieving conservation objectives identified in the Conservation Objectives Team (COT) report on BLM-managed public lands. The COT report indicates that the Core Area Strategy is a substantial regulatory mechanism that contributes to the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse and balances the priorities of retaining a healthy Greater Sage-Grouse population on the landscape and energy development.</p>
C-1	<p>The implementation framework outlined here replaces Appendix D in the 2015 Approved RMP Amendments and 2015 Bighorn Basin and Buffalo Field Office Revisions and Appendix H in the 2014 Lander Field Office RMP Revision. This Appendix C, intended to conform to the objectives of the Proposed RMP Amendment Alternative, is focused specifically towards Greater Sage-Grouse and is reflective of how the national strategy will be assimilated into the existing statewide implementation efforts currently in place in Wyoming. This framework has been developed mindful of the varying scales at which implementation will be evaluated at the local level to define successful conservation measures, at the state level to assess success of the statewide strategy, and across the species’ range.</p>
C-2	<p>The COT report identified priority areas for Greater Sage-Grouse population habitats as Priority Areas for Conservation (PACs). PACs are recognized as key areas across the landscape that are necessary to maintain redundant, representative, and resilient populations of the species. The COT Report describes maintaining the integrity of PACs as “the essential foundation for sage-grouse conservation.” PACs cover nearly 73 million acres across the West; within Wyoming, more than 15 million acres are considered priority habitat. Fifty-two percent of the priority habitat is BLM administered surface and 71 percent is BLM-administered minerals. Based upon 2007 through 2015 lek counts, PHMA in Wyoming contains an estimated 83 percent of the state-wide population of Greater Sage Grouse.</p>

Table 1. Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat within Wyoming				
Populations / Subpopulations: Wyoming Portion, Powder River and Wyoming Basins; Laramie; Jackson Hole; WAFWA Management Zones I & II				
Surface Estate	Priority Area Acres (%)	General Habitat Acres (%)	Non-Habitat Acres (%)	
Private	5,655,716 (38)	14,028,015 (53)	7,004,437	
State	1,119,078 (7)	1,766,279 (7)	754,053	
BLM	7,823,055 (52)	9,296,487 (35)	328,750	
Other ¹	483,710 (3)	1,104,942 (5)	10,363,760	
Total	15,081,561	26,650,412	18,451,000	
Fluid Mineral Estate	Priority Area Acres (%)	General Habitat Acres (%)	Non-Habitat Acres	
Non-federal	4,360,416 (29)	10,450,584 (40)	6,433,438	
BLM Managed ²	10,721,145 (71)	15,745,138 (60)	12,017,562	
Total	15,081,561	26,195,722		
¹ Excludes Wind River Indian Reservation Acreages ² BLM Managed Minerals includes 10,335,190 acres within National Parks, State Parks and Historic Sites, National Forests, National Wildlife Refuges and DOD Reservations. Of this total, BLM has jurisdiction on only 1,682,372 acres.				
<p>The conservation objectives identified in the COT Report, targeted at maintaining redundant, representative, and resilient sage-grouse habitats and populations, is the basis on which Wyoming's Sage-grouse Proposed RMP Amendments were developed. Due to the variability in ecological conditions and the nature of the threats across the range of the sage-grouse, developing detailed, prescriptive species or habitat actions was not attainable at the range-wide scale. Specific strategies and actions necessary to achieve the conservation objectives have been developed by the BLM in cooperation with state and local governments to ensure implementation of activities to meet the objectives identified in the COT report.</p>				
C-3	<p>The COT report identified a series of threats to Greater Sage-Grouse habitat and the extent of those threats at the population scale. The management actions identified in the ARMPA were specifically designed to reduce the threats, as they were identified. The Wyoming RMPs encompass lands within WAFWA Management Zones 1 and 2. To ensure that the threats are adequately addressed by the ARMPA, a strategy for reviewing activities and projects on public lands to determine the extent of their impact on Greater Sage-Grouse habitat has also been developed. The following outlines the process by which all activities on public lands will be reviewed.</p>			
C-3	<p>The BLM will ensure that any activities or projects in Greater Sage-Grouse habitats would ÷1 only occur in compliance with the Wyoming BLM's Greater Sage-</p>			

	<p>Grouse goals and objectives for priority management areas, and 2) maintain neutral or positive Greater Sage Grouse population trends and habitat by avoiding, minimizing, and offsetting unavoidable impacts to assure a conservation gain at the scale of this land use plan and within Greater Sage Grouse population areas, state boundaries, and WAFWA Management Zones through the application of mitigation for implementation level decisions. The mitigation process will follow the regulations from the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) (40 CFR 1508.20; e.g. avoid, minimize, and compensate), hereafter referred to as the mitigation hierarchy, while also following Secretary of the Interior Order 3330 and consulting BLM, USFWS and other current and appropriate mitigation guidance. If it is determined that residual impacts to Greater Sage Grouse from implementation level actions would remain after applying avoidance and minimization measures to the extent possible, compensatory mitigation projects will be used to offset residual impacts, or the project may be deferred or denied if necessary to achieve the goals and objectives for priority and general management areas in the Wyoming BLM RMPs.</p>
