Sage-Grouse Executive Order 2011-5 Worksheet Questions

Part 1 - Project Location and Large Disturbance Features

1. Is the project located in a northeast WY core or connectivity area (i.e., Buffalo, North Gillette, Thunder Basin, Newcastle, Douglas, North Glenrock, or Natrona north of Hwy 20/26 and north of Casper Mtn.)?
    a. If **yes**, has the pre-1994 habitat conversion/treatment disturbance been accurately accounted for and removed from the disturbance (i.e., set to exempt)?
2. Were there any large sagebrush disturbing wildfires or treatments within the DDCT area?
    a. If **yes** and included as disturbance, has a management plan been implemented to restore the area to functional sage-grouse habitat?
    b. Is the wildfire/treatment area (pre-2011) being considered transitional sage-grouse habitat (i.e., the proponent and local agency personnel have agreed to count the burn or treatment area as non-disturbed habitat based on an implemented management plan and trend data)?
        i. If **yes**, who is responsible for monitoring the transitional habitat until 2021?
3. Is the project (proposed disturbance and the permit area) within a Federal oil and gas unit established prior to August 1, 2008?
    a. If **yes**, has the BLM discussed the unit Plan of Development (POD) with the unit operator to estimate disturbance within the unit over the next +/- 10 years?
        - If **yes**, and a long-term POD can be documented, the unit may be counted as disturbance to the extent it will be developed if <100% of the current unit boundary.
        - If **no**, i.e., no discussion of the POD has occurred and/or no long-term POD is available, then the unit should counted as 100% disturbed using the current unit boundary until such a plan or documentation is available.
4. Is the DDCT area overlapped by a pre-August 1, 2008 unit, but the project lies outside the unit?
    a. If **yes**, has the BLM discussed the unit Plan of Development (POD) with the unit operator to estimate disturbance within the unit over the next +/- 10 years?
        - If **yes**, and a long-term POD can be documented, the unit may be counted as disturbance to the extent it will be developed if <100% of the current unit boundary.
        - If **no**, i.e., no discussion of the POD has occurred and/or no long-term POD is available, then the unit should counted as 100% disturbed using the current unit boundary until such a plan or documentation is available.

Attachment 3

Part 2 - Disturbance Guidelines and Stipulations for Development

1. Is the DDCT disturbance calculation output within the 5% surface disturbance threshold?
    a. If **no**, would the disturbance calculation exceed 5% without the addition of the proposed project?
2. Is all surface occupancy >0.6mi from the perimeter of occupied leks?
3. Are seasonal stipulations for development activities (March 15 - June 30) being applied to the project?
    a. Have sage-grouse winter concentration areas been identified in the project area and are seasonal stipulations (Dec. 1 - March 14) being applied to the project?
4. Are main roads associated with the project located >1.9 miles and access/maintenance roads located >0.6mi from the perimeter of occupied leks?
    a. If **no**, have the proponent and local agency personnel agreed on the use of the roadways within the aforementioned buffers?
5. Will there be new transmission or distribution lines constructed as a result of the project?
    a. If **yes**, have the power line right-of-ways and all disturbance associated with power line construction been accurately counted in the disturbance calculation?
    b. Will new power lines be co-located in existing power line corridors or within the right-of-way of another existing linear feature?
    c. Will new power lines be buried?
        i. If **no**, will they be >0.6mi from perimeter of any occupied leks and raptor-proofed?
6. March 1 - May 15: Will noise (activity) associated with the project occur between 6PM and 8AM during any phase of project implementation (i.e., development through production), including traffic to and from the project location?
    a. If **yes**, were ambient noise level measurements taken at sunrise at lek perimeters to ensure that new noise is limited to 10 dBA above baseline?
7. Is vegetation removal associated with the project planned between March 15 and June 30 within 4mi of an occupied lek?
    a. If **yes**, what are the potential impacts and has the vegetation removal been discussed and agreed upon by the proponent and local agency personnel?
8. Does the project include vegetation treatment?
    a. If **yes**, does the treatment comply with Executive Order 2011-5 and WGFD sagebrush treatment protocols?
    b. What measuring protocols were used to assess the total sagebrush cover prior to treatment?
    c. If the treatment will not be counted as disturbance (i.e., treatment area will remain suitable habitat), what controls will be used to ensure that cover does not fall below protocol thresholds?

9. Has the proponent agreed to monitor affected and surrounding (control) leks?
    a. If **yes**, will they coordinate with the permitting agency and local WGFD biologist to determine monitoring/data needs?
    b. Does the proponent indicate a willingness to use adaptive management if there are declines on monitored leks determined to be caused by the project?
        i. If **yes**, what actions could be taken?
10. Does the reclamation plan comply with Executive Order 2011-5?
    a. If **no**, has the proponent discussed reclamation to return the disturbed area to suitable sage-grouse habitat with the surface owner?

Part 3 - Density Guidelines and Specific Stipulations

1. If the project includes oil and gas development and/or mining activity, is the 1 /640 density calculation accurate and within Executive Order 2011-5 guidelines?
2. Is the project located in a sage-grouse connectivity corridor?
    a. If **yes**, is a 0.6mi Controlled Surface Use (CSU) buffer being applied around occupied lek perimeters?
    b. Are timing stipulations (March 15 - June 30) being applied to the project within nesting habitat within 4mi of leks?

Part 4 - Deviations and Mitigation

1. Are there any deviations from Executive Order 2011-5 process or stipulations?
    a. If **yes**, does the proposed project meet at least one of the following conditions:
        - No suitable habitat is present in one contiguous block of land that includes at least a 0.6mi buffer between the project area and suitable habitat.
        - No sage-grouse use occurs in one contiguous block of land that includes at least a 0.6mi buffer between the project area and adjacent occupied habitat, as documented by total absence of sage-grouse droppings and an absence of sage-grouse activity for the previous ten years.
        - Provision of a development/mitigation plan that has been implemented and demonstrated by previous research not to cause declines in sage-grouse populations. The demonstration must be based on monitoring data collected and analyzed with accepted scientific based techniques.
2. Are there additional mitigation efforts being proposed by the proponent or recommended by the biologist that could be implemented to offset anticipated impacts to sage-grouse?
    a. If **yes**, will the proponent implement these mitigation measures?