Bureau of Land Management
Boise District Office
Bruneau Field Office
3948 Development Ave
Boise, ID 83705
http://www.id.blm.gov

Determination of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management

A. BLM Office: Bruneau Field Office

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-ID-BO20-2011-0004-DNA

Lease/Serial Case File No.: TBD

Proposed Action Title/Type: Battle Creek Allotment Grazing Permit Issuance

Location/Legal of Proposed Action: Battle Creek Allotment 00802

Applicant (if any): JR Simplot Company/ Battle Creek (lease from Black, Meyers, Hanks)

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures: A grazing preference transfer categorical exclusion, DOI-BLM-ID-B020-2011-0002-CX, transferred 782 AUMs from Bruneau Cattle Company (lease from Black, Meyers, Hanks) to JR Simplot Company/Battle Creek. This DNA documents that the analysis in Environmental Assessment (EA) # ID-120-2007-3353 is adequate so that a grazing permit can be issued to JR Simplot Company/Battle Creek.

The Proposed Action is to issue a grazing permit to JR Simplot Company/ Battle Creek for livestock grazing in the Battle Creek Allotment 00802. The term of the permit will be 3 years, April 1, 2011, to March 31, 2014, in accordance with CFR 43 4130.2(d)(3). In accordance with CFR 43 4130.3-3, modifications of permits or leases, the authorized officer may modify a permit to comply with the land use plan; an allotment management plan; or an activity plan; or management objectives; or meet provisions of subpart 4180 (Idaho's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management). If this is necessary, then the existing permit will be canceled and a proposed and final decision that implements the new permit term and conditions will be issued.

Environmental Assessment (EA) ID-120-2007-3353 described impacts of range improvements and prescribed mitigation to comply with animal, botanical and cultural requirements which in turn complied with Bruneau Kuna MFP (1983) objectives and Idaho's Standard for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (S&G's).

This DNA will not cover Owens Allotment. Owens Allotment was separated from Battle Creek Allotment by a final decision dated February 20, 2008.

Mitigation measures are incorporated as grazing permit mandatory and other terms and conditions. Table 1 specifies mandatory terms and conditions in compliance with 43 CFR 4130.3-1. The mandatory terms and conditions are; the kind and number of livestock, the period(s) of livestock use within the allotment, and the amount of use in animal unit months.

Table 1 Mandatory terms and conditions for JR Simplot Company/Battle Creek that comply with 43 CFR 4130.3-1 (a).

Allotment	Livestock		Grazing Period		% Public Land	Animal Unit Months		
	Number	Kind	Begin	End		Active	Suspended	Permitted
00802 Battle Creek	155	Cattle	4/1	10/31	100	782	0	782[1]

[1] *Permitted AUMs equal total active and suspended AUMs.*

Other terms and conditions

1. Livestock grazing management in the Battle Creek Allotment shall be made in accordance with the field manager's final decision.

2. Ten days flexibility will be allowed when cattle are moved from pasture to pasture. The ten day flexibility period will begin five days before and end five days after the scheduled move date. Additional flexibility in livestock move dates beyond the ten day flexibility period requires prior approval by the field manager. Also, 15 days of flexibility after May 31st will be allowed to move livestock from pasture 21 to other pastures. The BLM authorized officer may make annual adjustments to the dates dependent on range readiness, production, water availability, and other factors.

3. Livestock turnout is subject to the Boise District range readiness criteria.

4. Supplemental feeding is limited to salt, mineral, and/or protein in block, granular, or liquid form. If used, these supplements must be placed at least one-quarter (1/4) mile away from any riparian area, spring, stream, meadow, aspen stand, sensitive plant populations, playa, or water development located on public land unless a variance is approved by the authorized officer.

5. Livestock exclosures located within the Battle Creek Allotment are closed to livestock use.

6. Maintenance activities within the Little Jacks Creek Wilderness Area require prior consultation with the authorized officer. Motorized vehicles are restricted to designated roads in the Little Jacks Creek Wilderness Area.

