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Purpose and Need for RMP Amendment

Incorporate measures in existing land use plans to *conserve, enhance, and restore GRSG habitat*...in the context of the BLM’s *multiple use and sustained yield mission*. 
Ongoing Implementation Activities

• Appreciation to all our partners

• Development of policy
  • Internal workshops
  • External workshops
  • GRSG Task Force

• Ongoing development of strategic conservation and restoration efforts

• Ongoing development of mitigation framework and mitigation mechanisms
Policy Development

- Managing Diffuse Uses
- Managing Discrete Uses
- Strategic Restoration & Reducing Threats
- Reporting and Adapting
MANAGING DIFFUSE USES

Wild horse and burro
Recreation
Grazing
Assessing Condition and Response

- Habitat assessment
  - Multi-scale, biologically meaningful area
  - Site scale indicator benchmarks established based upon potential (Table 2-2)
  - No single indicator—preponderance of evidence approach
- Prioritization
- Failure to meet criteria
  - Causation—determine and adjust
  - Grazing—thresholds and responses
  - WH&B—gather
Three Instruction Memoranda:

1. Gunnison and Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Policy (HAF)

2. Setting Priorities for Review and Processing of Grazing Authorizations

3. Incorporating Thresholds and Responses into Grazing Permits/ Leases
Flexibility and Partner Involvement

• Continue to use existing data as we transition to HAF

• Opportunities to integrate other modeling assessment approaches – e.g. STM

• Working on Pilot project to integrate rangeland health with Oregon STM

• Local conditions and multiple indicators will be considered

• BLM will continue to involve permittees and other stakeholders in developing T&Rs
MANAGING DISCRETE USES

Surface disturbance authorizations
Travel and transportation
Limiting Disturbance

• Minimize Surface Disturbance
  ▪ Land use allocations – avoidance of impacts
  ▪ Project screening - disturbance caps, buffers, RDFs, BMPs
  ▪ Recommend Sagebrush Focal Areas for mineral withdrawal

• 3% Disturbance Cap – BLM and State processes
Disturbance at the PAC and the Project Scale

1. Oil/Gas wells and development facilities
2. Coal mines
3. Wind towers
4. Solar fields
5. Geothermal development
6. Mining
7. Roads
8. Railroads
9. Power lines
10. Communication towers
11. Other vertical structures
12. Other developed ROWs
Two Instruction Memoranda:

1. Tracking and Reporting Surface Disturbance and Reclamation

2. Oil and Gas Leasing and Development Sequential Prioritization
Flexibility and Partner Involvement

• Collaboration with State to promote consistent tracking and tools

• BLM RMPA and State Action Plan – similar but different
IMPLEMENTING RESTORATION AND CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES

RMPA Objectives
Assessment tools
5-year program of work
Strategic and Priority Areas

- Developed to meet multiple sage-steppe restoration priorities identified in:
  - RPMA treatment objectives
  - FIAT Project Planning Areas (PPA),
  - Sagebrush Focal Areas
  - Sage Grouse Initiative NRCS Focal Areas

- Funding is focused in high priority areas

- 5-Year Program of Work
RMP Treatment Objectives

Table 2-5
Decadal Treatment Objectives for Greater Sage-grouse Habitat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment Objective</th>
<th>Average Annual Acres</th>
<th>Average Decadal Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conifer reduction</td>
<td>40,250</td>
<td>402,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sagebrush thinning</td>
<td>53,217</td>
<td>532,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive plant control*</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>127,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crested wheatgrass restoration</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>18,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Principally annual grasses

- Total Average Annual Acres = 108,011
- Total Average Decadal Acres = 1,080,110
## Treatment Activities for FY2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Treatment Acres</th>
<th>Conifer Thin</th>
<th>Annuals</th>
<th>Sage Brush Thin</th>
<th>Crested Wheatgrass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64,500</td>
<td>37,900</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORTING AND ADAPTING

Adaptive management
Tracking implementation
2020 status review
Meeting Resource Objectives

• Status and trend of land health
  • Consistent data
  • West-wide sample design
  • Reporting at multiple scales

• Adaptive Management
  • **Soft triggers** implemented at the project level and augment conditions of approval
  • **Hard triggers** implemented at the plan level and change allocation decisions
Two Instruction Memoranda:

1. Resource Management Plan Effectiveness and Implementation (AIM)

2. Land Use Plan Adaptive Management Hard and Soft Triggers
AIM Efforts for FY16 and Beyond

- 10 crews collected 650 AIM points
- Funding secure for FY17 work
- It’s a transition that will take several years
Adaptive Management Strategy

Annual monitoring of each unit for changes in habitat and populations
Adaptive Management Triggers

- Thresholds set for habitat and populations in PACs
- Soft Triggers represent an intermediate threshold
- Hard Triggers are more severe threshold
- Triggers calculated annually in coordination with state and federal agencies to validate the analyses
- 2015 triggers analyzed
Causal Factor Analysis

- Convene a team to analyze probable causes for exceeding the threshold
- Determine which threats are most likely causing habitat and/or population declines
- Determine how the threats are operating
- Recommend actions to further mitigate or eliminate threats
- Recommend actions to promote or accelerate recovery
- Process is being tested and refined in Baker PAC
THANK YOU