Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan

Final Draft
May 27, 2003

Table of Contents

	Page
1. Introduction	2
2. Purpose of the Plan	3
3. Guiding Goals and Principles of the Plan	3
4. Plan Implementation	4
5. Goals and Recommended Management Practices Defined	7
6. Sage-Grouse and Their Habitats	9
6.1. Sage-Grouse Population Status and Trends in Wyoming	9
6.2. Sage-Grouse Habitats	15
7. Issues and Recommendations	
7.1. Conflicting Wildlife and Wild Horse Management Goals	22
7.2. Farming	24
7.3. Hunting	25
7.4. Invasive Plants	27
7.5. Livestock Grazing	28
7.6. Mineral Development	31
7.7. Parasites and Diseases	34
7.8. Pesticides	35
7.9. Predation	36
7.10. Recreation	38
7.11. Residential Development	39
7.12. Vegetation Management	41
7.13. Weather	44
8. Habitat Monitoring, Assessment and Evaluation	46
9. Research Needs	49
10. Endangered Species Act Listing Factors	51
11. Citizen Working Group	52
12. Glossary	53
13. List of References	55
14. Appendix 1: Population Monitoring and Assessment	79
15. Appendix 2: Nesting and Early Brood-rearing Habitat Methods and Descriptions	88

Introduction

In the second half of the 20th Century, numbers of greater sage-grouse (*Centrocerucus urophasianus*), referred to as sage-grouse throughout this plan, have declined throughout their range. The causes of the decline have not been quantified.

In 2000, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) designated the Upper Columbia populations (Washington State) of the western greater sage-grouse (*Centrocerucus urophasianus phaios*) as candidates for listing under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act), 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq*., due to their limited distribution and population numbers. The candidate designation means that listing is warranted, but is precluded by higher priority actions. In March 2003, the Service determined that the western subspecies was not warranted for listing. In addition, the Gunnison sage-grouse *(C. minimus)*, a closely related sagebrush obligate in western Colorado and eastern Utah, has also been designated as a candidate for listing under the Act. On December 26, 2002, the Service published a notice of negative finding for a petition received on the Mono Basin population (CA/NV) of the greater sage-grouse, as the petitioner was not able to definitively identify a distinct population segment. The Service has received petitions to list the greater sage-grouse across its entire range. While no decisions have been made on these petitions, litigation is pending.

People involved in the sage-grouse issue have initiated conservation planning efforts focused on outlining what is required to sustain or perpetuate populations. Wyoming elected to create this comprehensive statewide document, with locally developed plans to follow. Parties involved in the initial statewide effort included: agricultural, industrial, governmental, environmental, hunting, and Native American tribal interests.

The Wyoming strategy focuses on implementation by local working groups. In the absence of plans developed at local levels, goals and tasks and Recommended Management Practices (RMPs) found in this plan should guide planning and management efforts.

Using the concepts of rangeland health as a management philosophy (National Academy of Sciences 1994) should lead to a more balanced rangeland ecosystem, including a mosaic of seral stages beneficial to the greater sage-grouse.

Purpose of the Plan: (In no priority order)

The purpose of the Wyoming Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan will be to:

- establish the framework for local working groups to guide management efforts directed at halting long-term population declines
- maintain and improve sage-grouse habitats in Wyoming
- provide for coordinated management across jurisdictional or ownership boundaries
- develop the statewide support necessary to assure the survival of Wyoming's sage-grouse populations
- be dynamic and flexible enough to include new information and issues as well as results from current and future conservation efforts
- provide Wyoming-based management solutions to sage-grouse problems using Wyoming-based data and research to the extent practicable
- address the five listing factors as defined by the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended

Guiding Goals and Principles of the Plan: (In no priority order)

- increase the present abundance and distribution of sage-grouse in Wyoming
- halt sage-grouse population declines in Wyoming
- determine the primary causes of sage-grouse declines
- provide Recommended Management Practices aimed at productive and healthy sage-grouse populations
- promote management that results in diverse, productive, and healthy sagebrush habitats while recognizing that sagebrush habitats provide values for species other than sage-grouse
- promote public involvement in planning and decision-making
- provide a framework for the development and implementation of local sage-grouse conservation plans to address and rectify potential impacts
- maintain an atmosphere of cooperation, participation, and commitment among wildlife managers, landowners, land managers, other stakeholders and interested public in development and implementation of conservation actions
- respect individual views and values, and implement conservation actions in a cooperative manner that generates broad community support
- implement conservation actions in a manner that meets the needs of sage-grouse, and are least disruptive to a stable and diverse economic base in Wyoming
- recognize the need to continually update data and apply them to local situations
- monitoring and evaluation are an important part of this plan, and adjustments to the goals, objectives, and conservation actions will be made considering the best available data
- identify research needs where knowledge is lacking
- encourage long-term funding for collecting and analyzing data over a period of time adequate to make appropriate resource management decisions

Plan Implementation

The statewide plan is largely reliant on implementation by local working groups. The role of the local working groups is to adapt the statewide plan to specific local areas and develop and implement strategies that will improve or maintain sage-grouse populations and habitats. In the absence of a completed local sage-grouse plan we encourage applicable state and federal agencies to use the information provided in the statewide plan as sage-grouse management guidance.

The statewide plan offers an overview of issues affecting sage-grouse in Wyoming and provides recommendations to address those issues. This plan is organized to facilitate the identification of issues that potentially impact sage-grouse populations on a local scale, and identify what steps should be taken to minimize those impacts. The plan has been developed using the most current information available. We encourage further investigation, but caution against "reinventing the wheel." Local working groups should not try to rewrite the statewide plan, but should focus on site-specific implementation to meet the goals outlined in this plan.

Statewide recommendations will need to be adapted to fit local conditions. While this will require development of an implementation plan, efforts should be focused on getting things done on the ground. Local working groups should evaluate potential limiting factors and develop strategies to address those factors. Groups should utilize resource specialists from all appropriate disciplines to develop and implement on the ground conservation actions. The Wyoming Game and Fish Commission (WGFC) should enter into agreements with federal agencies to implement this plan, and to address the needs of sage-grouse in all land use plans. Implementation of strategies will be done within the scope of agencies' existing policies, although local groups may influence agency policy, they do not have the authority to change agency policies, many of which are mandated by state and federal law.

Local working groups are in the best position to respond to these issues and will be essential to conservation of sage-grouse in Wyoming. Successful implementation will require the establishment of local working groups within a meaningful timeframe. Decisions are being made today relative to sage-grouse in Wyoming. One of the priorities is to identify populations at high risk and rank them according to need and potential for success. Consequently, local working groups should be established as soon as possible in high priority areas to allow citizen participation in the process. This may require commitment of resources from the State above and beyond what is currently available to the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission (WGFC). The general public, especially Wyoming citizens, have a role in sage-grouse conservation. Funding for sage-grouse conservation should not be limited to revenue from hunters, anglers and other traditional funding sources. Wyoming has access to federal Shrub-Steppe Restoration funding that could be used to initiate planning efforts. In addition, other state and federal land management agencies are allocating resources to sage-grouse conservation, and grant funding is becoming available nationwide.

Local Working Group Structure

- local working groups (groups) should be comprised of an equal number of knowledgeable individuals from four areas - agriculture, conservation, industry, and agencies, with single representatives from local government, tribes, public at large, etc. (No more than 12 individuals should comprise a group.)
- the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) through the WGFC should call for participation in local areas and appoint local working group members who are credible representatives from the above four areas
- members should live or work in the area affected
- groups should utilize resource specialists from all appropriate disciplines
- groups should be facilitated with an identified administrator to take minutes and coordinate meetings
- after the 2nd meeting groups should elect a chair, to make sure tasks are completed,
- groups should establish a decision-making process, (consensus, majority, etc.) as well as timelines for accomplishing tasks
- these should be field-oriented, on-the-ground groups
- adequate advance meeting notice is essential and participation should be available to the public (e.g. WGFD website, and other appropriate sites)
- members of the statewide working group should be viewed as a resource to local working groups
- local groups should identify information gaps and research needs that exist within their area

Local Working Group Expectations

Within two years, Local Working Groups are expected to:

- identify and prioritize issues affecting sage-grouse in their area
- identify solutions to problems affecting sage-grouse in their area
- develop an action plan geared toward addressing these problems
- identify priority areas for implementation of conservation actions
- identify funding sources to implement conservation actions
- recommend to private, State or Federal land managers at least one project
- provide annual updates of progress to the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission and other affected agencies

The statewide working group recommends eleven local working groups as shown in Figure 1. Within one year of approval of this plan, local working group(s) should be formed in Upper Green River Basin, Powder River Basin, and Bates Hole/Shirley Basin to address local sage-grouse conservation plans. Within two years, additional groups should be added in Great Divide Basin, Wind River/Sweetwater River Basin, Lower Green River Basin, and Southwest. Within three years groups, should be added in Upper North Platte, Bighorn Basin, Jackson Hole, and Cheyenne River. Within two years of the formation of each local group, goals and tasks as outlined in the statewide plan should be acted upon.



Figure 1. Local conservation planning areas for sage-grouse.

The following tasks (many of which are RMP's in this plan) are largely beyond the scope of Local Working Groups. The WGFD, in coordination with the BLM, Forest Service and other resource agencies/institutions as appropriate, should address these tasks within three years of the adoption of the statewide plan.

1) Continue to refine and implement sage-grouse population monitoring protocols that will more accurately document long-term population trends.
2) Prepare local and statewide annual reports of sage-grouse data utilizing the WGFD Sage-Grouse Database that includes status of known leks, hunter harvest and productivity data based on wings from harvested birds. These reports should include three and ten year trends (longer term where available).
3) Identify and map seasonal sage-grouse habitats (winter, breeding, nesting, early/late brood-rearing) statewide.
4) Develop and implement sage-grouse habitat monitoring protocols at both broad- and mid-scale (as defined in the plan).
5) Maintain or increase current levels of research on sage-grouse and their habitat (using the list of research needs provided in the plan).
6) Provide educational materials to the public-at-large and to specific groups as appropriate (e.g. recreationists, developers, landowners, hunters) about sage-grouse and their habitat needs. The first such document should be a Wyoming guide to enhancing sage-grouse habitat directed toward landowners/lessees who graze livestock."

Goals and Recommended Management Practices Defined

Goals describe desired results of Recommended Management Practices, and monitoring determines if goals are being met. Goals should be designed to be attainable, measurable, and based upon an appropriate timeline. Local sage-grouse working groups should develop site-specific objectives, which are consistent with the statewide goals outlined in this conservation plan. Statewide conservation plan goals are consistent with the intent and goals outlined in the MOU among the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, U.S. Department of Agriculture (Forest Service), U.S. Department of Interior (BLM), and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The most current information available was used to develop statewide goals.

A Sage-Grouse Recommended Management Practice (RMP) is a management practice that should contribute to the maintenance or improvement of sage-grouse populations, or enhance the ecological health of Wyoming's sage-grouse habitats. RMPs are designed to be a "tool-box" of options local sage-grouse working groups and others can refine and use to address issues that have the potential to influence sage-grouse populations or habitats. Recommended Management Practices should be implemented based upon need. Highly impacted habitats and populations may require multiple tools or the whole "tool-box," while stable habitats and populations may only require a few maintenance tools. RMPs are intended to focus management strategies to help reach the goals outlined in local Wyoming Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan(s).

RMPs should be implemented when a population is trending downward, or is below the population indicated by 2000 lek data (see Population Status and Trend), or when local sage-grouse working groups, based upon the best available science, determine those RMPs are necessary to maintain local sage-grouse populations or habitat. Long- and short-term population thresholds of concern occur when lek counts indicate a population has declined by at least 10 percent over a 10 year period, or when lek counts demonstrate that a population has declined for three consecutive years with a cumulative decline of 10 percent. Long-term data generally consists of 10 or more years and shows the effects of habitat quality and management over time that may require long-term changes to land/resource use patterns. Short-term data should consist of no less than 3 consecutive years and may reveal the effects of more ephemeral issues such as drought that may require short-term changes in land/resource use patterns. Before implementing RMPs that alter existing management practices, limiting factors of the declining population should be assessed. This may include evaluating existing data or initiating detailed monitoring. RMPs should be selected to address the limiting factor(s) causing the decline. Monitoring should continue after RMPs are implemented to determine if goals are being achieved. Implementation of RMPs that substantially alter existing management strategies should be subject to local review by all affected interests.

The Statewide Sage-Grouse Working Group identified issues that could potentially affect sage-grouse populations and RMPs that could be used to address the identified issues. These goals and RMPs are divided into habitat based and activity based

sections. Duplication may occur. Repetition does not imply greater importance. Local working groups may identify additional issues.

When selecting RMPs the following fundamentals should be considered:

- apply most current and pertinent research to determine which management practices are contributing to negative trends in local sage-grouse populations and their seasonal habitats, and adjust management as information emerges
- RMPs selected should be directed to the factor(s) identified as causing the impact to or limiting the population (e.g. if a lack of forbs is identified as limiting chick survival the RMP should be directed to enhancing the production of food forbs)
- management decisions should be based on applicable studies, local conditions, and the potential of the range sites
- proposed changes to current planning documents or existing on-the-ground management for the purpose of enhancing sage-grouse should include an economic analysis of both the positive and negative impacts to existing users

Sage-Grouse and Their Habitats

Sage-Grouse Population Status and Trends in Wyoming

Sage-grouse are a large upland game bird considered a “landscape species”, annually using widespread areas of sagebrush habitats. Sage-grouse are common throughout Wyoming because sage-grouse habitat remains relatively intact compared to other states. Figure 2 shows current and historical sage-grouse distribution in Wyoming.



Figure 2. Wyoming greater sage-grouse distribution.

Available data sets and anecdotal accounts indicate declines in Wyoming sage-grouse populations over the last five decades.

Wyoming’s first systematic report of sage-grouse leks began in 1949 with Robert Patterson’s (1952) pioneering study, “The Sage Grouse in Wyoming”. This study was largely conducted in northern Sweetwater County near Farson. Patterson counted 42 leks and observed 3,118 males in 1949 (average 74/lek) and 3,199 in 1950 (average 76/lek). By the 1990’s, 39 of the 42 leks had been abandoned and are now considered historical. Six leks not identified by Patterson have since been documented. There were a maximum of 548 males on the 9 active leks in the study area in the 1990’s (average 61/lek).

Efforts to monitor leks increased over the last half of the 20th Century to the point that in 2002, 1,164 leks were checked across Wyoming and 375 of these were viewed at least three times and are considered "count" leks. The remaining 789 are considered "survey" leks where activity or lack of activity was monitored. The number of checked leks equals the sum of counted leks plus surveyed leks.

While the effort to monitor leks has increased along with the total number of males counted, the number of males counted per lek has declined each decade since 1949 (Table 1, Figures 3 and 4).

Table 1. Wyoming statewide lek data by decade, 1949-2000. Based on February 2003 WGFD Sage-Grouse Database.

Years	# lek checks	# males observed	males/ lek	# lek counts	# males observed	males/ lek
1949-60	287	13,210	46	151	10,865	72
1961-70	814	25,119	31	142	6,726	47
1971-80	1,752	30,977	18	184	5,536	30
1981-90	5,302	80,609	15	430	10,005	23
1991-2000	7,838	97,438	12	1,956	41,874	21



Figure 3. Wyoming lek observations by decade total.



Figure 4. Wyoming statewide male sage-grouse per lek by decade average for lek counts and all lek checks.

Lek data must be interpreted with caution for several reasons: 1) the survey effort and the number of leks surveyed/counted has varied over time, 2) it is assumed that not all leks in the state have been located, 3) sage-grouse populations often cycle over approximately a 10 year period, 4) the effects of unlocated or unmonitored leks that have become inactive cannot be quantified or qualified, and 5) lek locations may change over time. Both the number of leks and the number of males attending these leks must be quantified in order to estimate population size. Monitoring male attendance on leks provides a reasonable index of relative change in abundance in response to prevailing environmental conditions over time.

Long-term harvest trends are similar to that of spring counts of males on leks. Hunting season regulations have varied over time, potentially changing total harvest irrespective of the grouse population trend, therefore the number of birds harvested per day per hunter statistic may provide a more consistent measure of relative bird availability, and therefore, abundance (Figure 5). The number of birds harvested per day declined approximately 50 percent between the 1960's and 1990's from an average of about two birds per day per hunter in the 1960's to about 1 bird per day in the 1990's. The rate of decline is very similar to that reflected in the lek data. Over most of this time the bag limit was consistently 3 birds per day.



Figure 5. Wyoming statewide total sage-grouse harvest and birds/day 1957-2001.

One of the primary components of an effective sage-grouse conservation strategy will be the continued development of a standardized population monitoring program capable of producing meaningful, rigorous status and trend information. This monitoring program should result in regular reports being generated by the WGFD that can be used by local planning groups to analyze local situations and implement local conservation plans. These data should also be suitable for aggregate analysis at the statewide level.

With the exception of a few areas in the state where lek counts were conducted, lek monitoring during the latter half of the 20th Century was done primarily to document the presence/absence of leks. Because of the sheer number of leks in the state, the data were not collected systematically enough to provide meaningful population size information. Beginning about 1996, efforts were begun to collect more rigorous count information on specified leks so that population trends could be more precisely determined. Based on this information it appears that the statewide sage-grouse population was at very low levels in the mid 1990s but increased approximately three-fold during the late 1990's, peaking in 2000 (Figure 6). This increase was attributed to increased precipitation received in those years. While 2000's population increase was short-lived due to the return of drought conditions and was undoubtedly lower than that of the early 1950s, it does represent a baseline year for when the statewide population was relatively healthy.



Figure 6. Wyoming statewide average males/lek 1980-2002.

For purposes of this statewide plan, the relative population level indicated by the lek count data from the year 2000 serves as a statewide objective to achieve during population peaks. The 295 leks that were counted in the state in 2002 had a peak count average of 28 males per lek. During the mid-1990's low point, there were not enough leks being counted to provide a reliable low point below which the population should not be allowed to reach. For purposes of this plan we recommend the average number of males on count leks not decline below 10 males per lek during population cyclic lows. The number of known active leks in 2002 (1,650-1,700) is the minimum number of leks the state should seek to maintain. It is assumed that a majority, but not all leks have been identified. This goal is subject to change dependent on the receipt of new information.

Since 1992, WGFD has expanded its effort to monitor and evaluate sage-grouse populations through increased funding for research and a renewed emphasis on obtaining lek counts and harvest information. Management costs borne by WGFD since 1990 are shown in Figure 7. Other agencies (e.g. BLM, Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service), private industry, and volunteers have also expanded efforts to conserve sage-grouse in Wyoming through research funding, monitoring, and mapping efforts. Several studies have been conducted, the results of which were utilized in the development of this document. In addition, a WGFD internal sage-grouse working group has been formed to encourage consistent data collection across the state and provide research and management recommendations. A statewide sage-grouse database has recently been developed that incorporates lek survey and count data as well as harvest data, including age and sex of harvest as determined by wing barrels. As this database comes into use, it should provide the basis for both local and statewide analysis of sage-grouse population status and trend. Additional efforts are being made across the species range to standardize population monitoring techniques.



Figure 7. WGFD annual sage-grouse management expenditures 1990-2000.

Sage-Grouse Population and Population Monitoring Goals

1) Maintain or increase cyclical peak sage-grouse numbers as measured by a consistently applied monitoring protocol using data from the year 2000 as a baseline (28 males/count lek).
2) Do not allow the average number of males/count lek to decline below 10 during cyclical lows.
3) Maintain or increase active sage-grouse leks at or above the number of known leks in 2002 (1,650-1,700).
4) Provide for the long-term and short-term monitoring of sage-grouse in Wyoming.
5) Reflect as accurately as possible the historic distribution and status of sage-grouse.
6) Continue to implement established protocols for future population monitoring and record keeping, including mechanisms to insure consistent implementation.

Sage-Grouse Population Monitoring Recommended Management Practices

1) Prepare local and statewide annual summaries of sage-grouse data utilizing the primary database that includes information on the location and status of all known leks, hunter harvest and wing data.
2) Develop a monitoring protocol that would more accurately document long-term population trends.
3) Develop and refine techniques to measure productivity where wing data are unavailable.
4) Review population data annually to determine three and ten year trends.

Sage-Grouse Habitats

Sagebrush and sagebrush habitats are essential for sage-grouse survival. Suitable habitat consists of plant communities dominated by sagebrush and a diverse native grass and forb (flowering herbaceous plants) understory. The composition of shrubs, grass and forb varies with the subspecies of sagebrush, the condition of the habitat at any given location, and range site potential. Seasonal habitats must occur in a patchwork or mosaic across the landscape. Their spatial arrangement, the amount of each seasonal habitat, and the vegetative condition determine the landscape's potential for sage-grouse. This arrangement is an important factor in determining if a population is migratory or non-migratory in nature. Both quantity and quality of the sagebrush environment determines suitability for and productivity of sage-grouse.

Winter Habitat

During winter, sage-grouse feed almost exclusively on sagebrush leaves and buds. Suitable winter habitat requires sagebrush above snow. Sage-grouse tend to select wintering sites where sagebrush is 10-14 inches above the snow. Sagebrush canopy covers utilized by sage-grouse above the snow may range from 10 to 30 percent. Sage-grouse generally return to traditional wintering areas before heavy snowfall. Movements to wintering areas vary widely ranging from a few miles to over 50 miles, depending on the area. Foraging areas tend to be gentle southwest facing slopes and windswept ridges. Sage-grouse roost in open, low sagebrush sites on clear, calm nights. During windy periods or during snowstorms sage-grouse seek taller shrubs with greater canopy cover. Sage-grouse will fly considerable distances (>5 miles) and elevations (>1,000 feet) between winter feeding sites and suitable snow roosting sites. Sage-grouse will burrow in deep powdery snow to conserve energy. During severe winters, the amount of suitable available habitat is greatly reduced. Severe winter habitat may, or may not be, considered crucial habitat. Some severe winter habitat may be essential and used to a great extent during severe winters, while others may only be used occasionally.

Winter Habitat Goal

1) Maintain winter habitats in a manner that results in sustained or improved health with no long-term net loss of severe winter habitat.

Winter Habitat Recommended Management Practices

1) Use aerial photos, surveys, other remote sensing techniques, local knowledge and anecdotal information to identify winter habitat.
2) Map winter habitat by vegetation type, range site, and seral stages.
3) Manage winter habitat for robust annual growth of leaves and leaders on sagebrush.
4) When planning sagebrush altering activities, consider winter habitat needs on a landscape scale.

5) Integrate knowledge of wintering habitat with planning and management activities that will affect sagebrush habitats.

Breeding Habitat (Leks) - Early Spring

Breeding occurs on strutting grounds (leks) during late March and April. Leks are generally situated on sites with minimal sagebrush, broad ridge tops, grassy openings, and disturbed sites such as burns, abandoned well locations, airstrips or roads. Sage-grouse select spots with lower herbaceous height and less shrub cover than surrounding areas as lek sites. Leks are generally proximal to nesting habitat.

There are migratory and non-migratory populations of sage-grouse. In some areas both migratory and non-migratory birds may use the same lek. If all of the components of their habitat are available within one area, some sage-grouse may not migrate. For these non-migratory populations the lek may be an approximate center of their annual range. Migratory sage-grouse populations may move seasonally through hundreds of square miles of widely distributed habitats. There is evidence that sage-grouse hens exhibit fidelity to lek and nesting areas, and males return to leks where they have achieved stature in the breeding hierarchy.

As populations decrease, leks can be abandoned; however as populations increase and expand, leks can become active again.

Lek-Associated Habitat

Stands of sagebrush surrounding leks are used extensively by sage-grouse. During breeding, sage-grouse use the habitat surrounding a lek for foraging, loafing and protection from weather and predators. Pre-nesting habitats should contain areas of early-to-mid seral stage vegetative communities at fine scales with relatively open sagebrush canopies and a robust, leafy forb understory. These areas should be interspersed throughout potential nesting habitats. A small-grained mosaic of early-to-late seral stages of sagebrush communities is desired.

Plant composition in early spring habitat contributes to nesting success. At green-up, forbs are more nutritious than sagebrush. Sage-grouse hens need these protein, calcium, and phosphorus rich foods to support nest initiation, increase clutch size, and improve hatch success as well as early chick survival. Low growing leafy forbs, especially milky-stemmed composites (e.g. dandelion), represent potential food forbs. Commonly identified important food forb species include common dandelion (*Taraxacum officinale*), curlycup gumweed (*Grindelia squarrosa*), western salsify (*Tragopogon dubius*), western yarrow (*Achillea lanulosa*), prickly lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), cudweed (*Gnaphalium palustre*), fleabane (*Erigeron* spp.), sweetclover (*Melilotus officinalis*), milkvetch (*Astragalus bisulcatus*), alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*), winterfat (*Eurotia lanata*) and fringed sagewort (*Artemisia frigida*) although most forb species when they are young and succulent are eaten by sage-grouse.

Breeding Habitat Goal

1) Maintain breeding habitat in a manner that provides adequate protein, calcium and phosphorus rich foods, especially forbs to support nest initiation, clutch size hatching success and chick survival that will maintain robust populations and increase depressed populations.