C-3	<p>To ensure that impacts from activities proposed in sage-grouse Core Areas are appropriately approved and mitigated as necessary, the BLM will apply avoidance and minimization mitigation measures and conservation actions and potentially modify the location, design, construction, and/or operation of proposed land uses or activities to comply with statutory requirements for environmental protection. The avoidance and minimization mitigation measures and conservation actions (Appendix B €) for proposed projects or activities in these areas will be identified as part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental review process, through interdisciplinary analysis involving resource specialists, project proponents, government entities, landowners or other surface management agencies. The BLM has determined that compensatory mitigation is not compulsory unless required by other applicable law and in recognition that State authorities may also require compensatory mitigation (IM 2019-018, Compensatory Mitigation, December 6, 2018). Therefore, consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law, when authorizing third-party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation, the BLM will consider compensatory mitigation actions only as a component of compliance with a State mitigation plan, program, or authority, or when offered voluntarily by a project proponent. Those measures selected for implementation will be identified in the record of decision (ROD) or decision record (DR) for those authorizations and will inform a potential lessee, permittee, or operator of the requirements that must be met when using BLM-administered public lands and minerals to mitigate, per the mitigation hierarchy referenced above, impacts from the activity or project such that sage-grouse goals and objectives are met. Because these actions create a clear obligation for the BLM to ensure any proposed mitigation action adopted in the environmental review process is performed, there is assurance that mitigation will lead to a reduction of environmental impacts in the implementation stage and include binding mechanisms for enforcement (CEQ Memorandum for Heads of Federal Departments and Agencies 2011).</p>
C-4	<p>Step 2.2 –The proposal will be reviewed to determine whether it conforms with the Density and Disturbance Limitations. If the proposed activity occurs within a priority habitat management area (PHMA), evaluate whether the disturbance from the activity exceeds the limit on the amount of disturbance allowed within the activity or project area (Density/Disturbance Calculation Tool [DDCT] process). If</p>

	current disturbance within the activity area or the anticipated disturbance from the proposed activity exceeds this threshold, the project would be deferred until such time as the amount of disturbance within the area has been reduced below the threshold, redesigned so as to not result in any additional surface disturbance (collocation) or redesigned to move it outside of PHMA. Should the project be a result of a valid existing right, BLM will work to minimize the disturbance and determine any residual impacts that may require appropriate mitigation.
C-4	The maximum density of disruptive activities and surface disturbance allowed will be analyzed via the DDCT, and may will be conducted by the Federal Land Management Agency on federal land or and the project proponent on non-federal (private, state) land and must be reviewed by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department for compliance based on with Wyoming EO 2015-4 and accepted by the BLM as consistent with this these RMP Amendment ARMPA .
C-4 to C-5	State agency permit is needed, without a need for a federal permit: The first point of contact for addressing sage grouse issues for any state permit application should be the WGFD. Project proponents (proponents) need to have a thorough description of their project and identify the potential effects on sage grouse prior to submitting an application to the permitting agency. Project proponents should contact WGFD at least 45 60 days prior to submitting their application. More complex projects will require more time. It is understood that WGFD has a role of consultation, recommendation, and facilitation, and has no authority to either approve or deny the project. The purpose of the initial consultation with the WGFD is to become familiar with the project proposal and ensure the project proponent understands the DDCT and recommended stipulations.
C-5	Federal agency permit is needed, with or without a state permit: When a project requires federal action prior to approval, the proponent should contact the federal agency responsible for reviewing the action. The federal agency and the proponent will determine the best process for completing the DDCT and receiving recommendations from WGFD. Project proponents (proponents) need to have a thorough description of their project and identify the potential effects on sage grouse prior to submitting an application to the permitting agency.
C-5	Density and Disturbance Calculation The Density and Disturbance Calculation Tool, or DDCT (shown within this appendix as an example of the process but may be modified based on best available science and technology), is a spatially-based tool that calculates both the average density of disruptive activities and total surface disturbance within the area affected by the project, or DDCT assessment area. The DDCT assessment area is created based on buffers around proposed projects (first buffer) in protected sage-grouse core areas, and subsequent buffers around any occupied, core area leks within the first buffer. A four mile buffer is used to identify 75% of the sage-grouse use around a lek. All activities will be evaluated within the context of maximum allowable disturbance (disturbance percentages, location and number of disturbances) of suitable sage-grouse habitat within the DDCT assessment area. This tool allows for better siting of projects rather than averaging the density/disturbance calculation per section.
