

# United State Department Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Oregon State Office

P.O. Box 2965

Portland, Oregon 97208



**In Reply Refer to:**

6520 (OR-931) P

June 18, 2004

EMS TRANSMISSION 06/21/04

Instruction Memorandum No. OR-2004-087

Expires: 9/30/2005

**To:** District Managers and Field Managers: Burns, Lakeview, Prineville, and Vale  
Attn.: District Sage-grouse Team Leads

**From:** State Director, Oregon/Washington

**Subject:** Greater Sage-grouse Information Request for Land Use Planning DD: 06/30/2004  
Areas in Oregon for Use by the Oregon Sage-grouse and  
Sagebrush Habitat Conservation Team

**Program Area:** Special Status Species Management

**Purpose:** The purpose of this request is to gather data about the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) activities and management that may impact greater sage-grouse and its habitat in Oregon. This information will be used by the Oregon Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Habitat Conservation Team to complete the Oregon Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Plan. As with the Washington Office (WO) BLM information request, this information request applies to all programs. In many cases, the questions are identical to the previous WO data call.

**Policy/Action:** The numbering and wording of questions in this data call is identical to the previous WO data call with the goal of simplifying this request. New information requested is denoted by both a \*\* and a yellow highlight in the answer blank. There are two critical differences in this request when compared to the WO request. Occupied and historic sage-grouse habitats will be determined from the Oregon BLM/Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife sage-grouse habitat Geographic Information System (GIS) coverage, not Schroeder 2000 as in the WO data call. Ownership will be determined from the state ownership GIS coverage and not determined by the National Science and Technology Center as in the WO data call. You will have to modify several of the answers in the WO data call in order to complete this data call. Please be sure to read each question carefully.

**Timeframe:** By June 30, 2004, district sage-grouse teams will complete the following information tables and remit these electronically to George Buckner.

---

**Budget Impact:** None

**Background:** The Oregon Sage-grouse and Sagebrush Habitat Conservation Team is a multidisciplinary group charged to provide a comprehensive conservation strategy for sage-grouse in Oregon. Similar planning efforts have been ongoing in the other ten western states where sage-grouse occur. The Oregon Greater Sage-grouse Conservation

Plan differs from the other state planning efforts because it was targeted to meet the criteria established within the US Fish and Wildlife Service Policy for Evaluating Conservation Efforts (PECE), and it will provide programmatic guidance for the Oregon BLM (i.e., there will be only ONE comprehensive sage-grouse plan for Oregon). One of the fundamental criteria in PECE is for a plan to identify “threats” to the species and measures to mitigate them. This requested information builds upon data gathered and provided to the WO May 26, 2004, in order to identify such “threats.” In fact, much of the data already provided to the WO is requested therein. There are a few additional and complementary questions that are critical to this new request.

**Manual/Handbook Sections Affected:** None

**Coordination:** District sage-grouse leads will decide how much time and effort is needed to coordinate this effort with other Interdisciplinary Team staff and other field offices.

**Contact:** Field offices or districts should direct questions to George Buckner at (503) 808-6382, Fred Taylor at (541) 573-4469, or Todd Forbes at (541) 947-6134.

**Districts with Unions** are reminded to notify their unions of this Instruction Memorandum and satisfy any bargaining obligations before implementation. Your servicing Human Resources Office or Labor Relations Specialist can provide you assistance in this matter.

Signed by  
Kathy Eaton

Authenticated by  
Cindy Fredrickson  
OSO Records Manager

1 Attachment

1 - [Greater Sage-Grouse Information Request for Land Use Planning Areas for Oregon Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan](#) (13pp)

Distribution

WO-230 (204LS)

OR-930 (Michael Mottice)

OR-931 (George Buckner, Michael Haske)

## Greater Sage-Grouse Information Request for Land Use Planning Areas for Oregon Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan

The purpose of this request is to gather data about the BLM activities and management that may impact greater sage-grouse and its habitat in Oregon. This information is integral to the development of the Oregon Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan. As with the national BLM information request, this information request applies to all programs. In many cases the questions are identical to previous data call.