Breeding Habitat Recommended Management Practices

1) Limit the distribution of lek site information to avoid stressing birds. Avoid disturbance on lek sites while birds are on the lek, generally from March through May.
2) Identify and map lek and lek associated habitats.
3) Maintain areas of low sagebrush canopy cover and high herbaceous composition adjacent to nesting habitat.
4) Avoid habitat alteration on or within ¼ mile of the perimeter of lek sites.

Nesting Habitat - Late Spring

Approximately two-thirds of hens nest within 3 miles of the lek where they were bred. The remainder of the birds usually nest within 15 miles of the lek, but one collared bird in western Wyoming ranged 60 miles.

Sage-grouse typically nest under sagebrush, but may use other large shrubs. Sage-grouse select mid-height, denser sagebrush stands for nesting. Studies conducted in southern and southwestern Wyoming indicate that the nest bush heights (*Aretemisia tridentata wyomingenisis*) ranged between 8 to 18 inches for sage-grouse, but individual plants (all subspecies of *Artemisia tridentata*) utilized rangewide by sage-grouse may reach 32 inches in height. Sagebrush canopy cover at nesting sites ranged between 6% and 40%. Wyoming studies indicate greater total shrub and dead sagebrush canopy cover, and residual grass cover are vegetative attributes sage-grouse choose in the nest selection process, when compared to surrounding vegetation. These sagebrush stands should have sagebrush of varying heights with good residual grass under the sagebrush canopy, and the areas between the sagebrush should have good forb cover while maintaining some grass and litter cover. Live grass heights measured immediately after hatch ranged between 4 and 9 inches with residual grass heights of 2 to 6 inches. Herbaceous cover was quite variable and ranged between 1% and 85%. Although dead sagebrush canopy cover has been shown to be statistically significant in nest selection, it represented only 12% to 21% of the overall canopy cover in the stand. Dead sagebrush may provide screening cover while allowing for increased amounts of herbaceous understory.

In general, at nest sites, dense residual grasses at least as tall as the bottom of the canopy on mid-height sagebrush plants appear to positively influence hatching success. Areas that support a diverse forb understory should be in close proximity to these nesting sites for feeding during incubation and brood-rearing. Hatching success

appears to improve with increased forb cover. The vegetative composition of an area depends upon site potential, seral stage and past management.

Nesting Habitat Goal

1) Maintain nesting habitat in a manner that provides adequate sagebrush, residual grass and forb cover in order to maintain robust populations and increase depressed populations of sage-grouse.

Nesting Habitat Recommended Management Practices

1) Any activity that removes sagebrush should leave adequate areas for nesting sage-grouse in occupied sage-grouse habitat. Areas with sagebrush canopy cover exceeding 30% should be evaluated for treatment.
2) Where understory is limiting, vegetation manipulations should be considered to restore the grass and forb component in sagebrush stands to meet the needs of nesting sage-grouse.
3) Monitor nesting habitat to determine limitations on nesting suitability and success.
4) Manage for forb abundance and diversity to benefit hen nutrition.
5) Under sagebrush plants suitable for nesting, allow grass to achieve its annual growth potential. The percentage of nesting habitat existing in this condition should be determined on a site-specific basis.
6) Manage interstitial areas between sagebrush in nesting habitat to enhance food forbs.

Early Brood-Rearing Habitat - June to Mid-July

Early brood-rearing habitats are used during the brood's first month of life. Hens move their brood immediately upon hatching from the nest site to brood-rearing areas. Sites used during the first 10-14 days after hatching are typically within 1 1/2 miles of the nest. The vast majority of chick mortality (87% of total brood loss in four studies occurring in Wyoming) occurs during this period. After the first 10 days, broods may have dispersed five or more miles from the nest.

A highly diverse vegetation mosaic is essential to early brood-rearing. Early brood-rearing habitat is more open (10-15% sagebrush canopy cover and similar sagebrush height) with higher herbaceous cover than nesting habitat. Brood survival is tied to an abundance of insects and green vegetation, primarily forbs, in close proximity to sagebrush cover that provides adequate protection from weather and predators. Food forb species important to chick survival are very similar to those listed as important for pre-laying hens. Vegetation diversity increases insect diversity. Insects are crucial during the first ten days post-hatch. Studies suggest insects can make up to 75% of chick diets. Insects remain an important source of protein throughout the summer.

Early Brood-rearing Habitat Goal

1) Maintain early brood-rearing habitat near nest sites in a manner that provides adequate areas with less sagebrush cover, higher herbaceous cover (especially forbs) and greater insect abundance and diversity as compared to nest sites.

Early Brood-rearing Habitat Recommended Management Practices

1) Manage sagebrush understory and interstitial areas in early brood-rearing habitats to provide an abundance of forbs, insects and herbaceous cover.
2) Identify and monitor insect availability, abundance and diversity within specific sites to gain an understanding of their importance to sage-grouse.

Late Brood-Rearing Habitat - Mid-July through Mid-September

As summer progresses and food plants mature and dry, sage-grouse move to areas still supporting succulent herbaceous vegetation. They continue to rely on adjacent sagebrush for protection from weather and predators, and for roosting and loafing. These areas may be lower elevation native or irrigated meadows where uplands lack green vegetation. Sage-grouse will also migrate to higher elevations, seeking habitats where succulent forbs are still available in sagebrush habitats or select sites such as moist grassy areas, or upland meadows. A delay in maturing of forbs has a noticeable effect on bird movements. In years with above-normal summer precipitation, sage-grouse may find succulent forbs on upland sites all summer. In more arid areas, riparian meadows become more important to survival of broods in the late summer. From mid to late summer, wet meadows, springs and streams are the primary sites that produce the forbs and insects necessary for juvenile birds. The drier the summer, the more sage-grouse are attracted to the remaining green areas.

Late Brood-Rearing Habitat Goal

1) Maintain a mosaic of riparian habitats and wet meadows (including hay fields) that provide an abundance of green forbs near sagebrush cover.

Late Brood-rearing Habitat Recommended Management Practices

1) Manage riparian habitats, wetlands, springs and water sources in close proximity to sagebrush for food forbs and insects while maintaining the integrity of the riparian system.
2) Maintain sagebrush cover close to hay meadows or riparian areas.
3) Consider creating water overflow on developed water sources, and fencing spring sources and overflow areas to provide food forbs.

Fall Habitat - Mid-September to First Major Snow

Time spent in fall habitat is highly dependent upon weather conditions. Sage-grouse normally move off late brood-rearing habitat onto transitional fall habitat before moving onto winter range. As fall precipitation increases and temperatures decrease, sage-grouse move into mixed sagebrush-grassland habitats in moist upland and mid-slope draws where fall green-up of cool-season grasses and some forbs occur. As the meadows dry and frost kills forbs, sagebrush consumption increases. Fall movements to winter ranges are slow and meandering from late August to December. With major snowfall accumulation, sage-grouse move onto winter range.

Fall Habitat Goal

1) Maintain linkages of sagebrush habitats that allow birds to move between late brood-rearing and winter habitats.

Fall Habitat Recommended Management Practices

1) Avoid loss of fall habitat.

Landscape Context

Providing for all habitat needs on the scale required by sage-grouse may be the most challenging element of managing the landscape. The value of the various successional stages of sagebrush communities to sage-grouse is not well understood. Therefore there is debate about how they should be managed to maximize benefits to sage-grouse. There is also a need to identify structure and cover components. These challenges are greatest in breeding (pre-nesting, nesting and early brood-rearing) habitats. These habitats have to be in proximity to one another and constitute a small-grained mosaic of seral stages and vegetation structure (height and cover). All habitat types are important, and an overabundance of one type will not make up for a lack of another. For example, managing for a late-seral stage on a landscape scale will not necessarily provide for early brood-rearing habitat, and conversely managing for early seral sagebrush habitats on a large scale usually fails to provide the nesting and security cover needs of sage-grouse.

Because leks have been shown to be reliable indicators of nesting habitat, it is suggested that habitat assessment focus on nesting and early brood-rearing habitat associated with leks. Landscape scale is highly variable because the landscape may contain migratory or resident populations, or both.

It is assumed that, if upland vegetation is managed at a variety of early, mid, and late seral stages at the landscape scale, the area will provide sage-grouse with ~~a~~ the variety of habitats required annually. Issues relating to the landscape scale habitat needs of sage-grouse must consider seasonal habitat (pre-nesting, nesting, early brood-rearing, late brood-rearing, fall, and winter), juxtaposition, seral stages of vegetation, site

potential, vegetative structure, and past and future management. The ideal or required percentages of each seasonal habitat and the juxtaposition of these habitats on the landscape are not well known.

Landscape Habitat Goals

1) Maintain and enhance healthy sagebrush ecosystems, which provide a diversity of sagebrush seral stages and types (age, structure, cover classes, density) plant and animal species diversity, and patches of appropriate habitat, including riparian areas.
2) Maintain a healthy sagebrush understory with a diversity and abundance of forbs and grasses.
3) Maintain a healthy, diverse and abundant sage-grouse food source including insects.
4) Maintain seasonal habitats in amounts and proportions that provide for the needs of sage-grouse on a landscape scale.
5) Maintain a variety of human uses, including traditional and emerging uses, while providing for the needs of sage-grouse.
6) Maintain soil stability, watershed function, integrity of nutrient cycles and energy flow, and presence of recovery mechanisms.
7) Maintain landscapes in a vegetative mosaic that provides a variety of early, mid, and late seral stages.

Landscape Habitat Recommended Management Practices

1) Design and implement vegetation manipulations that benefit sagebrush ecosystems in the long-term with consideration for the needs of sage-grouse. (see Vegetation Management Section)
2) Manage for age class diversity and patchiness (within and between habitat types) in sagebrush habitats.
3) Treat noxious weeds and other invasive plants of concern aggressively where they threaten quality of sagebrush habitat.
4) Within three years, identify and map seasonal sage-grouse habitats statewide.

Conflicting Wildlife and Wild Horse Management

Management goals for other wildlife species utilizing sagebrush ecosystems can conflict with sage-grouse population and habitat management goals. Managing a single sagebrush site for all wildlife species that may inhabit sagebrush communities is impractical or not possible because practices that benefit some species can be detrimental to others. Approximately 100 bird species, 70 mammal species, and several reptiles are found in sagebrush habitats including many sagebrush obligates or near-obligates such as the sage-grouse, sage sparrow, Brewer's sparrow, sage thrasher, pygmy rabbit, sagebrush vole, sagebrush lizard, and pronghorn. A number of other priority or sensitive wildlife species are dependent upon or inhabit the sagebrush ecosystem including white-tailed prairie dog, ferruginous hawk, mountain plover, midget-faded rattlesnake, Columbian sharp-tailed grouse, and swift fox among others. Each has specific micro-site habitat requirements that often conflict with the seasonal habitat requirements of sage-grouse. On a landscape scale, with a mosaic of seral stages and vegetation types, the specific seasonal habitat requirements of the various wildlife species that inhabit sagebrush ecosystems can be accommodated.

Elk, mule deer and pronghorn are the primary wild ungulates that occur within occupied sage-grouse habitat. Grazing and browsing can contribute to long-term changes in plant communities and can alter various habitat components that contribute to the health of sagebrush ecosystems and the sage-grouse habitat it supports**.** As with livestock these grazing/browsing effects may be positive, negative or neutral depending on site specific conditions. Areas of concern may be where there is annual heavy sagebrush browsing by large winter concentrations of mule deer, pronghorn or where high densities of wild horses or wintering elk reduce residual grasses in nesting habitat.

Federal and state laws, rules and regulations have been enacted that limit management options for various wildlife or plants. Some may conflict with sage-grouse management goals. Some threatened, endangered or candidate species have habitat requirements or other needs that directly conflict with sage-grouse habitat requirements or preferences.

Conflicting Wildlife and Wild Horse Management Goal

1) Minimize negative impacts to sage-grouse caused by management practices and habitat improvement projects intended for other species.

Conflicting Wildlife and Wild Horse Management Recommended Management Practices

1) Evaluate effects to sage-grouse caused when managing for other wildlife species.
2) Evaluate effects wild horses have on sage-grouse.
3) Review federal Appropriate Management Levels (AML) for wild horses as they relate to habitat conditions for sage-grouse. Until such review is complete, maintain wild horse numbers no higher than AML.

4) Document areas where conflicting species management goals may negatively impact sage-grouse.
5) Assess how proposed habitat improvement projects geared toward other species could impact sage-grouse.
6) When planning mitigation projects, avoid negative impacts to sage-grouse.
7) Review big game herd goals and modify and implement special big game seasons to meet harvest objectives as necessary to improve habitat conditions for sage-grouse.
8) Incorporate sage-grouse needs into management plans for wildlife, especially big game.

Farming

In Wyoming, “farming” is primarily harvest of native hay in meadows along some streams and rivers and very limited row or cash crop farming. Farming areas are primarily in irrigated settings with the major crops being native hay, alfalfa, barley, oats, corn and some sugar beets. Farming areas (dry land and irrigated) make up only about 1.5 million acres of the state, or 2.5 percent of the land area and have remained at that level for many years. Most farmland is privately owned, and the value of habitat and open space provided by the continued existence of farm operations should be recognized.

Many of the impacts that occurred from farming occurred following homesteading of Wyoming. Sagebrush habitats that had the best soils were converted to hay and row crops. Today only limited areas are being converted from sagebrush habitats to farmlands that support hay and row crops. Farms that raise alfalfa or native hay may be beneficial to sage-grouse. Some degree of habitat fragmentation may occur as a result of farming and associated infrastructure. Ecological and economic constraints limit the amount of land in Wyoming that can be converted to farmland. Federal farm programs associated with dry land crops may lead to the conversion of sagebrush to farmland.

Farming Goal

1) Conduct farming operations in a manner that is compatible with maintenance and enhancement of sage-grouse habitat.

Farming Recommended Management Practices

1) Map suitable sage-grouse habitat and focus conservation and management efforts on areas where the most benefit can be realized.
2) Identify the types of agricultural practices that are beneficial or detrimental to sage-grouse.
3) Develop and provide information on funding options available to landowners who wish to improve sage-grouse habitat.
4) Work with private landowners to prepare habitat maps, which identify seasonal habitats for sage-grouse and to develop a voluntary site-specific management program.
5) Provide landowners with information on sage-grouse and how to provide for and protect sage-grouse habitat.
6) Develop water sources to benefit both crop production and healthy riparian habitat. Avoid surface and sub-surface water depletion that impacts sage-grouse habitats.
7) Improve visibility of new fences, and of existing fences where problems have been documented, in sage-grouse habitats.
8) Research and develop incentives that would reward farmers who provide the type of habitat that maintains and enhances sage-grouse populations.

Hunting

Sage-grouse hunting in Wyoming is a traditional recreation activity in modern times and was one means of human subsistence prehistorically. Sage-grouse have been hunted annually under regulation of the WGFD since 1948. From 1937 to 1947 the hunting season was closed because of concern over low populations of grouse. Native Americans traditionally hunt male sage-grouse in the spring. This practice continues at minimal levels on the Wind River Indian Reservation.

Sage-grouse hunting provides recreational, cultural and economic values. The biological data the harvested birds provide via harvest surveys and wing collections serve as important indicators of population status. In addition, hunting creates a constituency of sage-grouse advocates who are interested in seeing that grouse and their needs as a population are met. However, concern has been expressed about the impacts of recreational hunting to sage-grouse populations in Wyoming.

It appears that hunting harvest of adult hens may have a detrimental impact on population. For many years it was traditional in Wyoming to hunt sage-grouse in late August or early September. However, data indicates hunting at this time makes adult hens more susceptible to harvest, because hens with chicks are still concentrated on late brood-rearing habitats. Sage-grouse are relatively long lived with lower reproductive rates and lower annual turnover than other game birds. Adult female grouse are more successful hatching clutches and raising chicks than are yearling hens. Thus, maintaining a higher proportion of adult hens in the population allows the population to grow faster under favorable habitat conditions. In order to relieve harvest pressure on adult hens, hunting seasons have been moved to late-September when typically cooler, wetter weather, along with the fact that chicks are more independent, results in dispersal of these family groups. This dispersal makes adult hens less vulnerable to harvest since they are more scattered across their habitat and mixed with barren hens and males. Harvest rates of successfully nesting hens have declined since the hunting season dates were changed in 1995. Overall harvest declined as well due to a dramatic decrease in hunter participation since other hunting seasons, especially big game in western Wyoming, begin in mid-September.

Complete closure of hunting seasons has not been documented to result in subsequent increases in breeding populations. However, two areas in Wyoming have been closed to hunting, southeast Wyoming and northwest Wyoming. Sage-grouse habitat and numbers are limited in these areas and while Wyoming has chosen a conservative approach to hunting in these areas, it is not anticipated the closures will result in increasing populations.

Research to document the impact of closing hunting seasons on local bird populations is currently being conducted in Idaho. The results of these efforts should be evaluated prior to consideration of closing hunting seasons in Wyoming.

Hunting Goal

1) Conduct hunting of sage-grouse in a manner that is compatible with maintaining robust populations and allows depressed populations to increase.

Hunting Recommended Management Practices

1) In stable to increasing populations (based on lek count information) maintain a 2 to 4 week hunting season with a 3 bird daily bag limit beginning no earlier than September 15.
2) If populations are declining (for 3 or more consecutive years based on lek count information) implement more conservative regulations that might include: reduced bag limits, adjusted season dates, limited quota seasons or closed seasons.
3) Populations should not be hunted where less than 300 birds comprise the breeding populations. (i.e. less than 100 males are counted on leks)
4) Collect hunter harvest data via hunter surveys and wing barrels.
5) Inform and educate the public about hunting impacts and benefits.
6) Determine the effects of hunting on sage-grouse populations.

Invasive Plants

The extent to which invasive plants, primarily non-natives, have historically affected sage-grouse in Wyoming is unknown. However, there is potential for these undesirable plants to have a significant effect in the future if left uncontrolled. Invasive plants along roadways and right-of-ways can spread to surrounding rangelands and riparian areas and replace native vegetation critical for sage-grouse nesting and brood-rearing. Primary species of concern in sage-grouse habitats appear to be knapweed, leafy spurge, cheatgrass, and Japanese brome. In riparian areas this list may be more expansive.

Invasive Plants Goal

1) Reduce, control and prevent the introduction of invasive plants of concern in known sage-grouse habitat.

Invasive Plants Recommended Management Practices

1) Identify invasive plants of concern in sage-grouse habitats.
2) Map areas where invasive plants of concern already exist.
3) Implement strategies to assist in prevention of the spread of noxious weeds or invasive plants detrimental to sage-grouse.
4) Prioritize and aggressively treat invasive plants in identified areas of concern.
5) Employ appropriate site preparation techniques and timely reseeding with approved seed mixes of any disturbed areas to prevent encroachment of invasive plants.
6) Maintain cumulative records for invasive plants treatment and prevention programs to evaluate site specific and cumulative impacts to sage-grouse habitats.

Livestock Grazing

Domestic livestock grazing has been identified as a factor that may affect the suitability and extent of sage-grouse habitat across the western United States. Grazing and browsing can contribute to long-term changes in plant communities and can alter various habitat components that contribute to the health of sagebrush ecosystems and the sage-grouse habitat it supports.

Both positive and negative direct effects of livestock grazing on sage-grouse habitats have been identified. For example, short duration grazing in late spring and early summer has been reported to improve both quantity and quality of summer forage (forbs) for sage-grouse. Conversely, continuous heavy use by livestock and/or wild ungulates rarely leaves suitable residual cover for nesting or maintains the site potential for riparian areas in sage-grouse habitat. However, there have been few research efforts made, and therefore little direct experimental evidence, linking specific livestock grazing practices to sage-grouse population levels.

The sagebrush ecosystem evolved with grazing by a variety of wildlife species. The timing, duration, location, and intensity of that grazing is not quantified. The introduction of livestock grazing into the sagebrush landscape presented a shift from a mixture of migrating, free ranging wildlife grazers and browsers toward managed domestic sheep and cattle. Since that time, there have been changes over the landscape in terms of the location, class and season of use, grazing management systems, and total numbers of herbivores on the range, large and small, domestic and wild. A focus on “improving range condition”, defined by public policy over the last 70 years as growing more grass, coupled with a shift from sheep to cattle also have affected sage-grouse habitats but these impacts are not well documented.

Active management aimed toward opening the canopy in decadent sagebrush stands and creating and maintaining a diversity of desirable micro-sites is beneficial to sage-grouse. Forb diversity and forb-associated insects are important to pre-nesting condition of hens and early brood-rearing of chicks. There is some evidence that there has been a reduction of these important habitat components as a result of current and historic grazing and fire management policies in some areas. The interaction between fire and grazing may be important to habitat diversity, but is not well understood.

A healthy sagebrush ecosystem provides the diverse age groups and vegetative seral stage classes necessary to sustain and increase sage-grouse populations while providing for other wildlife, and multiple uses of the area, including livestock grazing. Ecosystems that do not provide this diversity need long-term management strategies to allow recovery. Management changes should be analyzed so that those made on behalf of sage-grouse do not inadvertently cause unacceptable harm to other species.

Livestock Grazing Goal

1) Manage livestock grazing practices on state, federal and private lands in a manner that assists in maintaining healthy sage-grouse habitats or improving degraded habitats.

Livestock Grazing Recommended Management Practices

1) Encourage wildlife professionals, livestock producers and other interested parties to become more tolerant, understanding, and respectful of each other's perspective, and focus on areas of mutual interest.
2) Evaluate effects of different grazing treatments on sage-grouse productivity, survival, and habitat use.
3) Actively educate stakeholders about grazing strategies that can be used to improve or maintain sage-grouse habitats. Create and distribute a Wyoming guide to enhancing sage-grouse habitat.
4) In general, yearlong and spring-to-fall continuous grazing schemes in sage-grouse habitat should be avoided. Yearlong and spring-to-fall grazing may be a tool if it is not continued each year.
5) Where appropriate, implement livestock grazing systems that provide for areas and times of rest or deferment.
6) Avoid heavy utilization of grazed pastures to compensate for rested pastures (a year of rest cannot compensate for a year of excessive use).
7) Design grazing systems that provide sage-grouse habitat in riparian areas and around water sources.
8) During periods of forage drought utilize grazing schemes that reduce impacts to sage-grouse (e.g. adjust intensity, timing and/or duration of grazing).
9) Investigate the possibility of developing forage banks for use during periods of drought to alleviate inappropriate use by grazing animals on sage-grouse habitat.
10) Reduce disturbance to sage-grouse during the strutting period from livestock management activities (e.g. salting or mineral placement, turnout or gathering, bed ground/camp locations, etc.)
11) Develop and implement management plans for grazing that take into consideration the seasonal sage-grouse habitat needs. These management plans could include a variety of grazing systems designed to reach habitat goals, including short-duration, rest rotation, etc.
12) Look for ways to minimize negative impacts and enhance sage-grouse habitat when establishing livestock range improvement projects (e.g. water overflow for sage-grouse from water developments, placement of fences, facilities that provide raptor perch sites, construction of roads, salt grounds).
13) Avoid human activity near leks during the breeding season between the hours of 8 p.m. to 8 a.m.
14) Except for livestock guard dogs, avoid allowing dogs to run unchecked in sage-grouse habitats.
15) Experiment with types of grazing to improve sage-grouse habitat accompanied by monitoring to determine effects on sage-grouse.

16) Where necessary to build or maintain fences, evaluate whether increased visibility, alternate location, or different fence design will reduce hazards to flying grouse.

Mineral Development

Mineral and energy development impacts on sage-grouse have not been adequately quantified. The discovery and development of natural gas, oil, coal bed methane, coal, uranium, trona, bentonite, gypsum and construction materials throughout the western United States has impacted habitat and has been identified as a potential causative agent in declining sage-grouse populations. There is increasing demand for goods and services supported by the minerals industry. For example, according to the American Gas Association, natural gas consumption in the U.S. is expected to increase at least 40% by the year 2015, therefore impacts from these operations are expected to continue.

The various types of mineral operations are managed pursuant to a wide array of state and federal statutes and regulations, each with specific provisions that may or may not be flexible. No single set of RMPs for sage-grouse will work for all forms of mineral development, therefore, flexibility and a familiarity with the applicable and appropriate controlling regulations are necessary to adapt these operations to provide for the needs of the grouse. Local working groups must work with mineral development companies to devise appropriate local solutions. The selection and implementation of RMPs will also need to be approved by the surface management agency, and the state regulatory agency in order to be successful. RMPs have been divided into categories that may be considered for all mineral operations including those specific to oil and gas/coal bed methane, coal mining, other mining and sand and gravel operations.

Some potential impacts of mineral development to sage-grouse include: (1) direct habitat loss and fragmentation from mine, well, road, pipeline, transmission and power line construction, (2) alteration of plant and animal communities, (3) increased human activity which could cause animals to avoid the area, (4) increased noise which could cause animals to avoid an area or reduce their breeding efficiency, (5) increased motorized access by the public leading to legal and illegal harvest, (6) direct mortality associated with water evaporation ponds and production pits, and (7) reduced water tables resulting in the loss of herbaceous vegetation. Many of these impacts can be minimized by mitigation, reclamation, and planning for sage-grouse needs. Some of these impacts are short-term related to specific periods of activity, and some may result in positive effects such as increased forb production, habitat diversity and additional water sources. Impacts may be long-term (30 years or more), and rehabilitation of impacted habitats may take many years to complete.

