



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Utah State Office
P.O. Box 45155
Salt Lake City, UT 84145-0155
www.ut.blm.gov

IN REPLY REFER TO:
6840
(UT -930)P

May 6, 2004

Instruction Memorandum No. UT 2004-064
Expires: 9-30-2005

To: All Field Managers
From: State Director
Subject: Greater Sage-Grouse Information Request for Land Use Planning Areas

DD: 5/26/04

IMMEDIATE ATTENTION REQUIRED

On April 20, 2004, the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) published a positive 90-day finding that prompted further evaluation of the status of greater sage-grouse and its habitat. Over the next nine months, FWS will analyze information to determine if greater sage-grouse warrant a listing as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. To assist FWS in its evaluation, BLM will provide a synthesis of conservation actions on BLM-managed lands to FWS by June 21, 2004.

As you are aware, the Director has made sage-grouse conservation a Bureau priority, therefore, this request will require your immediate attention. Because the data call pertains only to greater sage-grouse, the Monticello Field Office is exempt from this Information Request.

Attached is an advanced hard copy version of a Washington Office information request designed to gather data about the BLM activities and management requirements that provide benefits or offer protection to greater sage-grouse and its habitat. An electronic version via Lotus Notes will be available by May 12th for entry and submission of your data. The questions in the hard copy version and electronic version will be identical; therefore, Field Offices are encouraged to begin compiling information while the National Science and Technology Center (NSTC) constructs the Lotus version. Field Offices will enter their data using the electronic version. **All information must be submitted in the electronic version by land use planning area by COB May 26, 2004.** Based on recent conversations with the Washington Office, this date will be considered firm, with no leeway expected. Field Managers should make adjustments as necessary to ensure the submission of data by the due date. Some Field Offices may require only limited responses, while for others this data call will be a significant workload, as the data is requested by planning area, which will require some of the offices to go through the exercise several times.

The attached WO Information Request contains detailed information about the request, including what data will be provided by NSTC, what data will be provided by the Field Office's, and how the data will be entered. The attached Excel Table lists the responsible Field Manager, or their designee, for each affected planning area; as well as the primary Field Office contact that will be responsible for inputting the data. Please review the attached Information Request carefully. The request covers several disciplines and will require the involvement of specialists from each discipline at the Field Office level. The State Office will provide assistance as needed. To assist the Field Offices, the Utah State Office has arranged a conference call for Tuesday May 11th, beginning at 9:00 a.m. **Please call in for the conference call to 888-889-2034 and use passcode 34715.** The call should include the Field Manager and/or the primary Field Office contact for the information request, as identified in the attached table. It is also recommended that other disciplines which will be involved in the data call be represented. The conference call will provide the Field Offices an opportunity to ask questions and begin the task of accomplishing the data call in the allotted time.

Field Offices should direct questions to Steve Madsen, State Office wildlife program lead at 801-539-4058, prior to May 17th, or David Mills, Colorado Plateau Special Status Species biologist at 435-896-1571, during the week of May 17th. To maintain consistency throughout the nine Bureau states responding to the data call, the wildlife program leads may direct questions to Washington Office contacts Megan Kram (202-785-6570) or Roxanne Falise (406-896-5025).

Signed by:
Gene R. Terland
Acting State Director

Authenticated by:
Rosie Geren
Records Manager

Attachments:

WO Advanced Copy – Greater Sage-grouse Information Request for Land Use Planning Areas
Table of Utah Field Managers and Primary Field Office Contacts



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Washington, D.C. 20240
<http://www.mt.blm.gov>



ADVANCED COPY

May 04, 2004

To: SD, ASD, DSD, Field Managers, Wildlife Program Leads
From: Dwight Fielder, WO-230 Group Manager
Subject: Greater Sage-grouse Information Request for Land Use Planning Areas

Program Areas: Fire/fuels management, Forestry, Minerals, Range management, Realty, Recreation, Wildlife