The numbering and wording of questions is identical to the previous data call with the goal of simplifying this request. New information requested is denoted by both a \*\* and a yellow highlight in the answer blank. Definitions are largely (see next paragraph) the same as the previous data call, and should serve as a reference for terms in this request.

There are **TWO** critical differences in this request, 1) **CURRENTLY OCCUPIED** habitat WILL BE defined from the Oregon BLM/ODFW sage-grouse habitat map, and 2) **OWNERSHIP** WILL BE defined from state ownership coverage. Currently occupied habitat is classified as either “yearlong”(YL), “winter” (WT) or “occupied, seasonal context uncertain” (CU). Therefore **POTENTIAL HABITAT** and **NON-HABITAT** will not be included in estimates of **CURRENTLY OCCUPIED** acreages. The ownership acreages from the state coverage and new habitat classifications will likely change your responses to questions 1-3, and the currently occupied habitat map will change answers 10a-10h.

If a hard copy of the original information request can be obtained, it may be submitted in lieu of completing the **REDUNDANT** questions, otherwise all questions must be answered in the new request. All **NEW** questions and **OLD** questions anticipated to have different answers from the previous data call are **HIGHLIGHTED** in **yellow**. It is imperative that each yellow fill-in the blank receive an answer. This value in all likelihood should be different from that of the original data call. Any questions blocked in **red** **DO NOT** require an answer.

Attachment 1 - 1

---

### Basic Information for the BLM Land Use Planning Area

The land use planning area (Resource Management Plan or Management Framework Plan) is \_\_\_\_\_ and year of current land use plan \_\_\_\_\_.

#### 1. Estimates of surface acreage

- a. Estimated total acres in planning area \_\_\_\_\_ acres
- b. Estimated acres BLM managed land in planning area \_\_\_\_\_ acres
- c. Estimated acres non-BLM managed land in planning area \_\_\_\_\_ acres

#### 2. Estimates of currently occupied greater sage-grouse habitat

- a. Total currently occupied sage-grouse habitat in planning area \_\_\_\_\_ acres
  - b. Total currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land in planning area \_\_\_\_\_ acres
  - c. Total currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on non-BLM managed land in planning area \_\_\_\_\_ acres
- \_\_\_\_\_

3. Estimates of historically, but not currently occupied greater sage-grouse habitat \_\_\_\_\_ acres
- a. Total historically, but not currently occupied sage-grouse habitat in the planning area \_\_\_\_\_ acres
  - b. Total historically, but not currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land in the planning area \_\_\_\_\_ acres
  - c. Total historically, but not currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on non-BLM managed land in planning area \_\_\_\_\_ acres

4. Estimate of active/occupied leks on BLM managed lands

- a. Total number of active/occupied leks in currently occupied greater sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land in the planning area, as of January 2004. If available, use the comprehensive (interagency) compilation of greater sage-grouse lek information from the state fish and game agency as the source of information.

\_\_\_\_\_ number of active/occupied leks Information not available

- b. Source of active/occupied greater sage-grouse lek information. Select all that apply.

- Comprehensive state fish and game agency; current through 2003
- BLM only; current through 2003
- Comprehensive state fish and game agency; NOT current through 2003
- BLM only; NOT current through 2003

Attachment 1 - 2

- 
- Information not available

### Activities and Conservation Actions Across Programs

Questions 5-10 apply to many or all programs and associated activities. For example, questions about specific treatments such as “Acres seeded or planted” would apply to all programs and include activities such as seeding after fire, seeding a disturbed site, planting sagebrush, weeds treatments, etc. Include activities implemented through the range program as appropriate, but do **not report grazing as a treatment**. Information in this section should be entered by the designated contact as a single response.

5. What is the maximum allowable number of acres of shrubland that can be treated as identified in the land use plan, amendments, or other programmatic guidance (e.g. Fire and fuels management plans)? Consider only BLM managed lands within the planning area.