Roads built to accommodate mineral exploration and development activities often result in the establishment of permanent travel routes, improved public access, increased long-term traffic related disturbance, indirect noise impacts, and direct mortality. Research suggests that road-related disturbances during the breeding season may cause sage-grouse leks to become inactive over time, reduce the number of hens bred on disturbed leks that initiate nests, and increases the distance from the lek hens will move to selected nesting habitat. Dust from roads and other surface disturbances can adversely affect plants and animals. Transmission and power line construction does not cause direct habitat loss, but sage-grouse tend to avoid areas associated with these

lines (as they provide potential raptor perch sites), thus resulting in an indirect loss of habitat in the vicinity of overhead lines. The potential effects of noise on sage-grouse include masking sounds that influence courtship, mate selection, grouping, escape, etc. Research into these subjects is on-going.

Mineral Development Goal

1) Develop the mineral resource in a manner compatible with maintenance and enhancement of sage-grouse populations and habitat.

General Mineral Development Recommended Management Practices

1) Evaluate and address the needs of sage-grouse when placing well sites, mines, pits and infrastructure. Develop a plan for roads, pipelines, etc. to minimize impacts to sage-grouse
2) Consider developing travel management plans that would allow seasonal closure of roads for all but permitted uses (i.e. recreation and hunting) and encourage the reclamation of unnecessary or redundant roads.
3) Where mineral development occurs in sage-grouse habitat, tailor reclamation to restore, replace or augment needed habitat types.
4) Where necessary to build or maintain fences, evaluate whether increased visibility, alternate location, or different fence design will reduce hazards to flying grouse.
5) Avoid construction of overhead lines and other perch sites in occupied sage-grouse habitat. Where these structures must be built, or presently exist, bury the lines, locate along existing utility corridors or modify the structures to prevent perching raptors, where possible.
6) Reduce noise from industrial development or traffic especially in breeding and brood-rearing habitats.
7) Manage water production to enhance or maintain sage-grouse habitat.
8) Avoid surface and sub-surface water depletion that impacts sage-grouse habitats.
9) Consider an exception or waiver of seasonal stipulations if technologies that significantly reduce surface disturbance are used.
10) Control dust from roads and other surface disturbances within the population's seasonal habitats.
11) Continue research efforts to determine the effects of mineral development on sage-grouse populations.
12) Consider off-site mitigation as an alternative mitigation for mineral development impacts on known sage-grouse habitat. Work with mineral entities to develop and implement acceptable offsite mitigative measures for enhancing sage-grouse or habitat, as needed, to offset impacts of surface disturbing activities

Oil and Gas Development and Sand and Gravel Mining (Also See General Mineral Development RMPs)

1) As a general rule, do not drill or permit new or expand existing sand and gravel activities within two miles of active leks between March 15 and July 15. As seasonal habitat mapping efforts are completed, re-direct efforts towards protecting nesting habitat.
2) Avoid surface disturbance or occupancy on or within 1/4 mile of known active lek sites.
3) Evaluate well spacing and location requirements under Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission jurisdiction in light of sage-grouse habitat needs and consider spacing exceptions that protect habitat. The limitations of obtaining spacing exceptions must be recognized.
4) Where sage-grouse are present or desired avoid human activity adjacent to leks during the breeding season between the hours of 8 p.m. and 8 a.m.
5) Where technically and economically feasible, use directional drilling or multiple wells from the same pad.
6) Where facilities are developed within sage-grouse habitat, minimize potential use by predators.
7) Encourage the development of new technologies that would reduce total surface disturbance within occupied sage-grouse habitat.

Other Solid Mineral Mining Operations (Also See General Mineral Development RMPs)

1) When feasible, new or expanded exploration and/or mining activities within two miles of active leks should occur prior to March 15th or after July 15th. Following initiation of mining (i.e. topsoil stripping) this recommendation would not be applied. As seasonal habitat mapping efforts are completed, re-direct efforts towards protecting nesting habitat.
2) When feasible, plan to avoid new surface occupancy or disturbance activities on or within 1/4 mile of the perimeter of known active a lek site from March 15 to July 15.
3) Where sage-grouse are present or desired, avoid human activity adjacent to leks during the breeding season between the hours of 8 p.m. and 8 a.m. This RMP may not be practical in active coal mining areas.

Parasites and Diseases

Sage-grouse are known to harbor a number of different parasites and diseases. Most diseases and parasites have evolved with sage-grouse over time. Many of these afflictions are often not a serious concern unless the sage-grouse are stressed. Diseases and parasites that affect sage-grouse include various bacteria, protozoa, worms and ecto-parasites. Many of the common parasites and diseases carried by sage-grouse appear to be non-pathogenic, but may increase the vulnerability of infected birds that are stressed or concentrated. Coccidiosis is one disease that has been identified as a cause of sage-grouse mortality. The potential effects of the newly emergent West Nile Virus are unknown at this time. Diseases and parasites may potentially become an issue if sage-grouse come into contact with captive raised birds released into the wild. In general, it is not believed that diseases and parasites are a major issue in sage-grouse declines.

Parasites and Disease Goal

1) Minimize impacts of parasites or disease on sage-grouse in Wyoming.

Parasites and Diseases Recommended Management Practices

1) Investigate and record deaths that could be attributed to parasites or disease.
2) Develop and implement strategies to deal with disease outbreaks where appropriate.

Pesticides

Pesticides (herbicides, insecticides and rodenticides) are used throughout the state for a variety of purposes and have been identified as a possible influence on sage-grouse. However, it is not believed that pesticides are currently a major issue for sage-grouse under existing application practices in Wyoming. No direct research on the effects of the field applications of currently used pesticides on sage-grouse has been conducted in Wyoming. Toxicity under laboratory conditions does not equate well to wildlife hazards under field conditions. Sage-grouse exposure and potential risk are dependent on numerous factors, such as application rate, pesticide formulation, and timing of treatment.

Pesticide impacts on sage-grouse in the field are difficult to quantify. This is exacerbated by the fact that these effects are believed to be sub lethal, such as predisposing animals to predation or reducing reproductive success. Elimination of insects, or reduction of forbs has been documented and may be locally significant, but not widespread. Loss of sagebrush to large-scale chemical treatments can eliminate sage-grouse habitat.

Pesticide Goals

1) Conduct pesticide application efforts in a manner that is compatible with sage-grouse health and habitat needs.
2) Encourage development of a statewide pesticide use database.

Pesticide Recommended Management Practices

1) Determine the extent of pesticide use within sage-grouse habitats.
2) Examine what, if any, effects each pesticide use may have on sage-grouse populations.
3) Where possible, adjust alfalfa harvest timing instead of applying pesticides to control weevils.
4) Make use of current laboratory analysis procedures where sage-grouse mortality is observed. Report where pesticides have caused mortality in sage-grouse.
5) Determine which pesticides and application strategies are simultaneously beneficial to agriculture and least harmful to sage-grouse.
6) Research effects of pesticides on sage-grouse in Wyoming with a specific goal of testing impacts of actual rangeland applications.
7) Work with county Weed and Pest Districts to identify low-toxicity alternatives to pesticides classified as a medium to very high risk to game birds.
8) Provide Wyoming retail dealers, Weed and Pest Districts, and county extension agents with information intended for users regarding product toxicity levels to sage-grouse, and alternatives that are effective while less toxic.
9) Encourage simple, standardized record-keeping formats for all Weed and Pest Districts, that would allow access to pesticide use information in their counties and statewide.
10) Address grasshopper issues using Reduced Area Application Treatments (RAATs) approach.

Predation

As should be expected, predation is and has always been the major cause of sage-grouse mortality. Predation during nesting and early brood-rearing has the greatest influence on sage-grouse populations. Nest predators identified in Wyoming studies include badgers, red foxes, ravens and ground squirrels. In addition, golden eagles, red foxes, ravens, coyotes, various hawks, bobcats, and weasels prey on sage-grouse throughout the year.

Humans have altered the landscape and influenced predator-prey relationships that evolved between sage-grouse and native predators. These activities have led to a change in the number, distribution and type of predators that prey on sage-grouse. As habitats are altered, and/or where predators dramatically increase in number or in type, impacts of predation may be magnified. “Newcomer” predators such as red fox and raccoons have expanded their range into sage-grouse habitats where they were not previously a factor. These newcomers and traditional sage-grouse predators have increased in numbers largely as a result of readily available food associated with human activities. Migratory bird protection has also allowed avian predator populations to expand.

Lethal predator control to increase production and recruitment in bird populations has only been shown to be effective on small, intensively managed areas where efforts are continual. Management of predators may be necessary in localized situations to maintain a sage-grouse population. Predator management may mean lethal control, but may also include removing key elements that attract predators (e.g. perches, food sources) and/or increasing the quality of habitat for sage-grouse.

As with many issues surrounding sage-grouse management, predator-prey relationships are complex and difficult to quantify. It is important to identify potential unintended consequences of predator control as it relates to sage-grouse. Large-scale predator removal is not indicated as a statewide objective. Where predation is demonstrated to be of significant concern, planning groups should consider localized predator management.

Predation Goals

1) Minimize the negative effects of predation in order to increase sage-grouse recruitment.
2) Maintain habitat quality that discourages predation.

Predation Recommended Management Practices

1) Local working groups should consider predator control to maintain or enhance local sage-grouse populations when they determine there is a demonstrated need such as a population is trending downward over a 3-year period; populations of "newcomer" predators are artificially high in sage-grouse habitat; specific sage-grouse populations need short-term help.

2) Develop and distribute educational materials regarding human practices that may allow establishment/expansion of predator populations. Examples of these activities include landfills and other garbage/waste disposal that may provide artificial food sources for a variety of predators, and buildings/structures that provide nesting/roosting habitat for ravens/raptors.
3) Avoid construction of overhead lines and other perch sites in occupied sage-grouse habitat. Where these structures must be built, or presently exist, bury the lines, locate along existing utility corridors or modify the structures in key areas.
4) Predator control to enhance sage-grouse survival should be targeted only to predators identified as impacting that sage-grouse population.
5) Better quantify and qualify the role of predation on sage-grouse in Wyoming.
6) Discourage the establishment, and bring into balance artificially high populations of “newcomer” predators in sage-grouse habitat.
7) Monitor the effectiveness of any predator control efforts that are implemented.
8) Request the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to do a species assessment on the raven. Encourage the FWS to include ravens in 50CFR21.43 “Control of Depredating Birds.”

Recreation

Recreational impacts to sage-grouse populations include potential disturbance of breeding and nesting activities, and habitat fragmentation due to road usage. Research suggests that road-related disturbances during the breeding season may cause sage-grouse leks to become inactive over time, cause fewer hens bred on disturbed leks to initiate nests, and increases the distance from the lek hens will move to selected nesting habitat. Dust from roads and other surface disturbances can adversely affect plants and animals. Recreational viewing of leks can cause disruption of breeding activities, especially when it is conducted from too close a distance and/or on a long-term basis. The increased use of off-road vehicles and other outdoor recreational activities may result in greater disturbance of sage-grouse and degradation of habitats. These impacts are more likely to occur on public lands, or on leks adjacent to public roads.

Recreation Goals

1) Conduct recreational activities in a manner that is not disruptive to sage-grouse or their habitat.

Recreation Recommended Management Practices

1) Develop travel management plans and enforce existing plans.
2) Restrict off-road-vehicle use in occupied sage-grouse habitats
3) Avoid recreational activities in sage-grouse nesting habitat during the nesting season.
4) Restrict organized recreational activities between March 15 and July 15 within two miles of a lek site.
5) Recreational facilities should be located at least two miles from lek sites and in areas that are not in crucial sage-grouse habitat
6) Establish and maintain a small number of lek viewing sites and minimize viewing impacts on these sites. Viewing sage-grouse on leks (and censusing leks) should be conducted so that disturbance to birds is minimized or preferably eliminated.
7) Agencies should generally not provide all lek locations to individuals simply interested in viewing birds.
8) Develop and provide information related to recreation and its impacts on sage-grouse habitat.
9) Discourage dispersed camping within important riparian habitats occupied by sage-grouse during late summer.
10) Avoid construction of overhead lines and other perch sites in occupied sage-grouse habitat. Where these structures must be built, or presently exist, bury the lines, locate along existing utility corridors or modify the structures in key areas.
11) Control dust from roads and other surface disturbances.
12) Inform the public that dog training on sage-grouse outside the hunting season is illegal.

Residential Development

Little or no research is available that directly addresses the effects of residential development on sage-grouse, but some of the effects are obvious. Residential development can cause direct loss of lek sites and seasonal habitats and also fragment those habitats. Other factors that may impact sage-grouse populations include increased roads, fencing, power lines, human activity, and density of cats and dogs. In addition, new landfills/trash facilities may increase predator populations.

Research suggests that road-related disturbances during the breeding season may cause sage-grouse leks to become inactive over time, cause fewer hens bred on disturbed leks to initiate nests, and increases the distance from the lek hens will move to selected nesting habitat. Dust from roads and other surface disturbances can adversely affect plants and animals**.** Transmission and power line construction does not cause direct habitat loss, but sage-grouse tend to avoid areas associated with these lines (as they provide potential raptor perch sites), thus resulting in an indirect loss of habitat in the vicinity of overhead lines. The potential effects of noise on sage-grouse include masking sounds that influence courtship, mate selection, grouping, escape, etc.

Residential Development Goal

1) Minimize the impacts of residential development on sage-grouse habitats and populations.

Residential Development Recommended Management Practices

1) Encourage assimilation of sage-grouse information into county plans as they are developed. Develop and distribute appropriate literature for developers and county planners.
2) Limit free-roaming dogs and cats.
3) Maintain appropriate stocking rates of livestock on small acreages.
4) Encourage cluster development, road consolidation and common facilities that would have a reduced impact on sage-grouse.
5) Where necessary to build or maintain fences, evaluate whether increased visibility, alternate location, or different fence design will reduce hazards to flying grouse.
6) Maintain healthy sagebrush communities on small acreages.
7) Plan development to allow for sage-grouse movement.
8) Where possible protect habitat through conservation. (i.e. land exchanges, conservation easements, leases or CRP type programs)
9) Develop or locate funding sources to encourage maintenance or improvement of sage-grouse habitat on private lands.
10) Locate and manage sanitary landfills, dumps and trash transfer stations to eliminate predator impacts to sage-grouse.
11) Provide education on the effects of residential development on sage-grouse habitat and populations. Facilitate conservation districts and extension agents' ability to educate the public about sage-grouse.

12) Consider developing travel management plans that would allow seasonal closure and reclamation of roads.
13) Reduce noise from industrial development or traffic especially in breeding and brood-rearing habitats.
14) Avoid construction of overhead lines and other perch sites in occupied sage-grouse habitat. Where these structures must be built, or presently exist, bury the lines, locate along existing utility corridors or modify the structures in key areas.
15) Control dust from roads and other surface disturbances.

Vegetation Management

Of Wyoming's 62 million acres, approximately 32 million acres are dominated by sagebrush. Sagebrush communities evolved as dynamic landscapes with climatic and soil type variation driving changes in fire frequencies, and in adaptive development of different sagebrush species. These sagebrush communities occur commonly in tracts occupying hundreds or thousands of acres. The combination of active fire suppression and inappropriate livestock grazing are believed to have contributed to dense, old, monotypic stands of sagebrush, reduction of herbaceous understories, and simplification of community diversity. Habitat conversion, sagebrush habitat treatments, and the introduction of invasive species have also affected these sagebrush communities.

Historic sagebrush communities were a mosaic of successional shrub age classes created and maintained by fire cycles ranging in frequency from 10 to greater than 100 years depending on the sagebrush species and site. Patchy fires appear to have been the norm in most sagebrush communities; while larger fires at lower frequencies occurred in other areas, depending on climate, topography, plant composition, and aridity of the site.

Vegetation management can be achieved through biological, mechanical, or chemical treatments. Biological treatments include prescribed fire, designed domestic livestock grazing, and insect pathogens. Fire, floods, insects, mammal and bird herbivory, plant diseases and allelopathy (chemical inhibition) are also biological processes. Chemical treatments to manipulate, control, enhance or remove sagebrush include a variety of herbicides and fertilizer. Mechanical brush control treatments in sagebrush systems include mowing, roto-beating, chaining, disking, roller harrowing, railing, and blading. Reseeding and planting shrubs is also common.

The use of fire and other treatments for improving habitat should be evaluated carefully prior to implementation. Removal of large tracts of sagebrush is detrimental to sage-grouse populations. While some birds may be able to adjust by using adjacent sagebrush habitats, sage-grouse hens show fidelity for nesting in the same general area. Mosaic patches of sagebrush of different ages and structures benefit sage-grouse. Vegetation treatments influence the abundance and diversity of insects in sagebrush ecosystems. Use of vegetative treatments requires planning and understanding of the sagebrush ecosystem so that sufficient stands of desirable sagebrush remain. These stands should provide adequate cover and food for the appropriate seasonal habitat within the area being treated.

Ongoing research conducted in brood-rearing habitats indicates that sage-grouse tend to use untreated sagebrush habitat and adjacent treated areas or natural openings equally within 60 meters of the edge separating these two habitat types. Efforts should be made to maximize the amount of sagebrush grassland habitat that is within 60 meters (200 feet) of an edge of untreated area allowing the birds the greatest use of the treated area and maximizing brood-rearing benefits from treatment dollars. For instance where brood-rearing habitat is of the greatest concern, attempt to create treated and

untreated habitat patches no greater than 120 meters (400 feet) in width. This may be reflected in relatively long narrow or patchy burns rather than large treated areas. However, treatments will vary based on the seasonal habitat type.

Vegetation Management Goals

1) Restore, maintain and/or enhance sagebrush ecosystem health and ecological processes and functions including associated riparian systems.
2) Maintain or enhance natural patterns (e.g. seasonal migrations), functions (e.g. cover/food), and processes (e.g. fire).
3) Maintain sagebrush habitats with a healthy understory of native grasses and forbs, diversity of species, diversity of age classes, and patches of varying size and density.

Vegetation Management Recommended Management Practices

1) Develop priorities and implement habitat enhancements in areas currently occupied by sage-grouse.
2) Develop priorities and implement habitat enhancements in historical or potential sage-grouse habitats.
3) Develop and implement wildfire suppression guidelines that address sage-grouse habitat health and management.
4) Remove juniper and other conifers where they have invaded sagebrush sites important to sage-grouse.
5) Ensure vegetation treatments and post-treatment management actions are appropriate to the soil, climate, and landform of the area.
6) Recognize that fire provides a natural diversity component in sagebrush habitats; manage fire on a landscape and patch scale at a local level.
7) Prescribed fire in drier sagebrush communities should only be conducted where it is likely to promote sagebrush ecosystem health.
8) In higher-elevation, wetter sagebrush communities, prescribed fire should maintain, enhance or promote sagebrush ecosystem health by mimicking natural fire frequencies.
9) Where sage-grouse are present or desired, fire management objectives should recognize that fire generally burns the better sage-grouse nesting and severe winter habitat.
10) Evaluate all wildfires greater than 40 acres in occupied sage-grouse habitat to determine if rehabilitation of the burned area is needed with emphasis placed on habitats that would be susceptible to invasion by annual grasses.
11) When rehabilitation is necessary, the first priority is protection of the soil resource. Use appropriate mixtures of sagebrush, native grasses, and forbs that permit burned areas to recover to a sagebrush-perennial grass habitat.
12) Grazing management following sagebrush treatments or manipulations should be designed to benefit long-term sagebrush diversity and ecosystem health. Grazing management strategies should be designed to permit reestablishment of native sagebrush, grasses, and forbs that benefit sage-grouse.

13) Experiments in habitat manipulation should be relatively small in comparison to a specific grouse population.
14) Determine threshold levels of habitat alteration that can occur without negatively impacting specific sage-grouse populations. As a general rule, treat no more than 20% of any seasonal habitat type until results are evaluated.
15) Treat sagebrush in patches rather than contiguous blocks.
16) Protect patches of sagebrush within burned areas from disturbance and manipulation.
17) Consider all alternatives when designing sagebrush treatments.
18) Additional treatments in adjacent areas should be deferred until the previously treated area again provides suitable sage-grouse habitat.
19) Avoid removing sagebrush adjacent to sage-grouse foraging areas along riparian zones, meadows, lakebeds and farmland unless such removal is necessary to achieve habitat management goals.
20) Use mechanical or other appropriate treatments such as herbicides in areas with relatively high shrub cover (>30%) and a poor herbaceous component in order to improve brood-rearing habitats.
21) Implement effective monitoring plans to determine the effectiveness of vegetation treatments.
22) Develop and maintain cumulative records for all vegetation treatments to determine and evaluate site specific and cumulative impacts to sage-grouse habitats and identify best management practices for successful vegetation treatments.

Weather

Sage-grouse evolved with long term climatic change, and survived multiple ice-ages and droughts. Annual weather fluctuations, multi-year weather events, and long term climatic change all influence sage-grouse populations by physically stressing them and by modifying their habitats. Annual variations in precipitation and temperature can affect annual sage-grouse production and can be very site-specific. Cold, wet weather during early-brood-rearing can physically stress and kill young chicks and have adverse affects on insect populations. However, cool, wet springs can be advantageous to sage-grouse by promoting herbaceous growth, especially forbs. Extremely hot-dry conditions during the early summer concentrates sage-grouse on the few riparian areas that remain well hydrated, and thereby increase the potential for predation and the risk of disease. Typically, wet years are good for sage-grouse production and dry years can inhibit production.

Short-term climatic cycles affect the length of the growing season and influence plant succession and the abundance and duration of herbaceous cover and forb availability. Typically, wet cycles benefit sage-grouse while dry cycles or drought may reduce the amount of grass and forb production to levels that are inadequate for sage-grouse survival. Periodic weather events such as extreme winters can increase snow depths to levels that cover most of the sagebrush and limit areas available for foraging and cover. Long term and/or extreme drought can cause changes in vegetative communities that decrease the effectiveness of sage-grouse habitats for long periods, and result in reductions in productivity that culminate in population declines. A multi-year weather cycle of above normal precipitation can enhance sage-grouse populations; due to the positive influence moisture has on vegetative communities. Multi-year weather events usually occur on a larger geographical scale than annual fluctuations, and influence sage-grouse populations at the regional level.

Although sage-grouse have evolved with weather fluctuations for thousands of years, it remains a significant factor in determining the status and well being of their populations. Weather can have either a positive or negative affect upon sage-grouse populations, and wildlife managers must understand these effects in order to correctly assess the extent to which they are limiting a population or contributing to its decline. The short-term role that weather plays and long-term climate change effects on sage-grouse populations must be considered when management practices for sage-grouse are selected.

Weather Goals

1) Better define weather and climate related effects on sage-grouse populations and their interactions with other limiting factors in order to correctly understand and assess fluctuations in sage-grouse populations.
2) Determine cause and effect relationships between forage drought, multiple uses, and sage-grouse recruitment.

Weather Recommended Management Practices

1) Correlate, on a local level, historical and present weather data with historical and present sage-grouse population data to determine weather impacts to sage-grouse populations and habitat.
2) Where drought has been documented for 2 consecutive years, consider implementation of Recommended Management Practices in year 3 that may include drought management of livestock and wildlife grazing, protection of critical sage-grouse habitats from wildfire and prescribed fire, reduced bag limits during sage-grouse hunting seasons, predator management programs to enhance nesting and early-brood-rearing success of impacted populations, water hauling and protection of water sources from evaporation, installation of guzzlers, snow fences and fencing of water source overflows, insure bird ladders are in place on existing water sources and other appropriate management options developed by local sage-grouse working groups.
3) Correlate climate data with sage-grouse population distribution.

Habitat Assessment, Monitoring And Evaluation

One of the guiding goals and principles of this plan is to promote management that results in diverse, productive, and healthy sagebrush habitats for sage-grouse as well as other species that may use sagebrush environments.

The basic goal for habitat assessment, monitoring and evaluation is to maintain long-term conservation and, where feasible, enhance or restore diverse, healthy sagebrush ecosystems capable of providing seasonal sage-grouse habitat necessary to meet or exceed established population objectives. Monitoring and assessment should be addressed at multiple scales ranging from broad to fine-scale. At the finer scale, quantitative and qualitative habitat assessments, monitoring and evaluation can be delineated and defined by local working groups.

The basic habitat goal is no net loss in overall distribution and quality of the sagebrush ecosystem. Within any sage-grouse habitat management plan, there is a need to address landscape heterogeneity, site potential, site condition, and the seasonal habitat needs of sage-grouse, enhancing the ability of managers to maintain an optimal balance of shrubs, forbs, and grasses at the community and landscape level.

For most of Wyoming, it appears that while some big sagebrush communities have increased or decreased, the overall landscape is remarkably similar to pre-settlement times. Knight (1994) reported that pre-settlement sagebrush steppe might have been more varied where periodic fires were possible, creating patches of grassland and young sagebrush, and that sagebrush cover might be more uniform today as a result of fire suppression and livestock grazing practices. Even though the quantity of habitat lost appears relatively low, the long-term downward trend in sage-grouse populations remains a concern.

Fine-scale habitat assessments, monitoring and evaluations within identified or potential sage-grouse habitat should be conducted at various scales depending on the size and type of management action or project that is being evaluated. Small-scale projects may require assessments on a 40-acre scale while large projects may exceed 250,000 acres. Site-specific habitat assessments may range from evaluation of current sagebrush community health to habitat suitability, response of sagebrush community to land use activity or treatment and successional status and direction. It is critical that habitat and rangeland assessments include seasonal habitat mapping based on field data.

