

Appendix 3. Metrics Tables

Overview

The Oregon Sage-Grouse Action Plan identifies conservation actions to ameliorate Oregon-specific threats to sage-grouse and their habitats. A description of each threat appears in Section IV of the Action Plan (“Assessing and Addressing Threats to Sage-Grouse”) as well as an outline and discussion of associated conservation actions. These actions are also organized in the table below and enhanced with further details including:

- Specific conservation action—name and number carried over from Section IV
- Strategy level (large-scale planning or site-specific management)
- Incremental objectives related to accomplishing actions
- Performance measures by which progress will be measured
- Responsible parties (expanded information based upon listing of such parties in Section IV)
- Timelines by which actions are anticipated to be completed
- Funding and other resources identified to implement actions.

Implementation Guidelines and Recommendations (IRGs) for a selection of conservation actions are also described in Appendix 4. Conservation actions are designed to be specific, measurable, and achievable. The Metrics Table below and IRGs will help meet those objectives and thus improve conservation effectiveness overall. In many cases, multiple parties will be responsible for implementing actions collaboratively across land ownership jurisdictions. However, as part of the SageCon implementation refinement phase for this Plan in fall 2015, lead agencies will be identified to coordinate efforts across the species’ range, in accordance with annual priorities, goals, funds, and other resources identified by the statewide governance board. *****Note: In light of the forthcoming implementation discussions and pending determinations over specific resource allocation, some aspects of the Metrics Table below remain in draft form and will be revised or completed more fully during 2015 and early 2016 implementation and coordination efforts.***

Conservation actions and IRGs identified in this Action Plan will be implemented in different ways, depending on land ownership.

- On federal lands, implementation of the conservation actions and IRGs will be guided by the Bureau of Land Management’s Resource Management Plan Amendment for Oregon (hereafter “BLM RMP FEIS”) (BLM 2015) and other regulations specific to federal lands. As such, an effort has been made to advance alignment between development of conservation actions and IRGs applicable to federal lands as part of this Plan and those developed and identified in the BLM RMP FEIS (BLM 2015).
- On state-owned lands, the State has authority to ensure that the conservation actions and IRGs in this Plan are implemented by relevant state agencies. The Plan advances this outcome through authorities including Governor Kate Brown’s Executive Order directing

state agencies to implement the provisions of this Action Plan and the new rules by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) governing development and mitigation in significant sage-grouse habitat (OARs 660-023-0115 and 635-140-0025, respectively). More information on the rules and the Executive Order can be located at the beginning of this Plan, in Section II, the individual threat subsections of Section IV, and in Appendices 17 and 19. Additionally, lands managed by the Department of State Lands (DSL) have been enrolled in a Candidate Conservation Agreement with Assurances (CCAA), and conservation measures detailed in site-specific plans for these lands must be implemented in accordance with the provisions of the CCAA.

- On private lands, conservation actions and IRGs related to habitat and land management (other than compensatory mitigation), including livestock management, are anticipated to be implemented voluntarily by landowners. It is recognized that the State of Oregon has no authority to direct habitat management on private lands. Thus, the State relies upon landowners to voluntarily implement conservation actions through incentive-based programs advanced by SWCDs, the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, the NRCS, and others. That said, Oregon’s leadership and significant landowner enrollment in Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances (CCAAs) or other federal or state incentive programs designed to reduce the threats to sage-grouse will provide enhanced certainty around advancement of voluntary actions. As such, during the development of this Action Plan, conservation actions and IRGs applicable to private lands were generally aligned with those identified in the Programmatic CCAA developed for Oregon (Harney SWCD and USFWS 2014). Commitment of significant state funding (see Section II) and federal funding also enhances the certainty of action implementation on private lands. Further, the State’s land-use development and mitigation rules apply to private lands, providing regulatory assurances regarding sage-grouse habitat protections and conservation benefit through mitigation actions.

Literature Cited

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2015. Oregon greater sage-grouse proposed Resource Management Plan amendment and Final Environmental Impact Statement. U.S. Department of the Interior, Portland, Oregon, USA.

Harney Soil and Water Conservation District (Harney SWCD) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2014. Greater sage-grouse programmatic candidate conservation agreement with assurances for private rangelands in Harney County, Oregon between the Harney Soil and Water Conservation District and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Portland, Oregon, USA.

Secretary of the Interior (USDOI). 2015. Rangeland fire prevention, management, and restoration. Implementation Plan: Secretarial Order 3336. U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., USA.

Stiver, S., E. T. Rinkes, D. E. Naugle, P. D. Makela, D. A. Nance and J. W. Karl. 2015. Sage-grouse habitat assessment framework: a multiscale assessment tool. Technical Reference 6710-1. Bureau of Land Management and Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Denver, Colorado, USA.

Monitoring Category Metrics

Sage-Grouse Biological Data: Action MON-1	
Description	<p>Action MON-1: Monitor sage-grouse population trends at four geographic scales: (1) statewide, (2) BLM district, (3) wildlife management unit (WMU), and (4) Priority Area for Conservation (PAC).</p> <p>Action MON-1-1 Assess sage-grouse population trends within PACs to determine if “hard” or “soft” thresholds (per BLM RMP FEIS) have been triggered</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory a statistically valid sample¹ of leks within each stratum (small, medium, large, extra-large) at each geographic scale, annually. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory all trend leks (continuous data since at least 1980) in PACs and outside of PACs. Inventory a minimum of 2 leks per stratum per PAC, plus a random selection of leks within each PAC for a total of 50% of leks in each PAC sampled. Analyze lek data to determine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum spring population estimates and trends determined at four geographic scales If statewide and regional management goals in the 2011 Strategy are met If BLM adaptive management thresholds have been met Areas of population richness
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual reporting of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proportion of leks inventoried at each geographic scale Minimum spring population estimates and trends determined at four geographic scales Annual data in relation to BLM adaptive management thresholds and statewide and regional management goals. Annual update of lek conservation status (occupied, pending, unoccupied) shared with LCDR and counties for designation of “significant sage-grouse habitat” Update of GIS layer representing lek locations Development of GIS layer representing areas of population richness Incorporation of the areas of population richness GIS layer into ORDSS, with regular updates.
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopt-a-Lek <ul style="list-style-type: none"> USFWS BLM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TNC ODFW
Timeline	Ongoing (annually)

¹ Statistically valid sample to be determined in consultation with statistician during fall 2015.

Sage-Grouse Biological Data: Action MON-1	
Funding²	<p>Identified Funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator • Ongoing ODFW, BLM, USFWS district budgets for lek inventories • BLM Eastern Oregon Sage-Grouse Monitoring Agreement (2015-2020) (5-yr. agreement; initial 2-yr. funds \$320K) to support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2 temporary ODFW biologists annually for lek surveys (including vehicle/fuel costs and related supplies/per diem) ○ Helicopter and aerial infrared lek surveys ○ Statistical consultant • USFWS Recovery Project funds awarded to ODFW in 2015 (2015-2016 initial funds \$37K) for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 2 temporary ODFW biologists for lek surveys ○ Support of Adopt-a-Lek volunteers (travel/per diem reimbursement) • Oregon Wildlife Heritage Foundation funds (anticipated \$5-7K annually to support Adopt-a-Lek volunteer coordinator) • Ongoing BLM state office funds for assessment of population trends in relation to BLM adaptive management thresholds <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oregon Wildlife Heritage Foundation funds (anticipated \$5-7K annually to support Adopt-a-Lek volunteer coordinator) <p>Funds to be identified:</p> <p>Funds TBD (awarded or requested from TNC to maintain the ORDSS)</p>

Sage-Grouse Biological Data: Action MON-2	
Description	<p>Action MON-2: Monitor sage-grouse habitat utilization in response to conservation actions or habitat degradation.</p> <p>Action MON-2-1 Employ new research to monitor sage-grouse response to conservation actions related to habitat improvement that will be implemented under this Plan and through the efforts of partner organizations.</p>
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research objectives are documented elsewhere for current projects. • Objectives for new monitoring projects will be developed as research priorities emerge.

² See Section II, Table 1 and Table 2 for a listing of specific agency Policy Option Packages (POPs) funded by the 2015 Oregon State Legislature, as well as a listing of ongoing relevant funding tied to specific agency programs (ODFW, ODA, DSL, ODF, OWEB, etc.).

Sage-Grouse Biological Data: Action MON-2		
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress reports submitted quarterly for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> South Warner research investigating long-term sage-grouse response to juniper removal Trout Creeks research investigating long-term sage-grouse response to wildfire MS theses and PhD dissertations 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BLM ODFW 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OSU
Timeline	<p>Phase 1 (John Severson, PhD Candidate, U of Idaho) South Warner research expected completion: Fall 2015</p> <p>Phase 2 (Andrew Olsen, PhD Candidate, Oregon State University) South Warner research expected completion: 2018</p>	<p>Phase 1 (Lee Foster, MS Candidate, Oregon State University) Trout Creeks research expected completion: December 2015</p> <p>Phase 2 (Catherine Engelman, PhD Candidate, Oregon State University) Trout Creeks research expected completion: 2018</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All funds for existing MS and PhD research have been identified.³ <p>Funds to be identified:</p> <p>Funds for future research efforts will be identified as research priorities emerge.</p>	

Development: Action MON-3	
Description	Action MON-3: Monitor current and new development and cultivated agriculture (approved and completed) within PACs.
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create a centralized development registry. Develop procedures for permitting entities to report new development for inclusion in development registry. Analyze development data within PACs in relation to incremental thresholds (1% per decade per PAC) and total threshold (3% per PAC). Incorporate new development into ORDSS.

³ Funding sources include Lakeview BLM (Healthy Lands Initiative funds), Oregon Hunters Association, Oregon Wildlife Heritage Foundation, and others.

Development: Action MON-3		
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Centralized development registry created Documentation of new large-scale development (approvals and completed projects) in registry Current reporting of development within PACs in relation to incremental thresholds (1% per decade per PAC) and total threshold (3% per PAC) Updated development GIS layer within ORDSS. 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BLM DLCD ODFW 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OWRD Sage-grouse counties planning departments TNC
Timeline	<p>Creation of development registry: December 2015</p> <p>Incorporation of GIS layer into ORDSS: December 2015</p> <p>Documentation of developments: Ongoing</p>	<p>Analyses of development within PACs: Ongoing</p> <p>Updates to GIS layer: Ongoing</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 300K funded to DLCD (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Disturbance Framework (funds support 1 FTE position)⁴ Ongoing BLM state office funds for assessment of development in relation to BLM adaptive management thresholds <p><i>Related funds:</i> \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)⁵</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p>Funds to be identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds TBD (awarded or requested from INR to conduct development analyses) Funds TBD (awarded or requested from TNC to maintain the ORDSS) 	

Conservation Actions: Action MON-4

⁴ Agency package: DLCD-108.

⁵ Agency package: ODFW-130.

Conservation Actions: Action MON-4		
Monitoring Action Description	Action MON-4: Monitor conservation actions implemented by a variety of stakeholders including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Sage-Grouse Initiative (SGI) • ODFW habitat programs (Mule Deer Initiative, Upland Game Bird funded projects, Access and Habitat Program) • BLM, USFWS, USFS (habitat projects on federal lands) • Mitigation creditors (habitat projects implemented for mitigation credits) • Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) • Private landowners (e.g., CCAA conservation measures) • Department of State Lands (e.g., CCAA conservation measures) • Cooperative weed management areas (CWMAs) 	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)	
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a centralized registry that includes conservation actions. • Issue an annual data call for conservation actions from stakeholders. • Analyze conservation actions within relevant geographic scales: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Statewide ○ BLM district ○ PACs ○ Within 4 mi of leks. • Create a conservation actions GIS layer and incorporate it into ORDSS. 	
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralized conservation actions registry created • Annual data call for conservation actions from stakeholders • Annual reporting (summary statistics) of conservation actions within relevant geographic scales: • Annual reporting of conservation actions in relation to targets outlined for specific threat performance measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Statewide ○ BLM district ○ PACs ○ Within 4 mi of leks. • Current conservation actions GIS layer within ORDSS 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODFW • Private landowners • SWCDs • USFS • USFWS • TNC
Timeline	Creation of conservation actions registry: December 2015	Analyses of conservation actions: Annually

Conservation Actions: Action MON-4	
	<p>Incorporation of GIS layer into ORDSS: December 2015</p> <p>Annual data call: Request sent October 15 annually; data call deadline December 31 annually</p> <p>Updates to GIS layer: Annually</p>
Funding	<p>Funds indicated below will be utilized for implementation, as well as contributing to/maintaining a central registry for conservation actions.</p> <p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)⁶ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)⁷ <p><i>Related funds:</i> \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)⁸</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator; ongoing ODA funding (Noxious Weed Program and SWCD Program); ongoing DSL funding tied to State CCAA.</p> <p>Funds to be identified: Funds TBD (awarded or requested from TNC to maintain the ORDSS)</p>

Landscape-Level Habitat Condition: Actions MON-5 and MON-6	
Monitoring Action Description	<p>Action MON-5: Assess sage-grouse habitat trends within PACs to determine if “hard” or “soft” thresholds (per BLM RMP FEIS; also see “Monitoring” in Section IV) have been triggered.</p> <p>Action MON-6: Monitor sage-grouse habitat quality according to vegetation states using predictive models trained and validated by plot data.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)

⁶ Agency package: ODFW-132.

⁷ Agency package: ODFW-105.

⁸ Agency package: ODFW-130.

Landscape-Level Habitat Condition: Actions MON-5 and MON-6		
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyze habitat data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In relation to BLM adaptive management triggers Summary statistics of each vegetation state within relevant geographic scales (statewide, BLM district, PACs, within 4 mi of leks) Spatial analyses of habitat that transitioned from one vegetation state to another within relevant geographic scales. Assess accuracy of currently available modeling tools; select desired tool to use moving forward. Create a landscape-level habitat condition GIS layer and incorporate it into ORDSS. 	
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual landscape-level habitat condition report Current landscape-level habitat condition GIS layer within ORDSS with annual updates. 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BLM INR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ODFW TNC
Timeline	<p>Completion of accuracy assessment of currently available modeling tools: December 2015</p> <p>Incorporation of GIS layer into ORDSS: December 2015</p>	<p>Habitat analyses: Annually</p> <p>Updates to GIS layer: Annually</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)⁹ Ongoing BLM state office funds for assessment of habitat trends in relation to BLM adaptive management thresholds <p><i>Related funds:</i> \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁰</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p>Funds to be identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds TBD (awarded or requested from INR to develop predictive models) Funds TBD (awarded or requested from TNC to develop predictive models and to maintain ORDSS) 	

⁹ Agency package: ODFW-132.

¹⁰ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Site-Specific Habitat Condition: Action MON-7		
Monitoring Action Description	Action MON-7: Conduct site-specific monitoring of habitat quality according to vegetation states at the map-unit level. Map units are geographic areas delineated during CCAA site-specific planning, mitigation credit planning, or other habitat improvement planning. (See related monitoring action MON-2 .)	
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)	
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor habitat quality as described in other documents (CCAA site-specific plans, mitigation credit site-specific plans, BLM rangeland and habitat assessments, etc.) • Conduct spatial analyses of habitat that has transitioned from one vegetation state to another within relevant geographic scales. 	
Monitoring and Reporting	Annual “roll-up” report on site-specific habitat condition	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • NRCS • Mitigation creditors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODFW • OWEB • DSL • SWCDs
Timeline	Habitat monitoring: As described in site-specific plans	Habitat analyses and reporting: Annually
Funding	<p>Funds indicated below will be utilized for implementation, including site-specific monitoring of conservation actions at the map-unit scale.</p> <p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M funded to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹¹ • \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)¹² • \$2.7M appropriated to BLM for habitat improvements in S. Warners (1 FTE position)¹³ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁴ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)¹⁵ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁶ • \$1.5M awarded to USFWS for habitat improvements on Hart Mt. National Wildlife Refuge¹⁷ 	

¹¹ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹² Agency package: ODFW-130.

¹³ Combined DOI Resilient Landscapes project funds (\$1.56M), FIAT funds (\$935K), and district funds.

¹⁴ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁵ Agency package: ODFW-132.

¹⁶ Agency package: ODFW-105.

¹⁷ Department of the Interior (DOI) Resilient Landscapes project funds.

Site-Specific Habitat Condition: Action MON-7	
	<p><i>Related Funds:</i> Ongoing DSL funding tied to state CCAA; ongoing ODA funding (SWCD Program)</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

Primary Threats Metrics

Juniper Encroachment (JPR): Action JPR-1	
Description	Action JPR-1: Promote education and outreach through SWCDs and other partner organizations to encourage participation in the NRCS Sage-Grouse Initiative (SGI) and CCAAs.
Strategy Level	I(Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enroll a minimum of 80% of eligible acres into CCAAs by enrollment deadline. Enroll a minimum of TBD% of eligible landowners into SGI.
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of the number of recruitment activities completed annually by each SWCD and other partner organizations Documentation of the number of landowners/acres recruited/enrolled to participate in SGI and CCAAs summarized annually
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NRCS OWEB ODFW SWCDs
Timeline	Landowner outreach: Ongoing Summary of recruitment: Annually
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁸ OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁹ \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)²⁰ \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)²¹ <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-grouse Conservation Coordinator; ongoing ODA funding (SWCD Program).</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NRCS \$200M SGI funding over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

¹⁸ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁹ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

²⁰ Agency package: ODFW-132.

²¹ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Juniper Encroachment: Action JPR-2	
Action Description	<p>Action JPR-2: Enlist LITs to apply local expert knowledge in conjunction with the spatial decision support tool (currently under development) to identify priority areas to address juniper encroachment.</p> <p>Action JPR-2-1 Develop GIS layers with polygons spatially representing priority areas for juniper removal (note: coarse layers have already been created by FIAT, coordinated by the BLM for Focal Habitat and Planning Areas specific to that process).</p> <p>Action JPR-2-2 Develop a regional LIT work plan identifying priority areas to address juniper encroachment, timelines, and responsible parties.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create GIS layers with polygons spatially representing priority areas for juniper removal (note: coarse layers have already been created by FIAT, coordinated by the BLM for Focal Habitat and Planning Areas specific to that process). • Develop regional LIT work plans identifying priority areas to address juniper encroachment, timelines, and responsible parties.
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed GIS layers • Development of regional LIT work plans
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM FIAT • LITs • ODFW • TNC
Timeline	<p>Completion date: Spring 2016</p> <p>(with ongoing updates as juniper removal is completed)</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator <p><i>Related funds for conveying priority habitat improvement areas to mitigation creditors: \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)²²</i></p> <p>Funds to be identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds TBD (awarded or requested from TNC to maintain the ORDSS)

Juniper Encroachment: Action JPR-3

²² Agency package: ODFW-130.

Juniper Encroachment: Action JPR-3		
Action Description	<p>Action JPR-3: Reduce Phases I and II juniper encroachment (<10% canopy cover) in sage-grouse priority habitats (PACs) and important areas of connectivity in Oregon to a rate greater than or equal to the rate of encroachment.</p> <p>Action JPR-3-1 Prioritize juniper removal within 4 miles of known leks (with an active or pending status) on federal, private, and state lands.</p> <p>Action JPR-3-2 Within 1 mile of known leks, completely remove juniper. Beyond the 1-mile buffer and within 4 miles of leks, completely remove juniper where feasible; where complete juniper removal is not feasible, reduce juniper canopy cover to less than 4%.</p> <p>Action JPR-3-3 After treatments within lek buffers are complete, prioritize Phases I and II juniper removal in additional priority areas that provide adequate sage-grouse habitat (e.g., sagebrush land cover >25%), have the potential to improve connectivity, and, particularly, have medium-to-high resistance and resilience. Prioritize removal of juniper encroaching into riparian zones</p>	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)	
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Note: Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.) • Remove a minimum of 10% of total acres of Phases I and II juniper within 4 mi of leks annually on private and state lands (over 10 years). • Remove a minimum of 5% of total acres of Phases I and II juniper within 4 mi of leks annually on public lands (over 20 years). • As priority areas are addressed and resources are available, remove a minimum of 5% of total acres of Phases I and II juniper beyond 4-mi lek buffers in additional priority habitats annually on private, state, and federal lands. 	
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual report detailing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Acres of juniper removal within 4 mi of leks on private, state, and federal lands ○ Juniper canopy cover within 4 miles of leks ○ Acres of Phases I and II juniper removal beyond 4 mi lek buffers in additional priority habitats 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs • USFS
Timeline	Removal of juniper within 4 mi of leks on private and state lands: December 2025 Removal of juniper within 4 mi of leks on public lands:	Removal of Phases I and II juniper beyond 4-mi lek buffers in additional priority habitats: December 20XX (date TBD)

Juniper Encroachment: Action JPR-3	
	December 2035
Funding	<p>Identified funds: (shared with actions JPR-4 and -5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)²³ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)²⁴ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)²⁵ • \$2.7M appropriated to BLM for habitat improvements in S. Warners (1 FTE position)²⁶ • \$1.5M awarded to USFWS for habitat improvements on Hart Mt. National Wildlife Refuge²⁷ • \$18M (\$9M to SWCDs plus match) via RCPP award for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)²⁸ <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator; ongoing DSL funding for CCAA/juniper work on state lands.</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> See funds identified to monitor conservation actions, landscape-level condition, and site-specific habitat condition.</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

Juniper Encroachment: Action JPR-4	
Action Description	<p>Action JPR-4: Strategically treat Phase III juniper encroachment (>10% canopy cover) as needed in sage-grouse priority habitats where the greatest opportunities exist to restore connectivity, reduce risk of catastrophic wildfire, and create future sage-grouse habitat opportunities.</p> <p>Action JPR-4-1 Prioritize Phase III juniper removal after Phases I and II have been addressed. Prioritize Phase III areas in or</p>

²³ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

²⁴ Agency package: ODFW-132.