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Not identified

6. What is the maximum allowable number of acres of grassland that can be treated as identified in the land use plan, amendments, or other programmatic guidance (e.g. Fire fuels management)? Consider only BLM managed lands within the planning area.

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Not identified

7. What is the maximum allowable number of acres of conifer that can be treated as identified in the land use plan, amendments, or other programmatic guidance (e.g. Fire fuels management)? Consider only BLM managed lands

within the planning area.

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Not identified

8. Does the land use plan, amendments, or other programmatic guidance contain reclamation standards with seed requirements sufficient to provide suitable habitat for sage-grouse (e.g. seed containing forb species and *Artemisia* sp.)

Yes

No

9. Does the land use plan, amendments, or other programmatic guidance require the treatment of noxious weeds on all surface disturbed areas to avoid new infestations on BLM managed lands in the planning area?

Yes

No

Attachment 1 - 3

\*\*9a. What is the total acreage of occupied sage-grouse habitat that has been treated with insecticides over the last 5 years:

\_\_\_\_\_ acres.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS **10a-10h WILL BE DIFFERENT** FROM THOSE PROVIDED IN THE NATIONAL DATA CALL---BECAUSE YOU ARE TO USE TREATMENTS **ONLY** IN **CURRENTLY OCCUPIED** HABITAT AS DEFINED IN OREGON SAGE GROUSE HABITAT MAP

10. Report the number of acres of treatments in the following habitats in currently and historically occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land in the planning area over

the last 5 years (fiscal year 2000 to present):

a. Acres of sagebrush/perennial grass habitats treated in **CURRENTLY OCCUPIED** sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land in the planning area (multiple treatments may be reported):

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Biological treatment

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Chemical treatment

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Mechanical treatment

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Prescribed fire

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Seeding or planting

b. Of the treatments reported in 10a, estimate the actual acres of treated sagebrush/perennial grass habitat that provide (or will provide) benefits for sage-grouse:

\_\_\_\_\_ acres (Note: Multiple treatments on a given acre should be counted only once)

\*\*or be detrimental to sage-grouse: \_\_\_\_\_ acres.

Information not available

c. Acres of perennial grassland habitat treated in **CURRENTLY OCCUPIED** sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land in the planning area (multiple treatments may be reported):

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Biological treatment

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Chemical treatment

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Mechanical treatment

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Prescribed fire

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Seeding or planting

d. Of the treatments reported in 10c, estimate the actual acres of treated perennial habitat that provide (or will provide) benefits for sage-grouse:

\_\_\_\_\_ acres (Note: Multiple treatments on a given acre should be counted only once)

\*\*or be detrimental to sage-grouse: \_\_\_\_\_ acres.

Information not available

Attachment 1 - 4

e. Acres of annual grasslands treated in **CURRENTLY OCCUPIED** sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land in the planning area (multiple treatments may be reported):

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Biological treatment

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Chemical treatment

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Mechanical treatment

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Prescribed fire

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Seeding or planting

f. Of the treatments reported in 10e, estimate the actual acres of treated annual grassland habitat that provide (or will provide) benefits for sage-grouse:

\_\_\_\_\_ acres (Note: Multiple treatments on a given acre should be counted only once)

\*\*or be detrimental to sage-grouse: \_\_\_\_\_ acres.

Information not available

g. Acres of conifer encroachment (into sagebrush) treated in **CURRENTLY OCCUPIED** sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land in the planning area (multiple treatments may be reported):

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Biological treatment

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Chemical treatment

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Mechanical treatment

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Prescribed fire

\_\_\_\_\_ Acres of Seeding or planting

h. Of the treatments reported in 10g, estimate the actual acres of treated conifer encroachment habitat that provide (or will provide) benefits for sage-grouse:

\_\_\_\_\_ acres (Note: Multiple treatments on a given acre should be counted only once)

\*\*or be detrimental to sage-grouse: \_\_\_\_\_ acres.