Information and data from broad-scale national or regional efforts and from mid-scale statewide efforts will often help form the basis for identifying fine-scale local field data collection and area mapping needs. Fine-scale, local project mapping and field evaluation will require interdisciplinary participation of sage-grouse population biologists, sagebrush habitat biologists, rangeland ecologists, soil specialists, other resource specialists, land managers, land users, local elected officials, landowners and other interested or affected parties or persons.

The use of ecological site descriptions and state-and-transition models for interpreting rangeland health and recognition of the dynamic nature, natural succession and range of variability within these communities lays the foundation for a sound scientific and ecological basis for sagebrush community assessments. Remote sensing image analysis, aerial photography and on-the-ground vegetation and cover type surveys can then be used to identify and monitor important sage-grouse seasonal habitats. This information will provide the basis for identifying response to current land management practices, habitat management activities and habitat treatments or restoration actions.

Habitat Assessment, Monitoring and Evaluation Goals

Broad-Scale:

1) Monitor and evaluate the distribution of sagebrush systems across Wyoming, which can or could support desired sage-grouse population objectives.
2) Monitor and evaluate the health, integrity and quality of sagebrush systems in Wyoming.

Mid-Scale:

1) Assess, monitor and evaluate shrub cover characteristics capable of supporting sage-grouse seasonal habitat requirements developed from Wyoming data and other applicable data sources. Information and data should include patch sizes, successional stages, shrub age structure, height, density, and distribution throughout the range of sagebrush ecosystems. Particular attention should be made to identify blocks, islands, corridors, and mosaic patterns and how they are arranged. It is important to maintain connectivity between habitat types.
2) Develop and continue to refine ecological site descriptions and state-and-transition model assessments based on rangeland health procedures. Incorporate sage-grouse habitat preference characteristics related to sagebrush cover, height, growth form, age class and sagebrush species to evaluate the relationship of these characteristics to herbaceous understory requirements for sage-grouse seasonal habitats in Wyoming.
3) Monitor and evaluate herbaceous understory characteristics with an emphasis on diversity of native forbs and grasses based on ecological site potential and successional status.
4) Restore and rehabilitate sagebrush communities where feasible, desirable or possible to maintain or enhance desired sage-grouse populations.

Fine-Scale:

1) Assess, monitor and evaluate the distribution and condition of sagebrush and herbaceous cover within desired condition for sage-grouse seasonal range.
2) Assess, monitor and evaluate the diversity and condition of the understory with emphasis on native species within desired condition for sage-grouse seasonal range.
3) Assess, monitor and evaluate vegetation characteristics, (i.e. shrub height, density, herbaceous structure and composition diversity) across the range of conditions desired for sage-grouse seasonal range.

4) Assess, monitor and evaluate restoration and rehabilitation possibilities in sagebrush communities with the potential to provide sage-grouse seasonal habitat.
5) Evaluate goals and objectives for sagebrush systems at the fine-scale based on:
    a. local knowledge about current habitat use;
    b. potential to support a variety of species including sage-grouse;
    c. existing native shrub patterns and sagebrush system associated characteristics;
    d. existing herbaceous cover and conditions;
    e. frequency and reasonably foreseeable likelihood of disturbance, e.g. fire;
    f. locations of seedlings or condition of shrub cover on adjacent areas; and
    g. importance of the area to seasonal needs of sage-grouse.

Research Needs

While many studies of sage-grouse and their habitats have been undertaken, there are still major issues and questions that remain unresolved. As a result, there is a need for additional mapping, research and data compilation. Local working groups should prioritize the need for data and information in their local area.

Mapping

1) Develop maps of current sage-grouse population seasonal use areas.
2) Develop maps of sage-grouse habitats for both statewide and local conservation planning and management efforts. Include documented positive or negative influences to sage-grouse or their habitat. (e.g. land treatments, wildfire, utility corridors, etc.)
3) Map vegetative type and seral stages in sage-grouse habitats. Evaluate quality of sagebrush habitats at local levels.
4) Identify and map canopy cover of sagebrush and herbaceous understory of sagebrush habitats. Evaluate habitat quality of herbaceous understory of sage-grouse habitats at local levels.
5) Develop mapping techniques that are consistent throughout the state.
6) Coordinate mapping efforts within and among agencies to eliminate duplication of effort.
7) Integrate sage-grouse mapping with other states where sage-grouse are a concern.
8) Periodically review and update maps to portray updated information on sage-grouse and their habitat.

Research

1) Encourage and fund long-term research studies.
2) Determine land management practices, particularly grazing management, that result in optimum forb and insect density, diversity, and abundance.
3) Determine the cause(s) of chick mortality during early brood-rearing.
4) Evaluate whether predator control aimed at increasing sage-grouse productivity is an effective management action.
5) Determine if changing predator species (e.g. increased red fox, raven, raccoon, etc.) impacts sage-grouse productivity.
6) Evaluate livestock grazing practice(s) as they relate to healthy sagebrush ecosystems and sage-grouse habitats.
7) Determine the effects of hunting on sage-grouse population sustainability.
8) Investigate the effects of habitat fragmentation on sage-grouse productivity and habitat selection.
9) Evaluate juxtaposition requirements between seasonal sage-grouse habitats (i.e. mosaic requirements for nesting and early brood-rearing habitats)
10) Evaluate the effects of pesticides on sage-grouse in rangeland applications.
11) Continue efforts to determine the effects of mineral development on sage-grouse populations.

12) Evaluate nest success based on sagebrush plant structure in addition to sagebrush and herbaceous plant cover and height.
13) Determine the impacts of West Nile Virus or other diseases on sage-grouse populations.
14) For all research projects, encourage consistency in design, methodology and reporting of data. Where design or methods are not consistent, clarify the differences.

Data Compilation

1) Prioritize sage-grouse populations by risk status throughout Wyoming.
2) Quantify invertebrate abundance and species composition changes over time
3) Analyze whether the historic shift from sheep to cattle has resulted in vegetative changes.
4) Correlate changes between alternate prey species abundance and sage-grouse abundance.
5) Correlate historical and present weather data with historical and present sage-grouse population data to determine weather impacts to sage-grouse populations and habitat.
6) Quantify possible effects of climate change on sagebrush and associated understory plant composition and distribution.
7) Quantify vegetative changes during the last 50 years in terms of overall cover, species composition, sagebrush community seral changes, and sagebrush: grass: forb: bare ground ratios. Investigate correlations between vegetative changes and sage-grouse population changes.

Endangered Species Act Listing Factors

The final product of the Wyoming Sage-Grouse Working Group is a Conservation Plan that addresses the five Endangered Species Act Listing Factors.

1. Present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of habitat or range,
2. Overuse for commercial, recreational, scientific or educational purposes,
3. Disease or predation,
4. Inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanism,
5. Other natural or manmade factors affecting the species continued existence.

Citizen Working Group

In July of 2000, the Wyoming Sage-Grouse Working Group was formed to develop a statewide strategy for conservation of sage-grouse in Wyoming. After an organizational meeting June 21, 2000, potentially affected interests submitted names of potential representatives that would be acceptable to the interest groups. The working group was then selected and consisted of 18 Wyoming citizens from diverse backgrounds including agricultural, industrial, governmental, environmental, hunting, and Native American tribal interests.

Group Members Included:

Linda Baker, Pinedale; Larry Bourret, Laramie; Joel Bousman, Boulder; Tim Byer, Douglas; Tom Christiansen, Green River; Joe Evans, Cheyenne; Bill Gerhart, Cheyenne; Larry Hayden-Wing, Laramie; Larry Kmoch, Rawlins; Don Lamborn, Kemmerer; Bruce Lawson, Casper; John Marton, Buffalo; Tom Rinkes, Lander; Stacey Scott, Casper; Albert Sommers, Pinedale; Renee Taylor, Casper; Western Thayer, Ft. Washakie; and Mark Winland, Gillette. The facilitator was Bob Budd.

Many others participated in several meetings and their contributions to the planning efforts were significant. The group had numerous meetings, all open to the public and publicized via WGFD news releases and the WGFD website.

Glossary

Avoid. The term “avoid” in this document means that there is flexibility to allow an activity consistent with goals and objectives in this plan.

Crucial Habitat. Any particular seasonal range or habitat that has been documented as the determining factor in a population’s ability to maintain and reproduce itself at a certain level over the long term.

Degraded Habitat. Habitat that is reduced in quality as a result of fragmentation, invasive plants, overgrazing/browsing, and/or shrub decadence or lack of understory due to advanced succession.

Drought. A prolonged chronic shortage of water, as compared to the norm, often associated with high temperatures and winds during spring, summer and fall or a period without precipitation during which the soil water content is reduced to such an extent that plants suffer from lack of water. (Society for Range Management)

Drought Operational Definition. Operational definitions help define the onset, severity and end of droughts. No single operational definition of drought works in all circumstances. There are four basic approaches to measuring drought: meteorological, hydrological, agricultural and socioeconomic. (National Drought Mitigation Center 1995)

> **Meteorological drought** is usually an expression of precipitation's departure from normal over some period of time.
> **Agricultural (forage) drought** occurs when there isn't enough soil moisture to meet the needs of a particular crop (including livestock production) at a particular time.
> **Hydrological drought** refers to deficiencies in surface and subsurface water supplies. It is measured as stream flow, and as lake, reservoir and ground water levels.
> **Socioeconomic drought** is what happens when physical water shortage starts to affect people, individually and collectively.

Forbs. Any broad-leafed herbaceous plant, other than grasses, sedges and rushes. These are generally flowering plants with tap roots, broad leaves, netlike veins, and solid non-joint stems.

Invasive Plants. A species that is 1) primarily non-native to the ecosystem under consideration and 2) whose introduction causes or is likely to cause economic or environmental harm or harm to human health.

Landscape. The exact boundaries or scale of a landscape are established according to the objectives of a study or discussion. The area included may be as small as a pond or as large as several counties or states, but in all cases, ecologists recognize that energy, water, nutrients, and organisms move back and forth across whatever boundaries are established. (Knight 1994)

Lek. A traditional courtship display and breeding area attended by male sage-grouse in or adjacent to sagebrush-dominated habitat. Leks are annually defined as:

> **Active.** Any lek that has been attended by male sage-grouse during the strutting season.
> **Inactive.** Leks where it is known that there was no strutting activity through the course of a strutting season.
> **Unknown.** Leks that have not been documented either active or inactive during the course of a strutting season.

Based on annual status a lek may be put into one of the following categories for management purposes:

> **Occupied Lek.** A lek that has been active during at least one strutting season within the last ten years.
> **Historic Lek.** A lek that has not been active during a consecutive ten-year period.
> **Undetermined Lek.** Any lek that has not been documented as being active in the last ten years but does not have sufficient documentation to be designated historical.

Mosaic. A landscape composed of patches of discrete ecological sites and/or seral stages in a variety of sizes and shapes.

"Newcomer" Predator. Predators that did not occur or have expanded their range in Wyoming within recent times as the result of changes in management practices and other human activities (e.g. red fox, raccoon, etc.). "Newcomer" predators may also apply to native species such as ravens which have increased in number (as apposed to range) due to human activity.

Seral Stage. The relatively transitory communities that develop under plant succession generally described as early, mid, and late seral stages. The mix of seral or successional stages on the landscape can be the result of disturbances, topography and soil, climate, uses of the land, management prescriptions, vegetation classification categories, and evaluation procedures.

Site Potential. The potential plant community that a particular area (ecological site) is capable of producing as a climax plant community.

Small-grained. A habitat or vegetation type that occurs at a much smaller scale or resolution than the overall landscape.

State-and-transition model. The idea that rangeland vegetation exhibits multiple states and transitions among them. See Bestelmeyer et al., Journal of Range Management, 56:114-126, March 2003.

List of References

Agenbroad, L. D. 1978. Buffalo jump complexes in Owyhee County, Idaho. Plains Anthropologist 23:313-321.

Anderson, J. E. and K. E. Holte. 1981. Vegetation development over 25 years without grazing on sagebrush-dominated rangeland in southeastern Idaho. Journal of Range Management 34: 25-29.

Anderson, M. R., E. J. Depuit, R. H. Abernethy, and L. H. Kleinman. 1992. Value of mountain rye for suppression of annual bromegrass on semi-arid mined lands. Journal of Range Management 45:345-351.

Angell, R. F. 1997. Crested wheatgrass and shrub response to continuous or rotational grazing. Journal of Range Management 50:160-164.

Angelstam, P. K. 1986. Population dynamics in tetraonids: the role of extrinsic factors. Pages 2459-2477. International Ornithological Congress: Ottawa, Canada.

Angelstam, P., E. Lindstrom, and P. Widen. 1984. Role of predation in short-term population fluctuations of some birds and mammals in Fennoscandia. Oecologia 62:199-208.

Austin, D. D., and P. J. Urness. 1995. Effects of horse grazing in spring on survival, recruitment, and winter injury damage of shrubs. Great Basin Naturalist 55:267-270.

Austin, D. D., P. J. Urness, and S. L. Durham. 1994. Impacts of mule deer and horse grazing on transplanted shrubs for revegetation. Journal of Range Management 47:8-11.

Autenrieth, R. E. 1981. Sage grouse management in Idaho. Wildlife Bulletin 9. Idaho Department of Fish and Game. Boise, Idaho, USA.

Bareiss, L. J., P. Schulz, and F. S. Guthery. 1986. Effects of short-duration and continuous grazing on bobwhite and wild turkey nesting. Journal of Range Management 39:259-260.

Barnett, J. K., and J. A. Crawford. 1994. Pre-laying nutrition of sage grouse hens in Oregon. Journal of Range Management 47(2):114-118.

Barnosky, C. W., P. M. Anderson, and P. J. Bartleim. 1987. The northwestern U. S. during deglaciation: vegetational history and paleoclimate implications. Geology of North America Volume K-3. North America and adjacent oceans during the last deglaciation. The Geological Society of America.

Batterson, W. M., and W. B. Morse. 1948. Oregon sage grouse. Oregon Fauna Series 1. Oregon Game Commission, Portland, Oregon, USA.

Baxter, G. 1998. Thinning dense sagebrush stands with spike 20P. Rangelands 20:14-16.

Beatty, R. G. 1973. The DDT Myth, Triumph of the Amateurs. The John Day Company, ISBN 0-381-98242-4

Beck, T. D. 1977. Sage grouse flock characteristics and habitat selection in winter. Journal Wildlife Management 41:18-26.

Beetle, A. A. and K. L. Johnson. 1982. Sagebrush in Wyoming. Wyoming Agricultural Experimental Bulletin 779.

Belsky, A. J., A Matzke, and S. Uselman. 1999. Survey of livestock influences on stream and riparian ecosystems in the western United States. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 54:419-431.

Bennett, L. E. 1992. Soil conservation service (SCS) brush project: final report. Wyoming Fish and Wildlife Research Unit. The University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, USA.

Bennett, L. E. 1999. Current shrub management issues in Wyoming. A white paper prepared for the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, Cheyenne, WY. 54p.

Benson, L. A., C. E. Braun, and W. C. Leininger. 1991. Sage grouse response to burning in the big sagebrush type. Proceedings, Issues and Technology in the Management of Impacted Western Wildlife. Thorne Ecological Institute 5:97-104.

Bergerud, A. T. 1985. The additive effect of hunting mortality on the natural mortality rates of grouse. Pages 345-366 in S. L. Beason and S. F. Robertson, editors. Game Harvest Management. Caesar Kleburg Wildlife Resource Institute, Kingsville, Texas.

Bergerud, A. T. 1988a. Population ecology of North American grouse. Pages 578-648 in A. T. Bergerud, and M.W. Gratson, editors. Adaptive strategies and population ecology of northern grouse. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA.

Bergerud, A. T. 1988b. Survival and breeding strategies of grouse. Pages 473-577 in A. T. Bergerud and M. W. Gratson, editors. Adaptive Strategies and population ecology on northern grouse. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, USA.

Berry, J. D., and R. L. Eng. 1985. Interseasonal movements and fidelity to seasonal use areas by female sage grouse. Journal Wildlife Management 49:237-240.

Blaisdell, J. P. 1949. Composition between sagebrush seedlings and reseeded grasses. Ecology 30: 512-519.

Blaisdell, J. P. 1953. Ecological effect of planned burning of sagebrush-grass range on the upper Snake River plains. USDA Technical Bulletin 1073.

Blaisdell, J. P., R. B. Murray, and E. D. McArthur. 1982. Managing Intermountain rangelands sagebrush-grass ranges. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service General Technical Report, INT-134.

Blank, R. R., J. A. Young, and F. L. Allen. 1995. The soil beneath shrubs before and after wildfire: implications for revegetation. In: Proceeding: Wildland shrub and arid land restoration symposium; 1995 April. Gen. Tech. Rep. GTR-315, Ogden, Utah. USDA, Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experimental Station 173-176.

Blus, L. J., C. S. Staley, C. J. Henny, G. W. Pendleton, T. H. Craig, E. H. Craig, and D. K. Halford. 1989. Effects of organophosphorus insecticides on sage grouse in southeastern Idaho. Journal of Wildlife Management 53(4):1139-1146.

Bock, C. E., and J. H. Bock. 1991. Response of grasshoppers (Orthoptera: Acrididae) to wildfire in southeastern Arizona. The American Midland Naturalist 125:162-167.

Boerboom, C. 1993. Russian Thistle. Pacific Northwest Cooperative Extension Bulletin, Pacific Northwest Extention Publication.

Bowman, G. B., and L. D. Harris. 1980. Effects of spatial heterogeneity on ground-nest depredation. Journal of Wildlife Management 44:806-812.

Boyce, M. S. 1990. The red queen visits Sage grouse leks. American Zoology 30:263-270.

Boyd, C. S., D. Rollins, and D. M. Engle. 1997. Is good range management for livestock really good management for wildlife? Rangelands 19:19-21.

Braun, C. E. 1979. Evolution of the effects of changes in hunting regulations on sage grouse populations. Colorado Division of Wildlife, Game Research Report, Project W-37-R-32. Job 9a.

Braun, C. E. 1981. Vulnerability and population characteristics of sage grouse in Moffat County. Colorado Division of Wildlife, Final Report, Federal Aid Project W-37-R-34, Work Plan 3, Job 11.

Braun, C. E. 1986. Changes in sage grouse lek counts with advent of surface coal mining. Proceedings: Issues and Technology in the Management of Impacted Western Wildlife, Thorne Ecological Institute 2:227-231.

Braun, C. E. 1987. Current issues in sage grouse management. Proceedings of the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies 67:134-144.

Braun, C. E. 1995. Distribution and status of sage grouse in Colorado. Prairie Naturalist 27:1-9.

Braun, C. E. 1996. Drought. Proceedings of the sage grouse workshop Pinedale, Wyoming.

Braun, C. E. 1998. Sage grouse declines in western North America: what are the problems? Proceedings of the Western Association of State Fish and Wildlife Agencies 78:139-156.

Braun, C. E., K. M. Giesen, R. W. Hoffman, T. E. Remington, W. D. Snyder. 1994. Upland Bird Management Analysis Guide, 1994-1998. Colorado Division of Wildlife.

Braun, C. E., and T. D. Beck. 1985. Effects of changes in hunting regulations on sage grouse harvest and populations. Pages 335-343 in S.L. Beasom and S.F. Robertson, editors. Game Harvest Management. Caesar Kleberg Wildlife Research Institute, Kingsville, Texes, USA.

Braun, C. E., T. E. Britt, and R. O. Wallestad. 1977. Guidelines for maintenance of sage grouse habitats. Wildlife Society Bulletin 5:99-106.

Braun, C. E., M. F. Baker, R. L. Eng, J. S. Gashwiler, and M. H. Schroeder. 1976. Conservation committee report on the effects of alteration of sagebrush communities on the associated avifauna. Wilson Bulletin 88:165-171.

Briggs, S. A. 1992. Basic Guide to Pesticides: Their Characteristics and Hazards. Hemisphere Pub.

Briske, D. D., and J. W. Sluth. 1982. Tiller defoliation in a moderate and heavy grazing regime. Journal of Range Management 35:511-514.

Bromley, M. 1985. Wildlife management implications of petroleum exploration and development in wildland environments. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Intermountain Research Station General Technical Report INT-191. Ogden, Utah, USA.

Brown, J. K. 1982. Fuel and fire behavior predictions in big sagebrush. Research Paper INT-290. Ogden, Utah. USDA, Forest Service Intermountain Forest and Range Experimental Station.

Brown, J. K 2000. Ecological principles: Shifting fire regimes and management considerations. In Wildland fire in ecosystems: Effects of fire on flora. Eds. Brown, J. K. and Smith, J. K. Gen Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-42 vol. 2. Ogden, UT. USDA, For. Serv., Rocky Mt. Res. Stat. pp 185-203.

Brown, J. K 2000. Introduction and fire regimes. In Wildland fire in ecosystems: Effects of fire on flora. Eds. Brown, J. K. and Smith, J. K. Gen Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-42 vol. 2. Ogden, UT. USDA, For. Serv., Rocky Mt. Res. Stat. pp 1-7.

Brown, J. L. 1964. The evolution of diversity in avian territorial systems. Wilson Bulletin 76:160-169.

Bryant, L. D. 1982. Response of livestock to riparian zone exclusion. Journal of Range Management 35:780-785.

Bunting, S. C. 1989. Forest site preparation and range improvement. Pages 103-106 *in* D. M. Baumgartner, D. W. Breuer, B. A. Zamora, L. F. Neuenschwander, and R. H. Wakimoto. Proceedings: Prescribed fire in the intermountain region symposium.

Bunting, S. C., B. M. Kilgore, and C. L. Bushey. 1987. Guidelines for prescribed burning in sagebrush-grass rangelands in the northern Great Basin. United States Department of Agriculture. General Technical Report. INT-231. Forest Service Intermountain Research Station. Ogden, Utah, USA.

Burger, L. D., L. W. Burger, Jr., and J. Faaborg. 1994. Effects of prairie fragmentation on predation of artificial nests. Journal of Wildlife Management 58:249-254.

Burkhardt, J. W. and E. W. Tisdale 1976. Causes of juniper invasion in southwestern Idaho. Ecology 76: 472-484.

Burkhardt, J. W. 1995. Herbivory in the intermountain west: an overview of evolutionary history, historic cultural impacts and lessons from the past. Pacific Northwest Range Short Course. January 16-18. Boise, Idaho, USA.

Butler, R. B. 1978. Bison hunting in the desert west before 1800: the paleoecological potential and the archaeological reality. Plains Anthropologist 23:106-112.

Butler, M. D., and L. C. Burrill. 1994. Yellow toadflax and dalmation toadflax. Pacific Northwest Cooperative Extension Bulletin, Pacific Northwest Extention Publication.

Cade, T. J. 2000. Fires destroy grouse habitat. . Grouse Partnership News. North American Grouse Partnership. Winter 2000. pp10-11.

Carr, H. D. 1968. A literature review on effects of herbicides on sage grouse. Colorado Division of Game, Fish and Parks.

Castrale, J. S. 1982. Effects of two sagebrush control methods on nongame birds. Journal of Wildlife Management 46:945-952.

Castrale, J. S. 1987. Pesticide use in no-till fields relative to wildlife. Indiana Academy of Science 96:215-222.

Champlin, M. R. and A. H. Winward. 1982. The effect of simulated fire on emergence of seeds found in the soil of big sagebrush communities. Abstract of Papers. Society for Range Management. Calgary, Alberta. p. 37.

Chang, Chi-ru. 1996. Ecosystem responses to fire and variations in fire regimes. In: Sierra Nevada ecosystem project final report to Congress. Status of Sierra Nevada. Vol. II. Assessments and scientific basis for management options. Davis: Univ. CA. Wildland Resources: 1071-1100.

Charney, J., P. H. Stone, and W. J. Quirk. 1975. Drought in the Sahara: a biophysical feedback mechanism. Science 187:434-435.

Christensen, E. M. and H. B. Johnson. 1964. Presettlement vegetation and vegetational change in three valleys in central Utah. Brigham Young Univ. Sci. Bull. 4: 1-15.

Christianson, T. A., J. A. Lockwood and J. Powell. 1989. Arthropod community dynamics in undisturbed and intensively managed mountain brush habitats. Great Basin Naturalist 49:570-586.

Church, K. E. 1984. Nesting biology of gray partridge in east central Wisconsin. Pages 46-53 *in* R. T. Dumke, R. B. Stiehl, R. B. Kahl, editors. Proceedings of Perdix III: Grey Partridge and Ring-necked Pheasant Workshop, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

Clifton, N. A. 1981. Response to prescribed fire in Wyoming big sagebrush\bluebunch wheatgrass habitat type. Thesis. University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, USA.

Coggins, K. A. 1998. Relationship between habitat changes and productivity of sage grouse at Hart Mountain National Antelope Refuge, OR. M.S. Thesis, ON State Univ. Corvallis, OR, USA.

Colenso-Postovit, B. 1981. Suggestions for sage grouse habitat reclamation on surface mines in Northeastern Wyoming. Thesis. University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, USA.

Connell, J. H. 1978. Diversity in tropical rain forests and coral reefs. Science 199:1302-1310.

Connelly, J. W. 1982. An ecological study of sage grouse in southeastern Idaho. Thesis. Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, USA.

Connelly, J. W. 1996. Pesticides. Proceedings of the sage grouse workshop Pinedale, Wyoming, USA.