²⁵ Agency package: ODFW-105.

²⁶ Combined DOI Resilient Landscapes project funds (\$1.56M), FIAT funds (\$935K), and district funds

²⁷ Department of the Interior (DOI) Resilient Landscapes project funds.

²⁸ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

Juniper Encroachment: Action JPR-4		
	adjacent to priority areas that provide adequate sage-grouse habitat (e.g., sagebrush land cover >25%), particularly in areas with medium-to-high resistance and resilience.	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)	
Objectives	(Note: Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.) Remove TBD % of Phase III juniper annually beyond 4-mi lek buffers in priority habitats.	
Monitoring and Reporting	Annual reporting of acres of Phase III juniper removal beyond 4-mi lek buffers in priority habitats.	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs • USFS 	
Timeline	Removal of Phase III juniper beyond 4-mi lek buffers in priority habitats: December 20XX (date TBD)	
Funding	<p>Identified funds: (shared with actions JPR-3 and -5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)²⁹ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)³⁰ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)³¹ • \$2.7M appropriated to BLM for habitat improvements in S. Warners (1 FTE position)³² • \$1.5M awarded to USFWS for habitat improvements on Hart Mt. National Wildlife Refuge³³ • \$18M (\$9M to SWCDs plus match) via RCPP award for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)³⁴ <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator; ongoing DSL funding for CCAA/juniper work on state lands.</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> See funds identified to monitor conservation actions, landscape-level condition, and site-specific habitat condition.</p>	

²⁹ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

³⁰ Agency package: ODFW-132.

³¹ Agency package: ODFW-105.

³² Combined DOI Resilient Landscapes project funds (\$1.56M), FIAT funds (\$935K), and district funds

³³ Department of the Interior (DOI) Resilient Landscapes project funds.

³⁴ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

Juniper Encroachment: Action JPR-4	
	<p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

Juniper Encroachment: Action JPR-5	
Action Description	Action JPR-5: Conduct long-term (>30 years) monitoring and evaluation of vegetation responses to treatments. Use an adaptive management approach to maintain the benefit of juniper removal within sage-grouse habitats, including retreatment as necessary.
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor 100% of juniper treatment areas at 5-year intervals. • Document sagebrush and understory perennial grass recovery at 100% of juniper treatment areas (using metrics TBD). • Adaptively manage in 100% of treatment areas identified to be in need of improved vegetation responses.
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sagebrush and understory perennial grass recovery ○ Adaptive management undertaken to improve vegetation responses as needed
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs • USFS
Timeline	<p>Completion date:</p> <p>Monitoring should occur at 5-year intervals.</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds: (shared with actions JPR-3 and -4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)³⁵ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)³⁶ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)³⁷ • \$2.7M appropriated to BLM for habitat improvements in S. Warners (1 FTE position)³⁸

³⁵ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

³⁶ Agency package: ODFW-132.

³⁷ Agency package: ODFW-105.

³⁸ Combined DOI Resilient Landscapes project funds (\$1.56M), FIAT funds (\$935K), and district funds

Juniper Encroachment: Action JPR-5	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$1.5M awarded to USFWS for habitat improvements on Hart Mt. National Wildlife Refuge³⁹ • \$18M (\$9M to SWCDs plus match) via RCPP award for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)⁴⁰ <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator; ongoing DSL funding for CCAA/juniper work on state lands.</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> See funds identified to monitor conservation actions, landscape-level condition, and site-specific habitat condition.</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

Juniper Encroachment: Action JPR-6	
Action Description	Action JPR-6: Monitor sage-grouse habitat utilization and/or population response in select areas where junipers have been removed. (See related monitoring actions MON-2 and MON-4 .)
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue South Warner research investigating long-term sage-grouse response to juniper removal. • Research objectives are documented elsewhere for current projects. • Objectives for new monitoring projects will be developed as research priorities emerge.
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress reports submitted quarterly for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ South Warner research investigating long-term sage-grouse response to juniper removal • MS theses and PhD dissertations
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODFW • OSU
Timeline	Phase 1 (John Severson, PhD Candidate, U of Idaho) South Warner research expected completion: Fall 2015

³⁹ Department of the Interior (DOI) Resilient Landscapes project funds.

⁴⁰ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

Juniper Encroachment: Action JPR-6	
	Phase 2 (Andrew Olsen, PhD Candidate, Oregon State University) South Warner research expected completion: 2018
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All funds for existing MS and PhD research have been identified.⁴¹ <p>Funds to be identified:</p> <p>Funds for future research efforts will be identified as research priorities emerge.</p>

Invasive Annual Grasses (IAG): Action IAG-1	
Action Description	<p>Action IAG-1: Enlist LITs and cooperative weed management areas (CWMAs), in cooperation with state, federal, and private land managers, to apply local expert knowledge in conjunction with the spatial decision support tool (currently under development) to develop regional strategic work plans that identify priority areas to address invasive annual grasses, timelines, and responsible parties. Regional strategic work plans should identify areas for invasive annual-grass <i>prevention, treatment and restoration, and containment</i>. More detailed actions relating to these three invasive plant management approaches are listed below.</p> <p>Action IAG-1-1 As part of regional strategic work plans, develop GIS layers with polygons spatially representing priority areas for invasive annual-grass treatment and containment (note: coarse layers have already been created by FIAT, coordinated by the BLM for Focal Habitat and Planning Areas specific to that process).</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create GIS layers with polygons spatially representing priority areas for invasive annual-grass response (note: coarse layers have already been created by FIAT, coordinated by the BLM for Focal Habitat and Planning Areas specific to that process). • Develop regional LIT work plans identifying priority areas to address invasive annual grasses, timelines, and responsible parties.
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed GIS layers • Development of regional LIT work plans
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM FIAT • CWMAs • LITs • ODFW • ODA • TNC
Timeline	<p>GIS layers for fire suppression priorities: June 2016</p> <p>Regional strategic work plans: Spring 2016</p>

⁴¹ Funding sources include Lakeview BLM (Healthy Lands Initiative funds), Oregon Hunters Association, Oregon Wildlife Heritage Foundation, and others.

Invasive Annual Grasses (IAG): Action IAG-1	
	(with ongoing updates as annual-grass invasions are contained)
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator <p><i>Related funds for conveying priority habitat improvement areas to mitigation creditors:</i> \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)⁴²; ongoing ODA funding (Noxious Weed Program and SWCD Program).</p> <p>Funds to be identified:</p> <p>Funds TBD (awarded or requested from TNC to maintain the ORDSS)</p>

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-2	
Action Description	<p>Action IAG-2: Implement invasive annual-grass management plans for each PAC that identify priority areas for <i>prevention</i>.</p> <p>Action IAG-2-1 Prioritize proactive herbicide treatments as a prevention strategy in recently burned areas, particularly areas with low resistance and resilience that are proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat. Prioritize sites within 4 miles of leks (active or pending) and sites <2 miles from "key habitat," defined as areas with 75% breeding bird density and where sagebrush land cover is >65%.</p> <p>Action IAG-2-1a Remove administrative and policy barriers that delay herbicide treatments from the most effective implementation timeframe.</p> <p>Action IAG-2-2 Conduct systematic and strategic surveys to detect areas of expanding invasive annual grasses and expedite reporting and treatment of new infestations (see section 7b (vii) of SO 3336 Implementation Plan).</p> <p>Action IAG-2-3 In priority invasive annual-grass prevention sites, limit disturbance within and around all remaining large, intact sagebrush patches, particularly in low-elevation sites with low resistance and resilience, because these sites are highly vulnerable to annual-grass invasion once desirable species are removed or disturbed.</p> <p>Action IAG-2-4 Require general techniques to prevent human-caused spread of annual invasive grasses resulting from road maintenance (e.g., blading), construction/development, and OHV activity, as well as during fire suppression activities.</p> <p>Action IAG-2-5 Suppress fire in areas within or proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat that are particularly vulnerable to annual-grass invasion.</p>

⁴² Agency package: ODFW-130.

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-2	
	<p>Action IAG-2-6 Utilize grazing management techniques that increase the resilience of systems to invasive annual-grass establishment.</p> <p>Action IAG-2-7 Monitor areas impacted by ground-disturbing activities for a minimum of 3 years and apply herbicide to new invasions of annual grasses expeditiously.</p>
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<p>(Note: Specific objectives will be developed/refined in LIT regional work plans. Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treat a minimum of 80-100% of recently burned acres (depending on the scale and severity of annual fire seasons) as a prevention strategy on private, state, and federal lands (prioritized in areas with low resistance and resilience proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat). • Complete 100% of herbicide treatments during the most effective timeframe. • Complete systematic surveys annually. • Treat 100% of all newly identified infestations during the fall following identification. • Require and implement prevention plans for 100% of the human activities identified to have the potential to spread invasive annual grasses. • Suppress 100% of fires in areas proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat that are at risk of annual-grass invasion. • Develop grazing management plans for 100% of acres enrolled in CCAAs/CCAs to reduce spread of invasive annual grasses as enrollment occurs. • Develop and implement monitoring and adaptive management plans for 100% of all disturbed areas.
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual documentation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Acres treated in recently burned areas on private, state, and federal lands ○ Systematic surveys and follow-up treatments of newly identified infestations ○ Inclusion in fuels/fire suppression protocol of Implementation Recommendations and Guidelines (IRGs) for fuels management and fire suppression activities to prevent human-caused spread of annual invasive grasses ○ Inclusion of IRGs for development and construction projects to prevent human-caused spread of annual invasive grasses as a requirement of permits ○ Suppressed fire ignitions ○ Grazing management plans developed/implemented ○ Monitoring and adaptive management actions undertaken in disturbed areas

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-2				
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ARS• BLM• BLM FIAT• County weed depts.• CWMAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• DSL• Local road districts• NRCS• ODA• ODFW	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• ODOT• OSU• OSWB• OWEB• Private landowners	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• RFPAs• Sage-Grouse Habitat Program Manager• SWCDs• USFS• Watershed councils
Timeline	Preventive treatments in burned areas: Ongoing, as needed Systematic surveys for invasive annual grasses: Annually Treatment of new infestations: During the fall following identification Incorporation of IRGs in fuels/fire suppression protocol: June 2015		Incorporation of IRGs as requirement of development/ construction permits: Ongoing Fire suppression in prioritized areas: As needed Development of grazing management plans: Ongoing, as CCAA/CCA enrollment and SSPs occur Development of monitoring and adaptive management plans for disturbed areas: Concurrent with new disturbance	
Funding	Identified funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• \$100K funded to ODA (2015-2017) for Oregon Invasive Species Council (sage-grouse) for overall response to invasive species, including restoration and protection⁴³• OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)⁴⁴• \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)⁴⁵• \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)⁴⁶• \$2.7M appropriated to BLM for habitat improvements in S. Warners (1 FTE position)⁴⁷• \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)⁴⁸			

⁴³ Agency package: ODA-320.

⁴⁴ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

⁴⁵ Agency package: ODFW-132.

⁴⁶ Agency package: ODFW-105.

⁴⁷ Combined DOI Resilient Landscapes project funds (\$1.56M), FIAT funds (\$935K), and district funds.

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-2	
	<p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator; ongoing DSL funding (state lands); ongoing ODA funding (Noxious Weed Program and SWCD Program).</p> <p><i>Related funds (for fire suppression in priority areas for invasive annual-grass prevention):</i> \$1.6M funded to ODF (2015-2017) for RFPA support (1.5 FTE positions)⁴⁹</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> See funds identified to monitor conservation actions, landscape-level condition, and site-specific habitat condition.</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM \$15M (FY16) Greater sag-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)
Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-3	
Action Description	<p>Action IAG-3: Implement invasive plant management plans for each PAC that identify priority areas for <i>treatment and restoration</i>.</p> <p>Action IAG-3-1 Prioritize treatment and restoration of invaded sites with the greatest potential to succeed (e.g., moderate infestations or areas with inadequate perennial species and medium-to-high resistance and resilience) that are proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize sites within 4 miles of leks (active or pending) and sites <2 miles from "key habitat," defined as areas with 75% breeding bird density and where sagebrush land cover is >65%. Over time, expand treatment and restoration activities outward from key habitat patches. <p>Action IAG-3-2 Prioritize restoration efforts in recently burned areas, particularly areas that are proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize sites within 4 miles of leks (active or pending) and sites <2 miles from "key habitat," defined as areas with 75% breeding bird density and where sagebrush land cover is >65%. <p>Action IAG-3-3 Implement successful novel techniques such as "precision restoration" and bio-controls (e.g., ACK55/soil</p>

⁴⁸ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

⁴⁹ Agency package: ODF-119 and ODF-120.

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-3		
	<p>bacterium <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i>, D7 <i>Rhizobacterium</i> strain), in areas where they are expected to have demonstrated efficacy.</p> <p>Action IAG -3-4 Monitor restoration projects for effectiveness and repeat rehabilitation activities if performance objectives are not met. (See related monitoring actions MON-2 and MON-4.)</p>	
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)	
Objectives	<p>(Note: Specific objectives will be developed/refined in LIT regional work plans. Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treat and restore a TBD % of prioritized areas annually. • Implement restoration efforts in a minimum of 80-100% of recently burned areas in priority areas (depending on the scale and severity of annual fire seasons). • Pending resource availability and completion of scientific trials, implement novel restoration techniques in 100% of areas where they are expected to be effective. • Develop and implement monitoring and adaptive management plans for 100% of all restoration areas 	
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual documentation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Acres receiving restoration treatments in prioritized areas on private, state, and federal lands ○ Efforts that employ “precision restoration techniques” ○ Monitoring and adaptive management of restoration projects 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARS • BLM • BLM FIAT • County weed depts. • CWMAs • DSL • Local road districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS • ODA • ODFW • ODOT • OSU • OSWB • OWEB • Private landowners • RFPAs • Sage-Grouse Habitat Program Manager • SWCDs • USFS • Watershed councils
Timeline	Restoration treatment in prioritized areas: TBD	Monitoring and adaptive management: Annually

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-3	
Funding	<p>Identified funds: (shared with actions IAG-2 and -4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$100K funded to ODA (2015-2017) for Oregon Invasive Species Council (sage-grouse) for overall response to invasive species, including restoration and protection⁵⁰ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)⁵¹ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)⁵² • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)⁵³ • \$2.7M appropriated to BLM for habitat improvements in S. Warners (1 FTE position)⁵⁴ • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)⁵⁵ <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator; ongoing DSL funding (state lands); ongoing ODA funding (Noxious Weed Program and SWCD Program).</p> <p><i>Related funds (for fire suppression in priority areas for invasive annual-grass prevention):</i> \$1.6M funded to ODF (2015-2017) for RFPA support (1.5 FTE positions)⁵⁶</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> See funds identified to monitor conservation actions, landscape-level condition, and site-specific habitat condition.</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM \$15M (FY16) Greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-4

⁵⁰ Agency package: ODA-320.

⁵¹ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

⁵² Agency package: ODFW-132.

⁵³ Agency package: ODFW-105.

⁵⁴ Combined DOI Resilient Landscapes project funds (\$1.56M), FIAT funds (\$935K), and district funds.

⁵⁵ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

⁵⁶ Agency package: ODF-119 and ODF-120.

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-4		
Action Description	<p>Action IAG-4: Implement invasive plant management plans for each PAC that identify priority areas to <i>contain</i> existing patches of invasive weeds.</p> <p>Action IAG-4-1 Implement and maintain containment programs for large infestations that may include the following techniques: (1) border spraying; (2) establishing a barrier to expansion with aggressive perennial species that are competitive with invasive weeds; (3) biological control agents; and/or (4) targeted grazing.</p> <p>Action IAG-4-2 Prioritize containment where large infestations of invasive annual grasses threaten highly valuable sage-grouse habitat. Prioritize sites within 4 miles of leks (active or pending) and sites <2 miles from "key habitat," defined as areas with 75% breeding bird density and where sagebrush land cover is >65%.</p>	
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)	
Objectives	<p>(Note: Specific objectives will be developed/refined in LIT regional work plans. Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contain TBD % of prioritized areas annually. • Repeat containment efforts as required (adaptive management). 	
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual documentation of acres treated as a containment strategy in prioritized areas on private, state, and federal lands 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • BLM FIAT • County weed boards • DSL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS • ODA • ODFW • Private landowners • Sage-Grouse Habitat Program Manager • SWCDs • USFS
Timeline	<p>Containment treatment in prioritized areas:</p> <p>Date TBD</p>	
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$100K funded to ODA (2015-2017) for Oregon Invasive Species Council (sage-grouse) for overall response to invasive species, including restoration and protection⁵⁷ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)⁵⁸ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)⁵⁹ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)⁶⁰ 	

⁵⁷ Agency package: ODA-320.

⁵⁸ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

⁵⁹ Agency package: ODFW-132.

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-4	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$2.7M appropriated to BLM for habitat improvements in S. Warners (1 FTE position)⁶¹ • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)⁶² <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator; ongoing DSL funding (state lands); ongoing ODA funding (Noxious Weed Program and SWCD Program).</p> <p><i>Related funds (for fire suppression in priority areas for invasive annual-grass prevention):</i> \$1.6M funded to ODF (2015-2017) for RFP support (1.5 FTE positions)⁶³</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> See funds identified to monitor conservation actions, landscape-level condition, and site-specific habitat condition.</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM \$15M (FY16) Greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-5	
Action Description	<p>Action IAG-5: Develop grazing management plans for lands and allotments enrolled in CCAAs and CCAs, as well as other Farm Bill programs that employ grazing techniques that maintain or improve the perennial native grass and shrub community and prevent spread of annual invasive grasses.</p> <p>Action IAG-5-1 Assess pastures/allotments dominated by Wyoming big sagebrush and prioritize implementation of proper grazing management plans for those with documented improper grazing impacts to native perennial grass and forbs, and soil biotic crusts.</p> <p>Action IAG-5-2 Identify allotments with invasive annual grasses and implement control measures to prevent the transfer of invasive species via livestock.</p> <p>Action IAG-5-3 Evaluate and treat heavily used areas (e.g., water sources or transfer areas) for non-native grass invasions and</p>

⁶⁰ Agency package: ODFW-105.

⁶¹ Combined DOI Resilient Landscapes project funds (\$1.56M), FIAT funds (\$935K), and district funds.

⁶² Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

⁶³ Agency package: ODF-119 and ODF-120.