Information not available

### Management Requirements Across Programs

11. Does the land use plan, amendment, or other programmatic guidance contain a “**no surface occupancy**” stipulation or other provision (i.e., condition of approval or other mitigative measure) that provides benefits to sage-grouse habitat?

Yes

No

a. If yes, how many acres associated with active occupied leks are protected by the “no surface occupancy” stipulation?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

Attachment 1 - 5

b. If yes, how many acres of **currently occupied** habitat on BLM managed land (other than the acres in 1 la) are protected by the “no surface occupancy” stipulation?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

c. What program(s) apply this protection to activities? Select one of the following for each program: “Yes — this program applies the protection to activities,” “No — this program does not apply the protection to activities,” or “N/A — this planning area does not have this program.”

Fire/Fuels management\_\_\_\_\_

Grazing management\_\_\_\_\_

Minerals\_\_\_\_\_

• Fluids\_\_\_\_\_

• Solids\_\_\_\_\_

OH V/Recreation\_\_\_\_\_

Riparian\_\_\_\_\_

Realty\_\_\_\_\_

Weed management\_\_\_\_\_

Wild horse and burro\_\_\_\_\_

Wildlife\_\_\_\_\_

12. Does the land use plan, amendment, or other programmatic guidance contain a “controlled surface use” stipulation or other provision (i.e., condition of approval or other mitigative measure) that provides benefits to sage-grouse habitat?

Yes

No

a. If yes, how many acres associated with active/ occupied leks are protected by the “controlled surface use” stipulation?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

b. If yes, how many acres of currently occupied habitat on BLM managed land (other than the acres in 12a) are protected by “controlled surface use” stipulation?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

c. What program(s) apply this protection to activities? Select one of the following for each program: “Yes — this program applies the protection to activities,” “No — this program does not apply the protection to activities,” or “N/A — this planning area does not have this program.”

- o Fire/Fuels management\_\_\_\_\_
- o Grazing management\_\_\_\_\_
- o Minerals\_\_\_\_\_
- Fluids\_\_\_\_\_
- Solids\_\_\_\_\_
- o OH V/Recreation\_\_\_\_\_
- o Riparian\_\_\_\_\_
- o Realty\_\_\_\_\_
- o Weed management\_\_\_\_\_
- o Wild horse and burro\_\_\_\_\_
- o Wildlife\_\_\_\_\_

13. Does the land use plan, amendment, or other programmatic guidance contain “prohibited use” or “timing restriction” stipulations or other provisions (i.e., conditions of approval or other mitigative measures) that provide benefits to sage-grouse during nesting season

Yes

No

a. If yes, how many acres associated with active/occupied leks are protected by “prohibited use” or “timing restriction” stipulations?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

b. If yes, how many acres of currently occupied habitat on BLM managed land (other than the acres in 13a) are protected by “prohibited use” or “timing restriction” stipulations?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

c. What program(s) apply this protection to activities? Select one of the following for

Each program: “Yes — this program applies the protection to activities,” “No — this program does not apply the protection to activities,” or “N/A — this planning area does not have this program.”

o Fire/Fuels management\_\_\_\_\_

o Grazing management\_\_\_\_\_

- Minerals\_\_\_\_\_
- Fluids\_\_\_\_\_
- Solids\_\_\_\_\_
- OH V/Recreation\_\_\_\_\_
- Riparian\_\_\_\_\_
- Realty\_\_\_\_\_
- Weed management\_\_\_\_\_
- Wild horse and burro\_\_\_\_\_
- Wildlife\_\_\_\_\_

14. Does the land use plan, amendment, or other programmatic guidance contain a “prohibited use” or “timing restriction” stipulation or other provision (i.e., condition of approval or other mitigative measure) that provides benefits to sage-grouse during the winter season

Yes

No

a. If yes, how many acres associated with active! occupied leks are protected by the “prohibited use” or “timing restriction” stipulation?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

b. If yes, how many acres of currently occupied habitat on BLM managed land (other than the acres in 14a) are protected by a “prohibited use” or “timing restriction” stipulation?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

c. What program(s) apply this protection to activities? Select one of the following for each program: “Yes — this program applies the protection to activities,” “No — this program does not apply the protection to activities,” or “N/A — this planning area does not have this program.”