C-10	Step 2.3 – The BLM’s goal for any new activity or development proposal within core areas is to provide consistent implementation of project proposals which meet the BLM’s ARMPA goals and the population management objectives of the state.

	<p>Activities would be consistent with the strategy where it can be sufficiently demonstrated that no undue harm declines to core populations would be expected as a result of the proposed action and would not impact the statewide viability of the species. Published research suggests that impacts to sage-grouse leks associated primarily with infrastructure and energy development are discernible at a distance of at least 4 miles and that many leks within this radius have been extirpated as a direct result of development (Walker et al. 2007, Walker 2008). Research also suggests that an evaluation of habitats and sage-grouse populations that attend leks within an 11-mile radius from the project boundary in the context of “large” projects may be appropriate in order to consider all seasonal habitats that may be affected for birds that use the habitats associated with the proposal during some portion of the life-cycle of seasonally migratory sage-grouse (Connelly et al. 2000).</p>
C-11	<p>Step 3—Apply Avoidance and Minimization Measures to Comply with Sage-Grouse Goals and Objectives</p> <p>The BLM will work jointly with the WGFD to evaluate projects and recommend avoidance and minimization measures. If the project can be relocated so as to not have an impact on sage-grouse and still achieve objectives of the proposal and the disturbance limitations, relocate the proposed activity and proceed with the appropriate process for review, decision and implementation (NEPA and Decision Record). This Step does not consider redesign of the project to reduce or eliminate direct and indirect impacts, but rather authorization of the project in a physical location that will not impact Greater Sage-Grouse. If the preliminary review of the proposal concludes that there may be adverse impacts to sage-grouse habitat or populations in Step 2 and the project cannot be effectively relocated to avoid these impacts, proceed with the appropriate process for review, decision and implementation (NEPA and Decision Record) with the inclusion of appropriate avoidance and minimization mitigation requirements to further reduce or eliminate impacts to sage-grouse habitat and populations and achieve compliance with sage-grouse objectives. Avoidance and minimization Mitigation measures could include design modifications of the proposal, site disturbance restoration, post project reclamation, etc. (see Appendix B €). The BLM will continue to require avoidance, minimization, and other onsite measures to adequately conserve Greater Sage-Grouse and its habitat, while remaining committed to implementing beneficial habitat management actions to reduce the threats of fire and invasive species. Compensatory or offsite mitigation may be required (Step 4) in situations where residual impacts remain after application of all avoidance and minimization measures.</p>
C-11	<p>Step 4 – Apply State-required Compensatory Mitigation or Reject / Defer Proposal</p> <p>If screening of the proposal has determined that direct and indirect impacts cannot be eliminated through avoidance or minimization, the BLM will cooperate with the State to determine appropriate project design and alignment with State policies and requirements, including those regarding compensatory mitigation evaluate the proposal to determine if compensatory mitigation can be used to offset the remaining adverse impacts and achieve sage-grouse goals and objectives. The WGFD will determine if the State requires or recommends any additional mitigation – including compensatory mitigation – under State regulations, policies, or programs related to the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse.</p>

	<p>The BLM will consider compensatory mitigation only as a component of compliance with a state mitigation plan, program, or authority, or when offered voluntarily by a project proponent. When the BLM is considering compensatory mitigation as a component of the project proponent's submission or based on a mitigation requirement from the State, the BLM's NEPA analysis will evaluate the need to avoid or minimize impacts of the proposed project and achieve the goals and objectives of this RMPA. The BLM will defer to the appropriate State authority to quantify habitat offsets, durability, and other aspects used to determine the State-recommended compensatory mitigation action.</p> <p>The BLM will incorporate state required or recommended mitigation into the BLM's NEPA decision-making process, if the WGFD determines that compensatory mitigation is required to address impacts to GRSG habitat as a part of State policy or authorization, or if a proponent voluntarily offers mitigation.</p> <p>Project-specific analysis will be necessary to determine how a compensatory mitigation proposal addresses impacts from a proposed action. The BLM will analyze whether the compensatory mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • achieves measurable outcomes for Greater Sage-Grouse habitat function on a landscape scale as determined by WGFD that are at least equal to the lost or degraded values in accordance with the Governor of Wyoming's Executive Order 2015-4. • provides benefits that are in place for at least the duration of the impacts. • accounts for a level of risk that the mitigation action may fail or not persist for the full duration of the impact. <p>The BLM will ensure mitigation outcomes are consistent with the State of Wyoming's mitigation strategy and principles outlined in this appendix.</p> <p>If the impacts cannot be effectively mitigated, reject or defer the proposal. The criteria for determining this situation could include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current trend within the priority habitat is down and additional impacts, whether mitigated or not, could lead to further decline of the species or habitat. • The proposed mitigation is inadequate in scope or duration, has proven to be ineffective or is unproven in terms of science-based approach. • The project would impact habitat that has been determined to be a limiting factor for species sustainability. • Other site specific information and analysis that determined the project would lead to a downward change of the current species population or habitat and not comply with sage grouse goals and objectives. <p>If, following application of available impact avoidance and minimization measures, the project can be mitigated to fully offset impacts and assure conservation gain to the species and comply with sage grouse goals and objectives, proceed with the appropriate process for review, decision and implementation (NEPA and Decision Record).</p>
C-12	<p>In all Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, when authorizing third-party actions, the BLM will seek to achieve the planning-level Greater Sage-Grouse management goals and objectives through implementation of mitigation and management actions,</p>

	consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law. Under this Proposed Plan Amendment, management would be consistent with the Greater Sage-Grouse goals and objectives, and in conformance with BLM Manual 6840, Special Status Species Management. In accordance with BLM Manual 6840, the BLM will undertake planning decisions, actions and authorizations “to minimize or eliminate threats affecting the status of [Greater Sage-Grouse] or to improve the condition of [Greater Sage-Grouse] habitat” across the planning area.