DD: 5/05/04, 5/06/04, 5/26/04

Attached is an advanced hardcopy version of an “information request” designed to gather data about the BLM activities and management requirements that provide benefits or offer protection to greater sage-grouse and its habitat. An electronic version via Lotus Notes will be available in mid-May for entry and submission of your data. The questions in the hardcopy version and electronic version will be identical; therefore, field offices are encouraged to begin compiling information while the National Science and Technology Center (NSTC) construct the Lotus version. **All information must be submitted in the electronic version by land use planning area by COB May 26, 2004.**

Immediate Action: By COB May 5, 2004, field offices should submit the following information to their state wildlife program lead:

- The name of the responsible Field Manager for each planning area. Field managers will be granted the permissions necessary to access the electronic version, review and edit information, and approve before submission.
- One Designated Contact for each planning area. The designated contact will have the authority to enter consolidated responses into the electronic version and submit via Lotus Notes.

By May 06, 2004, the wildlife program lead will compile the state list of planning area contacts into a table provided to them. Completed tables should be emailed it to Bruce Durtsche at NSTC. This information is critical for the database programmers to complete the electronic version.

Interdisciplinary Approach: This information request applies to all programs in planning areas with historically and currently occupied sage-grouse habitat. The questions focus on projects, conservation efforts, and management requirements that influence on-the-ground conservation. Most questions require compilation of information from several programs into a single response. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of this request, individuals with knowledge of fire/fuels management, forestry, minerals, range management, realty, recreation, and wildlife program areas must work together to answer the questions. GIS support is also recommended. Projects and conservation efforts that cross multiple planning areas and are funded by the State Office should be coordinated with and reported by the primary benefiting planning area(s). This includes the work months expended by state office staff, as requested in Table 17.

The following data may be useful when completing the information request, as many questions ask about activities occurring in currently and/or historically occupied sage-grouse habitat:

- Western US BLM Planning Unit Shapefile
- Schroeder, 2000 Greater Sage-grouse Range Shapefile
- A high resolution JPEG image of the western US showing planning units overlain by greater sage-grouse range.

The location for this data is ftp://ftp.int.blm.gov/blmshare/jerrys_folder/gsg_datacall

Background: On April 20, 2004, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) published a positive 90-day finding that prompted further evaluation of the status of greater sage-grouse and its habitat. Over the next nine months, FWS will analyze information to determine if greater sage-grouse warrant a listing as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. To assist FWS in its evaluation, BLM will provide a synthesis of conservation actions on BLM-managed lands to FWS by June 21, 2004.

Contacts: Field offices or districts should direct questions to the state wildlife program lead in their respective state. If there are unanswered questions, wildlife program leads may contact Megan Kram, 202.785.6570 or Roxanne Falise, 406.896.5025. Additional information will be available when the electronic version is completed and released.

Greater Sage-Grouse Information Request For Conservation Efforts by Land Use Planning Areas

On April 20, 2004, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) published a positive 90-day finding that prompted further evaluation of the status of greater sage-grouse and its habitat. Over the next nine months, FWS will analyze information to determine if greater sage-grouse warrant a listing as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. To assist FWS in its evaluation, BLM will provide a synthesis of conservation actions on BLM-managed lands to FWS by June 21, 2004.

The purpose of this information request is to gather data about BLM activities and management requirements that provide benefits or offer protection to sage-grouse and its habitat. The questions focus on projects, conservation efforts, and management requirements that influence on-the-ground conservation. All information should be reported by **land use planning area**. BLM will generate a report for FWS based on data collected in this information request.

This document is the paper version of the information request. Field offices will receive an electronic version via Lotus Notes in mid-May. The questions will be identical in the database version. This advanced copy paper version enables planning areas to gather and compile information immediately, rather than losing time while the National Science and Technology Center (NSTC) constructs the electronic version. **Planning areas must submit their responses in the electronic version by COB May 26, 2004.**

This information request applies to all programs. Most questions require compilation of information from several programs into a single response. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of this request, individuals with knowledge of the following program areas must work together to answer the questions.