Connelly, J. W., and C. E. Braun. 1997. Long-term changes in sage grouse (Centrocercus urophasianus) populations in western North America. Wildlife Biology 3:229-234.

Connelly, J. W., W. J. Arthur, and O. D. Markham. 1981. Sage grouse leks on recently disturbed sites. Journal of Range Management 52:153-154.

Connelly, J. W., Jr., H. W. Browers, and R. J. Gates. 1988. Seasonal movements of sage grouse in southeastern Idaho. Journal of Wildlife Management 52(1):116-122.

Connelly, J. W., K. P. Reese, R. A. Fischer, and W. L. Wakkinen. 2000a. Response of sage grouse breeding population to fire in southeastern Idaho. Wildlife Society Bulletin 28:90-95.

Connelly, J. W., M. A. Schroeder, A. R. Sands, and C. E. Braun. 2000b. Guidelines to manage sage grouse populations and their habitats. Wildlife Society Bulletin 28:1-19.

Connelly, J. W., Jr., W. L. Wakkinen, A. D. Apa, and K. P. Reese. 1991. Sage grouse use of nest sites in southeastern Idaho. Journal of Wildlife Management 55(3):521-524.

Connelly, J. W., W. L. Wakkinen, A. D. Apa, K. P. Reese, and J. W. Fischer. 1993. Re-nesting by sage grouse in southeastern Idaho. Condor 94:1041-1043.

Connelly, J. W., K. P. Reese, W. L. Wakkinen, M. D. Robertson, and J. W. Fischer. 1994. Sage grouse ecology report. Idaho Department of Fish and Game, Job Completion Report W-160-R-19 Subproject 9, Boise, Idaho, USA.

Conner, M. C., R. F. Labisky, and D. R. Progulske, Jr. 1983. Scent-station indices as measures of population abundance for bobcats, raccoons, gray foxes, and opossums. Wildlife Society Bulletin 11:146-152.

Conner, M. M., M. M. Jaeger, T. J. Weller, and D. R. McCullough. 1998. Effects of coyote removal on sheep depredation in northern California. Journal of Wildlife Management 62:690-699.

Cook, J. G., and L. L. Irwin. 1992. Climate-vegetation relationships between the Great Plains and the Great Basin. American Midland Naturalist 127(2):317-326.

Cote, I. M., and W. J. Sutherland. 1997. The effectiveness of removing predators to protect bird populations. Conservation Biology 11:395-405.

Crabtree, R. L., L. S. Broome, and M. L. Wolfe. 1989. Effects of habitat characteristics on gadwall nest predation and nest-site selection. Journal of Wildlife Management 53:129-137.

Crawford, J. A. 1982. Factors affecting sage grouse harvest in Oregon. Wildlife Society Bulletin 10:374-377.

Crawford, J. A. 1996 Drought. Proceedings of the sage grouse workshop. Pinedale, Wyoming, USA

Crawford, J. A., M. A. Gregg, M. S. Drut, and A. K. DeLong. 1992. Habitat use by female sage grouse during the breeding season in Oregon. Final Report. Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, USA.

Crawford, J. A. 2000. Sage grouse and fire: A double-edged sword. Grouse Partnership News. N. Amer. Grouse Partnership. Winter 2000: p 9 and 11.

Cronquist, A., A.H. Holmgren, N. H. Holmgren, J.L. Reveal and P.K. Holmgren,. 1994. Intermountain flora: Vascular plants of the Intermountain West. USA. Asterales. Vol. 5. New York Botanical Garden, Bronx, New York.

Dalke, P. D., D. B. Pyrah, D. C. Stanton, J. E. Crawford, and E. F. Schlatterer. 1960. Seasonal movements and breeding behavior of sage grouse in Idaho. Transactions of North American Wildlife and Natural Resource Conference 25:396-407.

Dantzker, M. S., G. B. Deane, and J. W. Bradbury. 1999. Directional acoustic radiation in the strut display of male sage grouse Centrocercus urophasianus. The Journal of Environmental Biology 202:2893-2909.

Daubenmire. R. 1968. Ecology of fire in grasslands. Adv. Ecological Research 5: 209-266.

Daubenmire. R. 1970. Steppe vegetation of Washington. WA Agric. Exp. Sta. Tech. Bull. 62. WA State Univ., Pullman, WA.

Daubenmire. R. 1975. An analysis of structural and functional characters along a steppe-forest catena. Northwest Science 49: 120-140.

DeLong, A. K., J. A. Crawford, and D. C. DeLong, Jr. 1995. Relationships between vegetational structure and predation of artificial sage grouse nests. Journal of Wildlife. Management 59:88-92.

Derner, J. D., R. L. Gillen, F. T. McCollum, and K. W. Tate. 1994. Little bluestem tiller defoliation patterns under continuous and rotational grazing. Journal of Range Management 47:220-225.

Dibello, F. J., S. M. Arthur, and W. B. Krohn. 1990. Food habits of sympatric coyotes, Canis latrans, red foxes, Vulpes vulpes, and bobcats, Lynx rufus, in Maine. The Canadian Field Naturalist 104:403-408.

Diefenbach, D. R., M. J. Conroy, R. J. Warren, W. E. James, L. A. Baker, and T. Hon. 1994. A test of the scent-station survey technique for bobcats. Journal of Wildlife Management 58:10-17.

Dobkin, D. S., A. C. Rich, and W. H. Pyle. 1998. Habitat and avifaunal recovery from livestock grazing in a riparian meadow system of the northwest Great Basin. Conservation Biology 12:209-221.

Doerr, T. B. and F. S. Guthery. 1983. Effects of Tebuthiuron on lesser prairie-chicken habitat and foods. Journal of Wildlife Management 47:1138-1142.

Drut, M. S., J. A. Crawford, and M. A. Gregg. 1994. Brood habitat use by sage grouse in Oregon. Great Basin Naturalist 54:170-176.

Duebbert, H. F., and H. A. Kantrud. 1974. Upland duck nesting related to land use and predator reduction. Journal of Wildlife Management 38:257-265.

Dunn, E. 1977. Predation by weasels (Mustela nivalis) on breeding tits (Parus spp.) in relation to the density of tits and rodents. Journal of Animal Ecology 46:633-652.

Dunn, P. O., and C. E. Braun. 1986. Summer habitat use by female and juvenile sage grouse. Journal of Wildlife Management 50:228-235.

EOARC . Eastern Oregon Agricultural Res. Center. OR State Univ., Burns, OR. data files.

Eddleman, L. E. and P. S. Doescher. 1999. Current issues in the sagebrush steppe ecosystem: grazing, fire, and other disturbances. Pages21-23 *in* P. G. Entwistle, A. M. DeBolt, J. H. Kaltenecker, and K. Steenhof, compilers. Proceedings: Sagebrush Steppe Ecosystems Symposium. Bureau of Land Management Publication Number BLM/ID/PT-001001=1150, Boise, Idaho, USA.

Eckert, R. E. Jr., and J. S. Spender. 1987. Growth and reproduction of grasses heavily grazed under rest-rotation management. Journal of Range Management 40: 156-159.

Eddleman, L. E. and P. S. Doescher. 1999. Current issues in the sagebrush steppe ecosystem: grazing, fire, and other disturbances. Pages 21-23 *in* P. G. Entwistle, A. M. DeBolt, J. H. Kaltenecker, and K. Steenhof, compilers. Proceedings: Sagebrush Steppe Ecosystems Symposium. Bureau of Land Management Publication Number BLM/ID/PT-001001=1150, Boise, Idaho, USA.

Ellis, K. L. 1985. Effects of a new transmission line on distribution and aerial predation of breeding male sage grouse. United States Bureau of Land Management, Final Report IV-H-10.

Ellison, L. N. 1991. Shooting and compensatory mortality in tetraonids. Ornis Scandinavica 22:229-240.

Emmerich, F. L., F. H. Tipton, and J. A. Young. 1993. Cheatgrass: changing perspectives and management strategies. Rangelands 15:37-40.

Enck, J. W. 1987. The effect of insect abundance on gray partridge chick survivorship in New York. Pages 3-16 *in* R. O. Kimmel, J. W. Schulz, and G. J. Mitchell, editors. Proceedings of Perdix IV: Grey Partridge and Ring-necked Pheasant Workshop. Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Farmland Wildlife Populations and Research Group.

Eng, R.L. 1952. A two summer study of the effects on bird populations of chlordane bait and aldrin spray as used for grasshopper control. Journal of Wildlife Management 16:326-337

Eng, R. L. 1963. Observations on the breeding biology of male sage grouse. Journal of Wildlife Management 27:841-846.

Eng, R. L., and P. Schladweiler. 1972. Sage grouse winter movements and habitat use in central Montana. Journal of Wildlife Management 36:141-146.

Enyeart, G. 1956. Responses of sage grouse to grass reseeding in the Pines area, Garfield County, UT. Thesis, UT State Agriculture College, Logan, Utah, USA.

Evans, C. C. 1986. The relationship of cattle grazing to sage grouse use of meadow habitat on the Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge. Thesis. University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, USA.

Extoxnet: Extension Toxicology Network, Pesticide Information Profiles. A Pesticide Information Project of Cooperative Extension Offices of Cornell University, Oregon State University, the University of Idaho, the University of California at Davis and the Institute for Environmental Toxicology, Michigan State University. Supported by USDA/Extension Service/National Agricultural Pesticide Impact Assessment Program. http://ace.orst.edu/info/extoxnet/faqs/

Ferguson, G. 1996. The Yellowstone wolves, the first year. Falcon Press. Helena, Montana, USA.

Fischer, R. A. 1994. The effects of prescribed fire on the ecology of migratory sage grouse in southeastern Idaho. Thesis, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, USA.

Fischer, R. A., K. P. Reese, and J. W. Connelly. 1996. An investigation on fire effects within xeric sage grouse brood habitat. Journal of Range Management 49:194-198.

Fischer, R. A., W. L. Wakkinen, K. P. Reese, and J. W. Connelly. 1997. Effects of prescribed fire on movement of female sage grouse from breeding to summer ranges. Wilson Bulletin 109(1):82-91.

Forman, R. T. T., and L. E. Alexander. 1998. Roads and their major ecological effects. Annual Review of Ecological Systems 29:207-231.

Forsyth, D. J., and N. D. Westcott. 1994. Carbofuran residues in grasshoppers and vegetation from aerially sprayed prairie pastures: potential effects on wildlife. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 13:299-306.

Fosberg, M. A.and M. Hironaka. 1964. Soil properties affecting the distribution of big and low sagebrush communities in southern Idaho. In: Forage plant physiology and soil-range relationships. ASA Spec. Publ. No. 5. p. 230-236.

Frandsen, W. H. 1983. Modeling big sagebrush as a fuel. Journal of Range Management 36:596-600.

Franson, J. C., E. J. Kolbe, and J. W. Carpenter. 1985. Famphur toxicosis in a bald eagle. Journal of Wildlife Diseases 21:318-320.

Freeburn, J. W. 1979. An economic analysis of sagebrush spraying in Wyoming. M.S. Thesis. Univ. WY, Laramie, WY.

Gates, R. J. 1983. Sage grouse, lagomorph, and pronghorn use of a sagebrush grassland burn site on the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory. Thesis. Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, USA.

Gates, R. J. 1985. Observations of the formation of a sage grouse lek. Wilson Bulletin 97:219-221.

George, T. L., L. C. McEwen, and A. Fowler. 1992. Effects of a carbaryl bait treatment on nontarget wildlife. Environmental Entomology 21:2139-1247.

Gese, E. M., O. J. Rongstad, and W. R. Mytton. 1989. Population dynamics of coyotes in southeastern Colorado. Journal of Wildlife Management 53:174-181.

Gibson, R. M. 1989. Field playback of male display attracts females in lek breeding sage grouse. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 24:439-443.

Gibson, R. M. 1990. Relationships between blood parasites, mating success and phenotypic cues in male sage grouse Centrocercus urophasianus. American Zoologist 30:271-278.

Gibson, R. M. and J. W. Bradbury. 1985. Sexual selection in lekking sage grouse: phenotypic correlates of male mating success. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 18:177-123.

Giesen, K. M. 1994. Evaluation of livestock grazing and residual herbaceous cover on sage grouse nest success. Colorado Division of Wildlife, Upland Bird Research 18:W-167-R.

Gill, R. B. 1965. Distribution and abundance of a population of sage grouse in North Park, Colorado. Thesis, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA.

Girard, G. L. 1937. Life history, habits, and food of the sage grouse Centrocercus urophasianus Bonaparte. University of Wyoming Publication 3., Laramie, Wyoming, USA.

Goodrich, S., D. Nelson, and N. Gale. 1998. Some features of Wyoming big sagebrush communities on gravel pediments of the Green River in Daggett County, Utah. Unpublished Report.

Goodrich, S., D. Nelson, and N. Gale. 1999. Some features of Wyoming big sagebrush communities on gravel pediments of the Green River Daggett County, UT. In: D. E. McArthur, W. K. Ostler, D. L. Wambolt (comps.), Shrubland Ecotones. USDA For. Ser. Proc. RMRS-P-11. pp 159-167.

Grayson, D. K. 1993. The desert's past: a natural prehistory of the Great Basin. Smithsonian Institution Press. Washington D. C., USA.

Greenwood, R. J., A. B. Seargent, J. L. Pielhl, D. A. Buhl, and B. A. Anderson. 1999. Foods and foraging of prairie striped skunks during the avian nesting season. Wildlife Society Bulletin 27:823-832.

Gregg, M. A. 1991. Use and selection of nesting habitat by sage grouse in Oregon. Thesis, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, USA.

Gregg, M. A. 2001. Sage grouse reproductive ecology and habitat associations: Applications to management. In Ecology and management of sage grouse: Expanded abstracts. 54th Ann. Meeting of SRM, Kona HI, USA. pp 8-12.

Gregg, M. A., J. A. Crawford, M. S. Drut, and A. K. DeLong. 1994. Vegetational cover and predation sage grouse nests in Oregon. Journal of Wildlife Management 58(1):162-166.

Grime, J. P. 1973. Control of species density in herbaceous vegetation. Journal of Environmental Management 1:151-167.

Gruell, G. E. 1985. Fire on the early western landscape: An annotated record of wildland fires 1771-1900. Northwest Sci. 59: 97-107.

Gruell, G. E. 1999. Historical and modern roles of fire in pinyon-juniper. In: S. B. Monson and R. Stevens (Comps)., Proceeding : Ecology and management of pinyon-juniper communities within the interior West. 1997. Provo, UT. USDA For. Ser. Proc. RMRS-P-9. Ogden, UT pp 24-28.

Gruell, G. E., L.E. Eddleman and R. Jandl. 1994. Fire history of the pinyon-juniper woodlands of Great Basin National Park. USDI, National Park Serv. Tech. Rep. NPS/PNROSU/NRTR-94-01.

Gutherie, R. D. 1990. Frozen fauna of the mammoth steppe. University of Chicago Press. Chicago, Illinois, USA.

Hall, F. C., and L. Bryant. 1995. Herbacious stubble height as a warning of impending cattle grazing damage to riparian areas. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station, General Technical Report PNW-GTR-362. Portland, Oregon, USA.

Halley, B. A., W. J. A. VandenHeuvel, and P. G. Wislocki. 1993. Environmental effects of the usage of avermectins in livestock. Veterinary Parasitology 48:109-125.

Hanson, W. R. and L. A. Stoddart. 1940. Effects of grazing upon bunch wheat grass. Am. Soc. Agron. 32: 278-289.

Harniss, R. O. and R. B. Murray. 1973. 30 years of vegetal change following burning of sagebrush-grass range. Journal of Range Management 26:322-325.

Harniss, R. O., and H. A. Wright. 1982. Summer grazing of sagebrush-grass range by sheep. Journal of Range Management 35:13-17.

Hart, R. H., and E. F. Balla. 1982. Forage production and removal from western and crested wheatgrass under grazing. Journal of Range Management 35:362-366.

Hart, R. H., S. Clapp, and P. S. Test. 1993. Grazing strategies, stocking rates, and frequency and intensity of grazing on western wheatgrass and blue grama. Journal of Range Management 46:122-126.

Hart, R. H., M. J. Samual, P. S. Test, and M. A. Smith. 1988. Cattle, vegetation, and economic responses to grazing systems and grazing pressure. Journal of Range Management 41:282-286.

Hart, R. H., M. J. Samuel, J. W. Waggoner, Jr., and M.A. Smith. 1989. Comparisons of grazing systems in Wyoming. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 44:344-347.

Hart, R. H., K. W. Hepworth, M. A. Smith, and J. W. Waggoner, Jr. 1991a. Cattle grazing behavior on a foothill elk winter range in southeastern Wyoming. Journal of Range Management 44:262-265.

Hart, R. H., M. J. Samuel, J. W. Waggoner, Jr., and M. A. Smith. 1991b. Grazing systems in Wyoming—Impacts of grazing pressure and livestock distribution. Rangelands 13:12-16.

Hassan, M. A. and West, N. E. 1986. Dynamics of soil seed pools in burned and unburned sagebrush semi-deserts. Ecology. 67(1): 269-272.

Hayden-Wing, L.D., D.B. Costain, J.L. Hull, M.R. Jackson and T.B. Segerstrom. 1986. Movement patterns and habitat affinities of a sage grouse population in northeastern Wyoming. Proceedings, Issues and Technology in the Management of Impacted Western Wildlife. Thorne Ecological Institute 2:207-226.

Heath, B., R. Straw, S. Anderson, and J. Lawson. 1996. Proceedings of sage grouse workshop. Pinedale, Wyoming, USA.

Heath, B., R. Straw, S. Anderson, and J. Lawson. 1997. Sage grouse productivity, survival, and seasonal habitat use near Farson, Wyoming. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Completion Report. Cheyenne, Wyoming, USA.

Heath, B., R. Straw, S. Anderson, J. Lawson, and M. Holloran. 1998. Sage-grouse productivity, survival, and seasonal habitat use among three ranches with different livestock grazing, predator control, and harvest management practices. Wyoming Game and Fish Department Completion Report. Cheyenne, Wyoming, USA.

Heitschmidt, R. K., J.R Conner, S. K. Cannon, W. E Pinchak, J. W. Walker, and S. L. Dowhower. 1990. Cow/calf production and economic returns from yearlong continuous, deferred rotation and rotational grazing treatments. Journal of Agriculture Production 3:92-99.

Hepworth, K. W., P. S. Test , R. H. Hart., J. W. Waggoneer, Jr., and M.A. Smith. 1991. Grazing systems, stocking rates, and cattle behavior in southeastern Wyoming. Journal of Range Management 44:259-262.

Henny, C. J., L. J. Blus, E. J. Kolbe, and R. E. Fitzner. 1985. Organophosphate insecticide (Famphur) topically applied to cattle kills magpies and hawks. Journal of Wildlife Management 49:648-658.

Herman, C. M. 1963. Disease and infection in the Tetraonidae. Journal of Wildlife Management 27:850-855.

Hickey, J. J. 1955. Some American population research on gallinaceous birds. Pages 326-396 *in* A. Wolfson, editor. Recent studies in avian biology. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois, USA.

Higby, W. 1964. Spraying effects on wildlife. WY Wildlife Vol. XXVIII, No. 12 Wyoming Game and Fish Dept. Cheyenne, WY p4-7.

Higby, W. 1965. Effects of sagebrush spraying on sage grouse populations. In: Western States Sage Grouse Workshop. Paper.

Higby, W. 1969. A summary of the Longs Creek control project. Proc. Biennial Western State Sage Grouse Workshop 6: 164-168.

Hill, E. F. and V. M. Mendenhall. 1980. Secondary poisoning of barn owls with famphur, an organophosphate insecticide. Journal of Wildlife Management 44:676-681.

Hoffman, R. W. 1985. Effects of changes in hunting regulations on blue grouse populations. Pages 327-334 *in* S. L. Beason and S .F. Robertson, editors. Game Harvest Management. Caesar Kleburg Wildlife Resource Institute, Kingsville, Texas, USA.

Hoglund, J., R. V. Alatalo, and A. Lundberg. 1992. The effects of parasites on male ornaments and female choice in the lek-breeding black grouse (Tetrao tetrix). Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology 30:71-76.

Holechek, J. L. 1996. Drought in New Mexico: prospects and management. Rangelands 18:225-227.

Holechek, J. L. and Stephenson, T. 1983. Comparison of big sagebrush vegetation in north-central New Mexico under moderately grazed and grazing excluded conditions. Journal of Range Management 36: 455-456.

Holger, J. P., D. Rollins, and R. L. Gillen. 1990. Effects of cattle stock density on trampling loss of simulated ground nests. Wildlife Society Bulletin 18:71-74.

Holloran, M. J. 1999. Sage grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) seasonal habitat use near Casper, Wyoming. Thesis, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, USA.

Homer, C. G., T. C. Edwards, Jr., R. D. Ramsey, and K. P. Reese. 1993. Use of remote sensing methods in modeling sage grouse winter habitat. Journal of Wildlife Management 57(1):78-84.

Honess, R. F. and G. Post. 1968. History of an epozootic in Sage grouse. University of Wyoming Agricultural Experiment Station Scientific Monographs. 14:1-33.

Houston, D. B. 1973. Wildfires in northern Yellowstone National Park. Ecology 54: 1109-1117.

Hudson, R. H. R. K. Tucker, M.A. Haegele. 1984. Handbook of Toxicity of Pesticides to Wildlife. United States Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service.

Hull-Sieg, C., D. W. Uresk, and R. M. Hanson. 1987. Impact of bentonite mining on selected arthropods. Journal of Range Management 40:128-131.

Hupp, J. W., and C. E. Braun. 1989. Topographic distribution of sage grouse foraging in winter. Journal of Wildlife Management 53(3):823-829.

Jensen, M.E. and R. Evertt. 1994. An overview of ecosystem management principles. In: Eastside forest ecosystem health assessment: Volume II: Ecosystem Management: Principles and applications. M.E. Jensen and PIS. Bourgerom (eds.). USDA, For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-318. p6-13.

Johnson, W. M. 1969. Life expectancy of a sagebrush control in central Wyoming. Journal of Range Management 22:177-182.

Johnson, G. D., and M. S. Boyce. 1990. Feeding trials with insects in the diet of sage grouse chicks. Journal of Wildlife Management 54(1):89-91.

Johnson, K. H. and C. E. Braun. 1999. Viability and conservation of an exploited sage grouse population. Conservation Biology 13:77-83.

Johnson, K. H., R. A. Olson, and T. D. Whitson. 1996. Composition and diversity of plant and small mammal communities in Tebuthiuron-treated big sagebrush (Artemisia tridentata). Weed Technology 10:404-415.

Johnson, M. K. and R. M. Hansen. 1979. Coyote food habits on the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory. Journal of Wildlife Management 43:951-956.

Johnson, T. N., Jr., and H. L. Morton. 1989. Tebuthiuron persistence and distribution in some semiarid soils. Journal of Environmental Quality 18:433-438.

Johnson, T. N., Jr., and H. L. Morton. 1991. Long-term tebuthion content of grasses and shrubs on semiarid rangelands. Journal of Range Management 44:249-253.

Johnson, W. M. 1958. Reinvasion of big sagebrush following chemical control. Journal of Range Management 11:169-172.

Johnston, J. J., ed. 2001. Pesticides and Wildlife. (ACS symposium series; 771) American Chemical Society, 2001.

Kearl, W. G. and J. W. Freeburn. 1980. Economics of big sagebrush control for mitigating reductions of federal grazing permits. University of Wyoming Division of Agricultural Economics AE 80-05R.

Kindschy, R.R. 1991. Pristine vegetation of the Jordan Crater Kipukas: 1978-91. USDI, BLM, Vale, OR.

Klebenow, D. A. 1969. Sage grouse nesting and brood habitat in Idaho. Journal of Wildlife Management 33:649-662.

Klebenow, D. A. 1970. Sage grouse vs. sagebrush control in Idaho. Journal of Range Management 23:396-400.

Klebenow, D. A. 1972. The habitat requirements of sage grouse and the role of fire in management. Tall Timbers Fire Ecology Conference 12:305-315.

Klebenow, D. A. 1982. Livestock grazing interactions with sage grouse. Pages 113-123 *in* J. M. Peck and P. D. Dalke, editors. Wildlife-Livestock Relationships Symposium: Proceedings 10, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, USA.

Klebenow, D. A. 1985. Habitat management for sage grouse in Nevada. World Pheasant Association 10:34-46.

Klebenow, D. A., and G. M. Gray. 1968. Food habits of juvenile sage grouse. Journal of Range Management 21:80-83.

Klebenow D., G. Zunino, M. Stigar, and A. Alstatt. 1990. Sage grouse production and mortality studies. Nevada Department of Wildlife, Job Final Report, Federal Aid Project W-48-R-21, Study XVII, Job 1.

Klott, J. H., and F. G. Lindzey. 1990. Brood habitats of sympatric sage grouse and Columbian sharp-tailed grouse in Wyoming. Journal of Wildlife Management 54(1):84-88.

Knight, D.H. 1994. Mountains and Plains: Ecology of Wyoming Landscapes. Yale University. 338p.

Kobriger, G. 1980. Food habitats of Hungarian partridge in North Dakota. North Dakota Game and Fish Department.