C-12	In undertaking BLM management actions and, consistent with valid existing rights and applicable law, in authorizing third party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation, the BLM will require and assure mitigation that provides a net conservation gain to the species, including accounting for any uncertainty associated with the effectiveness of such mitigation. This will be achieved by avoiding, minimizing, and compensating for impacts by applying beneficial mitigation actions. In Wyoming, the USFWS has found that “the core area strategy, if implemented by all landowners via regulatory mechanism, would provide adequate protection for sage-grouse and their habitats in the state.” The BLM will implement actions to achieve the goal of net conservation gain consistent with the Wyoming Strategy (EO 2015-4). Compensatory mitigation would be used when avoidance and minimization measures consistent with EO 2015-4 are inadequate to protect core population area Greater Sage Grouse.
C-12	The BLM will continue to apply the mitigation hierarchy as described in the CEQ regulations at 40 CFR 1508.20; however, the BLM would focus on avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, and reducing impacts over time. Compensation, which involves replacing or providing substitute resources for the impacts, would be considered only when voluntarily offered by a proponent or when imposed by the State. The BLM commits to cooperating with the State to analyze applicant-proposed or state-imposed compensatory mitigation to offset residual impacts. Mitigation will follow the regulations from the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) (40 CFR 1508.20; e.g. avoid, minimize, and compensate), hereafter referred to as the mitigation hierarchy. If impacts from BLM management actions and authorized third party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation remain after applying avoidance and minimization measures (i.e. residual impacts), then compensatory mitigation projects will be used to provide a net conservation gain to the species. Any compensatory mitigation will be durable, timely, and in addition to that which would have resulted without the compensatory mitigation (see glossary).
C-12	The BLM remains committed to achieving the planning-level management goals and objectives identified in this RMPA and the 2015 ARMPA by ensuring Greater Sage-Grouse habitat impacts are addressed through implementing mitigating actions consistent with the governing RMP. Accordingly, the BLM has coordinated with the State to develop a memorandum of agreement (MOA) to guide the application of the mitigation hierarchy and State required or voluntary compensatory mitigation actions for future project authorizations in Greater Sage-Grouse habitat on public lands. The BLM would not deny a proposed authorization in Greater Sage-Grouse habitat solely on the grounds that the proponent has not proposed or agreed to undertake voluntary compensatory mitigation. The MOA describes the State’s policies, authorities, and programs for Greater Sage-Grouse conservation and the process regarding how the BLM would incorporate avoidance,

	<p>minimization, and other recommendations from the State necessary to improve the condition of Greater Sage-Grouse habitat consistent with RMPA goals and objectives, in one or more of the NEPA analysis alternatives. The MOA would be implemented to provide an improvement to Greater Sage-Grouse habitat at a State level (as opposed to a WAFWA Management Zone or a Field Office), in collaboration with applicable partners (e.g., federal, tribal, and state agencies). Generally, and as described in the MOA, when the BLM receives applications for projects in Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, the BLM would ensure project design is aligned with State requirements and would ensure the proponent coordinates with the State to develop any additional mitigation—including compensatory mitigation—that the State may require in order to comply with State policies and programs for the conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse.</p> <p>The BLM is relying on the State of Wyoming's mitigation framework, which, due to its provisions for durability and additionality, would still provide conservation gains and benefits consistent with the goals of this RMPA and the 2015 Plans. The implementation of compensatory mitigation actions would be directed by MOAs that describe how the BLM would align with State authorities and incorporated in the appropriate NEPA analysis subsequent to the Proposed RMP Amendment. While the conservation benefit of compensatory mitigation may be limited when weighed against the threats to Greater Sage-Grouse, particularly in the Great Basin region where wildland fire remains a key threat, the BLM is committed to implementing state-imposed mitigation requirements to help minimize the impacts of anthropogenic disturbance and habitat fragmentation throughout the range of Greater Sage-Grouse. The BLM is not proposing any action that would preclude proponents from offering compensatory mitigation; it is clarifying the BLM's reliance on voluntary compensatory mitigation consistent with federal law.</p> <p>The BLM, via the WAFWA Management Zone Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, will develop a WAFWA Management Zone Regional Mitigation Strategy that will inform the NEPA decision making process including the application of the mitigation hierarchy for BLM management actions and third party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation. A robust and transparent Regional Mitigation Strategy will contribute to Greater Sage-Grouse habitat conservation by reducing, eliminating, or minimizing threats and compensating for residual impacts to Greater Sage-Grouse and its habitat.</p>