- Fire/fuels management
- Forestry
- Minerals
- Range management
- Realty
- Recreation
- Wildlife

Other participants should include:

- One or more GIS specialists
- A designated contact who will enter the consolidated responses into the electronic Lotus version of the information request.
- The Field Office Manager who will oversee the completion of the information request for the planning area and who will approve the completed request before it is submitted electronically.

A response must be entered for each question unless furnished by NSTC. Program specialists should provide estimates based on their best professional judgment. Many questions include a

response option of “information not available” or “not identified” to ensure that information is recorded as accurately as possible.

Information furnished for this information request was provided by NSTC and derived through GIS. These acreage calculations should be considered estimates. The GIS datasets used for these calculations are the best available that encompass the entire western United States and as such, are broad in resolution. The datasets used were the BLM land use planning areas, BLM public lands, BLM broad resolution sagebrush/sage-grouse habitat (WO IM 2004-136), and greater sage-grouse distribution (Schroeder et al, in press).

Unless stated otherwise, all reporting is specific to **currently occupied greater sage-grouse habitat** on BLM lands within the land use planning area.

Definitions are provided at the end of this document for terms written in ***bold, italics, and larger font***. Please read all definitions because they are specific to this information request. If a biological term is not defined, you may find one of the following sources useful:

- 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 28:967-985. http://sagemap.wr.usgs.gov/Docs/Sage_Grouse_Guidelines.PDF.
- Connelly, J.W., K.P. Reese, M.A. Schroeder. 2003. Monitoring of Greater Sage-grouse Habitats and Populations. Station Bulletin 80. College of Natural Resources Experiment Station, University of Idaho. Moscow Idaho. http://sagemap.wr.usgs.gov/docs/grouse_habitat_book.pdf.
- State sage-grouse conservation plans (BLM state sage-grouse program lead)
- 90-Day Finding for Petitions to List the Greater Sage-Grouse as Threatened or Endangered. Federal Register vol. 69 no. 77 April 21, 2004. pp. 21484-21494. <http://mountain-prairie.fws.gov/species/birds/sagegrouse/90daynotice04212004.pdf>.

Many questions are framed to gather information about conservation actions that have occurred in the last 5 years (fiscal year 2000 to present). Even though actions implemented more than 5 years ago may be beneficial to sage-grouse, a decision was made to limit the reporting so that field offices could respond within the short time allowed.

The BLM information request is one of many sources of information that FWS will analyze during the status review for greater sage-grouse. State Fish and Wildlife agencies will submit population data and information about their conservation efforts. The Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies will provide a recently completed Rangelwide Sage-grouse Conservation Assessment. The assessment contains a tremendous amount of data including BLM specific information made available to the public. This request was developed to avoid any duplication of effort.

Planning areas should direct questions to the BLM wildlife program lead in their respective state. The wildlife program leads may direct questions to Washington Office contacts Megan Kram (202-785-6570) or Roxanne Falise (406-896-5025).

Basic Information for the BLM Land Use Planning Area

Select a land use planning area (Resource Management Plan or Management Framework Plan) from the drop-down list: _____ [drop-down list of planning areas]

[Furnished Information based on the land use planning area selected]

- Name (first and last): [planning area contact responsible for completing information request for this planning area – preassigned, contact information furnished]
 - Name (first and last): [field manager responsible for the planning area – preassigned, contact information furnished]
 - BLM State Office [furnished and tied to planning area]
 - State [furnished and tied to planning area - western US states]
 - Year of current land use plan [furnished and tied to planning area]
1. Estimates of surface acreage [furnished by NSTC, visible to the respondent]
 - a. Estimated total acres in planning area
 - b. Estimated acres ***BLM managed land*** in planning area
 - c. Estimated acres ***non-BLM managed land*** in planning area
 2. Estimates of ***currently occupied greater sage-grouse habitat*** [furnished by NSTC and visible to the respondent]
 - a. Total currently occupied sage-grouse habitat in planning area
 - b. Total currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land in planning area
 - c. Total currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on non-BLM managed land in planning area
 3. Estimates of ***historically, but not currently occupied greater sage-grouse habitat*** [furnished by NSTC and visible to the respondent]
 - a. Total historically, but not currently occupied sage-grouse habitat in the planning area
 - b. Total historically, but not currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land in the planning area
 - c. Total historically, but not currently occupied sage-grouse habitat on non-BLM managed land in planning area
 4. Estimate of ***active/occupied leks*** on BLM managed lands [furnished by the respondent]
 - 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
 - Information not available