7. Pursuant to 43 C.F.R. §10.4(b)), the permittees must notify the authorized officer of BLM, by telephone with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony (as defined in 43 C.F.R.§ 10.2) on public land. Pursuant to 43 C.F.R. §10.4(c), the permittees must immediately stop any ongoing activities connected with such discovery and make a reasonable effort to protect the discovered remains of objects.

8. Properly complete, sign and date an Actual Grazing Use Report Form (BLM Form 4130-5) for each allotment. The completed form(s) must be submitted to the BFO within 15 days from the last day of authorized annual grazing use.

Standard Terms and Conditions

Standard Terms and Conditions will be in addition to the allotment-specific Mandatory and Other Terms and Conditions listed above:

1. Grazing permit or lease terms and conditions and the fees charged for grazing use are established in accordance with the provisions of the grazing regulations now or hereafter approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

2. They are subject to cancellation, in whole or in part, at any time because of:
   a. Noncompliance by the permittee/lessee with rules and regulations.
   b. Loss of control by the permittee/lessee of all or part of the property upon which it is based.
   c. A transfer of grazing preference by the permittee/lessee to another party.
   d. A decrease in the lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management within the allotment(s) described.
   e. Repeated willful unauthorized grazing use.
   f. Loss of qualifications to hold a permit or lease.

3. They are subject to the terms and conditions of allotment management plans if such plans have been prepared. Allotment management plans MUST be incorporated in permits or leases when completed.

4. Those holding permits or leases MUST own or control and be responsible for the management of livestock authorized to graze.

5. The authorized officer may require counting and/or additional or special marking or tagging of the livestock authorized to graze.

6. The permittee's/lessee's grazing case file is available for public inspection as required by the Freedom of Information Act.

7. Grazing permits or leases are subject to the nondiscrimination clauses set forth in Executive Order 11246 of September 24, 1964, as amended. A copy of this order may be obtained from the authorized officer.

8. Livestock grazing use that is different from that authorized by a permit or lease MUST be applied for prior to the grazing period and MUST be filed with and approved by the authorized officer before grazing use can be made.

9. Billing notices are issued which specify fees due. Billing notices, when paid, become a part of the grazing permit or lease. Grazing use cannot be authorized during any period of delinquency in the payment of amounts due, including settlement for unauthorized use.

10. Grazing fee payments are due on the date specified on the billing notice and MUST be paid in full within 15 days of the due date, except as otherwise provided in the grazing permit or lease. If payment is not made within that time frame, a late fee (the greater of $25 or 10 percent of the amount owed but not more than $250) will be assessed.

11. No Member of, or Delegate to, Congress or Resident Commissioner, after his/her election of appointment, or either before or after he/she has qualified, and during his/her continuance in office, and no officer, agent, or employee of the Department of the Interior, other than members of Advisory committees appointed in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App. 1) and Sections 309 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et. seq.) shall be admitted to any share or part in a permit or lease, or derive any benefit to arise therefore; and the provision of Section 3741 Revised Statue (41 U.S.C. 22), 18 U.S.C. Sections 431-433, and 43 CFR Part 7, enter into and form a part of a grazing permit or lease, so far as the same may be applicable.

This grazing permit:

1. Conveys no right, title, or interest held by the United States in any lands or resources.

2. Is subject to (a) modification, suspension or cancellation as required by land plans and applicable law; (b) annual review and modification of terms and conditions as appropriate; and (c) the Taylor Grazing Act, as amended, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, as amended, the Public Rangelands Improvement Act, and the rules and regulations now or hereafter promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior.

Annual Indicator Criteria (these indicators may be modified at any time by an Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) of resource specialists if monitoring indicates that a change is necessary to ensure that the listed criteria are being effective in helping to meet or make significant progress towards meeting Idaho Standards For Rangeland Health (ISRH) and resource objectives).

Annual Indicator Criteria for Uplands and Riparian Areas

1. Average utilization by livestock on key bunchgrass species measured at key areas:
   During the period of critical growth: not exceeding 40%.
   Outside the critical growth period: not exceeding 50%.
   The Modified Key Forage Plant Method will be used to determine utilization.

2. Less than or equal to 30% of new leaders on young willows (6 ft. or less in height) nipped by cattle, as measured at key areas, at the end of the growing season.