Koerth, B. H., W. M. Webb, F. C. Bryant, and F. S. Guthery. 1983. Cattle trampling of simulated ground nests under short duration and continuous grazing. Journal of Range Management 36:385-386.

Kolb, K. J., and J. S. Sperry. 1999. Differences in drought adaption between subspecies of sagebrush (Artemisia tridentata). Ecology 80(7):2373-2384.

Krementz, D. G., and J. R. Sauer. 1982. Avian communities on partially reclaimed mine spoils in south central Wyoming. Journal of Wildlife Management 46:761-765.

Kuchler, A. W. 1985. Potential natural vegetation (map at scale of 1:7,500,000). In: USGS, The National Atlas of the USA. U.S. Govt. Print. Off., Washington, D.C.

Kurtin, B., and E. Anderson. 1980. Pleistocene mammals of North America. Columbia University Press. New York, New York, USA.

Kurtz, G. L. 1995. Ecological inplications of Russian knapweed (Centaurea repens L.) infestation:small mammal and habitat associations. Thesis, Department of Rangeland Ecology and Watershed Management, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, USA.

Laycock W. A. 1979a. How heavy grazing and protection affect sagebrush-grass ranges. Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Logan, Utah, USA.

Laycock, W. A. 1979b. Management of Sagebrush. Rangelands 1:207-210.

Lindstrom, E., P. Angelstam, P. Widen, and H. Andren. 1986. Do predators synchronize vole and grouse fluctuations? – An experiment. Oikos 48:121-124.

Lumaret, J. P, E. Galante, C. Lumbreras, J. Mena, M. Bertrand, J. L. Bernal, J. F. Cooper, N. Kadiri, and D. Crowe. 1993. Field effects of ivermectin residues on dung beetles. Journal of Applied Ecology 30:428-436.

Lyon, A. G. 2000. The potential effects of natural gas development on sage grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) near Pinedale, Wyoming. Thesis, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, USA.

Mack, R. N., and J. N. Thompson. 1982. Evolution in steppe with few large, hooved mammals. American Naturalist 119:757-773.

Mahrt, J. L., F. C. Zwinkel, and T. G. Tessier. 1991. Blood parasites of blue grouse (Dendragapus obscurus) in western North America. Journal of Wildlife Disease 27:482-485.

Major, J. T. and J. A. Sherburne. 1987. Interspecific relationships of coyotes, bobcats, and red foxes in western Maine. Journal of Wildlife Management 51:606-616.

Mankin, P. L., and R. E. Warner. 1992. Vulnerability of ground nests to predation on an agricultural habitat island in east-central Illinois. American Midland Naturalist 128(2):281-291.

Manley, W. A., R. H. Hart, M. J. Samuel, M. A. Smith, J. W. Waggoner, Jr., and J. T. Manley. 1997. Vegetation, cattle, and economic responses to grazing strategies and pressures. Journal of Range Management 50:638-646.

Marcstrom, V., R. E. Kenward, and E. Engren. 1988. The impact of predation on boreal tetraonids during vole cycles: an experimental study. Journal of Animal Ecology 57:859-872.

Martin, N. S. 1970. Sagebrush control related to habitat and sage grouse occurrence. Journal of Wildlife Management 34:313-320.

Martin, R. C. 1990. Sage grouse responses to wildfires in spring and summer habitats. Thesis. University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, USA.

McAdoo, J. K., and D. A. Klebenow. 1978. Predation on range sheep with no predator control. Journal of Range Management 31:111-114.

McArthur, D.E., A. C. Blauer, and S.C. Sanderson. 1988. Mule deer induced mortality of big sagebrush. Journal of Range Management 41: 114-117.

McCracken, D. I. 1993. The potential for avermectins to affect wildlife. Veterinary Parasitology 48:273-280.

McDowell, M.K.D. 2000. The effects of burning in mountain big sagebrush on key sage grouse habitat characteristics in southeastern Oregon. M.S. Thesis Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.

McKell, C. M. 1975. Shrubs-a neglected resource. Science 187:803-809.

McNown, C. D., Walker J. W., J. W. Stuth, and R. K. Heitschmidt. 1991. Nutrient intake of cattle on rotational and continuous grazing treatments. Journal of Range Management 44:596-601.

Mead, J. I., L. D. Agenbroad, O. K. Davis, and P. S. Martin. 1986. Dung of *Mammuthus* in the arid southwest, North America. Quaternary Research 25:121-127.

Messick, J. P., E. G. Bizeau, W. W. Benson, and W. H. Mullins. 1974. Aerial pesticide applications and ring-necked pheasants. Journal of Wildlife Management 38:679-685.

Milchunas, D. G., and W. K. Lauenroth. 1993. Quantitative effects of grazing on vegetation and soils over a global range of environments. Ecological Monographs 63:327-366.

Miller, M. 2000. Fire autoecology. In Wildland fire in ecosystems: Effects of fire on flora. Eds. Brown, J. K. and Smith, J. K. Gen Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-42 vol. 2. Ogden, UT. USDA, For. Serv. Rocky Mt. Res. Stat. pp 9-34.

Miller, R. 2001. The role of fire in sage grouse habitat. In: Ecology and management of sage grouse: Expanded Abstracts. 54th Annual Meeting of SRM, Kona, HI. PP 13-19.

Miller, R. G., Findley, R. R. and Alderfer-Findley, J. 1980. Changes in mountain big sagebrush habitat types following spray release. Journal of Range Management 33: 278-281.

Miller, R. F., T. J. Svejcar, and N. E. West. 1994. Implications of livestock grazing in the intermountain sagebrush region: plant composition. Pages 101-146 *in* M. Vavra, W. A. Laycock, and R. D.

Pieper, editors. Ecological Implications of livestock herbivory in the west. Society for Range Management, Denver, Colorado, USA.

Miller, R. F., T. J. Svejcar, and J.A. Rose. 2000. Western juniper succession in shrub steppe: Impacts on community composition and structure. Journal of Range Management.

Miller, R. F., and J. A. Rose. 1995. Western juniper expansion in eastern Oregon. Great Basin Naturalist 55: 37-45.

Miller, R. F., and J. A. Rose. 1998. History, ecology and management of western juniper woodlands and associated shrublands: An annual report of preliminary results and progress. Eastern Oregon Agric. Reseach Center, OR State Univ. and USDA Agric. Research Serv. Burns, OR.

Miller, R. F., and J. A. Rose. 1999. Western juniper expansion in eastern Oregon. Great Basin Naturalist 55: 37-45.

Miller, R. F., and P.E. Wigand. 1994. Holocene changes in semiarid pinyon-juniper woodlands: Response to climate, fire and human activities in the U. S. Great Basin. BioScience 44: 465-474.

Miller, R. F., and L. L. Eddleman. 2000. Spatial and temporal changes of sage grouse habitat in the sagebrush biome. Oregon State Agricultural Experiment Station Technical Bulletin 151. 35p.

Moorman, T., and F. B. Reeves. 1979. The role of endomycorrhizae in revegetation practices in the simi-arid west. II. A bioassay to determine the effect of land disturbance on endomycorrhizal populations. American Journal of Botany 66:14-18.

Morton, D. M. and D. G. Hoffman. 1976. Metabolism of a new herbicide, tebuthiuron {1-[5-(1,1-Dimethylenthyl)-1,3,4-Thiadiazol-2-YL]-1,3-dimethylurea}, in mouse, rat, rabbit, dog, duck, and fish. Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health 1:757-768.

Mueggler, W. F. 1950. Effects of spring and fall grazing by sheep on vegetation of the upper snake river plains. Journal of Range Management 3:308-315.

Mueggler, W. F., and J. P. Blaisdell. 1958. Effects on associated species of burning, rotobeating, spraying, and railing sagebrush. Journal of Range Management 11:61-66.

Mulholland, J.L. 1984. Big sagebrush response and reestablishment following chemical control in western Wyoming. M.S. Thesis. Univ. WY, Laramie, WY.

Murie, J. O. 1992. Predation by badgers on Columbian ground squirrels. Journal of Mammalogy 73:385-394.

National Academy of Science. 1994. Rangeland Health.

Neel, L. A. 1980. Sage grouse response to grazing management in Nevada. Thesis, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, USA.

Nelle, P. J. 1998. The long-term effects of fire on sage grouse nesting and brood –rearing habitats on the Upper Snake River Plain. Thesis. University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, USA.

Nelle, P. J., K. P. Reese, and J. W. Connelly. 2000. Long-term effect of fire on sage grouse nesting and brood-rearing habitats in the Upper Snake River Plain. Journal of Range Management 53-586-591.

Niemuth, N. D. 1992. Effects of nest predation on breeding biology of sage grouse (Centrocercus urophasianus). Thesis, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, USA.

Norelius, E. E., and J. A. Lockwood. 1999. The effects of reduced agent-area insecticide treatment for rangeland grasshopper (Orthoptera:Acrididae) control on bird densities. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 37:519-528.

Oakleaf, R. J. 1971. The relationship of sage grouse to upland meadows in Nevada. Nevada Department of Fish and Game, Job Final Report, Federal Aid Project W-48-2.

Olson K. C., G. B. Rouse, and J. C. Malechek. 1989. Cattle nutrition and grazing behavior during short-duration-grazing periods on crested wheatgrass range. Journal of Range Management 42:153-157.

Olson, R., J. Hanson, T. Whitson, and K. Johnson. 1994. Tebuthiuron to enhance rangeland diversity. Rangelands 16:197-201.

Olson, R. A. and T. D. Whitson. 1999. Enhancing rangeland productivity and biodiversity by thinning big sagebrush with tebuthiuron. Abstract, 52: 57th SRM meeting, Omaha, NE.

Omphile, U. 1986. Vegetation and soil moisture responses following three big sagebrush control methods. Thesis. University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, USA.

Overbay, J. C. 1992. Ecosystem management. In: Procceding of the national workshop: taking an ecological approach to management. 1992 April; Salt Lake City, UT.USDA, For. Serv. WO-WSA-3, Wahington, D.C. p 3-15.

Owens, M. K., and B. E. Norton. 1990. Survival of juvenile basin big sagebrush under different grazing regimes. Journal of Range Management 43:132-135.

Owens, M. K., and B. E. Norton. 1992. Interactions of grazing and plant protection on basin big sagebrush (Artemisia tridentata spp. tridentata) seedling survival. Journal of Range Management 45:257-251.

Paige, C., and S. A. Ritter. 1999. Birds in a sagebrush sea: managing sagebrush habitats for bird communities. Partners in Flight Western Working Group, Boise, Idaho, USA.

Paine, L., D. J. Undersander, D. W. Sample, G. A. Bartelt, and T. A. Schatteman. 1996. Cattle trampling of simulated ground nests in rotationally grazed pastures. Journal of Range Management 49:294-299.

Parmenter, R. R., J. A. MacMahon. 1987. Early successional patterns of arthropod recolonization on reclaimed strip mines in southwestern Wyoming: The ground dwelling beetle fauna (Coleoptera). Environmental Entomology 16:168-175.

Passey, H.B., Hugie, V.K., Williams, E. W., and Ball, D.E. 1982. Relationships between soil, plant community, and climate on rangelands of the Intermountain West, U. S. USDA, Tech. Bull No. 1669. 118p.

Patterson, R. L. 1952. The sage grouse in Wyoming. Sage Books Incorporated, Denver, Colorado, USA.

Paysen, T. E., Ansley, J. R., Brown, J. K., Gottfried, G. J., Hasse, S. M., Harrington, M. G., Narog, M. G., Sackett, S. S., and Wilson, R. C. 2000. Fire in western shrubland, woodland and grassland ecosystems. In: Wildland fire in ecosystems: Effects of fire on flora. Eds. Brown, J. K. and Smith, J. K. Gen Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-42 vol. 2. Ogden, UT. USDA, For. Serv,, Rocky Mt. Res. Stat. pp 121-159.

Pearson, L. C. 1965. Primary production in grazed and ungrazed desert communities of eastern Idaho. Ecology. 46: 278-285.

Pechanec, J.F., A. P. Plummer, J. H. Robertson, and A. C. Hull. 1965. Sagebrush control on rangelands. USDA, Handbook No. 277.

Peterson, J. G. 1970. The food habits and summer distribution of juvenile sage grouse in central Montana. Journal of Wildlife Management 34:147-155.

Peterson, J. G. 1995. Ecological implications of sagebrush manipulations. Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, Wildlife Management Division, Federal Aid Project W-101-R-2.

Phillips, R. L., D. E. Biggins and A. B. Hoag. 1986. Coal surface mining and selected wildlife-a ten year study near Decker, Montana. Proceedings, Issues and Technology in the Management of Impacted Western Wildlife. Thorne Ecological Institute 2:235-244.

PIC Technologies Inc. 1999. Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Pinedale anticline natural gas field exploration and development project, Sublette, Wyoming. United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management, Pinedale Field Office, Pinedale, Wyoming.

Pierson, F. B., and D. L. Scarnecchia. 1987. Defoliation of intermediate wheatgrass under seasonal and short-duration grazing. Journal of Range Management 40:228-232.

Pieper, R. 1994. Ecological implications of livestock grazing. Pages 177-211 *in* M. Vavra, W. A. Laycock, and R. D. Pieper, editors. Ecological Implications of livestock herbivory in the west. Society for Range Management, Denver, Colorado, USA.

Pinchak, W. E., M. A. Smith, R. H. Hart, and J. W. Waggoner, Jr. 1991. Beef cattle distribution patterns on foothill range. Journal of Range Management 44:267-275.

Pitts, J. S., and F. C. Bryant. 1987. Steer and vegetation response to short duration grazing. Journal of Range Management 40:386-389.

Post, G. 1951. Effects of toxephene and chlordane on certain game birds. Journal of Wildlife Management 15:381-386.

Powell, G. V. and D. C. Gray. 1980. Dosing free-living nestling starlings with an organophosphate pesticide, famphur. Journal of Wildlife Management 44:918-921.

PRISM Environmental Management Consultants. 1982. A review of petroleum industry operations and other land use activities affecting wildlife. The Canadian Petroleum Association. Calgary, Alberta. 20pp.

Pyle, W. H. and J. A. Crawford. 1996. Availability of foods of sage grouse chicks following prescribed fire in sagebrush-bitterbrush. Journal of Range Management 49:320-324.

Pyrah, D. B. 1970. Sage grouse habitat research in central Montana. In E. F. Schlatterer and D.B. Pyrah, editors. Ecological effects of chemical and mechanical sagebrush control. Montana Fish and Game Department Completion Report, Project W-105-R-4:293-300.

Rasmussen, D. I., and L. A. Griner. 1938. Life history and management studies of the sage grouse in Utah, with special reference to nesting and feeding habits. Transactions of the North American Wildlife Conference 3:852-864.

Rauchfuss, F. L. 1955. The ecology of Halogeton glomeratus on Wyoming rangelands. Thesis. University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, USA.

Rees, E. 1993. Threatened, endangered, and sensitive species affected by livestock production: a preliminary survey of data available in ten western states. Unpublished Data, Audubon Society of Portland, Oregon, USA.

Reeves, F. B., D. Wagner, T. Moorman, and J. Kiel. 1979. The role of endomycorrhizae in revegetation practices in the simi-arid west. I. A comparison of incidence of mycorrhizae in severely disturbed vs. natural environments. American Journal of Botany 66:6-13.

Reichel, J. D. 1991. Relationships among coyote food habits, prey populations, and habitat use. Northwest Science 65(3):133-137.

Remington, T. E., and C. E. Braun. 1985. Sage grouse food selection in winter, North Park, Colorado. Journal of Wildlife Management 49:1055-1061.

Remington, T. E. and C. E. Braun. 1991. How surface coal mining affects sage grouse, North Park, Colorado. Proceedings, Issues and Technology in the Management of Impacted Western Wildlife. Thorne Ecological Institute 5:128-132.

Reynolds, R. T., and C. H. Trost. 1980. The response of native vertebrate populations to crested wheatgrass planting and grazing by sheep. Journal of Range Management 33:122-125.

Rickard, W. H. 1970. Ground dwelling beetles in burned and unburned vegetation. Journal of Range Management 23:293-294.

Rickard, W. H. and Sauer, R. H. 1988. Self-revegetation of disturbed ground in deserts of Nevada and Washington. Northwest Sci. 56: 41-46.

Ritchie, M. E., M. L. Wolfe, and R. Danvir. 1994. Predation of artificial sage grouse nests in treated and untreated sagebrush. Great Basin Naturalist 54:122-129.

Rittenhouse, L. R., and F. A. Sneva. 1976. Expressing the competitive relationship between big sagebrush and crested wheatgrass. Journal of Range Management 29:326-327.

Roberts, T. C., Jr. 1991. Cheatgrass: management implications in the 90's. Rangelands 13:70-72.

Robertson, M. D. 1991. Winter ecology of migratory sage grouse and associated effects of prescribed fire in southeastern Idaho. Thesis, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, USA.

Robinson, I. B. 1982. Drought relief schemes for the pastoral zone. Australian Rangeland Journal 4:67-77.

Robinson, W. B. 1961. Population changes of carnivores in some coyote-control areas. Journal of Mammalogy 42:510-515.

Rogers, G. F. 1982. Then and now: A photographic history of vegetation change in the central Great Basin desert Univ. Utah Press. Salt Lake City, UT.

Rose, K. K. 1999. Sustainable control of dalmation toadflax (Linaria genistifolia spp), musk thistle (Carduus nutans), and downy brome (Bromus tectorum) using cool-season, perennial grass competition. Thesis. Department of Plant Science, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, USA.

Rose, J. A., Miller R. F., and Svejcar, T. 1994. Vegetation and livestock exclusion in the sagebrush steppe. In: Management of Great Basin rangelands. OR State Univ., Agric. Exp. Sta. Special Rep. 935 p 53-59.

Roseberry, J. L. 1979. Bobwhite population responses to exploitation: real and simulated. Journal of Wildlife Management 43:285-305.

Ryan, K. C. 2000. Global change and wildland fire. In: Wildland fire in ecosystems: Effects of fire on flora. Eds. Brown, J. K. and Smith, J. K. Gen Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-42 vol. 2. Ogden, UT. USDA, For. Serv,, Rocky Mt. Res. Stat. pp 175-183.

Salih, Mohamed S.S.; Taha, F. H.; and Payne, G. F. 1973. Water repellency of soils under burned sagebrush. Journal of Range Management 26(5): 330-331.

Samuel, M. J., and G. S. Howard. 1982. Botanical composition of summer cattle diets on the Wyoming high plains. Journal of Range Management 35:305-308.

Sanera, M. and J. S. Shaw. 1996. Facts Not Fear. Regnery Publishing Inc. ISBN 0-89526-488-X

Sargeant, A. B. 1972. Red fox spatial characteristics in relation to waterfowl predation. Journal of Wildlife Management 36:225-236.

Sargeant, A. B., M. A. Sovada, and R. J. Greenwood. 1987. Responses to three prairie ground squirrel species, Spermophilus franklinii, S. richardsonii, and S. tridecemlineatus, to duck eggs. The Canadian Field-Naturalist 101:95-97.

Savage, D. E. 1969. The relationship of sage grouse to upland meadows in Nevada. Transactions of the Annual. Meeting, California-Nevada Section of The Wildlife Society 16:8-17.

Savory, A. 1988. Holistic resource management. Island Press. Washington D. C., USA.

Schneegas, E. R. 1967. Sage grouse and sagebrush control. Transactions of the North America Wildlife and Natural Resource Conference 32:270-274.

Schoenburg, T. J. and C. E. Braun. 1982. Potential impacts of strip mining on sage grouse movements and habitat use. Colorado Division of Wildlife. Job Completion Report. Federal Aid Project W-37-R-35, Work Plan 3, Job 12.

Schranck, B. W. 1972. Waterfowl nest cover and some predation relationships. Journal of Wildlife Management 36:182-186.

Schroeder, M. A. 1997. Unusually high reproductive effort by sage grouse in a fragmented habitat in north-central Washington. Condor 9:378-385.

Schroedl, G. F. 1973. The archeological occurrence of bison in the Southern Plateau. Washington State University Lab of Anthropology. Report of Investigation 51. Pullman, Washington, USA.

Schuman, G. E., D. T. Booth and J. R. Cockrell. 1998. Cultural methods for establishing Wyoming big sagebrush on mines lands. Journal of Range Management 51:223-229.

Schuman, G. E., E. M. Taylor, Jr., F. Rauzi. 1991. Forage production of reclaimed mined lands as influenced by nitrogen fertilization and mulching practice. Journal of Range Management 44:382-384.

Sime, C. A. 1991. Sage grouse use of burned, non-burned, and seeded vegetation communities on the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho. Thesis. Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana, USA.

Simon, F. 1940. The parasites of the sage grouse. University of Wyoming Publication 7:77-100.

Small, R. J., Holzwart, J. C., and Rusch, D. H. 1991. Predation and hunting mortality of ruffed grouse in central Wisconsin. Journal of Wildlife Management 55:512-520.

Smith, G. J. 1987. Pesticide Use and Toxicology in Relation to Wildlife: Organophosphorus and Carbamate Compounds. United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service.

Sneva , F. A., Rittenhouse, R. L., Tueller, P. T. and Reece, P. 1984. Changes in protected and grazed sagebrush-grass in eastern Oregon, 1973-1974. OR State Univ. Agric. Exp. Sta. Bull. 663. 11p.

Stabler, R. M., C. E. Braun, and T. D. I. Beck. 1977. Hematozoa in sage grouse from Colorado. Journal of Wildlife Disease 13:414-417.

Stahlecker, D. W. 1978. Effect of a new transmission line on wintering prairie raptors. Condor 80:444-446.

Steen, H., N. G. Yoccoz, and R. A. Ims. 1990. Predators and small rodent cycles: an analysis of a 79-year time series of small rodent population fluctuations. Oikos 59:115-120.

Stigar, M. S. 1989. Hunting low density sage grouse populations. Thesis. University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, USA.

Stohlgren, T. J., L. D. Schell, and B. Vanden Heuvel. 1999. How grazing and soil quality affect native and exotic plant diversity in Rocky Mountain grasslands. Ecological Applications 9:45-64.

Strong, L. 1993. Overview: the impact of avermectins on pastureland ecology. Veterinary Parasitology 48:3-17.

Sturges, D. L. 1983. Long term effects of big sagebrush control on vegetation and soil water. Journal of Range Management 36:760-765.

Sturges, D. L. 1993. Soil-water and vegetation dynamics through 20 years after big sagebrush control. Journal of Range Management 46:161-169.

Sveum, C. M., J. A. Crawford, and W. D. Edge. 1998. Use and selection of brood-rearing habitat by sage grouse in south-central Washington. Great Basin Naturalist 58:344-351.

Swanson, F.J., J.A. Jones, D.O. Wallin, and J.H. Cissel. 1994. Natural variability—Implications for ecosystem management. In: Eastside forest ecosystem health assessment: Volume II: Ecosystem Management: Principles and applications. M.E. Jensen and PIS. Bourgerom (eds.). USDA, For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-318. p 80-94.

Swenson, J. E. 1986. Differential survival by sex in juvenile sage grouse and gray partridge. Ornis Scandinavica 17:14-17.

Swenson, J. E., C. A. Simmons, and C. D. Eustace. 1987. Decrease of sage grouse Centrocercus urophasianus after ploughing of sagebrush steppe. Biological Conservation 41:125-132

Tapper, S. 1979. The effect of fluctuating vole numbers (Microtus agrestis) on a population of weasels (Mustela nivalis) on farmland. Journal of Animal Ecology 48:603-617.

Tart, D.L. 1996. Big sagebrush plant associations of the Pinedale Ranger District, Pinedale, WY. USDA, For. Ser., Bridger-Teton National Forest. Jackson, WY. 97p.

Taylor, R. G., J. R. Workman, and J. E. Bowns. 1979. The economics of sheep predation in southwestern Utah. Journal of Range Management 32:317-321.

Taylor, S. M. 1999. Sheep scab – environmental considerations of treatment with doramectin. Veterinary Parasitology 83:309-317.

Thurow, T. L. and C. A. Taylor. 1999. Viewpoint: the role of drought in range management. Journal of Range Management 52:413-419.

Tidewell, W. D., S. R. Rashforth, and D. Simper. 1972. Evolution of floras in the intermountain region. Volume 1 in A. Cronquist, A. H. Cronquist, H. H. Holmgren, and J. L. Reveal (editors). Intermountain flora. Hafner Publishing Company. New York, New York, USA.

Tigner, J. R. and G. E. Larson. 1977. Sheep losses on selected ranches in southern Wyoming. Journal of Range Management 30:244-252.

Tisdale, E. W. 1994. Great Basin region: sagebrush types. In: T. N. Shiflet (ed.) Rangeland cover types. Soc. Range Manage., Denver, CO p40-46.

Tisdale, E. W., and M. Hironaka. 1981. The sagebrush-grass region: a review of the ecological literature. Idaho Forest, Wildlife and Range Experiment Station Bulletin 33. Moscow, Idaho, USA.

Tisdale, E. W., M. Hironaka and F.A. Fosberg. 1965. An area of pristine vegetation in Craters of the Moon National Monument, Idaho. Ecology 46: 349-352.

Tisdale, E. W., M. Hironaka and F.A. Fosberg. 1969. The sagebrush region in Idaho: a problem in range resource management. Univ. ID Agric. Exp. Sta. Bull. 512. 15p.