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-5		
	<p>prioritize for treatment and containment actions.</p> <p>Action IAG-5-4 Utilize targeted livestock grazing to reduce annual invasive plants, increase desirable perennial grasses and forbs, and maintain and increase desired habitat structure.</p>	
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)	
Objectives	<p>(Note: Specific objectives will be developed/refined in LIT regional work plans and/or CCAA/CCA site-specific plans. Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop grazing management plans for 100% of acres enrolled in CCAAs/CCAs (or other Farm Bill programs) to reduce spread of invasive annual grasses as enrollment occurs. • Assess TBD % of prioritized allotments annually. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implement control measures in 100% of areas identified to have impacts from improper grazing annually. • Assess TBD % of heavily used areas annually. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implement control measures in 100% of heavily used areas with invasive annual grasses. • Utilize targeted livestock grazing in 100% of the areas in which such a strategy is expected to successfully reduce invasive annual grasses. • Document invasive annual-grass reduction and understory perennial grass and shrub recovery in all treatment areas (using metrics TBD). 	
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual documentation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Allotments with impacts resulting from improper grazing ○ Control measures implemented on allotments with invasive annual grasses ○ Heavily used areas treated to control invasive annual-grass spread ○ Allotments where grazing is used for invasive annual-grass control, including effectiveness reporting ○ Monitoring and adaptive management of grazing management plans and prevention/treatment/containment projects 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • NRCS • Permittees enrolled in CCAs with grazing management as part of allotment SSPs • Private landowners enrolled in CCAAs with grazing management as part of SSPs • SWCDs 	
Timeline	<p>Development of grazing management plans:</p> <p>Ongoing, as CCAA/CCA enrollment and SSPs occur</p>	<p>Containment measures implemented in allotments with invasive annual grasses:</p> <p>Date TBD</p>

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-5	
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)⁶⁴ • Ongoing DSL funding (state lands CCAA) <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • BLM \$15M (FY16) Greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-6	
Action Description	<p>Action IAG-6: Support infrastructure, resources, and research that will enhance annual grass prevention and habitat restoration (see section 7b (vii) in SO 3336 Implementation Plan).</p> <p>Action IAG-6-1 Support ongoing research and implementation of pilot efforts evaluating annual-grass prevention and control techniques, as well as precision restoration technologies seeking to improve the likelihood of success when actively restoring sagebrush sites. Advance treatments that employ these new techniques and technologies (e.g., ACK55/soil bacterium <i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i>, D7 <i>Rhizobacterium</i> strain) in order to test their effectiveness, and expand to a wider scale where effective and where re-establishment of perennial grasses is likely to occur.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-specific Management)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify funds TBD for prevention and restoration technology research. • Identify funds TBD for local, native seed and/or plant collection and storage. • Advance project efforts that utilize and test new techniques and technologies, and scale up where appropriate.
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of funding identified for prevention; restoration technology research; and local, native seed stock • Documentation of the quantity of local, native seed and/or plants available locally, as well as efforts and opportunities to expand local capacity • Number of projects (and acres) addressed with new techniques and technologies, as well as project unit costs and effectiveness relative to other approaches
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARS • BLM • TNC

⁶⁴ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-6		
Timeline	Funding requests submitted for research: Ongoing	Native seed facility with TBD quantity of seed available established: Date TBD
Funding	Identified funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OWEB (min. \$10 mil. over 10 years) • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position) • DSL ongoing funding (state lands) • ODA ongoing funding (Noxious Weed Program and SWCD Program) • Funds TBD identified for ARS • Funds TBD identified for local, native seed collection/banks 	

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-7		
Action Description	Action IAG-7: Create “grass banks” or reserve forage areas as alternative grazing opportunities to provide rest for over-utilized rangelands or allotments, or to be utilized during drought conditions, post-fire, or after restoration work. Do so in a manner compatible with livestock operations locally. Action IAG-7-1 Remove administrative barriers to establishing “grass banks” on federal land. Action IAG-7-2 Maintain fencing and other improvements on “grass banks” so they are ready for use as need emerges. Action IAG-7-3 Assess “grass banks” to determine whether, if ungrazed, they are contributing to fire risk/fuel loads, and use grazing as a management tool to reduce fuel loads if required.	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)	
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop policies to facilitate converting relinquished allotments into grass banks. • Designate a minimum of TBD acres to be grass banks by 20XX (date TBD). • Conduct routine maintenance on infrastructure in grass bank allotments. 	
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the number of allotments reserved for grass banks and the quantity of cattle that can be accommodated during restoration activities elsewhere • Administrative policy developed to facilitate grass bank establishment 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL 	
Timeline	Policy completion: Spring 2016	Grass bank(s) established: Opportunisticly , as grazing permits are relinquished

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-7	
Funding	Identified funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM state office funds for policy work • Ongoing BLM district funds • Ongoing DSL funds

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-8	
Action Description	<p>Action IAG-8: Remove administrative or procedural barriers to invasive annual-grass management.</p> <p>Action IAG-8-1 Place cheatgrass on Oregon’s noxious weed list.</p> <p>Action IAG-8-2 Support policy changes to remove the court-ordered injunction prohibiting the use of herbicides on all federally administered lands in Oregon.</p> <p>Action IAG-8-3 Support restructuring of the post-fire emergency stabilization and restoration (ESR) funding scheme to ensure that adequate funds are available for long-term post-fire habitat management (see section 7b (v) in SO 3336 Implementation Plan).</p> <p>Action IAG-8-4 Support development of a post-fire emergency stabilization and restoration program for private lands.</p> <p>Action IAG-8-5 Coordinate with state and federal agencies to develop consistent procedures and policies for the treatment of noxious and invasive plants, chemical usage, and timing.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add cheatgrass to Oregon’s noxious weed list. • Complete all environmental assessments (EAs) to support removal of court-ordered injunction on herbicide use on federal lands. • Develop private land ESR program. • Restructure federal ESR program. • Align state and federal policies and procedures for invasive annual-grass treatment.
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of cheatgrass to noxious weed lists • Removal of court-ordered injunction on herbicide use on federal lands • New private land ESR program created • Restructuring of federal ESR completed • Alignment of federal and state policies/procedures completed
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • ODA • County weed boards
Timeline	Updating of noxious weed lists: January 2016 Development of private land ESR: 20XX (date TBD)

Invasive Annual Grasses: Action IAG-8	
	<div> Removal of court-ordered injunction: January 2016 </div> <div> Policy alignment: June 2016 </div> <div> ESR restructuring: June 2015 </div>
Funding	Identified funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing ODA funds for policy work • Ongoing BLM state office funds for policy work

Wildfire: Action WF-1	
Action Description	<p>Action WF-1: Implement best practice, proactive <i>fire risk reduction</i> strategies to reduce the threat wildfire poses to sage-grouse habitat in PACs and important areas of connectivity.</p> <p>Action WF-1-1 Identify and map priority habitat areas (e.g., sagebrush communities with low resilience to disturbance and low resistance to invasive annual grasses associated with warm and dry soil temperature and moisture regimes), where implementation of proactive management strategies should be prioritized. As part of this prioritization effort, emphasis should be placed on areas with high wildfire risk potential (e.g., areas dominated by invasive annual grasses with low resistance and resilience) that are within or proximal to areas highly valuable to sage-grouse (e.g., intact habitat in or adjacent to PAC areas or important to connectivity).</p> <p>Action WF-1-2 Based on the above prioritization effort, pre-position resources near PACs when conditions are conducive to large fire growth (e.g., high fire severity conditions, forecasted lightning) in order to ensure rapid response to ignitions. Coordinate among fire response agencies and entities to ensure that adequate equipment and funds are available for pre-positioning efforts.</p> <p>Action WF-1-3 Restrict unnecessary motorized travel (while maintaining access to livestock for grazers) and ban campfires in sage-grouse habitat during high fire severity conditions to reduce the risk of accidental ignitions.</p> <p>Action WF-1-4 Reduce the risk of vehicle or human-caused wildfires and the spread of exotic species by planting perennial vegetation (e.g., green strips) paralleling road rights-of-way.</p> <p>Action WF-1-5 Take steps to prevent future degradation and address currently degraded sagebrush systems (as described in the “Juniper Encroachment” and “Invasive Annual Grasses” sections above) to promote habitat resilience and reduce the impacts of wildfire in sage-grouse habitat.</p>

Wildfire: Action WF-1	
	<p>Action WF-1-6 Conduct fuel management treatments, including those identified below, designed to protect existing high-quality sagebrush habitat, modify fire behavior, restore native plants, and create habitat resilience and landscape patterns that benefit sage-grouse (see Section 7b (iii) in SO 3336 Implementation Plan).</p> <p>Action WF-1-6a Reduce juniper fuel loads in areas adjacent to valuable sage-grouse habitat. Prioritize Phases I and II juniper stands within 4 miles of known leks. Prioritize Phase III juniper stands after Phases I and II have been addressed. Prioritize Phase III areas in or adjacent to priority areas (PACs) that provide adequate sage-grouse habitat (e.g., sagebrush land cover >25%), particularly in areas with medium-to-high resistance and resilience.</p> <p>Action WF-1-6b Strategically use livestock grazing to reduce fuel loads in years with high accumulation of fuels to reduce wildfire risk, using grazing management that maintains or improves the native plant community health (e.g., dormant season use). (See related Action WF-3-4c.)</p> <p>Action WF-1-6c Establish fuel breaks and/or green strips in strategic locations to compartmentalize future fires, thereby reducing the potential acres burned and fire risk to sage-grouse habitat. Strategically place fuel breaks where high fire risk coincides with sage-grouse habitat with the lowest potential for post-fire recovery (e.g., areas with low-to-moderate resistance and resilience). Monitor and maintain fuel breaks to prevent annual-grass invasion in these disturbed areas and to determine if species planted in green strips spread beyond fuel breaks.</p> <p>When designing fuel breaks, consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The potential fire containment benefits versus the area of sage-grouse habitat lost in the fuel break footprint 2. Existing roads or utility corridors that could be widened with mowing, green-stripping, or black-stripping 3. Natural fuel breaks 4. Prevailing winds that may influence the placement of fuel breaks (e.g., prioritize east-to-west roads or place on south side of road if only one side is mowed); use of fire-resistant perennial species (e.g., crested wheatgrass or forage kochia) as an effective means to slow the spread of fire while preventing the establishment of non-native annual grasses. Consider the risk of these species spreading beyond seeded fuel breaks. <p>Action WF-1-6d In areas identified to be at very high risk for wildfire, with dense sagebrush that may contribute to fuel loads and where patch removal of sagebrush has been determined to not have a negative impact on sage-grouse, create a mosaic of sagebrush density to intersperse areas of low fuel continuity (less than 25 acres in size and making up less than 15% of the treatment block) among areas of desired shrub density required by sage-grouse (see Appendix 4 for desired sagebrush densities).</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	(Note: Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.)

Wildfire: Action WF-1		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create GIS layers with polygons spatially representing priority areas for fire risk reduction (note: coarse layers have already been created by FIAT, coordinated by the BLM for Focal Habitat and Planning Areas specific to that process). • Complete TBD % of green-stripping, prescribed fires, fuels reduction activities, and/or fuel breaks identified in FIAT assessment areas in Oregon annually (see related objectives for invasive annual-grass and juniper removal). • Reduce overall average annual fire size by TBD %. • Reduce human-caused fires by TBD % by implementing additional motorized travel and campfire bans and green-stripping along roads. • Decrease response time by TBD % by pre-positioning fire suppression resources. 	
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed GIS layers with polygons spatially representing priority areas for fire risk reduction (Note: coarse layers have already been created by FIAT teams coordinated by the BLM.) • Annual summary report/review documenting and evaluating the effectiveness of proactive fire risk reduction steps implemented by the BLM, ODF, and RFPAs, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pre-positioning of resources ○ Motorized travel and campfire bans ○ Fuel management treatments. • Annual documentation of fuel reduction activities including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Juniper removal within 4 mi of leks on private, state, and federal lands ○ Spot treatments to create mosaic of sagebrush density ○ Strategic livestock grazing ○ Fuel break development ○ Invasive annual-grass treatment. 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • BLM FIAT • DSL • LITs • ODF • Private landowners • RFPAs • USFS 	
Timeline	GIS layer prioritizing risk reduction locations (FIAT): June 2015 Pre-positioning of fire resources: Ongoing during fire season Annual summary report/review detailing fire-risk reduction steps: Annually in November	Completion of green-stripping, prescribed fires, and/or fuel breaks, per FIAT assessments: Annually Summary of fuels reduction activities: Annually See also juniper and invasive annual-grass performance measures and timelines.

Wildfire: Action WF-1	
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$100K funded to ODA (2015-2017) for Oregon Invasive Species Council (sage-grouse) for overall response to invasive species, including restoration and protection⁶⁵ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)⁶⁶ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)⁶⁷ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)⁶⁸ • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)⁶⁹ • Ongoing BLM Fire Operations funds • \$1.6M funded to ODF (2015-2017) for RFPA support (1.5 FTE positions)⁷⁰ • In-kind contributions from RFPA volunteers <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator; ongoing DSL funding (state lands); ongoing ODA funding (Noxious Weed Program and SWCD Program).</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> See funds identified to monitor conservation actions, landscape-level condition, and site-specific habitat condition.</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • Funds TBD (e.g., other new BLM funds for fire suppression)

Wildfire: Action WF-2	
Action Description	<p>Action WF-2: Focus fire <i>suppression</i> activities in prioritized sage-grouse habitat within the framework of the federal and state wildland fire policies (see Section 7 b (ii) in SO 3336 Implementation Plan).</p>

⁶⁵ Agency package: ODA-320.

⁶⁶ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

⁶⁷ Agency package: ODFW-132.

⁶⁸ Agency package: ODFW-105.

⁶⁹ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

⁷⁰ Agency package: ODF-119 and ODF-120.

Wildfire: Action WF-2

Action WF-2-1 Utilize trained resource advisors (biologists with sage-grouse expertise) to assist in prioritizing fire suppression activities so that valuable sage-grouse habitat is protected. Involve sage-grouse expertise with fire operations expertise as early and continuously as possible in fire suppression/ incident command efforts so as to integrate input on sage-grouse protection into the mapping and implementation of fire response efforts.

Action WF-2-2 After protection of life and property, including livestock, prioritize sagebrush habitats within 4 miles of a lek for fire suppression. Further prioritize suppression to prevent fire from entering valuable habitat (PAC and low-density) that is most vulnerable to invasion by annual grasses (e.g., Wyoming big sagebrush communities, areas with low resistance and resilience).

Action WF-2-3 Enhance fire response planning and coordination in sage-grouse habitat.

Action WF-2-3a Utilize mobile technology to ensure that incident management teams can access dynamically updated spatial data that can assist in prioritizing sage-grouse habitat protection during fire suppression.

Action WF-2-3b Ensure coordination among the BLM, RFPAs, and rural fire protection districts (RFPDs) to increase initial attack and extended attack capability and effectiveness.

Action WF-2-3c Agencies should focus an appropriate combination of resources to quickly arrive at new ignitions, combined with effective suppression strategies supported by appropriate tactical resources, also known as Speed and Focus, a principle of fire suppression actions.

Action WF-2-3d Reallocate fire response resources (crews, equipment, etc.) to important sage-grouse habitats, while maintaining adequate resources as required to protect life and property. Identify where resources are lacking and provide those resources to decrease response time to fires in sage-grouse habitats.

Action WF-2-3e To the extent possible, locate wildfire suppression facilities (e.g., base camps, spike camps, drop points, staging areas, helibases) in areas where physical disturbance to sage-grouse habitat can be minimized. Preferred areas for suppression facilities may include previously disturbed areas, grasslands, areas near roads/trails, or other areas where there is existing disturbance or minimal sagebrush cover.

Action WF-2-4 During fire suppression, use tactics that will retain the most sage-grouse habitat, including those listed below.

Action WF-2-4a Retain unburned areas of sage-grouse habitat (including interior islands and patches between roads and the fire perimeter), unless there is a compelling safety, resource protection, or control objective at risk. Consider the use of aircraft and mechanized equipment to protect these islands. This may require additional suppression (e.g., aircraft and mechanized equipment) and resources for holding and mop-up. Fire managers and resource advisors should proactively anticipate and plan for these needs early in the incident.

Action WF-2-4b Judiciously use heavy equipment and limit brush removal to the level necessary to expeditiously extinguish the

Wildfire: Action WF-2		
	<p>fire. Use existing fuel breaks, such as roads, utility corridors, or areas with fire-resistant vegetation, to minimize fire spread. Establish additional defensible fire lines in areas where (1) effectiveness is high; (2) fire risk is likely; and (3) negative impacts (fragmentation) are minimal.</p> <p>Action WF-2-4c Use direct attack tactics when they are safe and effective to reduce the amount of burned habitat. Direct attack supported by any available mechanized equipment (e.g., bulldozer, tractor with blade, aerial drops) is the most efficient at reducing the overall size of rangeland fires, thereby keeping habitat intact.</p>	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)	
Objectives	<p>(Note: Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Train TBD (number of) resource advisors annually and utilize them 100% during fires in sage-grouse habitat. • Prevent fire 100% of the time from burning in priority habitats. • Achieve effective communication and coordination among fire responders 100% of the time during fire suppression. • Reduce the sagebrush impacted by fire or fire suppression activities by TBD % through the use of tactics identified in Action 2-4. 	
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual identification and training of resource advisors • Procurement and implementation of mobile technology by incident management teams • Documentation of completed opportunities to enhance or improve suppression capability in and around emphasis areas, as identified during FIAT planning, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Asset acquisition ○ Coordination activities. • Annual summary report/review documenting and evaluating the effectiveness of fire suppression activities implemented by the BLM, ODF, and RFPAs, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Coordination among BLM and RFPAs before and during fire season ○ Acres of sage-grouse habitat impacted by or protected from wildfire during fire season ○ Allocation of fire response resources ○ Use of best practices to retain unburned areas, develop fuel breaks, and site wildfire suppression facilities, etc. 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • BLM FIAT • DSL • ODA • ODF • Private landowners • RFPAs • USFS 	
Timeline	<p>GIS layer prioritizing risk reduction locations: June 2015</p> <p>Identification and training of resource advisors</p>	<p>Completion of FIAT-identified opportunities to enhance or improve suppression capabilities: Date TBD</p>

Wildfire: Action WF-2	
	<p>June annually Annual summary report/review detailing fire suppression activities: Annually in November</p> <p>Procurement and incorporation of mobile technology by incident management teams: June 2015</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM Fire Operations funds • \$1.6M funded to ODF (2015-2017) for RFPA support (1.5 FTE positions)⁷¹ • In-kind contributions from RFPA volunteers <p><i>Related funds:</i> ongoing DSL funding (state lands)</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds TBD (e.g., other new BLM funds for fire suppression)

Wildfire: Action WF-3	
Action Description	<p>Action WF-3: <i>Build capacity and support planning and policies</i> so that state and federal agencies are best equipped to reduce the threat of wildfire in sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p>Action WF-3-1 Identify areas of sage-grouse habitat where fire response capacity is lacking or weak due to remoteness, difficulty of terrain, or lack of RFPA coverage, and implement an approach to improve response capabilities.</p> <p>Action WF-3-1a Expand RFPAs to fully cover the extent of priority sage-grouse habitat in Oregon or provide contracted or other capacity to cover currently uncovered lands.</p> <p>Action WF-3-1b Provide funding for contracted assistance, other partnership capacity, trainings, or other approaches that will improve fire response capacity, capability, and effectiveness in and adjacent to priority sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p>Action WF-3-2 Support pre-fire planning activities that will ensure readiness and swift decision making during the fire season (see Section 7b(i) of SO 3336 Implementation Plan (Secretary of the Interior 2015)).</p> <p>Action WF-3-2a Compile greater sage-grouse information into statewide tool boxes. Tool boxes will contain maps, lists of</p>

⁷¹ Agency package: ODF-119 and ODF-120.

Wildfire: Action WF-3

resource advisors, contact information, local guidance, and other relevant information for each BLM district.

Action WF-3-2b Preload maps of sage-grouse PAC and low-density habitat as well as connectivity corridors into all dispatch plans (e.g., WildCAD, run-cards).

Action WF-3-2c Inform fire duty officers about sage-grouse management objectives and PAC, low-density, and connectivity habitat to be prioritized in the event of a fire.

Action WF-3-2d Provide education to fire suppression personnel about the need for and value of protecting sagebrush landscapes.

Action WF-3-2e Annually review district fire management plans (Phase I) to incorporate new sage-grouse information (e.g., lek and habitat maps) and fire suppression resources (including location of fuel breaks, water sources, etc.) to ensure that up-to-date information is available and distributed to fire suppression personnel for setting wildfire suppression priorities and initial attack planning.

Action WF-3-2f Train resource advisors to assist in working with incident commanders and incident management teams to prioritize sage-grouse considerations during fire suppression activities.

Action WF-3-3 Support policies of and collaborate with all wildfire protection entities (Including BLM, ODF, and RFPAs) to promote integration across agencies and jurisdictions to provide seamless fire suppression during fires.

Action WF-3-3a Implement policy changes that integrate and coordinate more fire suppression resources, such as Air National Guard Mobile Airborne Firefighting Units and rangeland fire protection associations (RFPAs). Local resources such as RFPAs are often closest to ignition sites, knowledgeable of the landscape and infrastructure, and able to quickly mobilize. Optimize engagement of these resources during critical periods such as initial attack and in communicating with federal incident command teams to ensure that all parties are aware of what local conditions to avoid or take advantage of during suppression efforts.

Action WF-3-3b Encourage RFPAs to adopt minimum personnel training and equipment standards to ensure optimum coordination among BLM, RFPAs, and RFPDs across ownership boundaries and to most effectively achieve fire suppression and management outcomes.

Action WF-3-3c Conduct interagency training exercises with local, state, and federal agencies to ensure and optimize safety, coordination, communication, and effectiveness during fire management operations.

Action WF-3-4 Support policies of and collaborate with the BLM, USFS, and DSL to minimize administrative barriers to implementing fire prevention activities.

Action WF-3-4a Support administrative policies to implement habitat management activities, such as fire prevention efforts, that maintain habitat values associated with federal lands with special designations (e.g., Wilderness Study Areas, Areas of Critical

Wildfire: Action WF-3	
	<p>Environmental Concern).</p> <p>Action WF-3-4b Build flexibility into grazing permits on public lands so that grazing intensity may be adjusted during periods of low or high grass productivity (See related Action WF-1-6b).</p> <p>Action WF-3-5 Build capacity so that agencies and entities responsible for fire suppression have adequate resources to take appropriate actions.</p> <p>Action WF-3-5a Identify funds to upgrade or construct additional airports outside sage-grouse habitat that meet the requirements of single-engine air tankers to shorten response and turn-around times for suppression aircraft.</p> <p>Action WF-3-5b Identify funding to acquire additional fire-fighting resources where needed, including communication and other equipment as well as contracted support and partnerships. Consider establishing new incident attack centers in or adjacent to PACs.</p> <p>Action WF-3-5c Identify existing water sources and strategically develop additional water sources in priority sage-grouse habitats that (a) have high wildfire risk and (b) are >7 miles from an existing source. Pursue development of water sources that will not increase mosquito breeding areas.</p> <p>Action WF-3-5d Identify existing travel routes and primitive roads that, if upgraded, would minimally increase disturbance to sage-grouse habitat while affording decreased fire response time and reducing the need for cross-country travel during fire suppression. Incorporate strategies, such as locked gates and seasonal road closures, to restrict travel and, thereby, disturbance to sage-grouse, on any upgraded roads.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<p>(Note: Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create GIS layers with polygons spatially representing priority areas to expand fire response capacity (note: coarse layers have already been created by FIAT, coordinated by the BLM for Focal Habitat and Planning Areas specific to that process). • Secure \$\$ funds to meet needs for enhanced fire response capacity. • Increase fire response efficiency by TBD % through pre-planning activities. • Eliminate all administrative barriers to seamless integration across agencies • Complete TBD % of identified water development and route upgrades/enhancement activities annually.
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed GIS layers with polygons spatially representing priority areas to expand fire response capacity (note: coarse layers have already been created by FIAT teams coordinated by the BLM.) • Funding acquired to enhance fire response capacity • Completion of pre-fire planning activities including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of statewide sage-grouse tool boxes (to be updated annually)

Wildfire: Action WF-3		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annual preloading of sage-grouse habitat into all dispatch plans ○ Annual training of duty officers on sage-grouse habitat priorities ○ Annual training of resource advisors ○ Annual review of district fire management plans ○ Interagency training exercises ● Annual summary report/review documenting and evaluating the effectiveness of the pre-fire planning activities listed above and implemented by the BLM, ODF, and RFPAs ● Revised policies that promote integration across agencies and minimize administrative barriers ● Completion of TBD % of water development and travel route upgrades identified in FIAT assessment areas in Oregon annually 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● BLM ● BLM FIAT ● DSL ● LITs ● ODF ● RFPAs ● USFS 	
Timeline	<div> <div> GIS layer prioritizing areas to increase fire response capacity: June 2015 </div> <div> Funds acquisition for enhanced fire response: July 2015 </div> <div> Statewide sage-grouse tool boxes developed: June 2015 </div> <div> Pre-fire planning activities/trainings: May, annually </div> </div> <div> Annual summary report/review detailing pre-fire planning activities: Annually in November </div> <div> Policy revisions relating to agency integration: Date TBD </div> <div> Water developments and travel route upgrades: Date TBD </div>	
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ongoing BLM Fire Operations funds ● \$1.6M funded to ODF (2015-2017) for RFPAs support (1.5 FTE positions)⁷² ● Ongoing BLM state office funds for policy work ● In-kind contributions from RFPAs volunteers <p><i>Related funds:</i> ongoing DSL funding (state lands)</p>	

⁷² Agency package: ODF-119 and ODF-120.