C-12	<p>The BLM's Regional Mitigation Manual MS-1794 serves as a framework for developing and implementing a Regional Mitigation Strategy. The following sections provide additional guidance specific to the development and implementation of a WAFWA Management Zone Regional Mitigation Strategy.</p>
C-12	<p><u>Developing a WAFWA Management Zone Regional Mitigation Strategy</u> The BLM, via the WAFWA Management Zone Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Team, will develop a WAFWA Management Zone Regional Mitigation Strategy to guide the application of the mitigation hierarchy for BLM management actions and third party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation. The strategy should consider any state-level Greater Sage-Grouse mitigation guidance that is consistent with the requirements identified in this appendix. The Regional Mitigation Strategy should be developed in a transparent manner, based on the best science available and standardized metrics.</p>

C-12	<p>As described in the ARMPA, the BLM will establish a WAFWA Management Zone Greater Sage Grouse Conservation Team (hereafter, Team) to help guide the conservation of Greater Sage Grouse, within 90 days of the issuance of the Record of Decision. The Strategy will be developed within one year of the issuance of the ROD.</p>
C-13	<p>The Regional Mitigation Strategy should include mitigation guidance on avoidance, minimization, and compensation, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ———— Avoidance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ———— Include avoidance areas (e.g. right of way avoidance/exclusion areas, no surface occupancy areas) already included in laws, regulations, policies, and/or land use plans (e.g. RMPs, state plans); and, ———— Include any potential, additional avoidance actions (e.g. additional avoidance best management practices) with regard to Greater Sage Grouse conservation. • ———— Minimization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ———— Include minimization actions (e.g. required design features, best management practices) already included in laws, regulations, policies, land use plans, and/or land use authorizations; and, ———— Include any potential, additional minimization actions (e.g. additional minimization best management practices) with regard to Greater Sage Grouse conservation.
C-13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ———— Compensation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ———— Include discussion of impact/project valuation, compensatory mitigation options, siting, compensatory project types and costs, monitoring, reporting, and program administration. Each of these topics is discussed in more detail below. • ———— Residual Impact and Compensatory Mitigation Project Valuation Guidance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ———— A common standardized method should be identified for estimating the value of the residual impacts and value of the compensatory mitigation projects, including accounting for any uncertainty associated with the effectiveness of the projects. ○ ———— This method should consider the quality of habitat, scarcity of the habitat, and the size of the impact/project. ○ ———— For compensatory mitigation projects, consideration of durability (see glossary), timeliness (see glossary), and the potential for failure (e.g. uncertainty associated with effectiveness) may require an upward adjustment of the valuation. ○ ———— The resultant compensatory mitigation project will, after application of the above guidance, result in proactive conservation measures for Greater Sage Grouse (consistent with BLM Manual 6840—Special Status Species Management, section .02). • ———— Compensatory Mitigation Options <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ———— Options for implementing compensatory mitigation should be identified, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ———— Utilizing certified mitigation/conservation bank or credit exchanges. ———— Contributing to an existing mitigation/conservation fund. ———— Authorized user conducted mitigation projects. ○ ———— For any compensatory mitigation project, the investment must be additional (i.e. additionality: the conservation benefits of compensatory mitigation are demonstrably new and would not have resulted without the compensatory mitigation project).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compensatory Mitigation Siting ○ Sites should be in areas that have the potential to yield a net conservation gain to the Greater Sage Grouse, regardless of land ownership.