TRC Mariah Associates Inc. 1997. Environmental impact statement for the Jonah Field II natural gas development project, Sublette County, Wyoming. Draft Wildlife Technical Report.

Trueblood, R. W. 1954. The effects of grass reseeding in sagebrush lands on sage grouse populations. Thesis. Utah State Agriculture College, Logan, Utah, USA.

Tueller, P. T. 1973. Secondary succession, disclimax, and range condition standards in desert shrub vegetation. In: Arid Shrubland Proc., 3rd US/Australian Rangeland Panel. D. N. Hyder (ed.) Denver, CO. p 57-65.

Tueller, P. T., and Blackburn, W. H. 1974. Condition and trend of the big sagebrush/needleandthread habitat type in Nevada. Journal of Range Management 27: 36-40.

Tueller, P. T. and Platou, K. A. 1991. Plant succession gradient in a big sagebrush/grass ecosystem. Vegetatio. 94:57-68.

United States Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management. 1979. Kemmerer resource area oil and gas leasing environmental assessment record. Bureau of Land Management, Rock Springs District, Wyoming, USA.

United States Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management. 1999. Wyodak coal bed methane project draft environmental impact statement. BLM, Buffalo Field Office, Buffalo, Wyoming, USA.

Vale, T. R. 1974. Sagebrush conversion projects: an element of contemporary environmental change in the western United States. Biological Conservation 6(4):274-284.

Vale, T. R. 1975. Presettlement vegetation in the sagebrush-grass area of the intermountain west. Journal of Range Management 28:32-36.

Valentine, K. A. 1947. Distance from water as a factor in grazing capacity of rangeland. Journal of Forestry 45:749-754.

Vavra, M., R. W. Rice, R. M. Hansen, and P. L. Sims. 1977. Food habits of cattle on shortgrass range in northeastern Colorado. Journal of Range Management 30:261-263.

Vincent, D. W. 1992. The sagebrush/grasslands of the upper Rio Puerco area, New Mexico. Rangelands 14(5): 268-271.

Voigt, D. R., and B. D. Pyrah. 1974. Movement and nesting of sage grouse hens in central Montana. Journal of Wildlife Management 38:630-633.

Wakkinen, W. L. 1990. Nest site characteristics and spring-summer movements of migratory sage grouse in southeastern Idaho. Thesis. University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, USA.

Wakkinen, W. L., K. P. Reese, and J. W. Connelly. 1992. Sage grouse nest locations in relation to leks. Journal of Wildlife Management 56:381-383.

Walker, J. W., R. K. Heitschmidt, and S.L. Dowhower. 1989. Some effects of a rotational grazing treatment on cattle preference for plant communities. Journal of Range Management 42:143-148.

Wallestad, R. O. 1971. Summer movements and habitat use by sage grouse broods in central Montana. Journal of Wildlife Management 35:129-136.

Wallestad, R. O. 1975. Life history and habitat requirements of sage grouse in central Montana. Montana Fish and Game Department Technical Bulletin, Helena, Montana, USA.

Wallestad, R. O., and D. B. Pyrah. 1974. Movement and nesting of sage grouse hens in central Montana. Journal Wildlife Management 38:630-633.

Wallestad, R. O., and P. Schladweiller. 1974. Breeding season movements and habitat selection of male sage grouse. Journal of Wildlife Management 38:634-637.

Ward, J. C. 1940. The susceptibility of sage grouse to Strychnine. Wildlife Research Laboratory, U.S. Department of the Interior, Denver Colorado, USA.

Watts, M. J., and C. L. Wambolt. 1996. Long-term recovery of Wyoming Big sagebrush after four treatments. Journal of Environmental Management 46(1):95-102.

Welch, B. L., E. D. McArthur, and R.L. Rodriguez. 1987. Variation in utilization of big sagebrush accessions by wintering sheep. Journal of Range Management 40:113-115.

Welch, B. L., F. J. Wagstaff, and J. A. Robertson. 1991. Preference of wintering sage grouse for big sagebrush. Journal of Range Management 44(5):462-465.

West, N. E. 1983. Western Intermountain sagebrush steppe. In: N.E. West (ed.) Ecosystems of the World 5.: Temperate deserts and semi-deserts. Elseviier Scientific Publ. Co., New York, NY p 351-397.

West, N. E. 1988. Intermountain deserts, shrub steppes, and woodlands. In: M.B. Barbour and W.D. Billings (eds.) North American Terrestrial Vegetation. Campbidge Univ. Press. p 209-230.

West, N. E. 1999. Manageing for biodiversity of rangelands. In: Biodiversity in agrosystems. W.W. Collins and C. O. Qualset (eds.). CRC Press. p 101-120

West, N. E. and Hassan, M. W. 1985. Recovery of sagebrush-grass vegetation following wildfire. Journal of Range Management 38(2): 131-134.

Whitson, T. D. and H. P. Alley. 1984. Tebuthiuron effects on Artemisia spp. and associated grasses. Weed Science 32:180-184.

Whitson, T. D., L. C. Burrill, S. A. Dewey, D. W. Cudney, B. E. Nelson, R. D. Lee, and R. Parker. 1991. Weeds of the west. Western Society of Weed Science and Western United States Land Grant Universities Cooperative Extension Services, University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming, USA.

Whitson, T. D., M. A. Ferrell, and H. P. Alley. 1988. Changes in rangeland canopy cover seven years after Tebuthiuron application. Weed Technology 2:486-489.

Willis, M. J.,G. P. Kiester. Hr., D. A. Immel, D. M. Jones, R. M. Powell, and K. R. Durbin. 1993. Sage grouse in Oregon. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Research Report No. 15.

Wilson Bulletin Conservation Committee. 1976. Conservation committee report on effects of alteration of sagebrush communities on the associated avifauna. Wilson Bulletin 88:165-170.

Winward, A. H. 1980. Taxonomy and ecology of sagebrush in Oregon. Sta. Bull. 642. Agric. Exp. Sta. Oregon State, Univ., Corvallis, OR.

Winward, A. H. 1985. Fire in the sagebrush-grass ecosystem - the ecological setting. Pages 2-6 *in:* Sanders K., and J. Durham [and others],editors. Rangeland fire effects : a symposium ; Proceedings. United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management. Boise, Idaho, USA.

Winward, A. H. 1991. A renewed commitment to management of sagebrush grasslands. Agricultural Experiment Station Special Report 880. Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, USA.

Winward, A. H. and E.W. Tisdale. 1977. Taxonmy of *Artemisia tridentata* complex in Idaho. Bull. No. 19. Univ. of Idaho, College of Forestry, Wildlife and Range Sciences, Moscow, ID.

Workman, J. P. 1986. Range Economics. Macmillan Publishing Co. New York, New York, USA.

Wright, H. A. 1970. Responses of big sagebrush and three-tip sagebrush to season of clipping. Journal of Range Management 23:20-22.

Wright, H. A. 1974. Range burning. Journal of Range Management 27:5-11.

Wright, H. A. 1979. The role and use of fire in sagebrush grass and pinyon juniper plant communities. A state-of-the-art review. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service General Technical Report INT-58.

Wright, H. A. 1986. Effect of fire on arid and semi-arid ecosystems – North American Continent. In: Rangelands! A resource under siege. Proc. 2nd International Rangeland Congress. Cambridge Univ. Press: 575-576.

Wright, H. A., and A. W. Bailey. 1982. Fire ecology. United States and southern Canada. Wiley and Sons, New York, New York, USA.

Wrobleshi, D. W. 1999. Effects of prescribed fire on Wyoming big sagebrush communities: Implications for ecological restoration of sage grouse habitat. M. S. Thesis. OR State Univ., Corvalllis, OR.

Wyoming Game and Fish Department. 1992. Vertebrate Species List. Wyoming Game & Fish Dept., Cheyenne, WY.

Wyoming Interagency Vegetation Committee. 2002.Wyoming guidelines for managing sagebrush communities with emphasis on fire management. Wyoming Game and Fish Department and Wyoming BLM, Cheyenne, WY 53p.

Wyoming Shrub Ecology Workshop. 1982. Tour Stop Notes. Univ. Wyo. Dept. Range Manage. Laramie, WY.

Young, J. A., R. E. Eckert, Jr., and R. A. Evans. 1979. Historical perspectives regarding the sagebrush ecosystem. In: The sagebrush ecosystem: A symposium; 1978 April. Logan, UT. UT State Univ., College of Natural Resources. p 1-13.

Young, J. A. and R. A. Evans. 1981. Demography and fire history of a western juniper stand. Journal of Range Management 34: 501-506.

Young, J. A., R. A. Evans, R. E. Eckert, Jr., and B. L. Kay. 1987. Cheatgrass. Rangelands 9:266-270.

Zablan, M. A. 1993. Evaluation of sage grouse banding program in North Park, Colorado. Thesis. Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA.

Zamora, B. and P. T. Tueller. 1973. *Artemisia arbuscula, A. longiloba* and *A. n*ova habitat types in northern Nevada. Great Basin Naturalist 33: 225-242.

Zunino, G. W. 1987. Harvest effect on sage grouse densities in northwest Nevada. Thesis. University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, USA.

Appendix 1

POPULATION MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT*

One of the primary components of an effective sage-grouse conservation strategy will be the continued development and utilization of a standardized population monitoring program capable of producing meaningful, rigorous status and trend information. This monitoring program should result in regular reports being generated by the WGFD that can be used by local planning groups to analyze local situations and implement local conservation plans. These data should also be suitable for aggregate analysis at the statewide level and comparison to similar data sets from other states. The Wyoming Sage-Grouse Database has recently been developed. This database incorporates lek survey and count data as well as harvest data, including determination of the age and sex from wings deposited in hunter collection barrels. As this database comes into use, it should provide the basis for both local and statewide analysis of sage-grouse population status and trend.

Breeding Populations

Sage-grouse gather on traditional display areas (leks) each spring, affording the opportunity for tracking breeding populations. Methods include lek censuses (annually counting the number of male sage-grouse attending leks in a given area), lek complex routes (annually counting the number of male sage-grouse on a group (complex) of leks that are relatively close and represent part or all of a single breeding population), and lek surveys (annually counting the number of active leks in a given area). All monitoring procedures are conducted during early morning (1/2 hour before to 1 hour after sunrise), with reasonably good weather (light or no wind, partly cloudy to clear) from early March to early May. Timing is dependent on elevation of leks and persistence of winter conditions. Sage-grouse will begin displaying in late February at lower elevations with milder climates and in years with mild winter weather. Lek attendance will persist into early or mid-May at higher elevations.

All lek data should be collected and reported as defined below.

Lek. A traditional courtship display area attended by male sage-grouse in or adjacent to sagebrush dominated habitat. Designation of the site as a lek requires observation of two or more male sage-grouse engaged in courtship displays. In addition new leks must be confirmed by a survey conducted during the appropriate time of day and during the strutting season. Observation of sign of strutting activity can also be used to confirm a suspected lek.

* - based on Sage Grouse Methodology Committee Report on Sage Grouse Management Practices to the 1996 Western States Sage Grouse Workshop – Gillette, Wyoming and Monitoring of Sage Grouse Habitats and Populations – Draft by J.W. Connelly, K.P. Reese and M.A. Schroeder, January 2002. Metric measures have been converted and rounded to English units for this appendix.

Lek Complex. A group of leks in close proximity between which male sage-grouse may be expected to interchange from one day to the next. A specific distance criteria does not yet exist.

Lek Count. A census technique that documents the actual number of male sage-grouse observed on a particular lek or complex of leks using the methods described below.

Lek Survey. A monitoring technique designed primarily to determine whether leks are active or inactive and obtaining accurate counts of the numbers of males attending is secondary.

Annual status – Each year a lek will be determined to be in one of the following status categories:

Active. Any lek that has been attended by male sage-grouse during the strutting season. Presence can be documented by observation of birds using the site or by signs of strutting activity.

Inactive. Leks where it is known that there was no strutting activity through the course of a strutting season. A single visit, or even several visits, without strutting grouse being seen is not adequate documentation to designate a lek as inactive. This designation requires either an absence of birds on the lek during multiple ground visits under ideal conditions throughout the strutting season or a ground check of the exact lek site late in the strutting season that fails to find any sign (droppings/feathers) of strutting activity.

Unknown. Leks that have not been documented either active or inactive during the course of a strutting season.

Based on annual status a lek may be put into one of the following categories for management purposes:

Occupied Lek. A lek that has been active during at least one strutting season within the last ten years. Management protection will be afforded to occupied leks.

Historical Lek. A lek that has not been active during a consecutive ten-year period. A historic lek is one that has been surveyed or counted without male grouse or signs of strutting activity being observed in at least six strutting seasons spanning ten years. In addition the lek must be confirmed as inactive at least two of those ten years. A lek may also be designated as historic if the lek site and the adjoining sagebrush habitat have been destroyed (e.g. type conversion). Management protection will not be afforded to historical leks.

Undetermined Lek. Any lek that has not been documented as being active in the last ten years but does not have sufficient documentation to be designated historical. Management protection will be afforded to undetermined leks until their status has been documented as historical.

Locating Leks--Before a monitoring program for sage-grouse breeding populations can be designed, lek locations must be documented. Leks can be located by searching from the ground or air from early March to early May.

Helicopters or fixed-wing airplanes can be used for air searches. Strutting cocks are highly visible as the early morning sun shines on their white chests. Suspected breeding habitat should be flown on north - south transects with lines about ½ mile apart. Aerial searches are biased toward finding larger leks; small leks (<15 birds) are more difficult to detect. Calm, clear mornings are prerequisite to aerial searches. Winds over 15 mph and more than scattered cloud cover should be sufficient to cancel search flights. Cocks can be observed from the air at distances greater than a ½ mile in early morning sun, but cloud cover greatly reduces observability. Under conditions of marginal light, transect width should be narrowed. High winds not only make traveling a straight transect difficult, but also affect strutting behavior. Fewer cocks will strut continuously, and flushing distance appears to be greater under windy conditions.

Transects should be flown at about 300 feet above ground level. Whenever possible, two observers should be used in addition to the pilot so that one observer is always looking away from the sun regardless of the direction the aircraft is flying. Searches should begin at the east edge of the survey area and work west to minimize the possibility of the plane flying over leks prior to them being observed. Special attention should be paid to old lakebeds, stock-watering areas, and other relatively open sites largely surrounded by sagebrush with 15 to 25% canopy cover. Lek searches from an aircraft should be conducted from ½ hour before to one hour after sunrise, although during peak attendance the time can be stretched to 1½ hours after sunrise.

Cock behavior in response to approaching aircraft varies, but may affect search success. Strutting may continue as the plane approaches and flies near or over the lek, but in other instances, grouse have been observed squatting similar to that seen when an avian predator approaches. Sage-grouse virtually disappear when they squat, making it essential to locate cocks prior to close approach or fly over by the aircraft. Observers should continually strive to observe strutting cocks at a distance. Research has found that aerial count estimates can be up to a third less than ground counts. Therefore aerial counts are not usually considered adequate for monitoring trends in lek attendance, although efforts have been made in Nevada to develop a counting technique using helicopters.

In areas with no recent history of sage-grouse use or poor habitat, aircraft speed can be increased and search intervals increased to 1 mile. In areas where habitat alteration or human development is anticipated, narrower transect widths may be advisable to better ensure that the area is thoroughly searched.

Lek searches can be conducted from the ground by driving along roads in suspected or known breeding habitat and stopping every ½ mile to listen for sounds of breeding grouse. Ground searches can be started an hour before sunrise. In less accessible areas, searches can be made from a mountain bike, trail motorcycle, 4-wheel all terrain

vehicle, horseback or on foot. On a calm morning, breeding sage-grouse may be heard at a distance of almost 1 mile. All openings or areas of less dense sagebrush should be searched for breeding birds with binoculars or a spotting scope.

A variation of the ground survey can be used following snowfall during the night or early morning. Although lek activity is minimal during stormy weather and the birds may flush at the first sign of an intruder, some male sage-grouse will attend leks on virtually every morning during the spring, regardless of weather. Areas that are suspected of being leks can be searched immediately following a snowfall. If grouse use the area, tracks will be evident in the snow, and the number of tracks may give some indication of the relative size of the lek. Similarly, new leks can be located by the discovery of concentrated tracks/droppings/feathers at all times of the day when conducting other field activities (big game winter mortality transects). Return visits to such sites during the morning strutting hours must be made to confirm the location as a lek.

Not every site where sage-grouse are seen to strut is a strutting ground. Grouse that have been flushed from their lek will often resume strutting in a different site for the rest of that morning, and then return to the normal lek the following night. Juvenile cocks will sometimes pursue hens as they leave a lek, strutting as a group as far away as ½ mile from the lek as they follow the females. Care needs to be taken that a site identified as a strutting ground is truly a lek. Strutting activity should be documented at a site on at least two mornings before it is designated as a lek. Ground survey of the site to search for sign of prolonged activity can also separate true leks from temporary strutting sites.

The center point of all leks should be recorded in UTMs using NAD83 datum and stored within the Wyoming Sage-Grouse Database. Additionally, it is advisable to record/map the perimeters of all leks.

Lek Counts--Lek counts are a common means of monitoring sage-grouse populations. Lek counts document the actual number of male sage-grouse observed on a particular lek or complex of leks. A lek complex is a group of leks in close proximity between which male sage-grouse may be expected to interchange.

Although lek counts are widely used, concern over their usefulness has been expressed. However, techniques for correctly conducting lek counts have been described herein and problems generally seem to be related to disregarding accepted techniques. Reviews of raw data recorded while conducting lek routes have indicated that some leks have been counted at the wrong time of the year or during periods of wind or precipitation. All participants in lek counts should receive adequate training in the proper techniques. Video training guides (Power Point format) are available.

The following criteria should be used to insure the quality and utility of the count data:

1) Lek counts should be conducted every 7-10 days over a 3-4 week period following the peak of mating activity. Peak breeding usually occurs in early April in Wyoming, however peak male attendance usually occurs in late April or early May when yearling males show increased lek attendance rates.

2) Counts should only be conducted from the ground.
3) Counts should be made between ½ hour before to 1 hour after sunrise.
4) Counts should be conducted a minimum of three times each year for each lek.
5) Counts should only be conducted if wind speeds are less than 5 mph and there is no precipitation occurring.

Subdominant males are often less active than more dominant males occupying the center of the lek. These subdominant birds may be easily missed with a single count. A lek may be effectively counted in the following manner:

1) Locate a spot that provides good visibility of the entire lek. If the lek is very large (100 or more birds) it may be necessary to select two or more vantage points. Be careful not to get so close that an observer's presence disturbs the grouse.
2) Record the time that the lek count begins.
3) Count the birds from left to right (or vice versa).
4) Wait one to two minutes, then count from right to left.
5) Wait one to two minutes, then again count from left to right.
6) Record the highest number of males and females separately, and then move to the next lek.

Because some sage-grouse may use several leks in a given breeding season, changes in lek attendance observed during a lek count may be due to some birds shifting to nearby leks. Moreover, a single lek could disappear because of disturbance or vegetation change. The disappearance may or may not mean that the actual population is declining. Therefore, all leks within a complex should be counted during a lek census to access actual changes in the grouse population.

A lek complex route is a type of lek count with an important distinction—an attempt is made to census a group of leks that are relatively close and represent part or all of a single breeding population. Leks should be counted along routes to facilitate repetition by other observers, increase the likelihood of recording satellite leks, and account for shifts in breeding birds if they occur. Lek complex count routes should be established so that all leks along the route can be counted within 1.5 hours. If weather degenerates after a lek complex route has begun, the route should be run again.

If a lek is not occupied (and it had been in previous weeks or years), the observer should leave his/her vehicle and (with the engine off) listen for sounds of displaying grouse. Leks will move if birds are subject to continuing disturbance. Grouse may also be flushed from a lek by a predator and, if it is still reasonably early in the morning, may display nearby once the predator leaves the area.

Before establishing lek counts/routes in a given area, some thought should be given to personnel available for conducting routes. It is much better to have a few counts with high quality data than many with less than adequate data. Lek count routes should be coordinated through and assigned by the WGFD, although trained persons from outside the agency might collect lek count data. Those leks with a long history of consistent data collection are highly recommended to be included in count routes. A minimum of

one lek count route should be conducted in each management area occupied by sage-grouse.

Lek count data should be recorded on the standardized statewide reporting form and recorded in the Wyoming Sage-Grouse Database.

Lek Surveys— Ideally, all sage-grouse leks would be count leks. However, some sage-grouse breeding habitat is inaccessible during spring because of mud and snow, or so remote that leks cannot be routinely counted. Other leks may be situated in topography or vegetation that does not allow an accurate count of males from any vantage point. In addition, time and budget constraints limit the number of leks that can be visited. In these cases, lek surveys are the only reliable means of monitoring these populations. Lek surveys are designed primarily to determine whether leks are active or inactive. Only one visit to the lek is required and obtaining accurate counts of the numbers of males attending is secondary. Surveys require less manpower and time than lek counts. They can also be conducted from fixed-wing aircraft or helicopter. Because obtaining a peak male count is not a priority, surveys of leks not on count routes can begin with initiation of strutting in early March and extend into early-mid May, depending on the site and spring weather.

The major drawback to this technique is that it is not sensitive to a change in sage-grouse population size unless the sample size of leks is very large. As an example, a group of 5 leks could have had 50 males observed during one spring survey and 75 males observed two years later. These results should only be interpreted to mean that all 5 leks were active each year surveyed. What appears to be a 50% increase may not be the case. However, on a very large scale, Wyoming lek survey data have been shown to be consistent with lek count data population trends (up, down, stable).

To provide the most useful information on population trends, lek surveys should be conducted in the same manner and during the same time period each year. In other words, they should not be conducted from a fixed-wing aircraft one year and a helicopter the next year or in early March one year and in May the next. The date and time should be recorded for each survey. UTM coordinates for each lek encountered should also be noted, as well as any other information that observers might consider important. Although it is difficult to get an accurate count of birds from an aircraft, it is usually possible to estimate the number of birds present.

The activity status of leks whose exact location is known can be checked at any time of the day, and for a short period after the strutting season, by looking for signs of strutting activity. Sites used by sage-grouse for strutting are easily identified by heavy concentrations of scattered fecal pellets (not in discrete piles beside sagebrush, as is common on winter ranges), feathers, tracks and trampled vegetation. Strutting sites are usually marked by large numbers of caecal droppings (miniature black “cow pies”). Caecal droppings are initially green, but cure to black quickly in the sun. Presence of green caecal droppings and fresh tracks can be used to determine if a lek site was active that morning. Sage-grouse fecal droppings can last for years, although fading with time, but caecal droppings usually decay within days or weeks, depending on

precipitation, limiting the time that this sign can be used to document lek activity. Ground visits to the exact strutting center of a lek also provides an ideal opportunity to get the lek location accurately and precisely mapped, using either GPS technology or orthophoto quad maps.

As with lek counts, the ideal time for lek surveys is from about 1/2 hour before until 1 hour after sunrise, but sage-grouse will occasionally strut as late as two hours or more after sunrise. Late attendance on leks usually coincides with either 1) presence of hens on the lek, 2) overcast skies, fog, or light snowfall with dim light, or 3) during the small, or "new" phases of the moon, when little strutting activity occurs at night. Males will generally cease strutting activity early on mornings when hens are absent (late in the strutting season) or near the full moon, when much of the strutting and breeding occurs at night. At and near the full moon, sage-grouse may strut all night and males will occasionally initiate strutting at sunset or shortly after sunset. At these times, leks can occasionally be checked in the evening. While not providing a count of attendance, lek surveys can and have been conducted at night during the full moon, provided leks can be approached close enough to either hear or spotlight strutting grouse.

The frequency with which known leks are surveyed is based on manpower, budgets and rates of habitat alteration or development. Remote leks should be surveyed at least once every three years and others more frequently. Increasing public interest in sage-grouse has afforded the opportunity to utilize volunteers to survey or count leks and thus increase data collection efforts. The Wyoming Wildlife Federation's "Adopt-a-Lek" program has shown to provide a pool of reliable volunteers. Volunteers should be properly trained in monitoring techniques to ensure quality data and not disrupt breeding activity.

Data Analysis-- Prior to analysis, field data should be reviewed to ensure that information was collected properly. Lek count routes conducted during stormy weather, high winds or late in the morning (i.e., routes completed more than 1.5 hours after sunrise) should not be included in the analysis.

To assess breeding population trends, the minimum amount of information needed is a record of the number of active leks in a given area over a period of years. This information can be obtained from lek surveys and lek routes, but these data will only reflect gross changes in the population and may provide misleading results.

Lek count data that have been correctly collected provide more useful data for assessing population trends than information on the number of active leks. Lek counts provide the following data: active leks/route; average number of males/route or complex; maximum number of males/route or complex; average number males/lek; maximum number of males/lek; and possibly, males/area (all males counted on a group of lek routes). Sometimes the number of leks along a route changes because the route has changed, the habitat has changed or satellite leks have developed. If this occurs, then the most effective means of tracking populations and analyzing changes will be by examining the number of males per lek. If the number of leks does not change over a

period of years, the number of males per route should form the basis of breeding population assessment.

Females are usually counted along lek routes, but because of their secretive nature and cryptic appearance they are difficult to detect. Although the number of females counted may provide some information on peak of breeding, these data should not be used to assess population change.

The development of the Wyoming Sage-Grouse Database and Job Completion Report has facilitated data storage, retrieval, analysis and reporting on both regional and statewide levels. All current and historical data should be entered into the database.

