

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Informal Draft Comments on Nevada Strategic  
Plan for Conservation of Greater Sage-Grouse  
September 14, 2012**

**General Comments**

- We encourage greater deference be afforded to the Nevada Department of Wildlife's (NDOW) Habitat Categorization Map. We consider this approach scientifically defensible and it affords great utility at understanding current bird distribution. Also, this product and its associated components help target areas of restoration.
- We request quantification on the amount of acreage identified through the NDOW mapping process (Categories 1-4) that was captured/excluded from the Nevada Plan mapping effort in order to better understand our baseline or starting place.
- It will be impossible for the Service to consider this Plan an adequate regulatory mechanism without identification of specifics with regard to the 'how' and 'when' an action is denied or altered (thresholds, triggers).
- The concept of No Net Loss needs additional clarification as it pertains to 5% per 640 acre disturbance discussion and 20% Potential Habitat disturbance discussion.
- The avoid, minimize, and mitigate approach is generally the structure adhered to on federal lands under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The Service determined in 2010 this was inadequate.
- Habitat loss due to Acts of God (Fire and Invasive species) will occur. This loss needs to be taken into consideration and adaptive management principles need to be built into the regulatory process to deal with these events.
- Funding and mechanism for implementation needs to be identified.

**Specific Comments**

**1.0 Introduction – p.1, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph**

The standard or rationale for developing the Nevada Plan was to address the Service determination of inadequate regulatory mechanisms in our 2010 12-month Finding.

**Mapping – p.2**

We would submit that the final mapping product appears generally reasonable but we would appreciate clarification. Specifically, we would be interested in a comparison with NDOW's Habitat Categorization Map to ascertain how much Habitat Category 1, 2, and 3 is captured within the SGMA and how much is excluded. Further, we consider the NDOW mapping effort to be a defensible product and consider deviation based on rationale other than sage-grouse ecology to be challenging in light of our 2010 Finding.

**2.0 Definitions – p.4**

- **Sage-grouse Management Areas** – *“Delineation of the SGMA does not imply any degree of regulatory control or impose land-use restrictions for land-use management decisions for these lands.”* This statement is contrary to the rationale for developing this plan (see Introduction) and certainly affords the Service no reason for changing our 2010 opinion on the inadequacy of regulatory mechanisms.
- **Occupied Habitat** – There needs to be clarification on the burden of proof, scale, and rationale associated with the phrase *“last five years”*. Important corridors connecting basins with ridge-tops are likely used briefly and as such will have limited documentable sign of use. On a number of occasions, the Service has engaged in conversations with stakeholders that dismiss bird occurrence in some specific locale, when ultimately more intensive study demonstrates occurrence.
- **Suitable Habitat** – Definition needs clarification. This seems to be the same as Occupied Habitat.
- **Potential Habitat** – Definition needs clarification. We believe the intent is to identify habitat that is not suitable but could be if logistically reasonable restoration action is undertaken (i.e., PJ thinning). However, as worded it appears some Potential Habitat could be Occupied Habitat.
- **Last paragraph** – Our comments on this statement links to mapping and rationale for utilizing 85% Core, as defined by Doherty (2010). Policies outlined in Nevada Plan are not applicable to sage-grouse and suitable habitat outside the SGMA’s. Our concern is that, if we start with 85% and this is further segregated in to various habitat classification (Occupied, Suitable, etc.), which presumably influences degree of concern by future Committee/Technical Team, the map extent appears to move in one direction – toward less. Further, there may be indirect or direct effect to populations within SGMA’s due to activity immediately outside SGMA’s, especially if these habitats are occupied by sage-grouse.

### 3.0 NV Conservation Goals and Strategies – p. 5

1. The plan appears to aspire to "no net loss" of sage grouse habitat from development - this is good. The sentence as written, however, is slightly confusing. We interpret it mean no net loss of sage-grouse/habitat but the use of “for” instead of “from” in front of the word “activities” could be interpreted to mean no net loss of activities. Thus, we would appreciate clarification of this statement.
2. The plan states that Nevada should be "held harmless" for habitat loss due to fire and invasive species. Assuming this, it is difficult to credit the State Plan with addressing the biggest threat to sage grouse - fire and invasive species - even though there are several pages of the plan dedicated to this topic. We agree that federal lands fire issues are difficult for the state to control, but we would encourage articulating a clear vision for addressing this threat that federal agencies could evaluate. Specifically, disturbance by fire should be considered when evaluating the appropriateness of additional disturbance created through authorized activities.

“Avoid, Minimize Mitigate” - p. 5.

This approach is current policy under NEPA and Service determined this was inadequate. There needs to be identified specific thresholds and or triggers for the determination and application of each of these.