Activities and Conservation Actions Across Programs

[answers furnished by respondent]

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, weed 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

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 and historically 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)
Information not available

c. Acres of ***perennial grassland habitat*** treated in currently and historically 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 grassland habitat that provide (or will provide) benefits for sage-grouse:

_____ acres (Note: Multiple treatments on a given acre should be counted only once)
Information not available

e. Acres of ***annual grasslands*** treated in currently and historically 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)
Information not available
- g. Acres of ***conifer encroachment*** (into sagebrush) treated in currently and historically 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)
Information not available

Management Requirements Across Programs

[answers furnished by respondent]

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
- b. If yes, how many acres of currently occupied habitat on BLM managed land (other than the acres in 11a) 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
- OHV/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.”

- Fire/Fuels management
- Grazing management
- Minerals
 - Fluids
 - Solids
- OHV/Recreation
- Riparian
- Realty
- Weed management
- Wild horse and burro
- 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.”

- Fire/Fuels management
- Grazing management
- Minerals
 - Fluids
 - Solids
- OHV/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
- Minerals
 - Fluids
 - Solids
- OHV/Recreation
- Riparian
- Realty
- Weed management
- Wild horse and burro
- 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.”

- Fire/Fuels management
- Grazing management
- Minerals
 - Fluids
 - Solids
- OHV/Recreation
- Riparian
- Realty
- Weed management
- Wild horse and burro
- Wildlife

Partnership Projects Across Programs: FY02-FY04

[answers furnished by respondent]

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

Project type	Number of projects	BLM \$ expended (nearest \$1000)	Multiple planning areas involved? (yes or no)
Education			
Easements/ acquisitions			
Habitat enhancement (excluding cooperative weed mgmt. projects)			
Habitat restoration (excluding cooperative weed mgmt. projects)			
Inventory/mapping			
Monitoring			
Research			
Weed management			

Table 16-2. FY03

Project type	Number of projects	BLM \$ expended (nearest \$1000)	Multiple planning areas involved? (yes or no)
Education			
Easements/ acquisitions			
Habitat enhancement (excluding cooperative weed mgmt. projects)			
Habitat restoration (excluding cooperative weed mgmt. projects)			
Inventory/mapping			
Monitoring			
Research			
Weed management			

Table 16-3. FY04

Project type	Number of projects	BLM \$ expended (nearest \$1000)	Multiple planning areas involved? (yes or no)
Education			
Easements/ acquisitions			
Habitat enhancement (excluding cooperative weed mgmt. projects)			
Habitat restoration (excluding cooperative weed mgmt. projects)			
Inventory/mapping			
Monitoring			
Research			
Weed management			

Other Cooperative Efforts

[answers provided by respondent]

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

- Coordinated resource management groups
- Local sage-grouse working groups

State sage-grouse working groups
 Stewardship groups
 Technical working groups
 Watershed planning working groups

List of Partner Types

Federal agency or group
 State agency or group
 County
 Local governments/ Municipality
 Tribes
 Landowners
 RACS
 Commodity Interests (private or not-for-profit)
 Conservation Groups (private or not-for-profit)
 Universities

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.