C-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sites should be durable (see glossary). ○ Sites identified by existing plans and strategies (e.g. fire restoration plans, invasive species strategies, healthy land focal areas) should be considered, if those sites have the potential to yield a net conservation gain to Greater Sage Grouse and are durable. • Compensatory Mitigation Project Types and Costs ○ Project types should be identified that help reduce threats to Greater Sage Grouse (e.g. protection, conservation, and restoration projects). ○ Each project type should have a goal and measurable objectives. ○ Each project type should have associated monitoring and maintenance requirements, for the duration of the impact. ○ To inform contributions to a mitigation/conservation fund, expected costs for these project types (and their monitoring and maintenance), within the WAFWA Management Zone, should be identified. • Compensatory Mitigation Compliance and Monitoring ○ Mitigation projects should be inspected to ensure they are implemented as designed, and if not, there should be methods to enforce compliance. ○ Mitigation projects should be monitored to ensure that the goals and objectives are met and that the benefits are effective for the duration of the impact. • Compensatory Mitigation Reporting ○ Standardized, transparent, scalable, and scientifically defensible reporting requirements should be identified for mitigation projects. ○ Reports should be compiled, summarized, and reviewed in the WAFWA Management Zone in order to determine if Greater Sage Grouse conservation has been achieved and/or to support adaptive management recommendations. • Compensatory Mitigation Program Implementation Guidelines ○ Guidelines for implementing the state level compensatory mitigation program should include holding and applying compensatory mitigation funds, operating a transparent and credible accounting system, certifying mitigation credits, and managing reporting requirements.
C-14	<p><u>Incorporating the Regional Mitigation Strategy into NEPA Analyses</u></p> <p>The BLM will include the avoidance, minimization, and compensatory recommendations from the Regional Mitigation Strategy in one or more of the NEPA analysis' alternatives for BLM management actions and third party actions that result in habitat loss and degradation and the appropriate mitigation actions will be carried forward into the decision.</p>
C-14	<p><u>Implementing a Compensatory Mitigation Program</u></p> <p>The BLM needs to ensure that compensatory mitigation is strategically implemented to provide a net conservation gain to the species, as identified in the Regional Mitigation Strategy. In order to align with existing compensatory mitigation efforts, this compensatory mitigation program will be managed at a state-level (as opposed to a WAFWA Management Zone or a Field Office), in collaboration with our partners (e.g. federal, Tribal, and state agencies).</p>

C-15	To ensure transparent and effective management of the compensatory mitigation funds, the BLM will enter into a contract or agreement with a third party to help manage the state level compensatory mitigation funds, within one year of the issuance of the Record of Decision. The selection of the third party compensatory mitigation administrator will conform to all relevant laws, regulations, and policies. The BLM will remain responsible for making decisions that affect Federal lands.
C-15	Upon completion of the planning process, with issuance of this an Approved Plan and Record of Decision, subsequent implementation decisions will be put into effect by developing implementation (activity-level or project-specific) plans. These implementation decisions will be based upon the objectives identified in this the Approved Plan and Record of Decisions, and will be coordinated with local working groups.
C-16	Implementation strategies for a landscape scale species requires coordination across multiple scales, as the work that is conducted at the local scale must be tracked and evaluated for overall success within core areas, across the state of Wyoming across the region . As the Greater Sage-Grouse is formally managed by the State of Wyoming, and has a statewide strategy through Governor’s Executive Order 2015-4 2011-05 , implementation must be evaluated at that scale as well . For this reason, Wyoming Plans will utilize both local and state-wide multiple types of working groups, representing each of the scales at which implementation will be tracked.
C-16	<u>National Level</u> In December 2011, Wyoming Governor Matt Mead and Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar co-hosted a meeting to address coordinated conservation of the sage-grouse across its range. Ten states within the range of the sage-grouse were represented, as were the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and the Department of the Interior (DOI) — including representatives from the BLM and USFWS. The primary outcome of the meeting was the creation of a Sage-Grouse Task Force (Task Force) chaired by Governors Mead (Wyoming) and Hickenlooper (Colorado) and the Director of the BLM. The Task Force was directed to develop recommendations on how to best advance a coordinated, multi-state, range-wide effort to conserve the sage-grouse, including the identification of conservation objectives to ensure the long-term viability of the species.
C-16	<u>Regional Level</u> Regional Level Teams (Sage-grouse Implementation Group)
C-16	<u>Local Level</u> In 2000, a Statewide Local Working Group was established by the WGFD to develop and facilitate implementation of local conservation plans for the benefit of sage-grouse, their habitats, and whenever feasible, other species that use sagebrush habitats. This group prepared the Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan (Wyoming Sage-Grouse Working Group 2003) to provide coordinated management and direction across the state. In 2004, local Greater Sage-Grouse working groups were formed to develop and implement local conservation plans. Eight local working groups around Wyoming have completed conservation plans, many of which prioritize addressing past, present, and reasonably foreseeable threats at the state and local levels, and prescribe management actions for private landowners to improve Greater Sage-Grouse conservation at the local scale, consistent with Wyoming’s Core Population Area Strategy.