3. Annually, maintain a median of ≥ 6-inches of residual stubble height on herbaceous riparian vegetation on Shoofly and East Fork Shoofly Creek throughout the growing season.

4. Bank alteration on Shoofly and East Fork Shoofly Creek from trailing livestock would be limited to ≤ 15%.

Long-term Indicator Criteria (for Riparian Areas)

1. Increases in riparian plant cover, particularly late-seral sedges and willows, on streambanks as measured on riparian trend transects (Greenline transects; Burton et al. 2007, USDI 2007a – p.158, IDEQ 1992).

2. Increase in bank stability to ≥85% stable bank as measured on riparian trend transects (Greenline transects; Burton et al. 2007, USDI 2007a - p. 158, IDEQ 1992).

3. Decrease in Greenline-to-Greenline channel width (i.e. narrowing and deepening of the stream channel due to plant colonization and stabilization of streambanks; Burton et al. 2007).

Livestock Grazing Management for JR Simplot Company/Battle Creek will be as shown below in Table 2. The overlap of periods of use would allow for flexibility in the movement of livestock between pastures consistent with phenological development of the plants as a result of weather conditions and climatic variation.

Table 2 Livestock Grazing Management for JR Simplot Company/Battle Creek

Pasture	Year		
	2011	**2012**	**2013 - 2013**
8	4/1 – 5/15 Duration of use will be up to 45 days.		
21	5/1 – 5/31 Flexibility will be extended 15 days to June 15th to allow for all cattle to be removed from this pasture.		
12	5/20 – 7/20 Duration of use will be up to 45 days.		
22 (combine pastures 9 & 22)	5/6 – 7/10 Duration of use will be up to 45 days.		
Shoofly Creek	Spring and fall trailing only.		
East Fork Shoofly Creek	Spring and fall trailing and incidental use to maintain >6" stubble throughout the season.		
14	6/20 - 8/6 Duration of use will be up to 40 days.	8/25 – 9/30 Duration of use will be up to 40 days.	Repeat rotation
20	7/17 – 9/30 Duration of use will be up to 70 days.	6/20 – 8/31 Duration of use will be up to 70 days.	
18	4/1 – 10/31 Used at the discretion of the permittees as long as Idaho's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management continue to be met.		

The following range improvements were built as described and shown on maps for Alternative D of EA #ID-120-2007-3353. Construction of these range improvements was subject to approval by the authorized officer in conformance with site specific clearances for cultural resources, BLM special status plants species and BLM special status wildlife species.

1. Snow Creek Spring Exclosure Modification was completed in 2008.

2. Shoofly Gap Fence and Pasture 22 H Fence Removal were completed in 2008.

3. Cattleguards at pasture 14/22 fence at Upper East Fork of Shoofly Reservoir were completed 2008.

The following range improvement would be built as described and shown on map 2 of Alternative B of EA ID-120-2009-EA-0023 and is necessary to meet S&G's and comply with Bruneau MFP objectives.

1. Authorization of Hutch Spring Exclosure and Spring Development is pending completion of EA ID-120-2009-EA-0023. The decision record (final decision) is expected to be signed in the spring of 2011.

The following range improvements were authorized in Battle Creek Allotment final decisions

(decision record) dated February 20, 2008, but were not necessary to meet S&G's and comply with Bruneau MFP objectives. The below projects will require site specific environmental assessments (EAs) prior to the decision record (final decision) of an EA, therefore, EAs will need to be completed prior to authorization.

1. Authorization of Dry Creek Exclosure is pending a site specific EA. It would be a modification of the existing fence, currently known as the Dry Creek Riparian Pasture fence, to create an exclosure. A spring on State land would be developed to provide livestock water outside of the exclosure. If a water right cannot be secured in the name of BLM, then this range improvement would not be authorized (CFR 4120.3-9).

2. Authorization of State Section Extension of Shoofly Pipeline is pending a site specific EA. It would be an extension of the existing Shoofly Pipeline in pasture 8. The source of water for this pipeline would be located on private land. If a water right cannot be secured in the name of BLM, then this range improvement would not be authorized (CFR 4120.3-9).