Title of Cooperative Effort (furnished by respondent) {limit at 100 characters}	Type of Cooperative Effort (drop down – select one)	Type of Partners (drop down – select all that apply)	Fiscal Year Initiated (yyyy)	Ongoing/ Sunset date – Fiscal Year (yyyy)	Work-months expended (annual average rounded to nearest whole number)	Multiple planning areas involved? (yes or no)

Program Specific Activities and Conservation Actions

Areas with Special Management Designations

[answers furnished by respondent]

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

Grazing Management

[answers furnished by respondent]

19. How many acres of currently occupied sage-grouse habitat are included in allotment management plans?
 _____ 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 benefit sage-grouse?
 _____ number of project [3 character limit]

Minerals

[answers furnished by respondent]

23. For fiscal years 2000-2004, how many acres of surface disturbance associated with expired coal mine leases in currently and historically occupied sage-grouse habitat on BLM managed land have been reclaimed or restored (including structural removal, recontour, reseeded, 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, reseeded, etc.) to a condition that benefits sage-grouse habitat?
 _____ acres
Information not available

OHV/Recreation

[answers furnished by respondent]

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

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

Information not available

Realty

[answers furnished by respondent]

27. For fiscal years 2000-2004, how many acres of rights-of-way authorizations in currently 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

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

29. How many acres of currently occupied sage-grouse habitat were acquired 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

Definition of Terms for this Information Request

Active/ Occupied leks - Any lek attended by two or more males during the strutting season at least once over a 10 year period.

Annual grass habitats – Areas dominated by annual grasses with or without sagebrush present.

BLM managed lands – Public lands administered by BLM. This includes the BLM surface and Bankhead Jones (LU) lands.

Conifer encroachment – Sagebrush or perennial grassland areas (that have a potential to reestablish sagebrush) with conifer encroachment.

Controlled surface use – Use or occupancy is allowed (*unless* restricted by another stipulation) but identified resource values require special operational constraints that may modify the lease rights.

Currently occupied greater sage-grouse habitat – Acreage derived by GIS from greater sage-grouse distribution map compiled by Schroeder report

Easements/ Acquisitions – Projects undertaken to acquire land or buy easements on acres that provide benefits to sage-grouse habitat over the long term.

Educational – A project type defined as outreach/in-reach, interpretive materials, meetings, posters, technical sessions, brochures, and all other communication efforts for sage-grouse related issues.

Habitat enhancement/ restoration of currently occupied habitat – Projects undertaken to improve or augment the desired condition of sage-grouse habitat, including vegetation treatments, water developments etc. (excludes cooperative weed management projects)

Habitat restoration of historic, not currently occupied habitat – Projects undertaken to restore, rehabilitate or reclaim historic, but not currently occupied sage-grouse habitat, including re-vegetation efforts such as cheatgrass control, sagebrush seeding, etc.

Historically, but not currently occupied greater sage-grouse habitat – Acreage derived by GIS from greater sage-grouse distribution map compiled by Schroeder report.

Inventory/ mapping – Projects involving the determination of extent of habitat or population characteristics. Examples include (but are not limited to) projects such as mapping sagebrush cover or identifying seasonal habitat based on remotely sensed data, etc.

Monitoring – Projects involving the collection and analysis of information about habitat or population changes.

Noise limitation – A stipulation or condition of approval placed on a use authorization that identifies a decibel threshold or action that would reduce or limit the noise caused by an activity.

Non-BLM managed lands – All lands other than BLM administered public lands.

No Surface Occupancy – Use or occupancy of the land surface is prohibited to protect identified resource values.

Perennial Grassland Habitats – Native or seeded grasslands with generally less than 5 percent canopy cover.

Prohibited use – Stipulations or rules that prohibit specific activities on the ground in order to prevent damage to resource values. Prohibited use stipulations are usually incorporated into BLM use authorizations in an attempt to minimize or eliminate potential negative impacts. Prohibited use stipulations may be permanent or may be modified by timing restrictions.

Programmatic guidance – A planning document that applies to an entire BLM land use planning area and provides management direction for a program or activity (e.g. Fire/fuels Management Plans, OHV Amendment).

Research – cooperative efforts involving peer reviewed scientific investigations

Sagebrush/Perennial Grass Habitats – Areas with generally at least 5% sagebrush canopy cover and a native or seeded perennial grass understory.