Wildfire: Action WF-3	
	<p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD (e.g., other new BLM funds for fire readiness capacity)

Wildfire: Action WF-4	
Action Description	<p>Action WF-4: Coordinate with private and federal land managers to prioritize <i>post-fire rehabilitation</i> and ensure that adequate resources are available for emergency stabilization and ongoing restoration activities to protect, maintain, or restore sage-grouse habitat within PAC areas and to restore connectivity between PAC areas (see sections 7b (v) and 7b (vi) of SO3336 Implementation Plan).</p> <p>Action WF-4-1 Prioritize herbicide treatments as an invasive weed/annual-grass prevention strategy in recently burned areas, particularly areas with low resistance and resilience that are proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat. Use best available science to strategically prioritize herbicide treatments in areas that will provide the greatest benefit to sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action WF-4-2 Prioritize post-fire rehabilitation and longer-term restoration efforts in areas that are proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat. Use best available science to strategically prioritize longer-term post-fire rehabilitation investments in areas that will provide the greatest benefit to sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action WF-4-3 Utilize best practice management techniques to prevent invasive annual grasses and restore burned areas as described in the “Invasive Annual Grasses” section above.</p> <p>Action WF-4-4 Coordinate with the BLM and USFWS to adapt Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ESR) and Burn Area Emergency Response (BAER) programs to meet the needs of large-scale fire rehabilitation in sage-grouse habitat areas (see sections 7b (v) and 7b (vi) of SO3336 Implementation Plan).</p> <p>Action WF-4-4a Revise ESR and BAER policy direction and administrative procedures to ensure that planning and implementation time periods (1) allow for immediate herbicide treatments where required and (2) are adequate to ensure strategic and effective use of funds for short- and long-term site rehabilitation and restoration success.</p> <p>Action WF-4-4b Allocate adequate funds through ESR and BAER to ensure that rehabilitation projects are monitored so that adaptive management techniques can be applied to foster project success.</p> <p>Action WF-4-4c Develop mechanisms within ESR and BAER plans to protect rehabilitation investments over time.</p> <p>Action WF-4-5 Develop mechanisms to ensure that timely and adequate funding is available for emergency stabilization and rehabilitation on private lands.</p> <p>Action WF-4-6 Monitor sage-grouse habitat utilization and/or population response to areas that have burned and to post-fire</p>

Wildfire: Action WF-4			
	restoration activities. (See related monitoring actions MON-2 and MON-4 .)		
Strategy Level	I (Large Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)		
Objectives	<p>(Note: Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete herbicide treatments on a minimum of 80-100% of recently burned acres (depending on the scale and severity of annual fire seasons) as a prevention strategy on private, state, and federal lands (prioritized in areas with low resistance and resilience proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat). • Complete 100% of herbicide treatments during the most effective timeframe. • Complete longer-term restoration efforts on a minimum of 80-100% of recently burned acres (depending on the scale and severity of annual fire seasons) as a prevention strategy on private, state, and federal lands (prioritized in areas with low resistance and resilience proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat). • Develop private land ESR program. • Restructure federal ESR program. • Develop and implement monitoring and adaptive management plans for 100% of all fire rehabilitation projects. • Document understory perennial grass and shrub recovery (using metrics TBD). • Continue Trout Creeks research investigating long-term sage-grouse response to wildfire. • Research objectives are documented elsewhere for current projects. • Objectives for new monitoring projects will be developed as research priorities emerge. 		
Monitoring and Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual documentation of acres treated as a prevention strategy in recently burned areas on private, state, and federal lands (prioritized in areas with low resistance and resilience proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat) • Annual documentation of acres receiving post-fire restoration treatments in prioritized areas on private, state, and federal lands • Finalization of ESR/BAER policy restructuring • Development of ESR program/policies for private lands • Progress reports submitted quarterly for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Trout Creek research investigating long-term sage-grouse response to wildfire ○ MS theses and PhD dissertations 		
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • BLM FIAT • LITs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS • ODA • ODF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODFW • OSU • OWEB
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RFPAs • SWCDs • USFS
Timeline	Preventive treatments in burned areas: Ongoing, as needed with initial herbicide treatment occurring the first fall after fire		
			Rest from livestock grazing: As needed

Wildfire: Action WF-4		
	<p>Post-fire rehabilitation restoration activities in burned areas: Ongoing, as needed</p> <p>Federal ESR policy restructuring: June 2015</p> <p>Development of ESR program for private lands: June 2016</p> <p>Grass bank(s) established: Opportunisticly, as grazing permits are relinquished</p>	<p>Monitoring of sage-grouse use of fire impacted areas:</p> <p>Phase 1 (Lee Foster, MS Candidate, Oregon State University) Trout Creeks research expected completion: December 2015</p> <p>Phase 2 (Catherine Engelman, PhD Candidate, Oregon State University) Trout Creeks research expected completion: 2018</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <p>For post-fire rehabilitation on federal lands:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM ESR funds are to be determined as need emerges. <p>Potential sources for post-fire rehabilitation on nonfederal lands include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$100K funded to ODA (2015-2017) for Oregon Invasive Species Council (sage-grouse) for overall response to invasive species, including restoration and protection⁷³ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)⁷⁴ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)⁷⁵ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)⁷⁶ • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)⁷⁷ <p>For policy work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$1.6M funded to ODF (2015-2017) for RFPA support (1.5 FTE positions)⁷⁸ 	

⁷³ Agency package: ODA-320.

⁷⁴ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

⁷⁵ Agency package: ODFW-132.

⁷⁶ Agency package: ODFW-105.

⁷⁷ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

⁷⁸ Agency package: ODF-119 and ODF-120.

Wildfire: Action WF-4	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM state office funds <p>For monitoring of sage-grouse habitat utilization post-fire:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All funds for existing MS and PhD research have been identified.⁷⁹ • Funds for future research efforts will be identified as research priorities emerge. <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing DSL funding (state lands); ongoing ODA funding (Noxious Weed Program and SWCD Program).</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <p>Potential sources for post-fire rehabilitation on federal lands include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president’s budget <p>Potential sources for post-fire rehabilitation on nonfederal lands include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

⁷⁹ Funding sources include Lakeview BLM (Healthy Lands Initiative funds), Oregon Hunters Association, Oregon Wildlife Heritage Foundation, and others.

Development Threats Metrics

Including: Urban and Exurban Development; Renewable Energy; Electric and Natural Gas Transmission; Mining; Roads and Other Infrastructure

Development: Action DEV-1		
Action Description	Action DEV-1: Implement a memorandum of understanding for coordination among permitting counties, federal agencies, the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD), the Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), the Oregon Department of Geological and Mining Industries (DOGAMI), Department of State Lands (DLS), Oregon Parks and Recreation (OPR), Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), and all other land management or permitting agencies to site developments in accordance with ODFW's Sage-Grouse Mitigation Policy (OAR-635-140-0025) and the LCDC rule governing development in sage-grouse habitat (OAR 660-023-0115).	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)	
Objective	Develop MOU directing implementation of new sage-grouse OARs.	
Performance Measures	MOU developed and signed by all parties	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • Counties • DLCD • DOGAMI • ODFW • ODOE • ODOT • OPR • OWRD 	
Timeline	Completion date: November 2015	
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$300K funded to DLCD (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Disturbance Framework (funds support 1 FTE position)⁸⁰ • \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)⁸¹ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025) • Ongoing BLM state office funds for assessment of development in relation to BLM adaptive management thresholds • Funds TBD (awarded or requested for Willamette Partnership to finalize and scenario-test Habitat Quantification Tool) <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing permitting agencies and counties reviewing applications against LCDC rule</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW district funds for pre-consultations with biologists</p>	

⁸⁰ Agency package: DLCD-108.

⁸¹ Agency package: ODFW-130.

Development: Action DEV-2		
Action Description	Action DEV-2: Regulate new development (as defined in and using the methodologies adopted in OAR 660-023-0115) within PACs to ensure that future development does not exceed 3% of the total PAC acreage, including current baseline developed areas, and that future development does not exceed the metering described in OAR 660-023-0126 (no more than 1% in any 10-year period; see related Action MON-3.) ⁸²	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)	
Objective	Note: Also see objectives for Action MON-3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain development rate within PACs below 1% of total PAC acreage over any 10-year period. • Maintain development acreage within PACs below 3%. 	
Performance Measures	See performance measures for Action MON-3.	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • Counties • DLCD • DOGAMI • ODFW • ODOE • ODOT • OPR • OWRD 	
Timeline	Ongoing, commencing August 2015	
Funding	<p>Identified funds: (shared with actions DEV-1, -3, -4, and -5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$300K funded to DLCD (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Disturbance Framework (funds support 1 FTE position)⁸³ • \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)⁸⁴ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025) • Ongoing BLM state office funds for assessment of development in relation to BLM adaptive management thresholds • Funds TBD (awarded or requested for Willamette Partnership to finalize and scenario-test Habitat Quantification Tool) <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing permitting agencies and counties reviewing applications against LCDC rule</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW district funds for pre-consultations with biologists</p>	

⁸² Existing rights under the General Mining Law of 1872, as amended, on federal lands and existing mining operations permitted by DOGAMI on all land ownerships are not subject to development limits in the event the development cap of 3% is reached within a PAC. However, all mining developments, including those associated with existing locatable minerals rights (regardless of whether extraction operations have commenced) will count toward the development calculations as defined in and using the methodologies adopted in OAR 660-023-0115.

⁸³ Agency package: DLCD-108.

⁸⁴ Agency package: ODFW-130.

Development: Action DEV-3	
Action Description	Action DEV-3: Halt or slow development activities if predetermined “hard” or “soft” sage-grouse population and/or habitat adaptive management triggers are reached—as described in Appendix D, “Adaptive Management Strategy” in the BLM RMP FEIS (BLM 2015). (See related Actions MON-1-1 and MON-5 .)
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)
Objective	Note: Also see objectives for Actions MON-1 and MON-5 . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain or exceed PAC-level sage-grouse population and habitat goals as described in BLM RMP FEIS).
Performance Measures	See performance measures for Actions MON-1 and MON-5 .
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • Counties • DLCD • DOGAMI • ODFW • ODOE • ODOT • OPR • OWRD
Timeline	Habitat and population analyses: Annually
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$300K funded to DLCD (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Disturbance Framework (funds support 1 FTE position)⁸⁵ • \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)⁸⁶ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025) • Ongoing BLM state office funds for assessment of development in relation to BLM adaptive management thresholds • Funds TBD (awarded or requested for Willamette Partnership to finalize and scenario-test Habitat Quantification Tool) <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing permitting agencies and counties reviewing applications against LCDC rule</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW district funds for pre-consultations with biologists</p>

Development: Action DEV-4	
Action Description	Action DEV-4: Apply ODFW’s mitigation hierarchy, as described in OAR-635-140-0025, to new development impacts in significant sage-grouse habitat that is subject to state permitting or state jurisdiction on federal lands. Where development in sage-grouse habitat is

⁸⁵ Agency package: DLCD-108.

⁸⁶ Agency package: ODFW-130.

Development: Action DEV-4		
	<p>permitted in accordance with the aforementioned rules, (1) ensure that projects minimize the extent to which sage-grouse are negatively impacted; (2) require compensatory mitigation for direct and indirect impacts consistent with the standard defined in OAR-635-140-0025, such that a net conservation benefit for sage-grouse is achieved that replaces the lost functionality of the impacted habitat to a level capable of supporting greater sage-grouse numbers than the habitat which was impacted.</p> <p>Action DEV-4-1 Per OAR-635-140-0025 and OAR 660-023-0115, require consultation (at minimum a pre-application conference) with ODFW to assess the functionality of the habitat proposed to be impacted by developments.</p> <p>Action DEV-4-2 Develop mitigation banking and/or advance mitigation opportunities, consistent with OAR 635-140-0025.</p> <p>Action DEV-4-3 Utilize Oregon's Greater Sage-Grouse Mitigation Manual and Habitat Quantification Tool (Appendix 6) to calculate and implement compensatory mitigation requirements and opportunities (i.e., credits) consistently for all development projects that impact sage-grouse habitat. (See related Actions MON-4 and MON-7.)</p>	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)	
Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a Habitat Quantification Tool (HQT) that accurately conveys the mitigation requirement for developers, per ODFW's mitigation standard, as well as credit calculation and development opportunities for mitigation credit producers. • Create mitigation banking and advance mitigation credit opportunities to promote sage-grouse benefits prior to future impacts occurring. • Complete pre-application conferences for 100% of required proposed developments subject to the applicable OAR's. • Ensure that ODFW's mitigation standard is met by applying mitigation hierarchy requirement to 100% of applicable proposed developments. 	
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalization of Habitat Quantification Tool (HQT) for use in determining mitigation requirements for new development and for developing and calculating credits. • Completion of a mitigation banking and advance mitigation mechanism, with engagement by credit producers. • Documentation of progress toward achieving objectives set out in site-specific plans for mitigation projects in annual report. 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • Counties • DLCD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOGAMI • ODFW • ODOE • ODOT • OPR • OWRD
Timeline	<p>Application of mitigation standard: Ongoing, commencing August 2015</p> <p>Completion HQT: December 2015</p>	<p>Mitigation banking/advance mitigation mechanism: January 2016</p> <p>Mitigation Program reporting: Annually</p>

Development: Action DEV-4	
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$300K funded to DLCD (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Disturbance Framework (funds support 1 FTE position)⁸⁷ • \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)⁸⁸ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025) • Ongoing BLM state office funds for assessment of development in relation to BLM adaptive management thresholds • Funds TBD (awarded or requested for Willamette Partnership to finalize and scenario-test Habitat Quantification Tool) <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing permitting agencies and counties reviewing applications against LCDC rule</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW district funds for pre-consultations with biologists</p>

Development: Action DEV-5	
Action Description	<p>Action DEV-5: Identify and implement opportunities to reduce the risk of habitat loss due to development.</p> <p>Action DEV-5-1 Implement mechanisms in coordination with county planning departments and/or DLCD to further limit the density of farm-use dwellings and associated out-buildings within 3.1 miles of leks.⁸⁹</p> <p>Action DEV-5-2 Require site planning to consolidate infrastructure associated with new developments.</p> <p>Action DEV-5-3 Seek opportunities to acquire easements from willing landowners to eliminate future habitat conversion and development threats.</p> <p>Action DEV-5-4 Do not relinquish public lands for the purpose of urban development in priority sage-grouse habitat.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect 100% of leks from other development not covered in new LCDC rule by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Developing new county overlays for buffered sage-grouse leks to assist in local efforts to avoid or limit farm-use dwelling/infrastructure density in buffered leks. ○ Designating set-back distances or other approaches to lek protection. • Work with the Land Trust Alliance and others to identify at least one land trust to expand service to eastern Oregon sage-grouse

⁸⁷ Agency package: DLCD-108.

⁸⁸ Agency package: ODFW-130.

⁸⁹ Dwelling density to be determined.

Development: Action DEV-5	
	<p>country.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify a priority private acreage and opportunities (including incentives) for enrollment in a working land easements or other conservation-focused land management options. Protect 100% of public lands in priority sage-grouse habitat from urban development.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development of new county overlays for buffered sage-grouse leks within which efforts would be made to avoid or limit farm-use dwelling/infrastructure density^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} Set-back distances from leks and/or other protections adopted for farm-use dwellings/infrastructure in county ordinances Monitoring/tracking of the number of farm-use dwellings and the density of farm-use infrastructure developed within 3.1 miles of leks Documentation of the number of recruitment activities completed annually for landowner participation in conservation easements, as well as the amount of priority acreage engaged in easements or other conservation-based management Documentation of acres of public land retained as sage-grouse habitat
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DLCD Counties ODFW
Timeline	<p>New county ordinances: Spring 2016</p> <p>Conservation easements/Other options: Ongoing recruitment, annual reporting</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$300K funded to DLCD (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Disturbance Framework (funds support 1 FTE position)⁹⁰ \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)⁹¹ OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025) Ongoing BLM state office funds for assessment of development in relation to BLM adaptive management thresholds Funds TBD (awarded or requested for Willamette Partnership to finalize and scenario-test Habitat Quantification Tool) <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing permitting agencies and counties reviewing applications against LCDC rule</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW district funds for pre-consultations with biologists</p>

Development: Action DEV-6

⁹⁰ Agency package: DLCD-108.

⁹¹ Agency package: ODFW-130.

Development: Action DEV-6	
Action Description	<p>Action DEV-6: Encourage private landowners to participate in long-term or permanent sagebrush habitat protection or enhancement programs.</p> <p>Action DEV-6-1 Encourage private landowner participation in Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances offered through county SWCDs. Once enrolled, landowners must agree to “maintain contiguous habitat by avoiding further fragmentation” and are required to maintain their land with no net loss in habitat quantity or quality.</p> <p>Action DEV-6-1a Conduct outreach and education to promote private landowner enrollment in CCAAs.</p> <p>Action DEV-6-2 Encourage private landowners to participate in conservation easements with restrictions that preclude further agricultural conversion, with particular focus on land within PAC habitat.</p> <p>Action DEV-6-2a Promote the development of land trusts and encourage existing land trusts to expand service areas to eastern Oregon in order to accommodate conservation easements on lands in sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p>Action DEV-6-3 Identify opportunities, involving willing landowners, to transfer or exchange lands where such action would result in significant conservation benefits for sage-grouse, and would support rather than undermine rural economic values.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enroll a minimum of 80% of eligible acres into CCAAs by enrollment deadline. • Enroll a minimum of TBD % of eligible landowners into SGI. • Secure funds TBD for CCAAs and other habitat management assistance programs. • Work with the Land Trust Alliance and others to identify at least one land trust to expand service to eastern Oregon sage-grouse country. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Identify a priority private acreage and opportunities (including incentives) for enrollment in a working land easements or other conservation-focused land management.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the number of recruitment activities completed annually by each SWCD and other partner organizations • Funds identified and allocated to habitat management assistance programs • Documentation of the number of land trusts developed or with expanded service areas • Documentation of the number of private landowners/acres engaged in conservation-focused land management programs (SGI, CCAA’s, working lands easements, conservation-based ownership).
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS • ODFW • SWCDs
Timeline	<p>Landowner outreach: Summary of recruitment:</p> <p>Ongoing Annually</p>

Development: Action DEV-6	
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)⁹² • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025) <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

Development: Action DEV-7	
Action Description	<p>Action DEV-7: Identify areas where mining leases or surface occupancy is not compatible (or not compatible without stipulations) with maintaining functional sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p>Action DEV-7-1 Consider options to limit future development of existing leases on county and state lands in incompatible areas (e.g., withdraw under-performing or under-developed leases; limit extensions of under-developed leases).</p> <p>Action DEV-7-2 Where deemed necessary to limit disturbance to sage-grouse or their habitat, add relevant restrictions (e.g., timing and seasonality of operations) to existing state and federal leases.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop maps and GIS layers with identified exclusion areas. • Place relevant operational restrictions on 100% of the leases where current operations threaten sage-grouse.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of maps and GIS layers with identified exclusion areas • Documentation of relevant restrictions placed on state and federal leases
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DOGAMI
Timeline	<p>Maps/GIS layers: December 2015</p> <p>Lease restrictions: Case-by-case basis, ongoing</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM state office funds • Ongoing DOGAMI funds

⁹² Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS

Development: Action DEV-8	
Action Description	<p>Action DEV-8: Eliminate or minimize risk to sage-grouse by utilizing Implementation Recommendations and Guidelines in the siting, construction, operation, and maintenance of new or existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Action DEV-8-1 Develop conservation agreements with developers to ensure that Implementation Recommendations and Guidelines for all activities associated with development will be implemented to minimize risk to sage-grouse (see “Implementation Recommendations and Guidelines,” Appendix 4).</p> <p>Action DEV-8-2 Ensure that state regulatory oversight exists to minimize impacts to sage-grouse habitat for all relevant types of mining operations.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop conservation agreements with 100% of project proponents. • Review and consider revised mining regulations for types of operations that do not meet the definition in ORS 517.750 and do not trigger LCDC rules.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the number and quality of conservation agreements initiated with developers • Development of mining regulations where regulatory gaps exist (see Section IV for gaps)
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DOGAMI • DLCD • ODFW
Timeline	<p>Conservation agreements: Ongoing</p> <p>Evaluation of need for new state mining regulations: December 2015</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$300K funded to DLCD (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Disturbance Framework (funds support 1 FTE position)⁹³ • \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)⁹⁴ • Ongoing BLM state office funds • Ongoing DOGAMI funds <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW district funds for consultations with biologists</p>

⁹³ Agency package: DLCD-108.