3. Authorization of North Extension of Shoofly Pipeline is pending a site specific EA It would be an extension of the existing Shoofly Pipeline in pasture 8 and the source of water for this pipeline would be located on private land. If a water right cannot be secured in the name of BLM, then this range improvement would not be authorized (CFR 4120.3-9).

4. Authorization of Modified Joe's Basin Pipeline is pending a site specific EA. This would be a pipeline from private land to public land and the water source would be located on private land. If a water right cannot be secured in the name of BLM, then this range improvement would not be authorized (CFR 4120.3-9).

5. Authorization of Hutch Pipeline is pending a site specific EA. It would be an extension of the existing Hutch Pipeline to State land. The source of water for this pipeline is located on private land. If a water right cannot be secured in the name of BLM, then this range improvement would not be authorized (CFR 4120.3-9).

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Related NEPA documents

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

LUP/Document[1]	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Bruneau/Kuna Draft EIS	4-29 through 4-37	1982
Bruneau/Kuna Final EIS	14, 17-18, 20, 23, 26-27, 29-31, 33, 34, 36-37, 39	1982
Bruneau MFP	RM-1.1, RM-1.3, RM-1.4, RM-3.1, RM-5.1, WS-1, WL- 2.2, WL-3.3	March 30,1983
Bruneau-Kuna Land Use Decisions Summary and Rangeland Program Summary	9-10, 11-13, 17, 18, 20, 23-24, 26-27, 29-30	June 1983

[1]List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans, Management Framework Plans, or applicable amendments) and activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action. List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

NEPA/Other Related Documents[1]	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Battle Creek Allotment Final Assessment	4-6, 9-11, 20-21, 24-27, 34, 37, 42, 56-61, 97, 103-104, 142-146, 159	January 26, 2007
Battle Creek Allotment Final Evaluation and Determination	4-1 to 4-3, 4-11 to 4-12, 4-15 to 4-16, 4-18, 4-22, 4-25	June 8, 2007
Battle Creek Allotment Livestock Grazing Permit Renewal EA#ID-120-2007-3353	7-8, 10, 14, 16, 46, 54, 58-60, 62, 73-74, 99, 101-103, 107, 162	February 20, 2008
Bruneau Field Office Manager's Final Decisions for Battle Creek Allotment (decision record for EA#ID-120-2007-3353)	1-2, 5	February 20, 2008

[1]List applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action or documentation relevant to the proposed action (i.e., source drinking water assessment, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, rangeland health standard assessment and determination, or monitoring report).

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the new proposed action is the same as proposed in the EA #ID-120-2007-3353 except the new permit will be issued to new permittee and it will not cover Owens Allotment. Owens Allotment was separated from Battle Creek Allotment by a final decision dated February 20, 2008.

Yes, the grazing permit for Battle Creek Allotment 00802 is within the same analysis area of the Bruneau MFP (1983) and EA #ID-120-2007-3353.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. This proposal was analyzed in EA #ID-120-2007-3353. In addition, four (4) alternatives were analyzed that considered varying amounts of range improvements to meet S & G's.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (e.g., riparian proper functioning condition reports; rangeland health standards assessments; inventory and monitoring data; most recent USFWS lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the analyses presented in EA #ID-120-2007-3353 coincides with the conclusions currently reached for this action given changes to information and circumstances. In the period of time since the decision was signed for the EA #ID-120-2007-3353 (February 2008), sage-grouse were found warranted, but precluded from listing by higher priority listing decisions under ESA and designated a 'candidate' species (75 FR 13910; March 23, 2010). Bureau of Land Management Manual 6840 (2008) specifies that "Candidate species and their habitats are managed as Bureau sensitive species" (Glossary, p. 1) so the analysis in EA #ID-120-2007-3353 where sage-grouse were categorized as a Type 3 BLM Sensitive Species is consistent with the new designation for this species. Further guidance by Idaho BLM IM 2009-006 defers to the Conservation Plan for Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho (Idaho Sage-grouse Advisory Committee 2006) for livestock management relative to sage-grouse conservation and was followed in EA #ID-120-2007-3353. Given the planned completion of the Hutch Springs Exclosure and Spring Development in 2011and the minimal impacts to sage-grouse for projects that are still pending, sage-grouse were analyzed sufficiently under Alternative D in EA #ID-120-2007-3353.