Special Management Designation – A land use decision or proclamation that identifies a geographic area as unique or outstanding because of its attributes or values. Criteria vary depending on the designation. Examples of special management designations include but are not limited to: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, National Conservation Areas, National Monuments, Research Natural Areas, Wildlife Management Areas, Wilderness, Wilderness Study Areas, etc.

Stipulation – A condition or requirement attached to a use authorization, lease, or contract usually dealing with a protection of the environment or recovery of a mineral.

Timing restrictions – Language, usually in the form of stipulations, that is incorporated into BLM use authorizations (e.g., leases, contracts, permits, licenses, etc.) to afford temporary and limited protection to resource values. The timing of the restrictions is based on time frames that are critical to the characteristics of the resource being protected.

Treated or treatment– A practice or technique applied to vegetation for the purpose of altering the structure, density or composition of species. For this information request, do not include grazing as a treatment.

Weed management – Projects (or cooperative efforts) specifically designed to control or eliminate state-listed noxious weeds that negatively impact sage-grouse habitat.

BLM Greater Sage-Grouse Information Request
Basic Information

Plan Name ¹ Do not change any information in this column.	State Office Do not change any information in this column.	U.S. State(s). Do not change any information in this column.	Currently occupied greater sage-grouse habitat present (c=yes) ² Do not change any information in this column.	Historically occupied greater sage-grouse habitat present (h=yes) ² Do not change any information in this column.	Date of current RMP or MFP for states with current sg habitat ³ Fill in answers not provided.	LAST Name of Field Manager responsible for the planning area (one name only). This individual will have access to the electronic information request, and will approve and submit the completed request for the planning area. Enter a last name.	FIRST Name of Field Manager responsible for the planning area (one name only). Enter a first name.	LAST Name of the Individual who will serve as the primary contact for the information request (one name only). This individual will have access to the electronic database and will enter in the answer to the information request for the planning area. Enter a last name.	FIRST name of the individual who will serve as the primary contact for the information request. Enter a first name.
Arizona Strip RMP	ARIZONA	ARIZONA	-	h					
Alturas RMP	CALIFORNIA	CALIFORNIA	c	h	1983				
Bishop RMP	CALIFORNIA	CALIFORNIA	c	h	1993				
Cal-Neva MFP	CALIFORNIA	CALIFORNIA, NEVADA	c	h	1982				
Cinder Cone MFP	CALIFORNIA	CALIFORNIA	-	h					
Cowhead/Massacre MFP	CALIFORNIA	CALIFORNIA, NEVADA	c	-	1981				
Honey Lake MFP	CALIFORNIA	CALIFORNIA	c	h	1984				
Mount Dome MFP	CALIFORNIA	CALIFORNIA	-	h					
Northern and Eastern Mojave RMP	CALIFORNIA	CALIFORNIA, NEVADA	c	h					
Redding RMP	CALIFORNIA	CALIFORNIA	-	h					
Tulead/Homecamp MFP	CALIFORNIA	CALIFORNIA, NEVADA	c	-	1976				
Willow Creek MFP	CALIFORNIA	CALIFORNIA	c	h	1983				
Glenwood Springs RMP	COLORADO	COLORADO	c	h	1999				
Grand Junction RMP	COLORADO	COLORADO	c	h	1985				
Kremmling RMP	COLORADO	COLORADO	c	h	1991				
Little Snake RMP	COLORADO	COLORADO	c	h	1991				
Northeast RMP	COLORADO	COLORADO	c	-					
Royal Gorge RMP	COLORADO	COLORADO	-	h					
White River RMP	COLORADO	COLORADO	c	h	1997				
Baker RMP	IDAHO	OREGON, WASHINGTON	c	h	1989				
Bennett Hills/Timmerman Hills MFP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1976				
Big Desert MFP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1981				
Big Lost MFP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	-	1983				
Bruneau MFP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1983				
Cascade RMP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1988				
Cassia RMP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1984				
Challis RMP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1999				
Jarbidge RMP	IDAHO	IDAHO, NEVADA	c	h	1987				
Kuna MFP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1983				
Lemhi RMP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	-	1987				
Little Lost - Birch Creek MFP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	-	1981				
Magic MFP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1975				
Malad MFP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1981				
Medicine Lodge RMP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1985				
Monument RMP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1985				
Owyhee RMP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1999				
Pocatello RMP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1988				
Sun Valley MFP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1981				
Twin Falls MFP	IDAHO	IDAHO	c	h	1986				
Big Dry RMP	MONTANA	MONTANA	c	h	1996				
Billings RMP	MONTANA	MONTANA	c	h	1984				
Dillion MFP	MONTANA	MONTANA	c	h	1979				
Garnet RMP	MONTANA	MONTANA	-	h					
Headwaters RMP	MONTANA	MONTANA	c	h					
Judith, Valley, and Phillips RMP	MONTANA	MONTANA	c	h	1992				
North Dakota RMP	MONTANA	NORTH DAKOTA	c	h	1987				
Powder River RMP	MONTANA	MONTANA	c	h	1984				