⁹⁴ Agency package: ODFW-130.

Development: Action DEV-9		
Action Description	<p>Action DEV-9: Prioritize reclamation of all mines, including abandoned mines in PAC areas, with the aim to restore areas disturbed by mining and associated facilities to healthy sagebrush ecosystems.⁹⁵</p> <p>Action DEV-9-1 Develop reclamation plans with a realistic timeline that incorporates the likelihood of multiple treatments to return disturbed areas to functional sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p>Action DEV-9-2 Evaluate the need for restoration of previously reclaimed infrastructure sites. Prioritize areas in need of additional restoration efforts and identify potential funding sources, including mitigation credit/banking options.</p> <p>Action DEV-9-3 Monitor reclamation activities to document habitat and sage-grouse response.</p> <p>Action DEV-9-4 Evaluate and, where needed, develop improved state regulations and standards related to reclamation to reduce threats to sage-grouse.</p>	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II Site-Specific Management	
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop reclamation plans for 100% of mines, including abandoned mines, as well as funding sources. • Monitor all reclamation sites, including previously reclaimed sites, at set year intervals TBD. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Document sagebrush and understory perennial grass recovery at reclamation sites (using TBD metrics). ○ Conduct a policy/regulation review to identify opportunities to improve reclamation standards in sage-grouse habitat. Ensure that designated “secondary uses” of mining sites will reclaim and return the area to sage-grouse habitat where appropriate. 	
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the number and quality of reclamation plans • Documentation of funding sources to implement reclamation plans, including connection to advance mitigation/mitigation banking mechanisms. • Documentation of sagebrush and understory perennial grass recovery at reclamation sites • Documentation of adaptive management undertaken to improve outcomes of reclamation plans • Policy/regulation review completed; policies and regulations strengthened where necessary 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DLCD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOGAMI • Mine claimants • ODFW
Timeline	Development of reclamation plans for abandoned mines: TBD	Monitoring of reclamation sites should occur at set year intervals TBD.

⁹⁵ DOGAMI must approve reclamation proposals by applicants if they are compatible with the secondary land uses (uses of mining areas no longer employed for mining) designated by the local land-use administrator. Secondary land uses are determined on a case-by-case basis. If the land-use administrator specifies that areas disturbed by mining be returned to sagebrush habitat, DOGAMI has the authority to ensure compliance. However, other secondary uses that are not compatible with sage-grouse habitat needs may be designated by the local land-use administrators, and DOGAMI must approve reclamation proposals for these uses as well.

Development: Action DEV-9		
	Development of reclamation plans for new mines: Concurrent with new permits	Policy/regulation review: Spring 2016
Funding	Identified funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM state office funds • Ongoing DOGAMI funds • \$300K funded to DLCD (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Disturbance Framework (funds support 1 FTE position)⁹⁶ • \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)⁹⁷ • Mine claimants (for reclamation and monitoring activities) <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW district funds for consultations with biologists</p>	

⁹⁶ Agency package: DLCD-108.

⁹⁷ Agency package: ODFW-130.

Other Threats Metrics

Sagebrush Elimination: Action SBE-1	
Action Description	<p>Action SBE-1: Encourage landowners to enroll in habitat management assistance programs (e.g., CCAAs, SGI, and others) to ensure that technical expertise through ODFW, NRCS, SWCDs, and/or the OSU Extension Service is available to landowners prior to implementing vegetation treatments.</p> <p>Action SBE-1-2: Direct funding to ensure that adequate funds and staff capacity are available for development and implementation of conservation measures identified in site-specific habitat management plans.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enroll a minimum of 80% of eligible acres into CCAAs by enrollment deadline. • Enroll a minimum of TBD % of eligible landowners in SGI. • Secure TBD funds for CCAAs and other habitat management assistance programs
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the number of recruitment activities completed annually by each SWCD and other partner organizations • Documentation of the number of landowners/acres recruited/enrolled to participate in SGI and CCAA summarized annually • Funds identified and allocated to habitat management assistance programs
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • SWCDs
Timeline	<p>Landowner outreach: Ongoing</p> <p>Summary of recruitment: Annually</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds: (shared with SBE-1, -2, -3, and -4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)⁹⁸ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)⁹⁹ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)¹⁰⁰ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁰¹ <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p>Pending funds:</p>

⁹⁸ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

⁹⁹ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁰⁰ Agency package: ODFW-132.

¹⁰¹ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Sagebrush Elimination: Action SBE-1	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

Sagebrush Elimination: Action SBE-2	
Action Description	Action SBE-2: Strategically use chemical or mechanical treatments to remove sagebrush in areas where warranted with the highest potential to achieve treatment objectives, while minimizing the risk of annual-grass invasion and the fragmentation and loss of habitat (see Appendix 4 for additional implementation guidance related to spot treatments and the creation of mosaics of sagebrush density to benefit sage-grouse).
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<p>(Note: Specific objectives will be developed/refined in LIT regional work plans and/or CCAA/CCA site-specific plans. Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure and document that 100% of sagebrush treatments are undertaken and designed to benefit sage-grouse. • Treatment prescriptions and objectives will vary per project. Document understory perennial grass and shrub recovery in all treatment areas (using metrics TBD).
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Justification for sagebrush removal and anticipated benefits to sage-grouse ○ Number of acres in which sagebrush treatments are conducted ○ Sagebrush and understory perennial grass recovery within sagebrush treatment areas ○ Monitoring and adaptive management of restoration projects
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs
Timeline	<p>Documentation completed: As projects are proposed (e.g., during National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA] analyses)</p> <p>Summary of projects: Annually</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds: (shared with SBE-1, -2, -3, and -4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁰² • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁰³ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁰³ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁰⁴ Agency package: ODFW-132.

Sagebrush Elimination: Action SBE-2	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁰⁵ <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p>Pending funds: NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)</p>

Sagebrush Elimination: Action SBE-3	
Action Description	Action SBE-3 Avoid sagebrush conversion or maintenance of conversion projects on public lands for the sole purpose of increasing livestock forage (e.g., conversion to or maintenance of existing crested wheat seedings).
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	Ensure and document that no sagebrush elimination is undertaken for the sole purpose of increasing livestock forage.
Performance Measures	Documentation of any activities (and acreage amounts) that eliminate sagebrush for any other purpose than to benefit sage-grouse
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs
Timeline	<p>Documentation completed: As projects are proposed (e.g., during National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA] analyses)</p> <p>Summary of projects: Annually</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds: (shared with SBE-1, -2, -3, and -4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁰⁶ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁰⁷ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)¹⁰⁸ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵ Agency package: ODFW-105.

¹⁰⁶ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁰⁷ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁰⁸ Agency package: ODFW-132.

¹⁰⁹ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Sagebrush Elimination: Action SBE-3	
	<p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p>Pending funds: NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)</p>

Sagebrush Elimination: Action SBE-4	
Action Description	Action SBE-4: Balance the intent, position, and extent of fuel breaks with the direct habitat loss caused by such fire prevention measures (see Action WF-1-6c and associated IRG-WF-1-6c).
Strategy Level	II (Site- Level Management)
Objectives	Note: Also see objectives for Action WF-1-6c . Complete cost-benefit analyses for all proposed fuel breaks to weigh the fire prevention benefit against the potential negative sage-grouse impacts.
Performance Measures	Note: Also see performance measures for Action WF-1-6c . Documentation of the amount (acreage), location (with respect to PACs), and justification for fuel breaks and anticipated benefits to sage-grouse
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs
Timeline	<p>Documentation completed: As projects are proposed (e.g., during National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA] analyses)</p> <p>Summary of projects: Annually</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds: (shared with SBE-1, -2, -3, and -4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹¹⁰ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹¹¹ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)¹¹² • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹¹¹ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹¹² Agency package: ODFW-132.

¹¹³ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Sagebrush Elimination: Action SBE-4	
	<p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p>Pending funds: NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)</p>

Improper Grazing Management: Action GRZ-1	
Action Description	<p>Action GRZ-1: Encourage landowners to enroll in habitat management assistance programs (e.g., CCAAs, SGI, and others) to ensure that technical expertise through ODFW, NRCS, SWCDs, and/or the OSU Extension Service is available to landowners to develop grazing management plans that promote sage-grouse habitat and sustainable grazing operations.</p> <p>Action GRZ-1-2 Direct funding to ensure that adequate funds and staff capacity are available for development and implementation of conservation measures identified in site-specific habitat management plans.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enroll a minimum of 80% of eligible acres into CCAAs by enrollment deadline. • Enroll a minimum of TBD % of eligible landowners in SGI. • Secure TBD funds for CCAAs and other habitat management assistance programs.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the number of recruitment activities completed annually by each SWCD and other partner organizations • Documentation of the number of landowners/acres recruited/enrolled to participate in SGI and CCAAs summarized annually • Funds identified and allocated to habitat management assistance programs
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • SWCDs
Timeline	<p>Landowner outreach: Ongoing</p> <p>Summary of recruitment: Annually</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹¹⁴ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹¹⁵ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

Improper Grazing Management: Action GRZ-1	
	<p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator; DSL ongoing funding for state lands CCAA.</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

Improper Grazing Management: Action GRZ-2	
Action Description	<p>Action GRZ-2: Implement grazing management plans that contribute to the health of sage-grouse habitat. Grazing management conservation measures have been developed for Greater Sage-Grouse Programmatic Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances (CCAAs) for private and state rangelands, as well as Candidate Conservation Agreements (CCAs) for public lands. That list is represented in part below. However, additional conservation measures may be required for specific site conditions.</p> <p>Action GRZ-2-1 Inventory private lands and allotments to determine the current state of plant communities and use available ecological site descriptions to set realistic habitat goals. Utilize appropriate state-and-transition models (see Section III, “Strategy Level II”) to develop grazing management strategies that will transition inventoried habitat from less degraded states to more desirable states.</p> <p>Action GRZ-2-2 Prioritize inventories and processing of grazing permits within allotments that have the best opportunities for conserving, enhancing, or restoring sage-grouse habitat within PAC areas. Once completed, prioritize grazing allotments adjacent to PAC areas.</p> <p>Action GRZ-2-3 On BLM land, when incorporating desired habitat indicators (as described in Table 2-4 of BLM RMP, BLM 2015) and conditions consistent with the Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework (HAF) (Stiver et al. 2015) into grazing management plans, ensure that limitations of these approaches and potential benefits from state and transition model work are addressed. In particular, recognize that the conditions stipulated in the HAF may need to be adjusted for regional/local conditions and may not be realistic objectives given the initial vegetation state or underlying ecological site characteristics (e.g., soil and moisture regimes). Objectives must also be adjusted for factors unrelated to grazing (e.g., wildfire, drought, etc.) as well as for inter-annual variability.</p> <p>Action GRZ-2-4 Follow recommended grazing guidelines to meet seasonal sage-grouse habitat requirements. Consider (1) season or timing of use; (2) numbers of livestock (including temporary nonuse or livestock removal); (3) distribution of livestock use; (4) intensity of use; and (5) type of livestock.</p> <p>Action GRZ-2-5 Adjust grazing to respond to environmental conditions, such as wildfire, catastrophic flooding, or drought, in order to prevent overuse of vegetation and to facilitate habitat recovery. Grazing adjustments may include deferment, rotation, rest, seasonal use, timing, intensity, etc.</p>

Improper Grazing Management: Action GRZ-2	
	<p>Action GRZ-2-6 Manage grazing in riparian areas to ensure bank stability, survival of deep-rooted riparian vegetation, floodplain connectivity, and stream functionality.</p> <p>Action GRZ-2-7 Monitor grazed lands upon which conservation measures are implemented and adaptively manage to achieve positive trends and desirable states for sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action GRZ-2-7a Assess grazing impacts on the portion of the pasture/allotment known to be sage-grouse habitat rather than on “average use” throughout the entire pasture/allotment.</p> <p>Action GRZ-2-7b When monitoring demonstrates that grazing has contributed to forage use levels that are detrimental to habitat quality, make timely adjustments to minimize the impact to sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action GRZ-2-7c Conduct adjustments to grazing management in accordance with regulations of the responsible land management agency.</p> <p>Action GRZ-2-8 Where practicable, coordinate grazing management strategies across public and private lands so operations with deeded and BLM allotments can be planned as single units.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<p>(Note: Specific objectives will be developed/refined in CCAA/CCA site-specific plans.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop grazing management plans for 100% of acres enrolled in CCAAs/CCAs (or other Farm Bill programs) to reduce spread of invasive annual grasses as enrollment occurs. • Assess TBD % of prioritized allotments annually. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revise TBD % of grazing plans (on BLM allotments) annually to include HAF and/or other sage- grouse appropriate habitat indicators. • Include flexible measures in 100% of grazing management plans to allow for response to localized or emerging environmental conditions. • Monitor and adaptively manage all areas to which CCAA/CCA and BLM grazing management plans apply. • Achieve TBD % increase in the health of sage-grouse habitat, per criteria specified in site-specific plans or BLM monitoring plans. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Document invasive annual-grass reduction and understory perennial grass and shrub recovery in all treatment areas (using metrics TBD).
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual documentation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Conservation measures implemented by private landowners and public land permittees (as specified in site-specific plans) ○ The number of BLM grazing management plans reflecting HAF and/or other habitat indicators (note: BLM has prioritized completion of these plans in PACs, SFAs, and late-summer brood rearing habitat) ○ Flexible measures in grazing management plans to allow for response to emerging environmental conditions, and

Improper Grazing Management: Action GRZ-2	
	<p>implementation of these measures as required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Progress toward improvements in sage-grouse habitat indicators ○ Monitoring and adaptive management measures undertaken
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs
Timeline	<p>Development and implementation of grazing management plans: Ongoing, as CCAA/CCA enrollment and SSPs occur</p> <p>Habitat monitoring: As described in site-specific plans</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹¹⁶ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹¹⁷ • Ongoing BLM district funds • Ongoing DSL funding for state lands CCAA <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

Improper Grazing Management: Action GRZ-3	
Action Description	<p>Action GRZ-3: In consultation with permittees and/or private landowners, modify infrastructure to minimize impacts to sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action GRZ-3-1 Reduce physical disturbance to sage-grouse leks from livestock by placing salt, water, or mineral supplements beyond 0.6 mi. away on private lands (consistent with CCAA specifications, Harney SWCD and USFWS 2014) and 1.2 mi away on BLM lands (consistent with BLM RMP, BLM 2015) from occupied or pending leks.</p> <p>Action GRZ-3-2 Assess water developments for livestock and modify features according to Implementation Recommendations</p>

¹¹⁶ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹¹⁷ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

Improper Grazing Management: Action GRZ-3	
	<p>and Guidelines (Appendix 4) to minimize threats to sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action GRZ-3-3 Where necessary, develop new water sources for livestock in order to reduce the impact to riparian, wetland, playas, and wet meadow areas important to sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action GRZ-3-4 Use fencing where helpful in excluding livestock to promote trends toward proper functioning condition of springs, seeps, wet meadows, and/or riparian areas. Engage other techniques if equally effective in promoting such trends. Install antistrike markers on wetland fences to reduce sage-grouse collisions (see Section IV for more detail on fences).</p> <p>Action GRZ-3-5 Assess salting locations and alter the placement of salt to improve livestock distribution to the benefit of sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p>Action GRZ-3-6 Conduct range management activities using Implementation Recommendations and Guidelines to avoid disruption to lekking and nesting behaviors (see Appendix 4).</p> <p>Action GRZ-3-7 When practical, avoid supplemental winter feeding of livestock in PACs and low-density habitat, unless it is part of a plan to improve ecological health or create a mosaic of habitat in dense sagebrush stands, or is required for emergency care of livestock.</p> <p>Action GRZ-3-7a Develop grazing management plans that ensure that, if required, supplemental feeding is designed to minimize adverse impacts to sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action GRZ-3-8 Design and locate range management infrastructure according to Implementation Recommendations and Guidelines (Appendix 4) so that there is a neutral effect or benefit to sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action GRZ-3-9 Remove predator (corvid, coyote, raptor) attractants; remove and bury dead animals.</p>
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<p>(Note: Specific objectives will be developed/refined in CCAA/CCA site-specific plans. See also objectives related to grazing management plans in Action GRZ-2.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain or improve sage-grouse attendance at all leks by reducing disturbance associated with livestock infrastructure. • Assess TBD % of infrastructure annually within 0.6 mi and 1.2 mi of leks on private and BLM lands, respectively. • Assess TBD % of salting and water development locations annually. • Improve all infrastructure and salt and water locations within TBD timeframe of identifying need to do so. • See objectives related to development of grazing management plans.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See performance measures for Action MON-1, related to monitoring lek attendance, and GRZ-2, related to grazing management plans. • Documentation of the number of infrastructure improvements/modifications made to reduce risk to sage-grouse

Improper Grazing Management: Action GRZ-3	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs
Timeline	Development and implementation of infrastructure modifications: Ongoing, as CCAA/CCA enrollment and SSPs occur and as BLM allotment reviews occur
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹¹⁸ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹¹⁹ • Ongoing BLM district funds • Ongoing DSL funding for state lands CCAA <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

Improper Grazing Management: Action GRZ-4	
Action Description	Action GRZ-4: Develop and implement invasive plant management plans to prioritize areas for prevention, restoration, and containment of invasive annual grasses (see conservation strategies in "Invasive Annual Grass" section above).
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	See objectives identified for "Invasive Annual Grass" and "Noxious Weed" conservation actions.
Performance Measures	See performance measures identified for "Invasive Annual Grass" and "Noxious Weed" conservation actions.
Responsible Parties	See responsible parties identified for invasive annual grass and noxious weeds.
Timeline	See timelines identified in IAG and NXW sections.
Funding	See funds identified for "Invasive Annual Grass" and "Noxious Weeds" sections.

¹¹⁸ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹¹⁹ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

Improper Grazing Management: Action GRZ-5	
Action Description	<p>Action GRZ-5: Minimize direct impacts (mortality) and indirect impacts (reduction of forage) to sage-grouse when applying insecticides within sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p>Action GRZ-5-1 Consult with SWCDs, Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA), and/or the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) to determine the appropriate application of insecticides (products, timing, methods) to avoid harming sage-grouse.</p>
Strategy Level	II (Site Specific Management)
Objectives	See objectives identified for “Insecticides” conservation actions.
Performance Measures	See performance measures identified for “Insecticides” conservation actions.
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs
Timeline	See timelines identified in “Insecticides” section.
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹²⁰ • Ongoing BLM district funds • Ongoing ODA funding (Noxious Weed Program and SWCD Program) <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president’s budget

Improper Grazing Management: Action GRZ-6	
Action Description	Action GRZ-6: Support infrastructure, resources, and research that will contribute to rangeland health.