The analysis of effects to upland vegetation from the proposed action in EA #ID-120-2007-3353 is adequate. The effects of the proposed action to upland vegetation are adequately documented in Alternative D of EA ID-120-2007-3353. Native plant communities would be

maintained over the life of the permit. New information would not substantially change the effects analysis for upland vegetation.

The existing analysis is adequate for addressing impacts to cultural resources in the Battle Creek Allotment.

The Bruneau River from the mouth of the Jarbidge River downstream to the Buckaroo Ditch diversion dam was designated as critical habitat for bull trout (75 FR 63898; October 18, 2010). Bull trout critical habitat could not be affected by activities in the Battle Creek Allotment because no streams flowing through or originating on the allotment drain into the Bruneau River, nor does the allotment border the Bruneau River. Fisheries data and other information gained since the decision date of the EA was reviewed, and nothing was found that would substantially affect the original analysis (D. Mays pers com).

There have been changes to special status plants rankings but the analysis of impacts is still current and appropriate. In the EA for Battle Creek Allotment (2008), Howell's one-flowered goldenweed (*Haploppapus* uniflorus var. *howellii*) is discussed as a Type 4 ranked species. This plant is now known as thinleaf goldenhead (*Pyrrocoma linearis*) and is ranked as Type 3. While taxonomy has been updated and the conservation concern increased, the evaluation of project impacts to this species remains unchanged. This species was expected to benefit from the planned Dry Creek Exclosure project and this assessment holds today based on our knowledge of this species.

Other wildlife, fish, and plant species were adequately analyzed in EA #ID-120-2007-3353 and meet NEPA adequacy for this permit issuance.

Annual Indicator Criteria (AIC) may be modified at any time by an IDT of resource specialists if monitoring indicates that a change is necessary to ensure that criteria are being effective in improving, maintaining, or helping to meet or make significant progress towards meeting Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health (ISRH) and LUP resource objectives.

Secretarial Order 3310- Protecting Wilderness Characteristics. Areas inventoried for wilderness characteristics are present in the Battle Creek Allotment but would not be affected by this proposal as no change to the timing, intensity, and/or duration of grazing from that currently permitted would occur under this transfer.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Yes, direct and indirect impacts and short and long-term impacts were adequately analyzed in EA #ID-120-2007-3353. They are of the same kind and magnitude as those being documented by current monitoring. Cumulative impacts of other land uses have been carefully considered in the EA #ID-120-2007-3353.

Yes, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts were adequately analyzed in EA #ID-120-2007-3353. They are of the same kind and magnitude as those being documented by current management and monitoring. Cumulative impacts of other land uses were carefully considered in EA #ID-120-2007-3353.

The direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts for fish species were adequately analyzed in the EA and are of the same type, timing, and magnitude as those that would occur under the new proposed action. The effects and impacts of the new proposal would include the same number of cattle and the same grazing strategies as originally analyzed. Federally listed fish species or their habitat is not present in the action area or downstream that could be affected by the allotment.

The analysis of effects to upland vegetation from the proposed action in EA #ID-120-2007-3353 is the same as the effect of implementing Alternative D as described in the EA. Native plant communities would be maintained over the life of the permit.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current Proposed Action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, interested publics; tribal governments; permittees and agencies participated in the scoping for the Battle Creek Allotment grazing permit renewal process. A detailed list and summary of public involvement is shown on page 2-4 of the final decision (decision record), dated February 20, 2008, for the Battle Creek Allotment permit renewal EA. The scoping process involved many meetings, tours and exchange of written comments involving the Final Rangeland Health Assessment for Battle Creek Allotment 00802 and EA #ID-120-2007-3353. Protests of the decision record (proposed decisions) for EA #ID-120-2007-3353 were considered prior to issuing the decision record (final decisions). Western Watershed Project (WWP) and Idaho Wildlife Federation (IWF) appealed the decision record (final decisions) however; they withdrew their administrative appeal and filed a broad region-wide federal district court lawsuit. This lawsuit may result in a future district court hearing. Nevertheless, there has not been an injunction filed in federal district court to prevent livestock grazing in Battle Creek Allotment, therefore the grazing permit can be issued to JR Simplot Company/ Battle Creek.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

See the proposed decision for a list of agencies, tribes and interested publics consulted.