Production

Brood observations, brood routes and wing surveys have been used to assess sage-grouse production. Brood observations, sometimes called random brood routes, are simply records of all sage-grouse broods observed in a given area by any field personnel that find themselves in that area. This information provides some idea of the juvenile to adult ratio and percent of hens observed with broods. Thus, it is somewhat better than anecdotal data. However, it is not easily replicated and comparisons among years can be difficult to interpret.

Routes are usually conducted on foot, horseback or driven at speeds <20 mph in the morning (sunrise to about 0900) and evening (1800 to sunset) during late June, July and early August. Brood routes are normally established in areas known to have concentrations of sage-grouse. These areas are often in or adjacent to wet meadows, riparian zones and agricultural fields. Each brood is recorded separately and the presence of a hen is also recorded. Groups of unsuccessful females and males are also normally tallied. Because chicks are quite secretive it is usually necessary to flush the brood to obtain an accurate count. A trained bird dog can increase the efficiency of this procedure. If sufficient numbers of grouse are observed such that the sample size is adequate, this technique can provide a reliable indication of trends in production. Brood routes provide the following information: birds/km, broods/km, average brood size, and chick to adult hen ratio. For non-hunted populations or populations subject to very light hunting where relatively few wings can be collected, brood routes are the only method available for assessing production, short of using radio telemetry.

Sage-grouse wings collected during hunting seasons can be used to determine age and gender of harvested birds. For hunted populations, wing surveys are the most useful technique for assessing sage-grouse production (chicks/hen). However, sample sizes should exceed 150 wings, and could be considerably larger depending on the size of the area and population being sampled. Wings are normally collected at wing barrels or hunter check stations. The Wyoming Game & Fish Department's Sage-Grouse Sex and Age Guide should be used to determine age and gender of wings. Wings are usually read at an annual "wing-bee" held in November of each year. The wing-bee format allows for experience and expertise to be shared between participants.

Wing analyses and brood routes allow an assessment of trends in production and a comparison of production among areas. However, these data may not reflect population trends. For example, a portion of a population's winter habitat may be lost but the breeding range could remain intact. Production (juvenile to adult ratio) may be stable but the overall population may decline because of increased mortality on winter range. Thus, it is best to use this information in conjunction with data on breeding populations to make inferences on population trends.

Wing data should be entered into the Wyoming Sage-Grouse Database.

Winter Populations

Unlike breeding populations and production, there are no widely accepted methods for assessing winter populations. In part, this is because birds may be spread out over large areas during mild winters but concentrated in a relatively small proportion of the area in severe winters.

Probable winter use areas can be searched by 4-wheel drive vehicle, snowmobile, or on foot to document sage-grouse winter habitat. Aerial surveys using either a fixed-wing aircraft or helicopter may also be effective in identifying sage-grouse winter habitats and can often be done in conjunction with surveys for other wildlife (e.g. elk trend counts/classifications). Data collected should include at least approximate flock size and location. In addition, cover type (including sagebrush species present), topography, and snow depth data are also valuable but may not be possible to obtain from the aerial observations. Data should be acquired over a series of years with different snow conditions to give a more complete picture of winter grouse distribution.

Falconers can be a good source of winter distribution information and many have volunteered to collect and record winter locations.

Appendix 2

Nesting and Early Brood-rearing Habitat Methods and Descriptions

Vegetation variables were measured at nest sites, early brood-rearing habitat, and independent random locations at five study sites in Wyoming from 1994-2002.

Female sage-grouse were captured on and near leks from mid-March through April, 1994-2002 by spot-lighting and hoop-netting. Each captured hen was aged [yearling (<2 years old) or adult (≥2 years old)] based on the shape of the outermost wing primaries and fitted with a radio transmitter package secured with a PVC-covered wire necklace and situated on the breast.

Radio-marked sage-grouse hens were monitored bi-weekly through the pre-laying (April) and nesting (May-June) periods using hand-held receivers and 3-element Yagi antennas. Nest locations of radio-marked hens were determined by circling the bird until they could be observed. Rubber boots were worn while confirming nest locations to reduce human scent, and incubating hens were monitored after nest identification from a distance of ≥60 meters to minimize the chance of human-induced nest predation or nest abandonment.

Nests were examined to determine fate (successful or unsuccessful) when long-range monitoring indicated a hen had left the nest area. Nests were considered successful if ≥1 egg hatched, determined by the presence of a detached shell membrane.

Vegetation was evaluated between late May and early June at nest sites and independent random locations. To minimize differences resulting from herbaceous growth, vegetation was evaluated at successful nests, unsuccessful nests, and random plots concurrently following the first successful hatch. Standardized data collection protocol was used among the responsible individuals to reduce bias in measuring vegetative characteristics. The location of independent random sites was determined by randomly generating UTM coordinates for the study area. To ensure that random locations adequately represented available nesting habitat, the closest sagebrush plant taller than 35 centimeters (to the randomly generated point) was used as the center for the random plot.

Vegetation was evaluated along two perpendicular 30-meter transects intersecting the nest or random plot center. The orientation of the first transect was randomly determined. The line-intercept method was used to estimate the percent live sagebrush, dead sagebrush (<15% of the plant composed of living stems as determined by the presence of leaves), and total shrub canopy coverage. Dead sagebrush canopy cover was converted to a ratio of total sagebrush canopy cover. To estimate live sagebrush height, the maximum height (cm; excluding flowering stalks) of each intercepted sagebrush plant was recorded. Sagebrush density (plants/meter^2) was estimated by counting the number of sagebrush plants in a 1-meter wide belt along each transect (≥50% of a plant had to be within the belt to be counted).

Vegetation characteristics were measured within a 20 × 50 centimeter quadrat using a canopy-coverage method at the transect intersection (nest), at 1.0 meter, and at 2.5 meter from the intersection along each 15 meter portion of the 30 meter transect radiating from the nest or random center. Herbaceous variables were assumed to represent nest screening elements, and thus were measured relatively close (≤2.5 meter) to the nest to ensure a potential direct influence on nest fate. Herbaceous variables measured included maximum droop height (the highest naturally growing portion of the plant excluding flowering stalks) of grasses, total herbaceous cover, standing grass cover, and forb cover [which included the shrub species winterfat (*Eurotia lanata*) and fringed sagewort (*Artemisia frigida*)]. Grass species were grouped and classified as either new or residual (i.e. standing-dead). Because forbs are important food components of female sage-grouse diets, species were identified and further grouped as either food forbs or non-food forbs according to previous research. Food forb cover was converted to a ratio of total forb cover and examined, thereby providing a measure of relative food forb abundance at the nest site. It should be noted, however, that nearly all forbs are potential food for sage-grouse depending on succulence and stage of growth.

Table 1 depicts vegetation variables collected at nest sites from five studies in Wyoming from 1994 to 2002. Some vegetation variables were not collected at all studies.

To identify early-brood-rearing habitat successful hens were located twice during early brood-rearing stages. The first location was identified at least two weeks following hatch to ensure broods had reached brooding habitat, and allow the hen to become firmly attached to her chicks prior to human disturbance. To ensure that feeding sites were identified, broods were located between sunrise and 8:00 am.

Vegetation measurements were recorded at early brood-rearing habitat and independent random sites in June and July. Independent random sites were determined by randomly generating UTM coordinates for the study area. Vegetation was measured utilizing the same methodology that was used for nesting habitat. Table 2 depicts vegetation variables of early brood-rearing habitats at five study sites in Wyoming from 1994 to 2002, and are directly comparable due to the similarities in data collection protocol.

Tables 3 through 8 show monthly and annual precipitation that was collected at National Weather Service (NWS) collection sites near each study area. These tables also show long term monthly and yearly averages and the number of years that the data was collected for each site. The Pinedale and Big Piney weather stations were used in conjunction with the Pinedale sage-grouse study due to lack of data capture during some periods at the Pinedale location. These data are available on the Western Regional Climate Center web site (http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/).

Table 1. Means and standard deviations for nesting habitat variables qualified by sage-grouse nest and random plots in Wyoming, 1994-2002. T-tests were used to identify the differences between nest use vegetation plots vs. independent random vegetation plots. Bolded variables are significantly different. $\alpha = \leq 0.05$ Values in parentheses are standard deviations.

	Farson		Rawlins		Bates Hole		Pinedale		Kemmerer[1]	
Variable	NEST mean	RANDOM mean	NEST mean	RANDOM mean	NEST mean	RANDOM mean	NEST mean	RANDOM mean	NEST mean	RANDOM mean
Sample Size	82	90	42	61	87	87	50	63	64	77
Live Sagebrush Density (plants/m^2)	**1.85(0.67)**	**1.54(0.60)**	1.92(1.28)	1.60(1.00)	2.51(1.38)	2.43(1.29)	2.04(0.594)	2.38(0.63)		
Dead Sagebrush Density (plants/m^2)	**0.37(0.20)**	**0.30(0.25)**	**0.31(0.18)**	**0.22(0.17)**	0.294(0.15)	0.284(0.15)	0.33(0.190)	0.34(0.165)		
Vertical Obstruction Cover (cm)	26.80(11.78)	25.00(11.38)	47.00(20.09)	45.30(13.28)	0.396(0.18)	0.373(0.13)	N/A	N/A		
Total Shrub Canopy Cover (%)	**29.60(7.74)**	**24.70(10.15)**	**28.60(12.83)**	**23.80(10.31)**	**30.50(11.70)**	**28.60(10.40)**	38.1(11.60)	35.19(7.61)	28.4(11.33)	23.5(10.96)
Live Sagebrush Canopy Cover (%)	**24.40(6.59)**	**19.80(8.79)**	19.00(12.90)	16.60(9.92)	**25.40(10.50)**	**23.89(9.46)**	25.61(9.91)	26.96(5.83)	22.2(11.65)	18.6(9.29)
Dead Sagebrush Canopy Cover (%)	**3.28(2.32)**	**2.46(2.73)**	**3.10(3.05)**	**2.10(2.11)**	**3.14(1.82)**	**2.77(1.57)**	6.78(4.22)	4.95(3.39)		
Average Live Sagebrush Height (cm)	28.70(7.74)	26.60(10.44)	32.60(12.96)	27.40(11.87)	31.40(12.40)	30.70(10.20)	**32.7(11.50)**	**27.63(5.62)**	44.0(16.15)	35.9(17.53)
Residual Grass Height (cm)	7.94(4.29)	7.11(4.08)	**10.60(4.41)**	**7.80(3.36)**	11.73(3.00)	11.48(2.75)	11.46(3.71)	10.25(3.50)		
Residual Grass Cover (%)	**2.33(2.93)**	**1.49(1.49)**	**1.03(1.88)**	**0.44(0.85)**	2.45(1.55)	2.46(1.96)	**4.11(4.39)**	**2.66(0.641)**		
Live Grass Height (cm)	**14.90(3.37)**	**13.40(3.43)**	**16.60(3.56)**	**15.00(3.36)**	18.40(3.73)	17.73(3.95)	21.33(4.25)	21.79(3.59)		
Live Grass Cover (%)	**8.86(5.69)**	**6.67(4.69)**	8.20(4.73)	6.90(4.61)	4.59(2.61)	4.87(3.62)	**10.6(11.7)**	**5.44(3.76)**		
Total Forb Cover (%)	2.31(3.22)	3.27(4.15)	2.04(2.33)	2.11(3.05)	7.34(3.64)	7.18(3.90)	**8.19(9.21)**	**4.33(4.75)**	7.9(6.88)	5.4(5.61)
Food Forb Cover (%)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1.79(1.47)	1.90(1.57)	N/A	N/A		
Non-Food Forb Cover (%)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.55(3.26)	5.28(3.24)	N/A	N/A		
Litter Cover (%)	**10.61(5.86)**	**7.95(5.95)**	**26.10(17.02)**	**18.80(12.57)**	**8.54(3.34)**	**8.86(3.41)**	20.4(12.2)	20(6.97)	28.3(16.00)	21.7(16.00)
Bare Ground Cover (%)	31.90(16.21)	35.66(16.70)	**23.50(14.58)**	**35.10(13.82)**	5.01(5.63)	4.52(4.38)	**28.2(16.9)**	**39.6(12.0)**	19.1(13.67)	27.1(20.19)
Lichen Cover (%)	**1.14(2.30)**	**0.88(1.49)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Mat-former Cover(%)	N/A	N/A	0.07(0.20)	0.11(0.39)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Total Herbaceous Cover (%)	**21.20(11.95)**	**17.57(10.34)**	12.70(7.53)	10.20(6.56)	29.60(13.70)	31.90(16.20)	**18.5(20.1)**	**9.07(6.41)**	26.2(12.24)	22.3(13.55)
Nest Bush Height	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	**44.4(24.1)**	**21.4(22.5)**		

[1] Progress Report Data (Preliminary). No significance tests were preformed for progress reports.

Means and standard deviations for early brood-rearing habitat variables qualified by sage-grouse early use and random plots in Wyoming, 1994-2002. T-tests were used to identify the differences between early brood use vegetation plots vs. independent random vegetation plots. Bolded variables are significantly different. $\alpha = 0.05$ Values in parentheses are standard deviations.

	Farson		Rawlins		Bates Hole		Pinedale		Kemmerer[2]	
Variable	USE mean	RANDOM mean	USE mean	RANDOM mean	USE mean	RANDOM mean	USE mean	RANDOM mean	USE mean	RANDOM mean
Sample Size (n)	78	53	16	30	67	160	23	63	13	77
Live Sagebrush Density (plants/m^2)	1.80(0.640)	1.720(0.638)	1.76(1.160)	1.70(1.260)	2.15(1.35)	2.37(1.20)	**1.9(0521)**	**2.3(0.630)**		
Dead Sagebrush Density (plants/m^2)	**0.290(0.180)**	**0.219(0.118)**	0.29(0.240)	0.19(0.110)	0.312(0.24)	0.279(0.19)	0.33(.160)	0.35(0.165)		
Effective Vegetation Height (cm)	N/A	N/A	**36.5(23.60)**	**41.3(12.050)**	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Total Shrub Canopy Cover (%)	21.60(7.780)	22.26(8.860)	23.5(11.200)	24.6(8.764)	**19.29(9.93)**	**24.07(8.62)**	**30.0(6.30)**	**35.0(7.61)**		
Live Sagebrush Canopy Cover (%)	17.22(6.920)	17.89(8.350)	14.4(8.800)	17.3(10.407)	**15.83(8.67)**	**20.21(8.17)**	**21.5(7.35)**	**27.0(5.83)**	13.5(13.4)	18.6(9.29)
Dead Sagebrush Canopy Cover (%)	1.95(1.730)	1.92(2.680)	2.7(2.760)	2.1(2.136)	2.15(2.02)	2.32(1.57)	4.3(3.01)	4.9(3.39)		
Average Live Sagebrush Height (cm)	27.89(13.090)	25.89(9.730)	33.4(12.000)	26.2(12.598)	25.46(10.24)	26.68(7.82)	29.5(8.83)	27.6(5.62)		
Visual obstruction	0.18(0.070)	0.18(0.070)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Residual Grass Height (cm)	N/A	N/A	6.6(3.880)	8.4(3.505)	11.11(2.64)	10.90(2.51)	11.3(5.79)	10.3(3.50)		
Residual Grass Cover (%)	N/A	N/A	0.10(0.240)	.33(0.548)	**2.85(1.88)**	**2.01(1.18)**	3.5(3.90)	2.7(0.641)		
Live Grass Height (cm)	N/A	N/A	16.1(4.800)	14.4(2.739)	18.59(4.94)	17.84(3.72)	23.3(4.9)	21.7(3.59)		
Live Grass Cover (%)	6.77(4.280)	6.58(4.440)	12.5(13.200)	5.5(3.286)	5.89(5.74)	4.61(2.44)	14.2(18.1)	5.4(3.76)		
Total Forb Cover (%)	4.07(4.370)	3.22(3.470)	**2.8(2.800)**	**1.6(1.643)**	**9.25(4.93)**	**6.59(3.33)**	8.3(9.91)	4.3(4.75)		
Food Forb Cover (%)	0.46(0.890)	0.31(0.780)	N/A	N/A	3.55(4.34)	1.94(1.57)	N/A	N/A		
Non-Food Forb Cover (%)	3.61(4.190)	2.90(3.500)	N/A	N/A	5.70(2.91)	4.65(2.76)	N/A	N/A		
Litter Cover (%)	8.57(7.120)	7.94(6.340)	**24.7(16.800)**	**20.7(14.788)**	**8.52(2.88)**	**10.12(3.70)**	**13.8(7.25)**	**20(6.97)**		
Bare Ground Cover (%)	36.70(15.080)	33.87(17.210)	**17.4(9.00)**	**37.6(5.60)**	7.30(4.90)	7.62(7.82)	**23.5(17.8)**	**39.6(12.00)**		
Mat-former Cover (%)	N/A	N/A	0.4(1.600)	0.1(0.548)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Total Herbaceous Cover (%)	15.48(9.720)	15.86(10.220)	**16.9(16.800)**	**7.8(4.930)**	**37.25(15.0)**	**29.36(14.45)**	**24.8(23.9)**	**9.07(6.41)**		

[2] Progress Report Data (Preliminary). No significance tests preformed.

Table 3
FARSON, WYOMING
Monthly Total Precipitation (inches)
(483170)
a = 1 day missing, b = 2 days missing, c = 3 days, ..etc..,
z = 26 or more days missing, A = Accumulations present
Long-term means based on columns; thus, the monthly row may not
sum (or average) to the long-term annual value.
MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE NUMBER OF MISSING DAYS : 5
Individual Months not used for annual or monthly statistics if more than 5 days are missing.
Individual Years not used for annual statistics if any month in that year has more than 5 days missing.

Year(s)	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	ANN
1993	0.38	0.27	0.30	0.00z	1.56b	2.50c	1.80e	0.84d	0.15	0.51b	0.74b	0.20	9.25
1994	0.17a	0.61	0.57	0.00z	0.25	0.15	0.10	0.60	0.46	1.11d	0.44a	0.15	4.61
1995	0.50	0.54	0.83a	1.52a	4.03a	1.17b	0.88b	0.72	0.74	0.10	0.15	0.30	11.48
1996	0.16g	0.24	0.34	0.00	1.61c	0.79	0.62	0.00	1.18a	1.32b	0.00z	0.00z	6.10
MEAN	0.39	0.38	0.46	0.71	1.05	0.94	0.67	0.66	0.72	0.66	0.38	0.33	**7.73**
S.D.	0.34	0.33	0.40	0.56	0.90	0.88	0.77	0.66	0.68	0.57	0.32	0.27	2.38
No. YRS	72	77	77	76	75	74	68	73	69	73	71	71	49

Table 4
RAWLINS FAA AIRPORT, WYOMING
Monthly Total Precipitation (inches)
(487533)
a = 1 day missing, b = 2 days missing, c = 3 days, ..etc..,
z = 26 or more days missing, A = Accumulations present
Long-term means based on columns; thus, the monthly row may not
sum (or average) to the long-term annual value.
MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE NUMBER OF MISSING DAYS : 5
Individual Months not used for annual or monthly statistics if more than 5 days are missing.
Individual Years not used for annual statistics if any month in that year has more than 5 days missing.

YEAR(S)	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	ANN
1995	0.39	0.38	0.32	1.23	4.12a	2.19	0.26a	0.55	0.85	0.60	0.44	0.48	11.81
1996	0.71	0.08	0.76	1.64	3.14	0.36	0.56	0.19	0.52	0.54	0.74	1.10	10.34
1997	0.65	0.39	0.24	1.11	1.13	1.62	0.21	1.62	1.22	0.38	0.27	0.38	9.22
MEAN	0.49	0.53	0.68	1.05	1.33	0.91	0.76	0.75	0.80	0.82	0.58	0.48	**9.28**
S.D.	0.33	0.38	0.41	0.62	0.88	0.67	0.59	0.52	0.65	0.69	0.40	0.33	1.89
No. YRS	51	50	50	51	51	51	51	50	51	51	52	52	49

Table 5
Bates Creek 2, WYOMING
Monthly Total Precipitation (inches)
(480552)
a = 1 day missing, b = 2 days missing, c = 3 days, ..etc..,
z = 26 or more days missing, A = Accumulations present
Long-term means based on columns; thus, the monthly row may not
sum (or average) to the long-term annual value.
MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE NUMBER OF MISSING DAYS : 5
Individual Months not used for annual or monthly statistics if more than 5 days are missing.
Individual Years not used for annual statistics if any month in that year has more than 5 days missing.

YEAR(S)	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	ANN
1996	0.66	0.14a	0.43	2.93	2.00	0.80	1.03	0.58	0.59	3.43	1.23	0.61	14.43
1997	1.29	1.70	0.48	1.50	3.01	1.23	0.79	1.76	0.89	1.04	0.02a	0.82	14.53
1998	1.08	0.91a	0.83	0.75	0.54	3.54	1.24	1.00	0.97	6.44	0.74b	0.08	18.12
MEAN	0.61	0.66	1.05	1.65	2.22	1.35	1.06	0.91	0.82	1.27	0.74	0.58	**13.14**
S.D.	0.33	0.37	0.77	1.25	1.77	0.99	0.66	0.61	0.61	1.25	0.39	0.46	2.84
No. YRS	33	33	33	33	34	34	34	34	34	34	33	33	32

Table 6
PINEDALE, WYOMING
Monthly Total Precipitation (inches)
(487260)
a = 1 day missing, b = 2 days missing, c = 3 days, ..etc..,
z = 26 or more days missing, A = Accumulations present
Long-term means based on columns; thus, the monthly row may not
sum (or average) to the long-term annual value.
MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE NUMBER OF MISSING DAYS : 5
Individual Months not used for annual or monthly statistics if more than 5 days are missing.
Individual Years not used for annual statistics if any month in that year has more than 5 days missing.

YEAR(S)	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	ANN
1997	0.62	0.17	0.35	0.62	0.76	1.96	0.42	1.91	1.98	0.61	0.22	0.19	9.81
1998	0.98	0.48	1.29	0.59	2.02	3.93	2.59	0.78	0.96	1.02	0.29	0.50b	15.43
1999	0.68	0.68b	0.00z	2.37a	0.00z	0.00z	0.00z	0.00z	0.00z	0.00z	0.00z	0.00z	3.73
MEAN	0.64	0.51	0.63	0.87	1.62	1.25	1.02	1.02	1.10	0.77	0.71	0.65	**11.26**
S.D.	0.44	0.32	0.41	0.54	0.97	0.94	0.69	0.62	0.71	0.63	0.46	0.50	3.13
No. YRS	49	48	49	49	48	51	53	52	52	49	47	47	37

Table 7
BIG PINEY, WYOMING
Monthly Total Precipitation (inches)
(480695)
a = 1 day missing, b = 2 days missing, c = 3 days, ..etc..,
z = 26 or more days missing, A = Accumulations present
Long-term means based on columns; thus, the monthly row may not
sum (or average) to the long-term annual value.
MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE NUMBER OF MISSING DAYS : 5
Individual Months not used for annual or monthly statistics if more than 5 days are missing.
Individual Years not used for annual statistics if any month in that year has more than 5 days missing.

YEAR(S)	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	ANN
1997	0.56	0.08	0.14	0.20	0.07	1.03	1.26	3.82	1.24	0.53	0.21	0.35	9.49
1998	0.46	0.44	1.09	0.63	1.32	2.41	0.98	0.99	0.49	1.28	0.17	0.03	10.29
1999	0.28	0.52	0.00z	0.00z	0.82	0.86a	0.44	0.67	1.21	0.03	0.00a	0.01f	4.83
MEAN	0.37	0.31	0.44	0.65	1.05	0.92	0.74	0.81	0.84	0.55	0.38	0.39	**8.15**
S.D.	0.29	0.27	0.33	0.51	0.84	0.79	0.44	0.75	0.70	0.58	0.30	0.34	2.07
No. YRS	45	43	44	46	46	45	43	46	48	47	45	42	29

Table 8
KEMMERER WTR TRTMT, WYOMING
Monthly Total Precipitation (inches)
(485105)
*** Note *** Provisional Data *** After Year/Month 200210
a = 1 day missing, b = 2 days missing, c = 3 days, ..etc..,
z = 26 or more days missing, A = Accumulations present
Long-term means based on columns; thus, the monthly row may not
sum (or average) to the long-term annual value.
MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE NUMBER OF MISSING DAYS : 5
Individual Months not used for annual or monthly statistics if more than 5 days are missing.
Individual Years not used for annual statistics if any month in that year has more than 5 days missing.

YEAR(S)	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	ANN
2000	0.04	0.00	0.00a	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.80	1.22	0.00z	0.00z	0.00b	2.57
2001	0.00	0.16a	0.00	0.40	0.89	0.30	0.97	0.25	0.69	0.40	0.40	0.60	5.06
2002	0.79	0.00	0.37	0.00z	0.42	0.01	0.21	0.04	0.38	1.12	0.00z	0.00z	3.34
MEAN	0.75	0.59	0.65	0.82	1.17	1.11	0.74	0.87	0.99	0.77	0.82	0.71	**10.26**
S.D.	0.43	0.53	0.47	0.63	0.72	1.05	0.55	0.79	0.95	0.61	0.66	0.62	3.55
No. YRS	52	52	53	50	53	50	52	52	50	50	52	52	39