¹²⁰ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

Improper Grazing Management: Action GRZ-6		
	<p>Action GRZ-6-1 Provide educational opportunities for permittees and private landowners to learn about sage-grouse habitat requirements and conservation measures they can implement to improve rangeland conditions for livestock and sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action GRZ-6-2 Advance additional funding and capacity support for USDA Burns Agricultural Research Station and related institutional research efforts related to sage-grouse habitat health and rangeland management.</p> <p>Action GRZ-6-3 Create “grass banks” or reserve forage areas as alternative grazing opportunities to provide rest for overutilized rangelands or allotments, or to be utilized during drought conditions, post-fire or after restoration work. Do so in a manner compatible with livestock operations locally.</p> <p>Action GRZ-6-4 Create new and incorporate existing incentive-based programs to develop/improve important seasonal habitat (lek, nesting, brood rearing, wintering).</p> <p>Action GRZ-6-5 Assist Local Implementation Teams (LITs) in developing a process to evaluate management options and set priorities for funding habitat improvement projects.</p> <p>Action GRZ-6-6 Identify opportunities to compensate landowners for the cost of implementing conservation measures and facilitating practices to benefit sage-grouse and their habitat.</p>	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)	
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a minimum of 2 educational events for permittees annually per county. • Develop policies to facilitate converting relinquished allotments (or other opportunities) to grass banks/reserve forage allotments in a manner that supports and does not undermine livestock economies and conservation benefits. • Designate a minimum of TBD (number of) acres as available grass banks by 20XX (date TBD). • Conduct routine maintenance on infrastructure in grass bank allotments. • Maintain and increase funding by a minimum of TBD % for landowner incentive programs. 	
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of education events or other learning opportunities • Development of new conservation incentives, compensation programs, and mitigation opportunities to develop/improve seasonal habitats • Documentation of the number of allotments reserved for grass banks and the quantity of cattle that can be accommodated during restoration activities elsewhere • Administrative policy developed to facilitate grass bank establishment consistent with related objectives. • Allocation of funds for expansion of landowner incentive programs 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • GNO • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • SWCDs 	
Timeline	Landowner outreach: _____ Grass bank(s) established: _____	

Improper Grazing Management: Action GRZ-6		
	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Grass bank/reserve forage policy completion: Spring 2016</p>	<p>Opportunistically as grazing permits are relinquished or other opportunities identified.</p> <p>New incentive programs: TBD</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹²¹ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹²² • Ongoing BLM district funds <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p>For policy work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM state office funds • Ongoing Governor’s Natural Resource Office funds <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) 	

Agricultural Conversion: Action AGC-1		
Action Description	<p>Action AGC-1 Encourage private landowners to participate in long-term or permanent sagebrush habitat protection or enhancement programs.</p> <p>Action AGC-1-1 Encourage private landowner participation in Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances offered through county SWCDs. Once enrolled, landowners must agree to “maintain contiguous habitat by avoiding further fragmentation” and are required to maintain their land with no net loss in habitat quantity or quality.</p> <p>Action AGC-1-1a Conduct outreach and education to promote private landowner enrollment in CCAAs.</p> <p>Action AGC-1-1-b Ensure that technical expertise through SWCDs and the USFWS is available to develop and implement</p>	

¹²¹ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹²² Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

Agricultural Conversion: Action AGC-1	
	<p>site-specific plans (SSPs) designed to enhance habitat quality or quantity on private lands enrolled in CCAAs.</p> <p>Action AGC-1-2 Encourage private landowner participation in working lands conservation easements that protect their ranching interests and preclude additional agricultural conversion/tillage of sagebrush habitat, with particular focus on land within PAC habitat.</p> <p>Action AGC-1-3 Encourage private landowner participation in cost-share habitat improvement programs (Farm Bill, Crop Reserve Program, Sage-Grouse Initiative) offered by the NRCS, ODFW, and SWCDs, particularly those with landownership within PAC habitat.</p> <p>Action AGC-1-4 Where lands are at risk of conversion to non-sagebrush habitat (through sale, development, generational change, etc.), identify opportunities to compensate, incentivize, and/or transfer lands (from willing property owners to conservation-focused land management organizations, agencies, or private owners/entities) in order to ensure that lands will remain as functioning sagebrush habitat, with particular focus on land within PACs.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enroll a minimum of 80% of eligible acres in CCAAs by enrollment deadline. • Enroll a minimum of TBD % of eligible landowners in SGI. • Secure TBD funds for CCAA s and other habitat management assistance programs. • Work with the Land Trust Alliance and others to identify at least one land trust to expand service to eastern Oregon sage-grouse country. • Identify a priority private acreage and opportunities (including incentives) for enrollment in a working land easements or other conservation-focused land management options.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the number of recruitment activities completed annually by each SWCD and other partner organizations • Funds identified and allocated to habitat management assistance programs • Documentation of the number of land trusts developed or with expanded service areas • Documentation of the number of private landowners/acres engaged in conservation-focused land management programs (SGI, CCAA's, working lands easements, conservation-based ownership).
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS • ODFW • SWCDs
Timeline	<p>Landowner outreach: Ongoing</p> <p>Summary of recruitment: Annually</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹²³

¹²³ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

Agricultural Conversion: Action AGC-1	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OWEB (minimum \$10M 2015-2025)¹²⁴ <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p>Pending funds: NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)</p>

Agricultural Conversion: Action AGC-2	
Action Description	<p>Action AGC-2: Review and, where warranted, revise government programs that incentivize sagebrush elimination.</p> <p>Action AGC-2-1 Discourage the use of Farm Bill policies and commodity programs that facilitate ongoing conversion of native habitats to marginal cropland.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	Revise all programs that incentivize sagebrush elimination.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of government programs that incentivize sagebrush elimination • Documentation of use of any Farm Bill programs that result in sagebrush elimination
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS • GNRO
Timeline	<p>Review of Farm Bill programs: December 2015</p> <p>Documentation of Farm Bill program utilization: Annually</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing NRCS state office funds • ODFW funds (new and ongoing) ; Governor’s Natural Resource Office funds

Agricultural Conversion: Action AGC-3

¹²⁴ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

Agricultural Conversion: Action AGC-3	
Action Description	<p>Action AGC-3: Develop new policies that reduce the potential for agricultural conversion from sagebrush habitats.</p> <p>Action AGC-3-1 Continue and expand incentive programs that support conservation of sagebrush habitat on private lands</p> <p>Action AGC-3-2 Develop and/or enforce state restrictions on agricultural conversion of state-owned lands.</p> <p>Action AGC-3-3 Work with counties and the state to restrict or reduce agricultural conversion through planning and zoning efforts.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<p>(Note: Also see objectives for Action DEV-5.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain and increase funding by a minimum of TBD % for existing and new landowner incentive programs. • Issue a Governor’s Executive Order and develop an MOU guiding state agencies to follow the sage-grouse Action Plan.
Performance Measures	<p>(Note: Also see performance measures for Action DEV-5.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of new conservation incentives • Implementation of Governor’s Executive Order and MOU requiring DSL to implement conservation actions identified in this Plan, including restrictions on agricultural conversion • Development of county zoning/ordinances that result in greater protections against agricultural conversion
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counties • DLCD • DSL • GNRO • NRCS • OWRD • SWCDs
Timeline	<p>Development of new conservation incentives: Date TBD</p> <p>Completion of executive order and MOU: September 2015</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$300K funded to DLCD (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Disturbance Framework (funds support 1 FTE position)¹²⁵ • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹²⁶ • Ongoing NRCS state office funds • Ongoing DSL funds • Ongoing Governor’s Natural Resource Office funds

Agricultural Conversion: Action AGC-4

¹²⁵ Agency package: DLCD-108.

¹²⁶ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

Agricultural Conversion: Action AGC-4	
Action Description	<p>Action AGC-4: Avoid agricultural conversion of sagebrush (see Appendix 4, “Implementation Recommendations and Guidelines”).</p> <p>Action AGC-4-1 Avoid sagebrush removal or manipulation in sage-grouse breeding or wintering habitats.</p> <p>Action AGC-4-2 Avoid conversion of native rangeland to monotypic perennial grass seedings, cropland, and/or irrigated pasture.</p> <p>Action AGC-4-3 For lands enrolled in CCAAs, per CCAA Conservation Measure 1 (Harney SWCD and USFWS 2014), mitigate internally for any loss of quality or quantity in sage-grouse habitat (short-term losses related to long-term conservation gains excluded).</p> <p>Action AGC-4-4 Evaluate the extent to which vegetation restoration within previously converted agricultural lands serves as suitable habitat.</p>
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	Maintain the extent of sagebrush according to habitat objectives defined in the 2011 Strategy and the BLM RMP FEIS (i.e., 70% sagebrush; 30% other habitat types with restoration potential).
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of any actions that result in agricultural conversion of sagebrush • Documentation of restoration activities on lands previously converted from sagebrush habitat to agricultural purposes • Documentation of mitigation actions implemented for conversion that occurs on lands enrolled in CCAAs
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • OWRD • SWCDs
Timeline	Documentation completed: Annually
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹²⁷ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹²⁸ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)¹²⁹ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹³⁰ <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

¹²⁷ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹²⁸ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹²⁹ Agency package: ODFW-132.

¹³⁰ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Agricultural Conversion: Action AGC-4	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM \$15M (FY16) Greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

Recreation: Action REC-1	
Action Description	Action REC-1: Avoid development of recreational facilities (e.g., roads, trails, kiosks, and campgrounds) in sage-grouse habitats, particularly within PAC habitat and within 4 miles of leks to preserve key lekking and nesting habitat.
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow no new recreational facilities to be developed within 4 miles of leks or within PACs. • Maintain or improve sage-grouse attendance at all leks by avoiding disturbance associated with recreation.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of recreation development designed to avoid leks • See performance measures for Action MON-1 (related to lek attendance) and MON-3 (related to development).
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • Counties • DLCD • DSL • ODFW • WP
Timeline	Ongoing, commencing August 2015
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$300K funded to DLCD (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Disturbance Framework (funds support 1 FTE position)¹³¹ • \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)¹³² • Ongoing BLM state office funds for assessment of development in relation to BLM adaptive management thresholds <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing permitting agencies and counties reviewing applications against LCDC rule</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW district funds for pre-consultations with biologists</p> <p>Funds to be identified:</p> <p>Funds TBD (awarded or requested for Willamette Partnership to finalize and scenario-test Habitat Quantification Tool)</p>

¹³¹ Agency package: DLCD-108.

¹³² Agency package: ODFW-130.

Recreation: Action REC-2	
Action Description	<p>Action REC-2: Implement usage regulations for existing OHV recreational activities that will benefit sage-grouse habitat.</p> <p>Action REC-2-1 Apply seasonal closures to recreation sites during lekking and nesting periods.</p> <p>Action REC-2-2 Limit OHV travel to existing trails and restrict cross-country travel to reduce the negative impacts to sage-grouse habitats. Where habitat has already been highly degraded and is not proximal to sage-grouse leks or nesting habitat, cross-country travel may be considered.</p> <p>Action REC-2-3 Identify additional resources to support monitoring and enforcement of usage regulations.</p> <p>Action REC-2-4 Restrict OHV use in rangelands at risk of wildfire during fire season.</p> <p>Action REC-2-5 Monitor the extent and intensity of OHV use. Quantify daily and seasonal use in order to have adequate information to mitigate potential conflicts between sage-grouse habitat needs and recreational pursuits.</p> <p>Action REC-2-6 Eliminate refuse and food subsidies for predators of sage-grouse associated with OHV recreational areas.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain or improve sage-grouse attendance at all leks by avoiding disturbance associated with recreation. • Develop and implement OHV regulations, seasonal closures, or other restrictions and/or closures in significant sage-grouse habitat. • Secure funding for monitoring of OHV use and enforcement of OHV usage regulations. • Eliminate all predator subsidies associated with OHV areas.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See performance measures for Action MON-1 (related to lek attendance). • Development and implementation of OHV regulations and restrictions in areas where recreation poses a threat to sage-grouse • Allocation of funds for monitoring and enforcement • Documentation of predator subsidy removal efforts
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • ODFW • OHV orgs./user groups • OPRD
Timeline	OHV usage regulations implemented: Spring 2016
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <p>For policy work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM state office funds • Ongoing BLM district funds • Ongoing OPRD funds

Recreation: Action REC-2	
	<i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator and district-level staff.

Recreation: Action REC-3	
Action Description	<p>Action REC-3: Provide education to OHV users and recreationalists (including lek viewers) about how to avoid detrimental impacts to sage-grouse habitat or sage-grouse populations.</p> <p>Action REC-3-1 Educate the public and commercial bird watching guides about ethical viewing and photography of sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action REC-3-2 Educate OHV users on the impacts of noise to sage-grouse, as well as strategies to avoid erosion, spread of invasive annual grasses, and negative impacts to native plant health.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a minimum of 4 educational strategies implemented per year (targeted to recreationalists in sage-grouse habitat). • Install educational/interpretive signs at all recreational areas where recreation is negatively impacting sage-grouse.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Educational strategies (targeted to recreationalists in sage-grouse habitat) and participation ○ New educational/interpretive signs
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • ODFW • OHV orgs./user groups • OPRD
Timeline	<p>Education: Annually</p> <p>Sign installment: Spring 2016</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing OPRD funds • Ongoing BLM district funds <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p>

Recreation: Action REC-4	
Action Description	<p>Action REC-4 Prioritize lek persistence over providing lek viewing opportunities for the public.</p> <p>Action REC-4-1 Develop and implement a protocol for guidance in managing lek viewing activities, such that impacts to sage-grouse are minimized.</p>

Fences: Actions FNC-1, 2, 3, and 4	
	Action FNC-4: Avoid constructing new fences within 1.2 mi (2 km) of leks.
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	(Note: specific objectives will also be developed/refined in CCAA/CCA site-specific plans.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install antistrike makers on TBD % of identified high-risk fence segments annually. • Remove TBD % of unnecessary high-risk fence segments annually. • Install all new fencing more than 1.2 miles beyond leks.
Performance Measures	(Note: performance measures will also be developed/refined in CCAA/CCA site-specific plans.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Miles of high-risk fence segments marked with antistrike markers ○ Miles of high-risk fencing removed ○ Miles of fencing installed within 1.2 mi of leks
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • Private landowners • NRCS • SWCDs • ODFW
Timeline	Fence marking completed: Ongoing; TBD
Funding	Identified funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹³³ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹³⁴ • DSL funding for state lands CCAA • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹³⁵ Pending funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

Isolated/Small Size; Connectivity: Action CON-1	
Action Description	Action CON-1: Identify and protect existing areas of habitat between PAC areas and >75% breeding bird density areas that provide good

¹³³ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹³⁴ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹³⁵ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Isolated/Small Size; Connectivity: Action CON-1	
	lek-to-lek connectivity. Action CON-1-1 Utilize connectivity mapping and telemetry data to identify connectivity corridors that currently function as linkage pathways between portions of the sage-grouse population.
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	Maintain or improve connectivity between PACs and areas of population richness.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporation of connectivity GIS layers into ORDSS • Updates to connectivity mapping as new telemetry data becomes available
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TNC • ODFW
Timeline	ORDSS completion: December 2015 ORDSS updates: As new information becomes available
Funding	Funds to be identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds TBD (awarded or requested from TNC to maintain the ORDSS)

Isolated/Small Size; Connectivity: Action CON-2	
Action Description	Action CON-2: Identify isolated leks and enhance habitat in areas with the most potential to improve connectivity with the goal to improve linkages between these leks and the remaining sage-grouse population. Action CON-2-1 Utilize TNC connectivity maps to identify linkages that currently have low “quality” and “robustness,” that likely limit sage-grouse movement between small or isolated populations. Action CON-2-2 Utilize TNC connectivity maps to identify areas functioning as barriers to movement (“pinch points”) and prioritize these portions of linkages for habitat enhancement activities. Action CON-2-3 Identify and implement strategies to reduce barriers to movement in linkages prioritized for enhancement. Action CON-2-4 Include projects to improve connective habitat for consideration by credit producers engaged in sage-grouse mitigation activities.
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain or improve connectivity between isolated leks and PACs and/or areas of population richness. • Reduce linkages with low “quality” or “robustness” by TBD % annually. • Incorporate important connectivity areas into mitigation priorities and Habitat Quantification Tool (HQT) to promote restoration work

Isolated/Small Size; Connectivity: Action CON-2	
	in these areas and deter creation of further barriers in important linkages.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalization of Habitat Quantification Tool (HQT) for use in determining mitigation requirements for new development • Inclusion of connectivity areas as mitigation crediting priority • Documentation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of linkages with low “quality” or “robustness” restored ○ Progress toward achieving objectives set out in site-specific plans for mitigation projects in annual report ○ Conservation measures as identified in site-specific plans (e.g., for lands enrolled in CCAAs or other incentive programs) that restore connectivity
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TNC • ODFW
Timeline	<div>Finalization of HQT: December 2015</div> <div>Implementation of conservation measures: As described in SSPs</div> <div>Development of mitigation priorities: December 2015</div>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator <p><i>Related funds for conveying priority habitat improvement areas to mitigation creditors: \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)¹³⁶</i></p> <p>Funds to be identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds TBD (awarded or requested from TNC to maintain the ORDSS and refine connectivity mapping as required)

Isolated/Small Size; Connectivity: Action CON-3	
Action Description	<p>Action CON-3: Prevent loss of connectivity corridors by encouraging private landowners to participate in long-term or permanent sagebrush habitat protection or enhancement programs. Protect connectivity corridors on private and public land from future development, as well as habitat projects that reduce or eliminate sagebrush.</p> <p>Action CON-3-1 Encourage private landowner participation in Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances offered</p>

¹³⁶ Agency package: ODFW-130.

Isolated/Small Size; Connectivity: Action CON-3	
	<p>through county SWCDs. Once enrolled, landowners must agree to “maintain contiguous habitat by avoiding further fragmentation” and are required to maintain their land with no net loss in habitat quantity or quality.</p> <p>Action CON-3-1a Conduct outreach and education to promote private landowner enrollment in CCAAs.</p> <p>Action CON-3-1b Ensure that technical expertise through SWCDs and the USFWS is available to develop and implement site-specific plans (SSPs) designed to enhance habitat quality or quantity on private lands enrolled in CCAAs.</p> <p>Action CON-3-2 Encourage private landowner participation in working lands conservation easements that protect their ranching interests and preclude additional agricultural conversion of sagebrush habitat, with particular focus on land within PAC habitat and connectivity corridors.</p> <p>Action CON-3-3 Encourage private landowner participation in cost-share habitat improvement programs (Farm Bill, Crop Reserve Program, Sage-Grouse Initiative) offered by the NRCS, ODFW, and SWCDs, particularly those with landownership that overlaps with connectivity corridors and within PAC habitat.</p> <p>Action CON-3-4 Where lands providing existing or potential connectivity benefits are at risk of conversion to non-sagebrush habitat (through sale, development, generational change, etc.), identify opportunities to compensate, incent, and/or transfer lands (from willing property owners to conservation-focused land management organizations, agencies, or private owners/entities) in order to ensure lands will remain as functioning sage-brush habitat, with particular focus on land within PACs.</p> <p>Action CON-3-5 In accordance with OAR-635-140-0025 and OAR 660-023-0115, new development and related rights-of-way should avoid sage-grouse habitat, including important connectivity corridors and PAC areas.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enroll a minimum of 80% of eligible acres in CCAAs by enrollment deadline. • Enroll a minimum of TBD % of eligible landowners in SGI. • Secure TBD funds for CCAA s and other habitat management assistance programs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Work with the Land Trust Alliance and others to identify at least one land trust to expand service to eastern Oregon sage-grouse country. ○ Identify a priority private acreage and opportunities (including incentives) for enrollment in working land easements or other conservation-focused land management options.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the number of recruitment activities completed annually by each SWCD and other partner organizations • Funds identified and allocated to habitat management assistance programs • Documentation of the number of land trusts developed or with expanded service areas • Documentation of the number of private landowners/acres engaged in conservation-focused land management programs (SGI, CCAA’s, working lands easements, conservation-based ownership).

Isolated/Small Size; Connectivity: Action CON-3		
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counties DLCD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NRCS ODFW Private landowners SWCDs
Timeline	Landowner outreach: Ongoing	Summary of recruitment: Annually
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹³⁷ OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹³⁸ <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) 	

Isolated/Small Size; Connectivity: Action CON-4		
Action Description	<p>Action CON-4: Where appropriate, consider augmenting small or isolated populations and use best management techniques for translocations (see Appendix 4).</p> <p>Action CON-4-1 Monitor translocated sage-grouse to determine efficacy.</p>	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)	
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See objectives for population monitoring (Action MON-1). Develop ODFW policy detailing thresholds for when population augmentation would be indicated. 	
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See population monitoring performance measures (Action MON-1). Development of policy relating to sage-grouse translocations 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ODFW 	
Timeline	Policy development: December 2015	Translocations: As need is identified
Funding	Identified funds:	

¹³⁷ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹³⁸ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

Isolated/Small Size; Connectivity: Action CON-4	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator <p>Funds to be identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds for potential translocation efforts will be identified upon emergent need.