BLM Staff

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Holly Beck	Botanist	Special status plants/BLM - BFO
Jon Beck	Planning & Environmental coordinator	NEPA/BLM
John Biar	Resource coordinator - range	Livestock grazing/BLM – Boise District Office
David Draheim	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation/BLM-BFO
Jon Haupt	Rangeland Management Specialist	Livestock grazing/BLM - BFO
Kavi Koleini	Ecologist	Upland Vegetation/BLM-BFO
David Mays	Fisheries Biologist	Fisheries/BLM-BFO
Lois Palmgren	Archeologist	Cultural resources/BLM-BFO
Bruce Schoelberl	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife/BLM-BFO

Note: Refer to the Bruneau Kuna EIS, Bruneau Kuna MFP and EA #ID-120-2007-3353 for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

F. Mitigation Measures:

List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures have been incorporated and implemented.

Mitigation measures that resulted from EA ID-120-2007-3353 have been implemented in Battle Creek Allotment. For example, range improvements such as Snow Creek Spring Exclosure Modification (2008) improved resource conditions at the Snow Creek Spring riparian area. Shoofly Gap Fence and Pasture 22 H fence removal has improved riparian conditions in the East Shoofly Creek, West Shoofly and Shoofly Creek. In 2011, the Hutch Springs complex riparian area will be protected from livestock grazing and will greatly improve the riparian area in the Hutch Springs area.

Mitigation is incorporated into the terms and conditions and/or Annual and Long Term Indicator Criteria (AIC). The livestock grazing rotation has been implemented that adheres to the AICs listed below. These AICs are being effective in helping to meet or make significant progress towards meeting Idaho Standards For Rangeland Health (ISRH) and Bruneau MFP resource objectives.

Annual Indicator Criteria for Uplands and Riparian Areas

1. Average utilization by livestock on key bunchgrass species measured at key areas:
   During the period of critical growth: not exceeding 40%.
   Outside the critical growth period: not exceeding 50%.
   The Modified Key Forage Plant Method will be used to determine utilization.

2. Less than or equal to 30% of new leaders on young willows (6 ft. or less in height) nipped by cattle, as measured at key areas, at the end of the growing season.

3. Annually, maintain a median of ≥ 6-inches of residual stubble height on herbaceous riparian vegetation on Shoofly and East Fork Shoofly Creek throughout the growing season.

4. Bank alteration on Shoofly and East Fork Shoofly Creek from trailing livestock would be limited to ≤ 15%.

Long-term Indicator Criteria (for Riparian Areas)

1. Increases in riparian plant cover, particularly late-seral sedges and willows, on streambanks as measured on riparian trend transects (Greenline transects; Burton et al. 2007, USDI 2007a – p.158, IDEQ 1992).

2. Increase in bank stability to ≥85% stable bank as measured on riparian trend transects (Greenline transects; Burton et al. 2007, USDI 2007a - p. 158, IDEQ 1992).

3. Decrease in Greenline-to-Greenline channel width (i.e. narrowing and deepening of the stream channel due to plant colonization and stabilization of streambanks; Burton et al. 2007).

Another mitigation measure is the 40% utilization limit during the critical growing season of upland vegetation and the 50% utilization limit after the critical growing season of upland vegetation. This will maintain and improve long term trend of upland plant vegetation. This meets Standard 4 and complies with Guidelines 1, 4, 8, 9, 12 and 14.

Finally, other mitigation measures are the Boise District range readiness standards. They protect soils (Standard 1) from mechanical damage from livestock and allow for the physiological needs of native perennial grasses to be met (Standard 4).

G. Conclusion (*If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.*)

X	Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

/s/ Jon Haupt — March 21, 2011
Preparer — Date

/s/ Jon Beck — March 21, 2011
NEPA Specialist — Date

/s/ Arnold L. Pike — March 21, 2011
Bruneau Field Manager — Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4100 and the program-specific regulations.