BLM Greater Sage-Grouse Information Request
Basic Information

Plan Name ¹ Do not change any information in this column.	State Office Do not change any information in this column.	U.S. State(s). Do not change any information in this column.	Currently occupied greater sage-grouse habitat present (c=yes) ² Do not change any information in this column.	Historically occupied greater sage-grouse habitat present (h=yes) ² Do not change any information in this column.	Date of current RMP or MFP for states with current sg habitat ³ Fill in answers not provided.	LAST Name of Field Manager responsible for the planning area (one name only). This individual will have access to the electronic information request, and will approve and submit the completed request for the planning area. Enter a last name.	FIRST Name of Field Manager responsible for the planning area (one name only). Enter a first name.	LAST Name of the Individual who will serve as the primary contact for the information request (one name only). This individual will have access to the electronic database and will enter in the answer to the information request for the planning area. Enter a last name.	FIRST name of the individual who will serve as the primary contact for the information request. Enter a first name.
South Dakota RMP	MONTANA	SOUTH DAKOTA	c	h	1985				
West Hi-Line RMP	MONTANA	MONTANA	c	h	1988				
Caliente RMP	NEVADA	NEVADA	c	h	1981				
Egan RMP	NEVADA	NEVADA	c	h	1987				
Elko RMP	NEVADA	NEVADA	c	-					
Lahontan RMP	NEVADA	NEVADA	c	h					
Nellis RMP	NEVADA	NEVADA	-	h					
Paradise-Denio RMP	NEVADA	NEVADA	c	-	1982				
Schell RMP	NEVADA	NEVADA	c	h	1983				
Shoshone-Eureka RMP	NEVADA	NEVADA	c	h	1986				
Sonoma Gerlach RMP	NEVADA	NEVADA	c	h	1982				
Tonopah RMP	NEVADA	NEVADA	c	h	1997				
Walker RMP	NEVADA	NEVADA	c	h					
Wells RMP	NEVADA	NEVADA	c	h	1985				
Andrews-Steens RMP	OREGON	OREGON	c	-	1982				
Brothers-Lapine RMP	OREGON	OREGON	c	h	1989				
John Day RMP	OREGON	OREGON	c	h	1985				
Klamath Falls RMP	OREGON	OREGON	c	h	1995				
Lakeview RMP	OREGON	OREGON	c	h	2004				
Southeastern Oregon RMP	OREGON	OREGON	c	h	2002				
Spokane RMP	OREGON	WASHINGTON	c	h	1992				
Three Rivers RMP	OREGON	OREGON	c	-	1992				
Two Rivers RMP	OREGON	OREGON	c	h	1986				
Upper Deschutes RMP	OREGON	OREGON	c	h					
Upper Klamath Basin RMP	OREGON	OREGON	-	h					
Antimony RMP - CBGA	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1986	Armstrong	Lori	Greenwood	Larry
Beaver RMP - CBGA	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1986	Christensen	Todd	Bonebrake	Becky
Book Cliffs RMP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1985	Stringer	Bill	Faircloth	Tim
Box Elder RMP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1986	Carpenter	Glenn	Arana	Mark
Cedar RMP - CBGA	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1986	Christensen	Todd	Bonebrake	Becky
Diamond Mountain RMP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1994	Stringer	Bill	Faircloth	Tim
Dixie RMP	UTAH	UTAH	-	h	1999	Crisp	Jim	Corry	Dave
Escalante MFP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1981	Hunsaker	Dave	Barber	Harry
Garfield RMP - CBGA	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1986	Smart	Rex	Church	Lisa
Grand RMP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1985	Wyatt	Maggie	Cresto	Joe
Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1999	Hunsaker	Dave	Barber	Harry
Henry Mountain MFP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1982	Armstrong	Lori	Grayson	Suzanne
House Range RMP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1987	Hirst	Sherry	Pierce	Mark
Mountain Valley MFP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1982	Armstrong	Lori	Greenwood	Larry
Paria MFP	UTAH	UTAH	-	h	1981	Smart	Rex	Church	Lisa
Park City MFP	UTAH	UTAH	-	h	1975	Carpenter	Glenn	Swilling	Randy
Parker Mountain MFP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1982	Armstrong	Lori	Greenwood	Larry
Pinyon MFP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1983	Christensen	Todd	Bonebrake	Becky
Pony Express RMP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1990	Carpenter	Glenn	Arana	Mark
Price River RMP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1979	Gubbins	Patrick	Ludington	Wayne
Randolph MFP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1980	Carpenter	Glenn	Swilling	Randy
San Rafael RMP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1991	Gubbins	Patrick	Ludington	Wayne
Vermillion MFP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1981	Smart	Rex	Church	Lisa