Free-Roaming Equids: Action FRE-1	
Action Description	<p>Action FRE-1: Develop, implement, and enforce adequate regulatory mechanisms that ensure that free-roaming horse and burro populations do not exceed AMLs in HMAs, particularly those that overlap with PACs.</p> <p>Action FRE-1-1 Incorporate desired habitat conditions consistent with the Sage-Grouse Habitat Assessment Framework (HAF) (Stiver et al. 2015) into HMA management plans and adjust AMLs as necessary to maintain suitable sage-grouse habitat parameters (this action is consistent with BLM RMPFEIS) (BLM 2015).</p> <p>Action FRE-1-1a If habitat indicators demonstrate grazing overuse in HMAs with free-roaming equid populations in excess of AMLs, prioritize free-roaming equid gathers over livestock grazing reductions.</p> <p>Action FRE-1-2 Prioritize funding for free-roaming equid gathers in PACs that exceed AML unless removals are necessary in other areas to prevent catastrophic environmental impacts.</p> <p>Action FRE-1-3 Exclude free-roaming equids from habitat restoration sites until perennial grasses are re-established and can sustain disturbance.</p> <p>Action FRE-1-4 Use permanent sterilization as a method to suppress population growth rates.</p> <p>Action FRE-1-5 Conduct range improvements to reduce the impacts of free-roaming horse and burro use in areas of critical sage-grouse habitat.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate HAF into all HMA plans. • Maintain free-roaming equid populations at or below AMLs, including reductions in population numbers prioritized by where the greatest exceedances of AML and/or habitat impacts are occurring. • Exclude free-roaming equids from 100% of restoration sites, where they pose a threat to achieving restoration objectives.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporation of HAF into HMA plans • Documentation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Free-roaming equid populations at or below AMLs within HMAs in PACs ○ Range improvements to reduce free-roaming equid impacts

Free-Roaming Equids: Action FRE-1	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Effective horse exclusion from restoration sites
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • GNRO • WGA
Timeline	<p>HAF incorporation into HMA plans: December 2015</p> <p>AML objectives reached (and maintained):</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>Exclusion of free-roaming equids from restoration sites: Ongoing (as restoration work occurs)</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <p>For policy work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM state office funds • Ongoing BLM Wild Horse and Burro Program funds • Ongoing GNRO funds • Ongoing WGA funds <p>For habitat monitoring, gathers, and research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM district funds • Ongoing BLM Wild Horse and Burro Program funds

Free-Roaming Equids: Action FRE-2	
Action Description	<p>Action FRE-2: Develop sound research methods to assess free-roaming equid populations and their environmental impacts.</p> <p>Action FRE-2-1 Establish a consistent statistically based methodology for free-roaming equid surveys to obtain population estimates across all HMAs.</p> <p>Action FRE-2-2 Develop and implement a monitoring plan to assess the impacts of free-roaming equids on sage-grouse habitat including measures of vegetation, soil, and invertebrates.</p> <p>Action FRE-2-3 Develop management triggers for free-roaming horse and burro populations so that, when population levels or habitat impacts are met, an appropriate set of actions to ameliorate the situation may be implemented.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	TBD

Free-Roaming Equids: Action FRE-2	
Performance Measures	TBD
Responsible Parties	BLM
Timeline	TBD
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <p>For policy work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM state office funds • Ongoing BLM Wild Horse and Burro Program funds • Ongoing GNRO funds • Ongoing WGA funds <p>For habitat monitoring, gathers, and research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM district funds • Ongoing BLM Wild Horse and Burro Program funds

Other Circumstances Metrics

Climate Change: Action CC-1	
Action Description	<p>Action CC-1: Use climate change models to identify zones of sage-grouse habitat that are predicted to tolerate future climate patterns.</p> <p>Action CC-1-2 Incorporate connectivity mapping with climate change modeling to ensure that opportunities exist for sage-grouse to adapt (to the extent their biological site fidelity allows) to changing habitat availability.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	TBD
Performance Measures	TBD
Responsible Parties	TNC
Timeline	TBD
Funding	<p>Funds to be identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funds TBD (awarded or requested from TNC to maintain the ORDSS and refine connectivity mapping as required)

Climate Change: Action CC-2	
Action Description	<p>Action CC-2: Identify and protect sagebrush habitat within PACs that is most likely to persist into the future under new climatic conditions associated with climate change.</p> <p>Action CC-2-1 Utilize the conservation measures identified throughout this Action Plan to protect these areas from primary and secondary threats that result in habitat fragmentation or loss.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	TBD
Performance Measures	TBD
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BLM ODFW
Timeline	TBD

Climate Change: Action CC-2	
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator • Ongoing BLM state office funds • Ongoing BLM district office funds <p><i>Related funds for conveying priority habitat improvement areas to mitigation creditors: \$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)¹³⁹</i></p>

Drought: Action DRT-1	
Action Description	<p>Action DRT-1: Adaptively manage livestock grazing during drought conditions to meet rangeland health standards that support sage-grouse habitat needs.</p> <p>Action DRT-1-1 Implement grazing management plans that contribute to the health of sage-grouse habitat and include conservation measures for drought conditions.</p> <p>Action DRT-1-2 Follow recommended grazing guidelines during drought conditions to meet seasonal sage-grouse habitat requirements (see Appendix 4). Consider (1) season or timing of use; (2) numbers of livestock (including temporary nonuse or livestock removal); (3) distribution of livestock use; (4) intensity of use; and (5) type of livestock.</p> <p>Action DRT-1-3 Increase monitoring during drought conditions to ensure that adaptive management is implemented in a timely manner.</p> <p>Action DRT-1-4 Remove administrative barriers to enforcing and/or regulating AUM reduction during drought.</p>
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	(Note: specific objectives will be developed/refined in CCAA/CCA site-specific plans.) See objectives for grazing conservation actions.
Performance Measures	(Note: specific performance measures will be developed/refined in CCAA/CCA site-specific plans.) See performance measures for grazing conservation actions.
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • NRCS • OWEB • SWCDs

¹³⁹ Agency package: ODFW-130.

Drought: Action DRT-1	
Timeline	See timelines for grazing conservation actions and those identified in CCAA/CCA site-specific plans.
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁴⁰ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁴¹ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁴² • Ongoing BLM district funds • Ongoing DSL funding (state lands CCAA) <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

Drought: Action DRT-2	
Action Description	<p>Action DRT-2: Prioritize free-roaming equid gathers during drought conditions in Herd Management Areas (HMAs) in PACs that exceed Appropriate Management Levels (AMLs) to meet rangeland health standards that support sage-grouse habitat needs.</p> <p>Action DRT-2-1 During drought conditions, maintain free-roaming equid AMLs at the low end of specified range for HMAs, particularly for HMAs that overlap with PACs.</p>
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	See objectives for free-roaming equids.
Performance Measures	See performance measures for free-roaming equids.
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • GNRO • WGA
Timeline	See timelines for free-roaming equids.

¹⁴⁰ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁴¹ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁴² Agency package: ODFW-105.

Drought: Action DRT-2	
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <p>For policy work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM state office funds • Ongoing BLM Wild Horse and Burro Program funds • Ongoing GNRO funds • Ongoing WGA funds <p>For habitat monitoring, gathers, and research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM district funds • Ongoing BLM Wild Horse and Burro Program funds

Drought: Action DRT-3	
Action Description	<p>Action DRT-3: Support infrastructure and resources in advance of drought or other environmental conditions so that livestock producers are able to adjust grazing as required.</p> <p>Action DRT-3-1 Provide educational opportunities for permittees and private landowners to learn about sage-grouse habitat requirements and conservation measures they can implement to improve rangeland conditions for livestock and sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action DRT-3-2 Create “grass banks” or reserve forage areas as alternative grazing opportunities to provide rest for over-utilized rangelands or allotments, or to be utilized during drought conditions, post-fire or after restoration work. Do so in a manner compatible with livestock operations locally.</p> <p>Action DRT-3-3 Identify opportunities to compensate landowners for the cost of implementing conservation measures associated with drought and facilitating practices to benefit sage-grouse and their habitat.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a minimum of 2 educational events for permittees annually per county. • Develop policies to facilitate converting relinquished allotments (or other opportunities) to grass banks/reserve forage allotments in a manner that supports and does not undermine livestock economies and conservation benefits. • Designate a minimum of acres TBD as available grass banks/reserve forage by 20XX (date TBD). • Conduct routine maintenance on infrastructure in grass bank allotments. • Maintain and increase funding by a minimum of TBD % for landowner incentive programs.

Drought: Action DRT-3		
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of education events or other learning opportunities • Development of new conservation incentives, compensation programs, and mitigation opportunities to develop/improve seasonal habitats • Documentation of the number of allotments reserved for grass banks and the quantity of cattle that can be accommodated during restoration activities elsewhere • Administrative policy developed to facilitate grass bank establishment consistent with related objectives. • Allocation of funds for expansion of landowner incentive programs. 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • GNRO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • SWCDs
Timeline	<p>Landowner outreach: Ongoing</p> <p>Grass bank policy completion: Spring 2016</p>	<p>Grass bank(s)/reserve forage established: Opportunistically, as grazing permits are relinquished</p> <p>New incentive programs: TBD</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <p>For education and on-the-ground actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁴³ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁴⁴ • DSL ongoing funding (state lands CCAA) • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁴⁵ <p>For policy work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM state office funds • Ongoing Governor's Natural Resource Office funds <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <p>For education:</p>	

¹⁴³ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁴⁴ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁴⁵ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Drought: Action DRT-3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

West Nile Virus: Action WNV-1	
Action Description	Action WNV-1: Reduce, eliminate, or augment artificial water developments that may contribute to mosquito prevalence.
Strategy Level	II Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	Maintain Oregon's low incidence of sage-grouse die-offs attributable to WNV by identifying and addressing all artificial water sources that may contribute to mosquito prevalence.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of artificial water sources that may contribute to mosquito prevalence • Documentation of actions to reduce mosquito prevalence
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS • ODFW • Private landowners • SWCDs
Timeline	Ongoing, as CCAA/CCA enrollment and SSPs occur and as BLM allotment reviews occur
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁴⁶ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁴⁷ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁴⁸ • DSL ongoing funding (state lands) • Ongoing BLM district funds <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

¹⁴⁶ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁴⁷ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁴⁸ Agency package: ODFW-105.

West Nile Virus: Action WNV-2	
Action Description	<p>Action WNV-2: Monitor sage-grouse and other species for the presence of WNV.</p> <p>Action WNV-2-1 Coordinate monitoring efforts with the Oregon Department of Agriculture and Oregon Public Health Authority, as well as other research and management activities.</p> <p>Action WNV-2-2 Report observations of dead or sick sage-grouse or other bird deaths that could be attributed to disease or parasites to responsible agencies within 48 hours.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	Detect 100% of sage-grouse mortalities potentially attributable to WNV.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of WNV presence by county • Documentation and investigation of sage-grouse mortalities caused by WNV
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODA • ODFW • OPHA • Private landowners • SWCDs
Timeline	Ongoing
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁴⁹ • Ongoing funds ODA • Ongoing funds OPHA • Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator

West Nile Virus: Action WNV-3	
Action Description	Action WNV-3: When planning or modifying water developments, use Implementation Recommendations and Guidelines to mitigate potential impacts from WNV and encourage the design of water development structures to minimize WNV risk to sage-grouse (see Appendix 4).
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	Maintain Oregon's low incidence of sage-grouse die-offs attributable to WNV by designing water developments to prevent mosquito prevalence.
Performance Measures	Documentation of water developments modified or planned with WNV risk-reduction features

¹⁴⁹ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

West Nile Virus: Action WNV-3	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs
Timeline	Ongoing, as CCAA/CCA enrollment and SSPs occur and as BLM allotment reviews occur
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁵⁰ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁵¹ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁵² • DSL ongoing funding (state lands) • Ongoing BLM district funds <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

West Nile Virus: Action WNV-4	
Action Description	<p>Action WNV-4: Cooperate with responsible agencies to implement feasible recommended mosquito control guidelines (see Appendix 4).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use appropriate Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-regulated larvicides and/or adulticides in areas proximal to key sage-grouse habitat where mosquito habitat cannot be reduced. • Evaluate the effectiveness of spraying adult mosquitoes and consider using mosquito-specific control measures. • Balance the benefits of mosquito control to sage-grouse with other environmental considerations (e.g., other species dependent on mosquitoes).
Strategy Level	I (Large-scale Planning) and II(Site-specific Management)
Objectives	TBD

¹⁵⁰ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁵¹ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁵² Agency package: ODFW-105.

West Nile Virus: Action WNV-4	
Performance Measures	TBD
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs
Timeline	As required
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁵³ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁵⁴ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁵⁵ • DSL ongoing funding (state lands) • Ongoing BLM district funds <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

Catastrophic Flooding: Action FLD-1	
Action Description	<p>Action FLD-1: Use the Rangeland Hydrology and Erosion Model (RHEM) to identify areas in sage-grouse habitat with a high susceptibility to erosion risk during catastrophic flooding events and, where appropriate, develop and implement strategies to minimize erosion risk.</p> <p>Action FLD-1-1 Prioritize erosion mitigation activities (juniper removal, seedings, plantings, etc.) in areas identified by RHEM that are proximal to key sage-grouse habitat, with special focus on areas that have burned.</p> <p>Action FLD-1-2 Evaluate stream segments to identify areas critically at risk of erosion and identify and implement measures to enhance stream function.</p>

¹⁵³ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁵⁴ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁵⁵ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Catastrophic Flooding: Action FLD-1	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management_
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain or enhance riparian health and resilience to high-water events. • Complete TBD % of erosion mitigation activities in prioritized areas annually.
Performance Measures	Documentation of flood risk reduction activities undertaken as part of site-specific plans
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs
Timeline	Ongoing, as CCAA/CCA enrollment and SSPs occur and as BLM allotment reviews occur
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁵⁶ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁵⁷ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁵⁸ • DSL ongoing funding (state lands) • Ongoing BLM district funds <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

Catastrophic Flooding: Action FLD-2	
Action Description	<p>Action FLD-2: Implement grazing management plans that contribute to the health of sage-grouse habitat and include conservation measures for catastrophic flooding conditions.</p> <p>Action FLD-2-1 Follow recommended grazing guidelines during catastrophic flooding conditions to meet seasonal sage-grouse habitat requirements (see Appendix 4). Consider (1) season or timing of use; (2) numbers of livestock (including temporary nonuse or</p>

¹⁵⁶ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁵⁷ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁵⁸ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Catastrophic Flooding: Action FLD-2	
	livestock removal); (3) distribution of livestock use; (4) intensity of use; and (5) type of livestock.
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	(Note: specific objectives will be developed/refined in CCAA/CCA site-specific plans.) See objectives for grazing conservation actions.
Performance Measures	(Note: specific performance measures will be developed/refined in CCAA/CCA site-specific plans.) See performance measures for grazing conservation actions.
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs
Timeline	See timelines for grazing and those associated with CCAAs/CCAs.
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁵⁹ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁶⁰ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁶¹ • DSL ongoing funding (state lands) • Ongoing BLM district funds <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

Catastrophic Flooding: Action FLD-3	
Action Description	<p>Action FLD-3: Support infrastructure and resources in advance of catastrophic flooding or other environmental conditions so that livestock producers are able to adjust grazing as required.</p> <p>Action FLD-3-1 Provide educational opportunities for permittees and private landowners to learn about sage-grouse habitat</p>

¹⁵⁹ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁶⁰ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁶¹ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Catastrophic Flooding: Action FLD-3		
	<p>requirements and conservation measures they can implement to improve rangeland conditions for livestock and sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action FLD-3-2 Create “grass banks” or reserve forage areas as alternative grazing opportunities to provide rest for over-utilized rangelands or allotments, or to be utilized during or in response to catastrophic flooding, post-fire or after restoration work. Do so in a manner compatible with livestock operations locally.</p> <p>Action FLD-3-3 Identify opportunities to compensate landowners for the cost of implementing conservation measures associated with catastrophic flooding and facilitating practices to benefit sage-grouse and their habitat.</p>	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)	
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a minimum of 2 educational events for permittees annually per county. • Develop policies to facilitate converting relinquished allotments (or other opportunities) to grass banks/reserve forage allotments in a manner that supports and does not undermine livestock economies and conservation benefits. • Designate a minimum of acres TBD serve as available grass banks/reserve forage by 20XX (date TBD). • Conduct routine maintenance on infrastructure in grass bank allotments. • Maintain and increase funding by a minimum of TBD % for landowner incentive programs. 	
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of education events or other learning opportunities • Development of new conservation incentives, compensation programs, and mitigation opportunities to develop/improve seasonal habitats • Documentation of the number of allotments reserved for grass banks and the quantity of cattle that can be accommodated during restoration activities elsewhere • Administrative policy developed to facilitate grass bank establishment consistent with related objectives. • Allocation of funds for expansion of landowner incentive programs 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • GNRO 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • SWCDs
Timeline	<p>Landowner outreach: Ongoing</p> <p>Grass bank/reserve forage policy completion: Spring 2016</p>	<p>Grass bank(s)/reserve forage established: Opportunistically, as grazing permits are relinquished</p> <p>New incentive programs: TBD</p>
Funding	Identified funds:	

Catastrophic Flooding: Action FLD-3	
	<p>For education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁶² • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁶³ • DSL ongoing funding (state lands) • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁶⁴ <p>For policy work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM state office funds • Ongoing Governor's Natural Resource Office funds <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p>Pending funds: For education: NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)</p>

Predation: Action PRD-1	
Action Description	Action PRD-1: Use Implementation Recommendations and Guidelines (see Appendix 4) to reduce anthropogenic influences that artificially boost predator populations or provide predators with hunting advantages in PACs and within 4 miles of leks.
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	(Note: specific objectives will be developed/refined in CCAA/CCA and BLM site-specific plans.)
Performance Measures	Documentation of modifications to or elimination of anthropogenic infrastructure known to contribute to increased predator populations
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • Private landowners • SWCDs
Timeline	Ongoing, as CCAA/CCA enrollment and SSPs occur

¹⁶² Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁶³ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁶⁴ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Predation: Action PRD-1	
	and as BLM allotment reviews occur
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁶⁵ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁶⁶ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁶⁷ • DSL ongoing funding (state lands) • Ongoing BLM district funds <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

Predation: Action PRD-2 and PRD-3	
Action Description	<p>Action PRD-2: Evaluate the localized influence of predators on declining sage-grouse populations. If predators are implicated in population declines, consider predator control programs to provide a short-term conservation benefit while addressing habitat loss, degradation, and fragmentation.</p> <p>Action PRD-2-1 When predation-based downward population trends and declining nesting success are detected, initiate predator surveys to identify the responsible predator species and relevant control efforts for a given species.</p> <p>Action PRD-2-2 When determined to be necessary, pursue take permits for corvids from the USFWS as regulated by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.</p> <p>Action PRD-2-3 Implement nonlethal methods to reduce predator subsidies in conjunction with lethal predator removal programs.</p> <p>Action PRD-2-4 Monitor predator control programs to determine any effects on sage-grouse nest success, recruitment, survival,</p>

¹⁶⁵ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁶⁶ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁶⁷ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Predation: Action PRD-2 and PRD-3	
	<p>and population trends. Adapt control strategies accordingly.</p> <p>Action PRD-3: Consider implementing predator threat reduction programs to promote the success of translocation efforts. Threat reduction should include removal of predator subsidies and may also include predator removal programs.</p>
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See population monitoring objectives (Action MON-1). • Utilize population augmentation/translocation efforts where necessary to (a) re-establish populations in habitat where natural bird establishment is constrained, or (b) to sustain or rebuild populations in response to exigent conditions. • Utilize predator control where supported by evidence of predator-driven localized population declines or where needed to support population augmentation/translocation efforts, while also addressing predator subsidies, habitat declines, or other causes of constraints on population growth.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See population monitoring performance measures (Action MON-1). • Development of ODFW policy and criteria related to population augmentation/translocation. • Development of ODFW policy and criteria guiding potential use of predator control and/or removal to augment sage-grouse populations and/or respond to localized population declines. • Development and implementation of predator management plans when indicated
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODFW • USFWS
Timeline	<p>See population monitoring timelines.</p> <p>Predator management plans: As needed or concurrent with translocation efforts</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator • Ongoing ODFW funds for Upland Game Bird Coordinator • Ongoing ODFW district funds <p>Funds to be identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds for predator removal efforts will be identified as need emerges.

Hunting: Action HNT-1 and HNT-2

Hunting: Action HNT-1 and HNT-2	
Action Description	<p>Action HNT-1: Maintain ODFW's harvest policy of less than 5% of the fall population.</p> <p>Action HNT-2: Do not authorize recreational harvest of sage-grouse in wildlife management units where the estimated spring population is <100 males in consecutive years.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) (HNT-1) and I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management) (HNT-2)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See population monitoring objectives (Action MON-1). • Maintain harvest rates that will not result in additive mortality or impacts in declining areas of concern.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See population monitoring performance measures (Action MON-1). • Documentation of harvest permit calculations and any restrictions in response.
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODFW
Timeline	Annually
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator • Ongoing ODFW funds for Upland Game Bird Coordinator • Ongoing ODFW district funds

Insecticides: Action INS-1, INS-2, and INS-3	
Action Description	<p>Action INS-1: Prioritize treatment of insect infestations that could lead to significant loss of sagebrush plant communities in PAC areas, while minimizing direct (mortality) and indirect (reduction of forage) impacts to sage-grouse.</p> <p>Action INS-2: Use Implementation Recommendations and Guidelines pertaining to the use of insecticides in sage-grouse habitat (see Appendix 4).</p> <p>Action INS-3: Evaluate the use of other nonchemical alternatives that are safe for wildlife to treat or prevent insect infestations.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning) (INS-1 and INS-3) and I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management) (INS-2)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the extent of sagebrush according to habitat objectives defined in the 2011 Strategy and the BLM RMP FEIS (i.e., 70% sagebrush; 30% other habitat types with restoration potential) by reducing sagebrush loss due to insect infestations.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of insect infestations as they occur • Documentation of justification for use of insecticides

Insecticides: Action INS-1, INS-2, and INS-3	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWCDs • ODA • APHIS • Private landowners
Timeline	As required
Funding	Funds to be identified: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds for treatment of insect infestations will be identified as need emerges. • No funds identified for INS-3

Sagebrush Defoliator Moth: Action SDM-1 and SDM-2	
Action Description	<p>Action SDM-1: Assess areas impacted by Aroga moth to determine the extent of damage to sagebrush and implement recommended guidelines and activities to reduce the risk of annual-grass invasion and wildfire (see Appendix 4).</p> <p>Action SDM-2: Monitor sage-grouse habitat for Aroga moth outbreaks. As bio-control methods are developed, consider their use where warranted.</p>
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management) (SDM-1) and I (Large-Scale Planning) and II (Site-Specific Management) (SDM-2)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the extent of sagebrush according to habitat objectives defined in the 2011 Strategy and the BLM RMP FEIS (i.e., 70% sagebrush; 30% other habitat types with restoration potential) by reducing sagebrush loss due to Aroga moth. • See objectives for annual-grass and wildfire prevention.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of areas impacted by Aroga moth infestations as they occur • See performance measures for annual-grass and wildfire prevention.
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWCDs • OWEB • BLM • ODFW • NRCS • Private landowners • ODA • DSL
Timeline	As required
Funding	Identified funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁶⁸ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁶⁹ • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁷⁰ • Ongoing BLM district funds

¹⁶⁸ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁶⁹ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁷⁰ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Sagebrush Defoliator Moth: Action SDM-1 and SDM-2

Pending funds:

- NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)
- BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined)
- TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-1

Action Description	<p>Action NXW-1: Enlist LITs and cooperative weed management areas (CWMAs) in cooperation with state, federal, and private land managers to apply local expert knowledge in conjunction with the spatial decision support tool (currently under development) to develop regional strategic work plans that identify priority areas to address noxious weeds, timelines, and responsible parties. Regional strategic work plans should identify areas for noxious weeds <i>prevention, treatment and restoration, and containment</i>. More detailed actions relating to these three invasive plant management approaches are listed below.</p> <p>Action NXW-1-1 As part of regional strategic work plans, develop GIS layers with polygons spatially representing priority areas for noxious weed treatment and containment (note: coarse layers have already been created by FIAT, coordinated by the BLM for Focal Habitat and Planning Areas specific to that process).</p>	
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)	
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create GIS layers with polygons spatially representing priority areas for noxious weed response (note: coarse layers have already been created by FIAT, coordinated by the BLM for Focal Habitat and Planning Areas specific to that process). • Develop regional LIT work plans identifying priority areas to address noxious weeds, timelines, and responsible parties. 	
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed GIS layers • Development of regional LIT work plans 	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM FIAT • CWMAs • County weed boards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LITs • SWCDs • ODA • ODFW
Timeline	GIS layers for fire suppression priorities: June 2016	Regional strategic work plans: Spring 2016 (with ongoing updates as noxious weeds are contained)
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator 	

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-1	
	<p><i>Related funds for conveying priority habitat improvement areas to mitigation creditors:</i></p> <p>\$286K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon administration of the All-Lands Mitigation Program (1 FTE position)¹⁷¹</p> <p>Funds to be identified:</p> <p>Funds TBD (awarded or requested from TNC to maintain the ORDSS)</p>

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-2	
Action Description	<p>Action NXW-2: Encourage landowners to enroll in habitat management assistance programs (e.g., CCAAs, SGI, and others) to ensure that technical expertise through ODFW, NRCS, SWCDs, and/or the OSU Extension Service is available to landowners to address noxious weed issues.</p> <p>Action NXW-2-2: Direct funding to ensure that adequate funds and staff capacity are available for development and implementation of conservation measures identified in site-specific habitat management plans.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enroll a minimum of 80% of eligible acres in CCAAs by enrollment deadline. • Enroll a minimum of TBD % of eligible landowners in SGI. • Secure TBD funds for CCAAs and other habitat management assistance programs.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the number of recruitment activities completed annually by each SWCD and other partner organizations • Annual documentation of the number of landowners/acres recruited or enrolled to participate in SGI and CCAAs • Funds identified and allocated to habitat management assistance programs
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS • ODFW • OWEB • SWCDs
Timeline	<p>Landowner outreach: Ongoing</p> <p>Summary of recruitment: Annually</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁷² • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁷³ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)¹⁷⁴

¹⁷¹ Agency package: ODFW-130.

