


# Threat-Based Land Management in the Northern Great Basin: A Field Guide

## Managing rangeland complexity at feasible, relevant scales

Dustin Johnson, Matt Cahill, Chad Boyd, Vanessa Schroeder, Lee Foster, Angela Sitz, Jay Kerby, Tony Svejcar and Jackie Cupples



PNW 723  
September 2019

## Before using this guide, you should know

Sagebrush ecosystems in the northern Great Basin face threats from invasive annual grasses and expanding conifers. Land managers need to work at large spatial scales to address these two ecological threats, but have limited resources to do so.

This guide provides a framework for land managers to efficiently identify, discuss and address landscape-level threats. It is not an instruction manual.

With this method, users map simplified ecological states and estimate future trend. Broad ranges of vegetation and

environmental conditions can be mapped with the same state if they are faced with similar threats.

Understanding plant communities and tracking true change over time requires detailed and repeated monitoring.

This field guide is meant to pair with *Threat-Based Land Management in the Northern Great Basin: A Manager's Guide*, a more in-depth resource that provides greater detail and background on this process. The manager's guide can be found at: <https://catalog.extension.oregonstate.edu/pnw722>

## Steps for state classification and management

- 0

**Establish your management objectives:** Do this before using this guide—all other steps follow from your objectives. Clearly stated objectives will help you make key scale and management decisions.

Management objectives specify the overall desired outcome achieved by addressing a threat. The Bureau of Land Management provides a good resource to begin writing management objectives—a QR link is at the bottom right of this guide.
- 1

**Understand relevant ecology:** This guide uses plant functional groups and simplified vegetation patterns to identify states.
- 2

**Understand threats:** Environmental factors drive juniper encroachment and annual grass invasion. The resistance and resilience of a site will change how threats are expressed.

- 3

**Understand states:** Use the decision tree, photographs and illustrations on the back of this guide to understand and differentiate states. Recognize that reality will be more complex than the detail used in this framework.
- 4

**Choose appropriate scale and delineate states:** Mapping is difficult and subjective. The size of an individual map unit depends on the total scale of your specific landscape and on your management objectives. Choose map units that are large enough to matter, but small enough to manage. There is no perfect answer.
- 5

**Assess apparent trend:** Assess the apparent trend of each state as upward, downward, stable or unclear. Consider all factors together. Apparent trend is a snapshot estimate of how the plant community may change in the future.
- 6

**Identify management actions:** Assign management actions to each state based on its apparent trend. Be sure to describe how management actions will achieve management objectives.

## 1 Understand relevant ecology

Using functional groups improves monitoring efficiency, reduces observer error and eases sampling timing. Functional groups make visually evaluating vegetation state and apparent trend feasible over large areas. We include seven functional groups in our models based on southeastern Oregon, but these groupings may vary across the range of this vast biome.



**Large perennial bunchgrasses** are the glue that holds the western sagebrush ecosystem together. LPBG root masses bind soil in place, effectively compete with annual grasses, and provide forage and habitat for wildlife. Common species include bluebunch wheatgrass, Idaho fescue, needlegrasses and squirreltail.



**Small perennial bunchgrasses** primarily refers to Sandberg's bluegrass, a low-statured and early-growing species common across the western portion of the sagebrush ecosystem. SPBG can dominate in harsh, shallow soil sites or where heavy continuous grazing has reduced other bunchgrasses. Despite often occurring at high densities, SPBG have shallow root systems and do not compete as effectively with annual grasses.



**Annual forbs** are generally small-statured plants with highly variable productivity depending on year and site conditions. Common species include blue-eyed Mary (*Collinsia* sp.) and alyssum (*Alyssum* sp.). Large amounts of annual forbs, especially of introduced species, can indicate a depleted understory. This category does not include weeds such as yellow star-thistle which should be mapped and managed on a species-specific basis.




**Perennial forbs** are a large, diverse and variable group and are important for wildlife habitat and forage. The aster family, as well as lupines and paintbrushes, are particularly abundant.



**Invasive annual grasses**, including cheatgrass, medusahead and ventenata, are species that can fundamentally alter vegetation communities by replacing native grasses, dramatically increasing fire frequency and leading to a loss of sagebrush and perennial cover.




**Conifers** include tree species that are encroaching on historically treeless sagebrush rangelands. This guide primarily refers to juniper because Western juniper is of major concern in the northern portion of the sagebrush ecosystem, but Utah juniper and pinyon pine are major threats in other regions.



This guide was created in partnership with the following agencies:



## 2 Understand threats



## 3 Understand states: See back



## 4 Choose appropriate scale and delineate states

Now it's time to delineate states. Use the back of this guide to determine states and the examples in this panel to help decide at which scale to map. The appropriate scale for mapping states depends on your management objectives—there is no perfect answer. Map units should be small enough to feasibly manage, and large enough for management to matter in meeting objectives.

A tale of two pastures: An example comparing management and mapping


**Pasture 1 objective:** Maintain livestock forage within native plant community by controlling juniper encroachment.

**Pasture 2 objective:** Improve pasture for sage-grouse habitat by removing encroaching juniper.



## 5 Assess apparent trend

Use these factors collectively to determine the apparent trend of a site. Apparent trend will help you determine what monitoring or actions are needed, if any. Decide if the trend is upward, stable, downward or unclear. Unclear trends will likely require additional monitoring.



## 6 Identify management actions

Select and prioritize management actions for each site based on the state, apparent trend and management objectives. The example below shows how a user might manage for increasing the biotic resistance and resilience of a site.

A Stable	B Upward	B Downward	C Stable	C Downward	D Downward	E Downward
Prioritized for protection and maintenance						
Protect and maintain bunchgrasses						
Prevent fire						
		Address improper grazing				
		Reseed sagebrush				
		Reseed bunchgrasses				
		Remove juniper (if applicable)				
		Control weeds				
		Mitigate and contain				

This is only an example. After using this guide to understand and assess threats, use in-depth resources and knowledgeable colleagues to select and prioritize management actions. Follow these QR Links to related land-management resources from the Bureau of Land Management and The Nature Resources Conservation Service.



BLM Assessment, Inventory and Monitoring  
<http://aim.landscapetoolbox.org/design/indicators-methods>



NRCS Sage Grouse Initiative  
<http://www.sagegrouseinitiative.com>



The Nature Conservancy  
<http://www.nature.org>



SageSHARE  
<http://sageshare.org/>

© 2019 Published and distributed in furtherance of the Acts of Congress of May 8 and June 30, 1914, by the Oregon State University Extension Service, Washington State University Extension, University of Idaho Extension, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture cooperating. The three participating Extension services offer educational programs, activities, and materials without discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, familial/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, genetic information, veteran's status, reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) The Oregon State University Extension Service, Washington State University Extension, and University of Idaho Extension are an AA/EOE/Veterans/Disabled.  
Published September 2019



## 3

Use the decision tree, photographs and illustrations to determine and differentiate states. Recognize that reality will be more complex than the detail used in this framework.