BLM Greater Sage-Grouse Information Request
Basic Information

Plan Name ¹ Do not change any information in this column.	State Office Do not change any information in this column.	U.S. State(s). Do not change any information in this column.	Currently occupied greater sage-grouse habitat present (c=yes) ² Do not change any information in this column.	Historically occupied greater sage-grouse habitat present (h=yes) ² Do not change any information in this column.	Date of current RMP or MFP for states with current sg habitat ³ Fill in answers not provided.	LAST Name of Field Manager responsible for the planning area (one name only). This individual will have access to the electronic information request, and will approve and submit the completed request for the planning area. Enter a last name.	FIRST Name of Field Manager responsible for the planning area (one name only). Enter a first name.	LAST Name of the Individual who will serve as the primary contact for the information request (one name only). This individual will have access to the electronic database and will enter in the answer to the information request for the planning area. Enter a last name.	FIRST name of the individual who will serve as the primary contact for the information request. Enter a first name.
Warm Springs RMP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1987	Hirst	Sherry	Pierce	Mark
Zion MFP	UTAH	UTAH	c	h	1981	Smart	Rex	Church	Lisa
Buffalo RMP	WYOMING	WYOMING	c	h	1985				
Cody RMP	WYOMING	WYOMING	c	h	1990				
Grass Creek RMP	WYOMING	WYOMING	c	-	1998				
Great Divide RMP	WYOMING	WYOMING	c	h	1990				
Green River RMP	WYOMING	WYOMING	c	-	1998				
Kemmerer RMP	WYOMING	WYOMING	c	h	1986				
Lander RMP	WYOMING	WYOMING	c	-	1987				
Nebraska RMP	WYOMING	NEBRASKA	-	h					
Newcastle RMP	WYOMING	WYOMING	c	h	2000				
Pinedale RMP	WYOMING	WYOMING	c	-	1988				
Platte River RMP	WYOMING	WYOMING	c	h	1985				
Washakie RMP	WYOMING	WYOMING	c	-	1988				

¹ BLM Land Use Planning Areas from WO210; only includes those plans within greater sage-grouse historic distribution

² Schroeder, 2000

³ Dates in this table were provided by states in the land use planning data call.