Fire/Fuels management\_\_\_\_\_

Grazing management\_\_\_\_\_

Attachment 1 - 8

- 
- Minerals\_\_\_\_\_
  - Fluids\_\_\_\_\_
  - Solids\_\_\_\_\_
  - OH V/Recreation\_\_\_\_\_
  - Riparian\_\_\_\_\_
  - Realty\_\_\_\_\_
  - Weed management\_\_\_\_\_
  - Wild horse and burro\_\_\_\_\_

o Wildlife\_\_\_\_\_

15. Does the land use plan, amendment, or other programmatic guidance contain a “noise limitation” stipulation or other provision (i.e., condition of approval or other mitigative measure) that provides benefit to sage-grouse?

Yes

No

a. If yes, how many acres associated with active/ occupied leks are protected by the “noise limitation” stipulation?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

b. If yes, how many acres of currently occupied habitat on BLM managed land (other than the acres in 15a) are protected by a “noise limitation” stipulation?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

c. What program(s) apply this protection to activities? Select one of the following for each program: “Yes — this program applies the protection to activities,” “No — this program does not apply the protection to activities,” or “N/A — this planning area does not have this program.”

o Fire/Fuels management\_\_\_\_\_

o Grazing management\_\_\_\_\_

o Minerals\_\_\_\_\_

• Fluids\_\_\_\_\_

• Solids\_\_\_\_\_

o OH V/Recreation\_\_\_\_\_

o Riparian\_\_\_\_\_

o Realty\_\_\_\_\_

o Weed management\_\_\_\_\_

o Wild horse and burro\_\_\_\_\_

o Wildlife\_\_\_\_\_

**Partnership Projects Across Programs: FYO2-FYO4**

Question 16 (and associated Tables 16-1, 16-2, 16-3) applies to all programs that implement partnership projects that benefit sage-grouse or their habitat. Often, these projects are implemented using CCS, CCI, CESU, NFWF, Assistance Agreements, Intra-governmental Agreements, and other mechanisms. Respondents should consolidate projects by “Project Type” and report the number of projects and expended dollars. Projects that cover multiple planning areas should be identified.

List of project types

- Educational
- Easements/Acquisitions
- Habitat enhancement/restoration of currently occupied habitat
- Habitat restoration of historic, not currently occupied habitat
- Inventory/mapping
- Monitoring
- Research
- Weed management

16. Complete the tables below by Project Type. You must enter a value (including zero where appropriate) for each field in each table. State office administered projects should be coordinated with and reported by a planning area.

**Table 16-1. FY02**

**Table 16-2. FY03**

**Table 16-3. FY04**

Report cooperative efforts that address sage-grouse conservation as part of their resource management activities. Examples include: workgroups, resource/conservation planning, consensus building and other problem-solving cooperative efforts. Often these groups are active for several years but not project specific. For each sage-grouse conservation effort reported, estimate the average annual workmonths (nearest whole number) contributed by BLM staff

**List of Cooperative Efforts**

17. Complete the table below for Cooperative Efforts. You must first enter a title for each individual effort. Statewide efforts should be coordinated with and reported by a planning area.

**Table 17-1.**

Attachment 1 - 10

---

Program Specific Activities and Conservation Actions

Areas with Special Management Designations

18. How many acres of currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land in the planning area have a special management designation? Special management designations may include but are not limited to: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, National Conservation Areas, National Monuments, Research Natural Areas, Wildlife Management Areas, and Wilderness Study Areas.