¹⁷² Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁷³ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁷⁴ Agency package: ODFW-132.

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-2	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁷⁵ <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator; DSL ongoing funding (state lands CCAA)</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-3	
Action Description	<p>Action NXW-3: Implement noxious weed management plans for each PAC that identify priority areas for <i>prevention</i>.</p> <p>Action NXW-3-1 Prioritize proactive herbicide treatments as a prevention strategy in recently burned areas, particularly areas with low resistance and resilience that are proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat. Prioritize sites within 4 miles of leks (active or pending) and sites <2 miles from "key habitat," defined as areas with 75% breeding bird density and where sagebrush land cover is >65%.</p> <p>Action NXW-3-1a Remove administrative and policy barriers that delay herbicide treatments from the most effective implementation timeframe.</p> <p>Action NXW-3-2 Conduct systematic and strategic surveys to detect areas of expanding noxious weeds and expedite reporting and treatment of new infestations.</p> <p>Action NXW-3-3 In priority noxious weed prevention sites, limit disturbance within and around all remaining large, intact sagebrush patches, particularly in low-elevation sites with low resistance and resilience, because these sites are highly vulnerable to noxious weed invasion once desirable species are removed or disturbed.</p> <p>Action NXW-3-4 Require general techniques to prevent human-caused spread of noxious weeds resulting from road maintenance (e.g., blading), construction/development, and OHV activity, as well as during fire suppression activities.</p> <p>Action NXW-3-5 Suppress fire in areas within or proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitats that are particularly vulnerable to noxious weed invasion.</p> <p>Action NXW-3-6 Utilize grazing management techniques to increase the resilience of systems to noxious weed establishment.</p>

¹⁷⁵ Agency package: ODFW-105.

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-3				
	Action NXW-3-7 Monitor areas impacted by ground-disturbing activities for a minimum of 3 years and apply herbicide to new invasions of noxious weeds expeditiously.			
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)			
Objectives	<p>(Note: Specific objectives will be developed/refined in LIT regional work plans. Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treat a minimum of 80-100% of recently burned acres (depending on the scale and severity of annual fire seasons) as a prevention strategy on private, state, and federal lands (prioritized in areas with low resistance and resilience proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Complete 100% of herbicide treatments during the most effective timeframe. • Complete systematic surveys annually. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Treat 100% of all newly identified infestations during the fall following identification. • Require and implement prevention plans for 100% of the human activities identified to have the potential to spread noxious weeds. • Suppress 100% of fires in areas proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat that are at risk of annual-grass invasion. • Develop grazing management plans for 100% of acres enrolled in CCAAs/CCAs to reduce spread of noxious weeds as enrollment occurs. • Develop and implement monitoring and adaptive management plans for 100% of all disturbed areas. 			
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual documentation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Acres treated in recently burned areas on private, state, and federal lands ◦ Systematic surveys and follow-up treatments of newly identified infestations ◦ Inclusion of Implementation Recommendations and Guidelines (IRGs) for fuels management and fire suppression activities to prevent human-caused spread of annual invasive grasses in fuels/fire suppression protocol ◦ Inclusion of IRGs for development and construction projects to prevent human-caused spread of annual invasive grasses as a requirement of permits ◦ Suppressed fire ignitions ◦ Grazing management plans developed/implemented ◦ Monitoring and adaptive management actions undertaken in disturbed areas 			
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARS • BLM • BLM FIAT • County weed depts. • CWMAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSL • Local road districts • NRCS • ODA • ODFW 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODOT • OSU • OSWB • OWEB • Private landowners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RFPAs • Sage-Grouse Habitat Program Manager • SWCDs • USFS • Watershed councils
Timeline	Preventive treatments in burned areas: Incorporation of IRGs as requirement of development/ construction			

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-3		
	<p>Ongoing, as needed</p> <p>Systematic surveys for noxious weeds: Annually</p> <p>Treatment of new infestations: During the fall following identification</p> <p>Incorporation of IRGs in fuels/fire suppression protocol: June 2015</p>	<p>permits: Ongoing</p> <p>Fire suppression in prioritized areas: As needed</p> <p>Development of grazing management plans: Ongoing, as CCAA/CCA enrollment and SSPs occur</p> <p>Development of monitoring and adaptive management plans for disturbed areas: Concurrent with new disturbance</p>
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$100K funded to ODA (2015-2017) for Oregon Invasive Species Council (sage-grouse) for overall response to invasive species, including restoration and protection¹⁷⁶ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁷⁷ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)¹⁷⁸ • ODA ongoing funding (Noxious Weed Program and SWCD Program) • DSL ongoing funding (state lands CCAA) • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁷⁹ • \$2.7M appropriated to BLM for habitat improvements in S. Warners (1 FTE position)¹⁸⁰ • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs, 3 (FTE positions)¹⁸¹ <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p><i>Related funds (for fire suppression in priority areas for invasive annual-grass prevention):</i> \$1.6M funded to ODF (2015-2017) for RFPA support (1.5 FTE positions)¹⁸²</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> See funds identified to monitor conservation actions, landscape-level condition, and site-specific habitat condition.</p>	

¹⁷⁶ Agency package: ODA-320.

¹⁷⁷ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁷⁸ Agency package: ODFW-132.

¹⁷⁹ Agency package: ODFW-105.

¹⁸⁰ Combined DOI Resilient Landscapes project funds (\$1.56M), FIAT funds (\$935K), and district funds.

¹⁸¹ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁸² Agency package: ODF-119 and ODF-120.

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-3	
	<p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-4	
Action Description	<p>Action NXW-4: Implement invasive plant management plans for each PAC that identifies priority areas for <i>treatment</i> and <i>restoration</i>.</p> <p>Action NXW-4-1 Prioritize treatment and restoration of invaded sites with the greatest potential to succeed (e.g., moderate infestations or areas with inadequate perennial species in medium-to-high resistance and resilience areas) that are proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize sites within 4 miles of leks (active or pending) and sites <2 miles from "key habitat," defined as areas with 75% breeding bird density and where sagebrush land cover is >65%. Over time, expand treatment and restoration activities outward from key habitat patches. <p>Action NXW-4-2 Prioritize restoration efforts in recently burned areas, particularly areas that are proximal to valuable sage-grouse habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize sites within 4 miles of leks (active or pending) and sites <2 miles from "key habitat," defined as areas with 75% breeding bird density and where sagebrush land cover is >65%. <p>Action NXW-4-3 Implement successful novel techniques, such as "precision restoration" and bio-controls, in areas where they are expected to have demonstrated efficacy.</p> <p>Action NXW-4-4 Monitor restoration projects for effectiveness and repeat rehabilitation activities as required.</p>
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<p>(Note: Specific objectives will be developed/refined in LIT regional work plans. Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treat and restore TBD % of prioritized areas annually. • Implement restoration efforts in a minimum of 80-100% of recently burned areas in priority areas (depending on the scale and severity of annual fire seasons). • Pending resource availability and completion of scientific trials, implement novel restoration techniques in 100% of areas where they

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-4															
	are expected to be effective. • Develop and implement monitoring and adaptive management plans for 100% of all restoration areas.														
Performance Measures	• Annual documentation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Acres receiving restoration treatments in prioritized areas on private, state, and federal lands ○ Efforts that employ “precision restoration techniques” ○ Monitoring and adaptive management of restoration projects 														
Responsible Parties	<table> <tr> <td>• BLM</td><td>• DSL</td><td>• ODFW</td><td>• SWCDs</td></tr> <tr> <td>• BLM FIAT</td><td>• NRCS</td><td>• Private landowners</td><td>• USFS</td></tr> <tr> <td>• County weed boards</td><td>• ODA</td><td>• Sage-Grouse Habitat Program Manager</td><td></td></tr> </table>			• BLM	• DSL	• ODFW	• SWCDs	• BLM FIAT	• NRCS	• Private landowners	• USFS	• County weed boards	• ODA	• Sage-Grouse Habitat Program Manager	
• BLM	• DSL	• ODFW	• SWCDs												
• BLM FIAT	• NRCS	• Private landowners	• USFS												
• County weed boards	• ODA	• Sage-Grouse Habitat Program Manager													
Timeline	Restoration treatment in prioritized areas: Date TBD														
Funding	Identified funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$100K funded to ODA (2015-2017) for Oregon Invasive Species Council (sage-grouse) for overall response to invasive species, including restoration and protection¹⁸³ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁸⁴ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)¹⁸⁵ • ODA ongoing funding (Noxious Weed Program and SWCD Program) • DSL ongoing funding (state lands CCAA) • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁸⁶ • \$2.7M appropriated to BLM for habitat improvements in S. Warners (1 FTE position)¹⁸⁷ • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs, 3 (FTE positions)¹⁸⁸ <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p><i>Related funds (for fire suppression in priority areas for invasive annual-grass prevention):</i> \$1.6M funded to ODF (2015-2017) for RFP support (1.5 FTE positions)¹⁸⁹</p>														

¹⁸³ Agency package: ODA-320.

¹⁸⁴ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁸⁵ Agency package: ODFW-132.

¹⁸⁶ Agency package: ODFW-105.

¹⁸⁷ Combined DOI Resilient Landscapes project funds (\$1.56M), FIAT funds (\$935K), and district funds.

¹⁸⁸ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁸⁹ Agency package: ODF-119 and ODF-120.

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-4	
	<p><i>Related funds:</i> See funds identified to monitor conservation actions, landscape-level condition, and site-specific habitat condition.</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-5	
Action Description	<p>Action NXW-5: Implement invasive plant management plans for each PAC that identify priority areas to <i>contain</i> existing patches of noxious weeds.</p> <p>Action NXW-5-1 Implement and maintain containment programs for large infestations that may include the following techniques: (1) border spraying; (2) establishing a barrier to expansion with aggressive perennial species that are competitive with noxious weeds; (3) biological control agents; and/or (4) targeted grazing.</p> <p>Action NXW-5-2 Prioritize containment where large infestations of noxious weeds threaten highly valuable sage-grouse habitat. Prioritize sites within 4 miles of leks (active or pending) and sites <2 miles from "key habitat," defined as areas with 75% breeding bird density and where sagebrush land cover is >65%. Also prioritize meadows and riparian areas where noxious weeds impact brood-rearing habitat.</p>
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Note: Specific objectives will be developed/refined in LIT regional work plans. Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.) • Contain TBD % of prioritized areas annually • Repeat containment efforts as required (adaptive management)
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual documentation of acres treated as a containment strategy in prioritized areas on private, state, and federal lands
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • BLM FIAT • County weed boards • DSL • NRCS • ODA • ODFW • Private landowners • Sage-Grouse Habitat Program Manager • SWCDs • USFS
Timeline	Containment treatment in prioritized areas:

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-5	
	Date TBD
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$100K funded to ODA (2015-2017) for Oregon Invasive Species Council (sage-grouse) for overall response to invasive species, including restoration and protection¹⁹⁰ • OWEB (minimum of \$10M 2015-2025)¹⁹¹ • \$500K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for SageCon pre- and post-wildfire resilience (1 FTE position)¹⁹² • ODA ongoing funding (Noxious Weed Program and SWCD Program) • DSL ongoing funding (state lands CCAA) • \$90K funded to ODFW (2015-2017) for support for conservation practices to alleviate threats to sage-grouse (2 FTE positions)¹⁹³ • \$2.7M appropriated to BLM for habitat improvements in S. Warners (1 FTE position)¹⁹⁴ • \$18M (\$9M RCPP award to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs, 3 (FTE positions)¹⁹⁵ <p><i>Related funds:</i> Ongoing ODFW funds for Sage-Grouse Conservation Coordinator</p> <p><i>Related funds (for fire suppression in priority areas for invasive annual-grass prevention):</i> \$1.6M funded to ODF (2015-2017) for RFPA support (1.5 FTE positions)¹⁹⁶</p> <p><i>Related funds:</i> See funds identified to monitor conservation actions, landscape-level condition, and site-specific habitat condition.</p> <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined)

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-6	
Action Description	Action NXW-6: Develop grazing management plans for lands and allotments enrolled in CCAAs and CCAs, as well as other Farm Bill programs that employ grazing techniques that maintain or improve the perennial native grass and shrub community, and prevent spread

¹⁹⁰ Agency package: ODA-320.

¹⁹¹ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

¹⁹² Agency package: ODFW-132.

¹⁹³ Agency package: ODFW-105.

¹⁹⁴ Combined DOI Resilient Landscapes project funds (\$1.56M), FIAT funds (\$935K), and district funds.

¹⁹⁵ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁹⁶ Agency package: ODF-119 and ODF-120.

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-6	
	<p>of noxious weeds.</p> <p>Action NXW-6-1 Assess pastures/allotments dominated by Wyoming big sagebrush and prioritize implementation of proper grazing management plans for those with documented improper grazing impacts to native perennial grass and forbs, and soil biotic crusts.</p> <p>Action NXW-6-2 Identify allotments with noxious weeds and implement control measures to prevent the transfer of invasive species via livestock.</p> <p>Action NXW-6-3 Evaluate and treat heavily used areas (e.g., water sources or transfer areas) for noxious weed invasions and prioritize for treatment and containment actions.</p> <p>Action NXW-6-4 Utilize targeted livestock grazing to reduce annual invasive plants, increase desirable perennial grasses and forbs, and maintain and increase desired habitat structure.</p>
Strategy Level	II (Site-Specific Management)
Objectives	<p>(Note: Specific objectives will be developed/refined in LIT regional work plans and/or CCAA/CCA site-specific plans. Also see FIAT reports for objectives and timelines for activities in FIAT planning areas.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop grazing management plans for 100% of acres enrolled in CCAAs/CCAs (or other Farm Bill programs) to reduce spread of noxious weeds as enrollment occurs. • Assess TBD % of prioritized allotments annually. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implement control measures in 100% of areas identified as having impacts from improper grazing annually. • Assess TBD % of heavily used areas annually. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implement control measures in 100% of heavily used areas with noxious weeds. • Utilize targeted livestock grazing in 100% of the areas in which such a strategy is expected to successfully reduce noxious weeds. • Document invasive annual-grass reduction and understory perennial grass and shrub recovery in all treatment areas (using metrics TBD).
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual documentation of the following in relation to PAC locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Allotments with impacts resulting from improper grazing ○ Control measures implemented on allotments with noxious weeds ○ Heavily used areas treated to control invasive annual-grass spread ○ Allotments where grazing is used for invasive annual-grass control, including effectiveness reporting ○ Monitoring and adaptive management of grazing management plans and prevention/treatment/containment projects
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • NRCS

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-6	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permittees enrolled in CCAs with grazing management as part of allotment SSPs • Private landowners enrolled in CCAAs with grazing management as part of SSPs • SWCDs
Timeline	Containment measures implemented in allotments with noxious weeds: Date TBD
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$18M (\$9M funded to SWCDs plus match) for implementation of CCAAs (3 FTE positions)¹⁹⁷ • OWEB (\$10M minimum 2015-2025)¹⁹⁸ • DSL ongoing funding (state lands CCAA) • ODA ongoing funding (Noxious Weed Program and SWCD Program) <p>Pending funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRCS \$200M over next 4 years specific to sage-grouse across all western states (Oregon portion to be determined) • BLM \$15M (FY16) greater sage-grouse conservation and management (40% for project implementation; Oregon portion to be determined) • TBD additional BLM appropriations from president's budget

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-7	
Action Description	<p>Action NXW-7: Support infrastructure, resources, and research that will enhance noxious weed prevention and habitat restoration.</p> <p>Action NXW-7-1 Support ongoing research and pilot efforts evaluating noxious weed prevention and control techniques and precision restoration technologies, seeking to improve the likelihood of success when actively restoring sagebrush sites. Advance treatments that employ these new techniques and technologies in order to test their effectiveness, and expand to a wider scale where effective.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify funds TDB for prevention and restoration technology research. • Identify funds TDB for local, native seed collection and storage.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of funding identified for prevention and restoration technology research and local, native seed stock • Documentation of the quantity of local, native seed available

¹⁹⁷ Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) grant from NRCS.

¹⁹⁸ Funding from state lottery fund dedicated to identified priority sage-grouse conservation actions.

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-7	
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARS • BLM
Timeline	Funding requests submitted for research: Native seed facility with TBD quantity of seed available established: Ongoing Date TBD
Funding	Identified funds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds TBD identified for ARS • Funds TBD identified for local, native seed collection/banks

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-8	
Action Description	<p>Action NXW-8 Designate “grass banks” or reserve areas for grazers to utilize when rest is recommended on existing allotments or pastures, or to be utilized during drought conditions, post-fire or after restoration work in order to ensure restoration treatment success. Do so in a manner compatible with livestock operations locally.</p> <p>Action NXW-8-1 Remove administrative barriers to establishing “grass banks” on federal land.</p> <p>Action NXW-8-2 Maintain fencing and other improvements on “grass banks” so they are ready for use as need emerges.</p> <p>Action NXW-8-3 Assess “grass banks” to determine whether, if ungrazed, they are contributing to fire risk/fuel loads, and use grazing as a management tool to reduce fuel loads if required.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop policies to facilitate converting relinquished allotments to grass banks/reserve forage allotments in a manner that supports and does not undermine livestock economies and conservation benefits. • Designate a minimum of acres TBD as available grass banks by 20XX (date TBD). • Conduct routine maintenance on infrastructure in grass bank allotments.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of the number of allotments reserved for grass banks and the quantity of cattle that can be accommodated during restoration activities elsewhere • Administrative policy developed to facilitate grass bank establishment consistent with related objectives.
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • DSL
Timeline	Policy completion: Spring 2016 Grass bank(s) established: Opportunistically, as grazing permits are relinquished
Funding	Identified funds:

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-8	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing BLM state office funds for policy work • Ongoing BLM district funds

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-9	
Action Description	<p>Action NXW-9: Remove administrative or procedural barriers to noxious weed management.</p> <p>Action NXW-9-1 Support policy changes to remove the court-ordered injunction prohibiting the use of herbicides on all federally administered lands in Oregon.</p> <p>Action NXW-9-2 Support restructuring of the post-fire emergency stabilization and restoration (ESR) funding scheme to ensure that adequate funds are available for long-term post-fire habitat management.</p> <p>Action NXW-9-3 Support development of a post-fire emergency stabilization and restoration program for private lands.</p> <p>Action NXW-9-4 Coordinate with state and federal agencies to develop consistent procedures and policies for the treatment of noxious and invasive plants, chemical usage, and timing.</p> <p>Action NXW-9-5 Support funding infrastructure and resources for federal-, state-, and county-level noxious weed control programs which are key to sage-grouse habitat protection.</p>
Strategy Level	I (Large-Scale Planning)
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete all EAs to support removal of court-ordered injunction on herbicide use on federal lands. • Develop private land ESR program. • Restructure federal ESR program. • Align state and federal policies and procedures for noxious weed treatment.
Performance Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of court-ordered injunction on herbicide use on federal lands • New private land ESR program created • Restructuring of federal ESR completed • Alignment of federal and state policies/procedures completed
Responsible Parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BLM • County weed boards • ODA
Timeline	<p>Removal of court-ordered injunction: January 2016</p> <p>ESR restructuring: June 2015</p>

Noxious Weeds: Action NXW-9	
Funding	<p>Identified funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing ODA funds for policy work • Ongoing BLM state office funds for policy work