3. **Avoid** – “*Where ever possible*” – This definition needs further refinement with associated thresholds or Service is challenged to alter from 2010 Finding determination.
4. **Minimize** – “*Furthest extent practical*” – This definition needs further refinement with associated thresholds or Service is challenged to alter from 2010 Finding determination. These are Best Management Practices that are typically applied today. Some may have utility (although there is uncertainty here), but there are generally not silver bullets to these complex problems.
5. **Mitigate** – “*After all appropriate and practicable*” – This definition needs further refinement with associated thresholds or Service is challenged to alter from 2010 Finding determination.

There are fundamental challenges to AMM approach.

- Nevada has a substantial stewardship responsibility for sage-grouse across the West.
- Loss habitat will occur due to factors outside of our control – Acts of God.
- Habitat restoration in the southern Great Basin is difficult.
- Reestablishment of sage-grouse, either actively or passively, into locations following extirpations is not easily accomplished.
- Measuring and accounting for the cumulative effect of this approach will be essential.
- If the AMM approach, without associated thresholds, is adopted, we will continue to reduce extant habitat and sage-grouse populations will be mitigated in a negative direction.

Three general conservation policies – p. 5.

1. “*Conserve greater sage-grouse ...consistent with economic vitality...*” – We request clarification of this statement. What will be the economic and conservation thresholds that determine vitality?
2. We request additional clarification of this statement. Namely, “*all means*” but additionally do you foresee instances where activities will be incompatible with sage-grouse conservation. Further, this ties back to mapping effort - While avoid, minimize, and mitigate will proceed within SGMA, will known sage-grouse habitats outside of SGMA receive this same “degree” of protection. If not, this will actually diminish the current standard on federally managed lands under NEPA, which the Service determined inadequate.
3. A broad coalition – This is great.

p. 5, last paragraph – We are unsure what is meant for sage grouse by, “best possible outcome,” here.

**3.1 Management Strategy in Occupied Habitat – p. 6**

Suitable Habitat should be included under this category.

1. P. 5 of Plan states a goal of “no net loss” and this bullet seems to contradict this goal. While the Service will temporarily defer our opinion on the adequacy of a 5% disturbance standard per 640 acres, we contend that simply triggering an evaluation is not adequate and needs additional clarification. We submit that if a specific percent standard were to be adopted, the regulatory process would need to be able to enforce this cap. To be clear, we anticipate all activities that would disturb sage grouse and their habitat (including from invasive species encroachment) would be included in this cap.
2. While we recognize that a significant amount of winter habitat has been impacted by wildfire, we are unclear as to why winter range alone was identified specifically? You could also include nesting habitat in this sentence as quality is influenced significantly by shrub cover and, additionally, you could add a bullet that restricts treatments in brood-rearing habitat to those that maintain or expand current extent or quality of mesic or meadow habitat available in the summer.
3. Great
4. Great

### **3.2 Management Strategy in Potential Habitat – p. 6**

1. Great
2. Not entirely clear on this bullet. As written, it states that habitat disturbance (from any number of human activities?) could occur in potential habitat but not exceed 20% per year per SGMA. If potential habitat represents those sites that are unoccupied but logistically feasible to bring back to suitable habitat – 20 percent seems excessively high as you are dismissing areas that can offer future “lift”. This implies that in 5 years, all potential habitats could be converted to non habitat (mine, wind, geothermal, etc.). On the other hand, it is not clear why we would limit the amount of restoration activities that could occur per year in potential habitat, unless potential habitat was actually occupied habitat. I believe you are misusing Connelly *et. al.* 2000. He is referring to occupied habitat and additionally his time frame is not annually but 2-3 decades, depending on habitat?
3. Great

### **3.3 Management Strategy in Non-Habitat – p. 6**

1. Need to remain cognizant of potential impacts caused by indirect effects of activities occurring outside of suitable habitat (such as noise or predator subsidy) and scale at which non-habitat is mapped. Also can these activities be encouraged to be sighted outside SGMA’s? This, of course, would further depend on the rationale underlying the adopted map.

### **3.4 Interim Strategy - p. 7**

Until such time the regulatory process (criteria, thresholds, triggers, etc) of this Plan are established, we submit that adoption of this Plan (#s 1, 5, 7) would undermine current BLM and

USFS direction and would run counter to the determination made by the Service in our 2010 Finding with respect to inadequate regulatory mechanisms. Further, we contend the “grandfathering” clause (#2) (as of July 31, 2012) runs counter to over a decade of efforts towards recognizing the need and working toward sage-grouse conservation. While it is reasonable that ongoing, non-expanding, projects should have no additional obligations, activities that have yet to receive a decision under NEPA should be evaluated.