C-17	In addition to the tracking databases being maintained by the State of Wyoming, a national Greater Sage Grouse Land Use Plan Decision Monitoring and Reporting Tool is being developed to describe how the BLM will consistently and systematically monitor and report implementation level activity plans and implementation actions for all plans within the range of sage grouse. A description of this tool for collection and reporting of tabular and spatially explicit data will be included in the Record of Decision or approved plan. The BLM will provide data that can be integrated with other conservation efforts conducted by state and federal partners.
C-17	A website where the public can quickly and easily access data concerning implementation will be developed and kept current on the Wyoming BLM database. Creating this website and maintaining it through the implementation cycle will be a vital part of implementation success. The public is welcome to provide implementation comments to the BLM any time during the cycle, but schedules for implementation planning decisions will be posted so the public can make timely comments. All Activity Plan Working Group meetings where recommendations are made to the BLM will be open to the public, and will provide for specific and helpful public involvement. This includes providing web-based information to the public prior to any Activity Plan Working Group meetings; such that members of the public can provide input to the working session, both early and mid-way through the scheduled meetings.
C-17 to C-18	In addition to the conservation activities identified through implementation of the Resource Management Plan in coordination with the Local Working Group Conservation Plans, BLM will continue to partner with other agencies and stakeholders to identify conservation actions to benefit Greater Sage-Grouse habitat. Actions which may occur could include, but is not limited to Candidate Conservation Agreements (CCA) with accompanying Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances (CCAA), and designation of conservation easements, habitat improvement projects, cooperative agreements, or several other options. For a more detailed list of Wyoming-based conservation activities and initiatives, consult the Wyoming Wildlife and Natural Resources Trust.
C-18	CCAs are entered into when a potential threat to habitat is identified. BLM enters into CCAs with USFWS to identify potential threats and plan for conservation measures to address potential threats. The purpose of federal land CCAs and the accompanying non-federal CCAAs is to encourage conservation actions for species that are not yet listed as threatened or endangered. The goal is that enhancements in conservation can preclude the need for federal listing or so that conservation can occur before the status of the species has become so dire that listing is necessary. Although a single property owner's activities may not eliminate the need to list, conservation, if conducted by enough property owners throughout the species' range, can eliminate the need to list.
C-18	Conservation Easements are identified private lands with Greater Sage Grouse habitat where the private landowners enter into voluntary agreements with the government to give up developmental rights which may adversely affect habitat. The most common way these areas may be used in Wyoming is for mitigation banks. Allowing development within some areas of historic Greater Sage Grouse habitat or marginal habitat will require appropriate mitigation. In some cases the most appropriate mitigation may be for project proponents to buy credits at a

	conservation easement, thus creating a mitigation bank. Overall, the benefit is to the Greater Sage Grouse, as it reduces the overall potential for fragmented habitat by ensuring there are areas with no development potential which could adversely affect the viability of the species.
	To learn more about what CCAs and CCAAs are in place for Greater Sage grouse, please see the US Fish and Wildlife website: http://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?specode=B06W-
C-18	<u>Sweetwater River Conservancy Habitat Conservation Bank</u> The Sweetwater River Conservancy Habitat Conservation Bank is the first conservation bank established for Greater Sage Grouse. Located in central Wyoming, the bank manages habitat for Greater Sage Grouse allowing energy development and other activities to proceed on other lands within Wyoming. A conservation bank is a site or suite of sites established under an agreement with the USFWS, intended to protect, and improve habitat for species. Credits may be purchased which result in perpetual conservation easements and conservation projects on the land to offset impacts occurring elsewhere. The Sweetwater River Conservancy Habitat Conservation Bank launched with 55,000 deeded acres of Greater Sage Grouse habitat, and could expand up to 700,000 acres on other lands owned by the Sweetwater River Conservancy contingent upon demand (USFWS 2015).
C-18 to C-19	<u>Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative</u> The Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative is a long-term science-based effort to assess and enhance aquatic and terrestrial habitats at a landscape scale in southwest Wyoming, while facilitating responsible development through local collaboration and partnership. Collaborative efforts address multiple concerns at a scale that considers all activities on the landscape, and can leverage resources that might not be available for single agency projects. Greater Sage Grouse initiatives from the Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative have included habitat enhancement efforts (e.g., invasive weed treatment, prescribed grazing strategies), and Greater Sage Grouse research studies (Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative 2013).
