

**MONTANA SAGE GROUSE OVERSIGHT TEAM AGENDA ITEM BRIEF SHEET  
MAY 24, 2016**

**AGENDA ITEM: SAGE GROUSE STEWARDSHIP FUND GRANT APPLICATIONS**

**ACTION NEEDED: CONSIDERATION OF EACH APPLICATION RECEIVED AND DECISION WHETHER OR NOT TO FUND IT**

**SUMMARY:**

The Sage Grouse Stewardship Fund was established as a source of funding for competitive grants to establish ongoing free-market mechanisms for voluntary, incentive based conservation measures that maintain, enhance, restore, expand and benefit sage grouse habitat and populations on private lands, and public lands as needed. Nine applications were received: eight proposals for permanent conservation easements and one proposal for marking high risk fence. Applicants graciously honored requests for supplemental information to assure uniformity of information across all applications to the extent possible.

The Program created Workbooks using GIS to generate statistics about each project and to make maps. The proposed easements were buffered by 4 and 12 miles, respectively to place the proposal into a landscape context. Four miles relates to the nesting radius from leks and 12 miles relates to the distance at which birds respond to breaking of native range.

A peer review committee was formed, consisting of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, a retired wildlife biologist, a consultant from the private sector with experience in mitigation, and a private person on contract with the Program. Peer reviewers were provided with all application materials, supplemental information provided by applicants, and the Workbooks. They ranked the proposals, and responded to open-ended questions. Not every reviewer provided comments on every project. The Program reviewed the rankings and comments. The comments were compiled in a single document for each proposal, respectively.

**PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Any funds committed at this time count towards the [no more than] \$5 million which can be allocated before the mitigation framework and habitat quantification tool is finalized.

- ***Commit to funding at this time, subject to conditions and contingencies:*** Julie Burke Easement, Hansen Ranch Conifer Removal, Kelly Burke Easement, and Hansen Ranch Easement [special contingency is the applicant has until June 1, 2017 to secure matching funds or the award is revoked and that final building envelopes remain near existing residential compounds as represented].
  - Conditions and contingences should require, for example: final easement terms as represented by the applicant and are adequate to protect habitat values for sage grouse and offer future mitigation opportunities, matching funds remain committed, credits will be available for compensatory mitigation in the future, the state will become a third party beneficiary to the easement with a contingent right to enforce terms, the state consents before the easement is transferred for value, sold or extinguished, applicants enter in a grant agreement approved by MSGOT, applicants provide monitoring reports.
- ***Reconsider for funding at a later time, determined by MSGOT:*** 44 Ranch Easement, Raths Easement, Watson Easement, Smith Easement, and NWF Fence Marking.
  - This recommendation is based on the lack of important details critical to the determination of consistency with the purposes of the Stewardship Fund. Easement terms are not settled and specific fence segments have not been identified. In all cases, resource benefits to sage grouse, sage grouse habitats, and mitigation potential cannot be determined.

*[continued next page]*



MONTANA SAGE GROUSE  
Habitat Conservation Program

- If sufficient details and assurances are provided to MSGOT's satisfaction during this meeting, the proposals having the strongest habitat values for sage grouse are: 44 Ranch Easement and Raths Easement.
  - MSGOT could decide to tentatively approve these applications during this meeting, conditional on details being provided in writing in the near future.
  - MSGOT could reconsider all of these proposals during a meeting in August, 2016.
  - Alternatively, MSGOT could initiate a second grant cycle and consider them all anew, with an estimated decision timeline for December 2016. A December decision timeline would likely jeopardize the availability of matching funding.
  - Should MSGOT commit to funding of any of the easement proposals at this time, conditions and contingencies should require, for example: final easement terms as represented verbally during the MSGOT meeting on May 24 which are adequate to protect habitat values for sage grouse and offer future mitigation opportunities, matching funds remain committed, credits will be available for compensatory mitigation in the future, the state will become a third party beneficiary to the easement with a contingent right to enforce terms, the state consents before the easement is transferred for value, sold, or extinguished, applicants enter a grant agreement approved by MSGOT, and applicants provide monitoring reports.
  - Should MSGOT commit to funding the fence marking proposal at this time, conditions and contingencies should require, for example: individual high risk fence segments are identified and reviewed with the Program, the applicant and the respective state or federal agency, the applicant enters a grant agreement, matching funds remain committed, credits will be available for compensatory mitigation in the future, and the applicant provides monitoring reports.
- **Do Not Fund:** Weaver Easement.
    - This parcel occurs entirely within general habitat and is on the edge of sage grouse habitat. While the parcel has high resource values for other wildlife species, it does not align well with the purposes of the Stewardship Fund, which specifically targets sage grouse habitats.