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

\*\*18a. How many of these acres are specific to or will result in the protection or enhancement of sage-grouse habitat?

 acres

**Grazing Management**

19. How many acres of currently occupied sage-grouse habitat are included in allotment management plans?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

\*\*19a. How many acres addressed in allotment management plans include objectives for sage-grouse habitat?

 acres

20. For fiscal years 2000-2004, how many acres of currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land have been affected by changes in timing of permitted grazing to improve rangeland health and benefit sage-grouse habitat?

Do not double-count acres.

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

21. For fiscal years 2000-2004, how many acres of currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land have been affected by temporarily resting or suspending grazing (e.g. in response to wildfire or drought) to improve rangeland health and benefit sage-grouse habitat? Do not double-count acres.

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

22. For fiscal years 2000-2004, how many water developments/structures have been installed on currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land that directly or indirectly benefits sage-grouse?

\_\_\_\_\_ number of projects

Attachment 1 - 11

\*\*22a. For fiscal years 2000-2004, how many water developments/structures have been installed on currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land that have increased grazing utilization to moderate or above?

\_\_\_\_\_ number of projects

### Minerals

23. For fiscal years 2000-2004, how many acres of surface disturbance associated with expired coal mine leases in currently historically occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land have been reclaimed or restored (including structural removal, recontour, reseeding, etc.) to a condition that benefits sage-grouse habitat?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

24. For fiscal years 2000-2004, how many acres of surface disturbance related to non-coal solid minerals projects in currently occupied and historically occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land have been reclaimed or restored (including structural removal, recontour, reseeding, etc.) to a condition that benefits sage-grouse habitat?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

### OHV/Recreation

25. For fiscal years 2000-2004, how many miles of roads and trails in currently occupied sage grouse habitat on BLM managed land have been closed or limited to benefit sage-grouse habitat? Count reoccurring closures on any given mile only once.

\_\_\_\_\_ miles of roads and trails (rounded to the nearest mile)

Information not available

\*\*25a. For fiscal years 2000-2004, how many ADDITIONAL miles of roads and trails in currently occupied sage grouse habitat on BLM managed land have been added?

\_\_\_\_\_ miles of roads and trails (rounded to the nearest mile)

26. For fiscal years 2000-2004, how many OHV or special use events have been restricted or prohibited on currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land that provided benefit to sage-grouse?

\_\_\_\_\_ number of events

\*\*26a. For fiscal years 2000-2004, how many OHV or special use events have been permitted on currently occupied

sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land

\_\_\_\_\_ number of events

Information not available

\*\*26b. How many leks have been identified as public viewing sites in the past 5 years? \_\_\_\_\_ How many of those have been closed to public viewing? \_\_\_\_\_

Attachment 1 - 12

---

## Realty

27. For fiscal years 2000-2004, how many acres of rights-of-way authorizations in currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land have been reclaimed or restored (including structural removal, recontour, reseeding, etc.) to a condition that benefits sage-grouse habitat?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Information not available

\*\*27a. How many acres of rights-of-way authorizations in currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land have been disturbed from direct and indirect impacts from rights-of-way authorization?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

28. How many acres of currently occupied sage-grouse habitat have been identified for acquisition in the land use plan, amendments or other programmatic guidance?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

\*\*28a. How many acres of currently occupied sage-grouse habitat have been identified (Zone 3) for disposal in the land use plan, amendments or other programmatic guidance?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

29. How many acres of currently occupied sage-grouse habitat were acquired in fiscal years 2000-2004?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

\*\*29a. How many acres of currently occupied sage-grouse habitat were disposed (Zone 3) in fiscal years 2000-2004?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

30. How many acres of currently occupied sage-grouse habitat are proposed for acquisition in fiscal years 2005-2009?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

\*\*30a. How many acres of currently occupied sage-grouse habitat are proposed for disposal (Zone 3) in fiscal years 2005-2009?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

## Fire

\*\*31. How many acres of occupied sage-grouse habitat are no longer suitable for sage-grouse as a result of wildfire?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

\*\*31a. or from prescribed fire?

\_\_\_\_\_ acres

Attachment 1 - 13