C-19	<u>Powder River Basin Restoration Program</u> The Powder River Basin Restoration Program is a collaborative partnership to restore and enhance Greater Sage Grouse habitat on a landscape level in the Powder River Basin. The basin encompasses 13,493,840 acres in northeast Wyoming and southeast Montana. Surface ownership is composed of approximately 70 percent private lands, 14 percent BLM-administered lands (including 8 percent in Wyoming and 6 percent in Montana), 8 percent Forest Service lands, and 8 percent States of Wyoming and Montana lands. Subsurface mineral ownership is 50 to 60 percent federal (BLM 2014). The Powder River Basin Restoration Program is focusing on areas affected by the federal oil and gas development that has occurred over the past decade in the Powder River Basin in northeastern Wyoming. Its objectives are restoring or enhancing disturbed previously suitable habitat to suitable habitat for sagebrush obligate species, primarily Greater Sage Grouse. This includes multiple sites affected by coal-bed natural gas abandonment reclamation efforts, wildfires, and

	<p>noxious and invasive plants. Priority will be given to those areas recognized as priority habitats (e.g., core population areas and connectivity corridors).</p> <p>Habitat objectives are meeting the needs for nesting, brood-rearing, and late brood-rearing. The program would contribute to efforts focused on the management and control of mosquitoes carrying West Nile virus and would include funding, labor, treatment locations, and other needs as determined.</p> <p>Additionally, efforts would be coordinated to reduce fuels in and near Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, to enhance sagebrush stands, support restoration efforts, and reduce the risk of high severity wildfire. Pine stands and juniper woodlands would be managed for structural diversity and to reduce fuels, especially near PHMA, human developments, and recreation areas.</p>
C-19 to C-20	<p><u>Natural Resource Conservation Service Sage-Grouse Initiative</u></p> <p>The US Department of Agriculture, NRCS Sage-Grouse Initiative (SGI) is working with private landowners in 11 western states to improve habitat for Greater Sage-Grouse (Manier et al. 2013). With 13.5 million acres of Greater Sage-Grouse habitat in private ownership within MZ II/VII (Manier et al. 2013, p. 118), a unique opportunity exists for the NRCS to benefit Greater Sage-Grouse and to ensure the persistence of large and intact rangelands by implementing the SGI.</p> <p>Participation in the SGI program is voluntary, but willing participants enter into binding contracts or easements to ensure that conservation practices that enhance Greater Sage-Grouse habitat, such as fence marking, protecting riparian areas, and maintaining vegetation in nesting areas, are implemented. Participating landowners are bound by a contract (usually 3 to 5 years) to implement, in consultation with NRCS staff, conservation practices if they wish to receive the financial incentives offered by the SGI. These financial incentives generally take the form of payments to offset costs of implementing conservation practices and easements or rental payments for long term conservation.</p> <p>While potentially effective at conserving Greater Sage-Grouse populations and habitat on private lands, incentive-based conservation programs that fund the SGI generally require reauthorization from Congress under subsequent farm bills, meaning future funding is not guaranteed.</p>
C-58	<p>Causal Factor Assessment</p> <p>The causal factor assessment will be completed within 180 days of determination that a hard trigger threshold has been crossed. Once the causal factor assessment is completed by the AMWG, the interim response strategy will be modified to adequately address the causal factors in consultation with the technical team. The AMWG would define a process to review and reverse adaptive management actions once the identified causal factor is resolved (e.g., returning to previous management once objectives of interim management strategy have been met). If a causal factor or factors cannot be identified, the interim response strategy shall stay in place until the cause can be determined and any new planning decision can be implemented.</p>
C-60	<p>Small Leks</p> <p>Small leks will be given separate special consideration. Due to geographic variations a definition of “small” is not provided, rather determination of “small”</p>

	will be made by the AMWG based upon recommendations of the scientific community. Generally, “small” is considered 10 or fewer males for a three year time period within a five-year range of analysis. If a trigger is hit based upon such a lek, then the adaptive management working group will evaluate the site-specific circumstances and determine appropriate remedial action.
C-60	<p>Glossary Terms</p> <p>Additionality: The conservation benefits of compensatory mitigation are demonstrably new and would not have resulted without the compensatory mitigation project. (BLM Manual Section 1794).</p> <p>Avoidance mitigation: Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action. (40 CFR 1508.20(a)) (e.g., may also include avoiding the impact by moving the proposed action to a different time or location.)</p> <p>Compensatory mitigation: Compensating for the (residual) impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments. (40 CFR 1508.20)</p> <p>Compensatory mitigation projects: Specific, on the ground actions to improve and/or protect habitats (e.g. chemical vegetation treatments, land acquisitions, conservation easements).</p> <p>Compensatory mitigation sites: The durable areas where compensatory mitigation projects will occur.</p> <p>Durability (protective and ecological): The administrative, legal, and financial assurances that secure and protect the conservation status of a compensatory mitigation site, and the ecological benefits of a compensatory mitigation project, for at least as long as the associated impacts persist. (BLM Manual Section 1794).</p> <p>Minimization mitigation: Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation. (40 CFR 1508.20 (b))</p> <p>Residual impacts: Impacts from an authorized land use that remain after applying avoidance and minimization mitigation; also referred to as unavoidable impacts.</p> <p>Timeliness: The conservation benefits from compensatory mitigation accruing as early as possible or before impacts have begun. (BLM Manual Section 1794).</p>