

Summary of changes from public comments received on July 2010 Draft of Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Strategy and Assessment and included in the March 2011 Draft.

Comment	Entity/Individual	Addressed	Page no.
Describe counties where grouse occur	OCA	List of counties where grouse habitat occurs was provided	1
Reference social and economic aspects of counties	AOC	Appendix referenced where social economic analysis could be found	1
Linkage to Oregon's Comprehensive Conservation Strategy	Commission	4 of 6 issues identified in OCCS listed as they pertain to sage-grouse	1
Linkage to existing land use plans is lacking	OCA	Language specifically referencing Resource Management Plans referenced	2
Clearly defined measures needed in ARM section	B. Mulder Tree Top Ranches	Identified effectiveness measures including grouse abundance, increased use or changes in habitat quality	3
Literature set incomplete as far as most recent	OCA	Recent references were updated to the Plan, including Kolada et al.	8,9
Geographic variation in shrub cover not explained	OCA	Recent studies from Eastern and western extremes of range were included in discussion	9
Need to emphasize importance of agricultural fields	OCA	Sentence added identifying the use of ag fields	9
Language confusing on predation rates	Baker Public Meeting, D. Fleming	First sentence of "Predation" paragraph rephrased to clarify relationship of survival to percentage lost to various types of mortality	11
Need greater discussion on types of predator	D. Fleming, OCA	Paragraph added to expand on potential predators on various life history stages	11
Suggested that threat of road density not well defined	ONDA	Language added to identify known impacts and relationship of road density	13
Suggested moving the entire 1st para of monitoring section	OCA	Chose not to move the paragraph, but added a sentence indicating the need for the definitions where they occur	14
Recommended that a more indepth historic perspective be included	Larson & Hutton, OCA	Staff suggests the existing historic data is adequate to address those concerns without making the document much lengthier	16

Summary of changes from public comments received on July 2010 Draft of Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Strategy and Assessment and included in the March 2011 Draft.

Recommended that a more indepth historic perspective be included	Larson & Hutton, OCA	Staff suggests the existing historic data is adequate to address those concerns without making the document much lengthier	16
Clarification is needed as to what is certain about historic numbers	SEORRAC	Reworded to capture "exact" magnitude is difficult to know, but there are less today than in past times	16
Predator removal data represent a minimum cull	SEORRAC	Inserted language reflecting this minimum	16
Clarification is needed as to what productivity levels equates to stable population	USFWS	Paragraph added that expands on this question with some analysis	31
Be specific to Oregon data	K. Kestner, Lake County	Inserted language specifying Oregon	34
Unclear why spring 2003 populations are used as benchmark	Larson & Hutton	Rationale added speaking to the fact that populations have fluctuated within 99% of the 2003 estimate	34
Triggers are not well described	Larson & Hutton	Paragraph added to rationale that explains why a 5 yr moving window was used	34
Confusion as to the linkage to the Baker population	SEORRAC	Language added to describe the stability of Baker and similarity of issues	39
Too specific with regards to Mal. Refuge habitat	SEORRAC	Generalized language about locations of grouse use to "portions"	40
Wordsmithing about sagebrush stands	SEORRAC	Changed to "severely depleted"	42
Feral horses/burros greater discussion needed	OCA, OHA	Section added on feral horses	44
Language regarding past use of riparian biased	B. Mulder Tree Top Ranches, Larson & Hutton, OCA	Language deleted	45
Climate change needs to be addressed	ONDA, RNP many others	1-page of text was added as well as a conservation guideline	45
Delete "inappropriate" to difficult to define	K. Kestner, Lake County	Reworded such use conflicts with sage-grouse use of those areas.	45
Speculative comments on impacts delete	RNP	Sentence was deleted	47
Geo thermal is different densities suggest using known quantified densities	ORMAT	Language added describing well densities	47

Summary of changes from public comments received on July 2010 Draft of Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Strategy and Assessment and included in the March 2011 Draft.

Wildlife are grazers too, should be recognize	OCA, Larson & Hutton	Language added "by wildlife and domestic livestock. Public land livestock grazing is based on prescribed forage utilization	57
Corrected figure needed in Table 18	SEORRAC	Correction made on subtotal of potential habitat	66
Greater discussion on connectivity needed and 70/30 goal	ONDA	Two additional paragraphs added identifying recent science that supports the 70/30 goal	74
Clarify role as advise, consult and cooperate	Larson & Hutton	Exact language added to Action 1.1	77
Clarify definition of development	OCA, McKenzie Ranch, ONDA	Two additional paragraphs added to define development action	79
Define sustainable ranching	K. Kestner, Lake County	Added suggested language by Kestner to use BLM rangeland health assessments	79
To designate habitat classification, a formal rulemaking is required	C. Crowley, Columbia Energy Partners	Rule language added to formalize methodologies that are used to generate Core and Low Density Area Maps into rule, but just the methods not maps	82-83
General need to clarify language about Core Areas	Several publics	A couple of pages of new text were added to better describe how Cores are developed and what they can and cannot be used for	82-84
Social and economic issues understated	AOC	Added a quote regarding the general impact of ESA listing on economics	98
A broader group of noxious weeds needs to be mentioned	D. Helmick	Added additional invasive weed species per suggestion	107
Reference needed regarding brush beating	D. Fleming, OCA	Reference added Dahlgren et al. 2006	109
Clarification of implementation of Core Area approach	Several publics	Reworded and deleted setback distances from this guideline	87-88 & 113-114
Renewable energy development can assist in reducing carbon footprint	RNP	Climate change conservation guideline added that signifies this fact but also provides caution in the siting of such developments	115
Language to further specify role of regulatory mechanisms	K. Kestner, Lake County	Language added per suggestion	119
The importance of CCAA needs to be discussed	SEORRAC	Guidance suggested for the implementation of USFWS candidate agreements	119

Summary of changes from public comments received on July 2010 Draft of Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Strategy and Assessment and included in the March 2011 Draft.

Provide context for the importance of local communities and local knowledge to this process	1000 Friends	Several paragraphs added to address this concern	124-125
County involvement in process needs to be formal	AOC	Counties added as formal voting members to local implementation teams	126
Need to provide incentives to landowners	Burns public meeting, 1000 Friends	Paragraph added to suggest this	127
Local knowledge as an experimental study should be incorporated	1000 Friends	Paragraph added to suggest this	135
Economic activity related to sage-grouse needs clarification	AOC, Harney County	Language revised, and table added for specific economic contribution of all fish and wildlife activities	135-136
Social and economic issues understated	AOC, Harney County	AOC social and economic report added as an appendix to Plan	200