#### **4.0 Implementation Responsibilities**

We are unclear what impacts of listing the sage grouse would include that are “well documented,” – please document – or what, “significant negative impacts” would occur. We understand the perceptions here, and if we specifically can say what it is we’d like to avoid, we may be more successful in doing so in the event sage grouse are listed. Also, we believe that if this state plan is to be effective, then the effects of a decision to list sage grouse should not be much different than the effects of this plan.

#### **4.1 Sage-grouse Advisory Council – p. 8**

The individual topics addressed in this section are each important. The Service offers comments on selected topics, identified by bulleted number contained within the Plan. We have no comments on the topics not identified.

3. This topic is incredibly important and will establish the ground work from which the Service can assess the regulatory adequacy of this Plan.
5. Again, funding is a critical topic, which will facilitate the Service in forecasting potential for conservation.
10. We submit that the Council’s activities should be adaptive. Thus, some degree or form of latitude should be granted.

#### **5.0 Sage-Grouse Management Area Map Recommendations – p. 11**

- We would submit the best available science initiated the mapping efforts but after refinements based on an unclarified rationale, the SGMA Map was derived. While we appreciate the Committee’s effort toward mapping, we would encourage the adoption of the NDOW’s Habitat Categorization map and then pursuing refinements as new data are collected.
- Can the SGMAs be altered to include additional habitat or do these areas only get smaller?
- #5 – We are not clear as to what “exempt from additional regulations” implies?
- Last Paragraph – I am not sure what is implied by this statement. How will areas of known development be considered going forward. If these activities are to be “grandfathered in”, the area should not be excluded from the map and this existing disturbance should be considered when evaluating new developments.

#### **6.0 Threat Assessment and Recommended Actions**

Our comments on individual threats contained in this section are generally captured under the Avoid, Minimize, and Mitigate section above. As worded, several sections lead us to believe the

adopted standard for burden of proof is 'demonstrate harm' and not 'demonstrate no harm.' This may be important in the perception or reality of perpetuating 'business as usual.' We anticipate thresholds, standards and actions would need to be identified and established.

## **7.0 De Minimis Activities**

In general, the Service considers ranching operations and many ranching practices, when conducted in a sustainable manner, to generally be not incompatible with sage-grouse conservation. However, we encourage the review of individual practices and adoption of alternative approaches when they afford a positive influence on the species. There may be straightforward, practical, proven ideas that have not caught on within the agricultural and ranching communities.

We are recently becoming aware of concerns over a potential relationship between livestock grazing and the spread of invasive species such as cheatgrass. If such a relationship exists, then we would perceive livestock grazing to be of significantly greater concern to sagebrush ecosystem conservation. We encourage further exploration of this topic.

1. Timing of husbandry practices should be taken into consideration. We have witnessed sheep bands bedded down on leks sites during the leking season.
2. We are not sure what all is covered under "existing farming practices" but there may be practices that could be altered to afford a little more deference for the species without being overly burdensome on the producer. For example, cutting alfalfa or other pasture grass, starting from the inside of the field and working out, outfitting equipment with "flushing bars" when feasible, or altering livestock access to riparian areas in order to maintain stream and associated meadow integrity.
3. We assume all allotments have an associated Federal management plan. Thus, we infer from this bullet that all operations with allotments would be immune from any regulation adopted through this Plan. We contend that while an allotment plan may be appropriate, meaning it represents a sustainable prescription, implementation is a separate issue and one that requires follow-through. Some allotments remain degraded regardless of prescription or language contained in the management plan. Thus, we do not consider all operations that have existing management plans to be a de minimus activity but only those that actively and effectively implement prescriptive grazing plans, which are compatible with sage-grouse habitat requirements.
4. We would encourage as little infrastructure development as possible within four miles of a lek regardless of construction timing. Most hens nest in proximity to lek sites (this is what informs Doherty's model). Concentrating cattle through tank development or installing windmill structures, which are often used as nesting substrates by ravens within this four mile lek buffer would not be ideal.
5. We would strongly encourage limiting new aboveground transmission lines within four miles of lek sites.
6. No comment
7. We would discourage new fences within 1.25 miles of a lek or other sites where seasonal congregations of sage-grouse occur. Also, we would encourage exploring other fencing

options such as electric or let down in lieu of traditional, three or four strand wire designs.

8. No comment
9. Mesic sites are incredible important to sage-grouse in Nevada. When considering how much is “enough water”, we would encourage deference be afforded to sage-grouse.
10. We are not familiar with the RAAT protocol. Grasshopper’s do, however, represent an important dietary item for developing chicks. Thus, we would encourage limiting herbicide application intended to reduce insect numbers.
11. No comment
12. No comment
13. No comment