



**Bureau of Land Management**  
Boise District Office  
Four Rivers 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:** Four Rivers Field Office

**NEPA Log Number:** DOI-BLM-ID-B011-2011-0009-DNA

**Lease/Serial Case File No.:** N/A

**Proposed Action Title/Type:** Swan Falls Riparian Restoration and Fence Line Project

**Location/Legal of Proposed Action:**

T1S, R1W, Section 35 se/ne, ne/se, nw/se, sw/ne, and Section 36 sw/sw. Figures 1 and 2.

**Applicant (if any):** N/A

**Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:**

The proposed actions of this DNA tier to the original Proposed Action described in ID-090-00-58 – Snake River Birds of Prey – Swan Falls – Roadway Reconstruction and Rehabilitation project. Specifically, the Proposed Action (pages 2-4) identified the “elimination or rehabilitation of road/track that are creating erosion risks...” in addition, the Proposed Action states; “The blocking of roads and trails will stop motorized impacts that may be affecting cultural sites”. A map published in the original EA depicted the location and type of barriers; e.g. rocks. To date some of the actions used to reduce these impacts have been insufficient and soil and vegetation impacts are continuing. The following descriptions of the proposed actions below are designed to increase project success and more effectively eliminate these impacts.

Fencing – A 1.5 mile three-wire smooth fence (A) with an approximate 50’ from road center set-back would be placed along the Swan Falls road to control continued

unauthorized off-highway vehicle (OHV) use. Vehicles are causing accelerated damage to vegetation and associated wildlife habitat as well as increasing soil erosion in areas identified for habitat improvement and restoration. The fence will replace the rock barriers depicted on a map published as part of the original EA.

Pedestrian Trail Construction – All ancillary routes west of proposed fence line would be scarified and seeded (B). One 1.5 mile two track through the area would have one track scarified and seeded (C). The other track would be left for pedestrian, horseback, and mountain bike use. Approximately 475 feet of a trail would be delineated with gravel and would lead from the main parking area to the riparian area for access to the river (D).

Impact Area Re-contour – A less than 1 acre impact area would be scarified, rice straw wattles installed and road fill applied to depressions (E).

Vehicle Turn-Out area Designation and Stile Placement – Three stiles would be placed along the fence to allow pedestrian, horseback, and mountain bike access from and through already impacted areas. One stile would be placed at each end where parking already occurs (F and G). An impacted area that currently serves as the main access route from Shore Road would be delineated as a parking area. One stile would be installed at this parking area (H).

Seeding/Planting – Native plant seeds and container stock would be broadcast/planted on the areas impacted from unauthorized OHV use to facilitate re-establishment of vegetation (B, C and E).

**B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans**

<b>LUP/Document<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Sections/Pages</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>
Snake River Birds of Prey NCA RMP and ROD	Soil (page 2-7 and 2-8); Vegetation – Riparian and Water Quality (pages 2-11 and 2-12)	2008

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

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

**Fencing:** The placement of fencing to control OHV use, while not specifically mentioned in the Snake River Birds of Prey RMP, is consistent with several of the RMP Goals, Objectives, and Actions. The Soil Resources section (pages 2-7 and 2-8) contains the following objectives; Watersheds should have stable vegetative communities that provide for proper hydrologic function, nutrient cycling, energy flow, and soil stability. Soil productivity is maintained and enhanced. Accelerated soil erosion caused by human activities will be minimal. Within the Water Quality, Riparian and Wetlands Section (pages 2-11 and 2-12) the following Management Actions are; improve up to two miles of riparian/wetland habitat annually, and protect and restore all river, stream, and reservoir shorelines to maintain or enhance fisheries and aquatic-riparian habitat. In addition, as per the original Proposed Action (EA-ID-090-00-58), the blocking of roads and trails to stop motorized impacts was specifically addressed and a map depicting these barriers is in the original EA.

The additional actions; Pedestrian trail construction, impact area scarification and seeding/planting are similar to previously proposed actions in EA-ID-090-00-58, but have been modified to allow for greater resource protection. For-instance better vehicle turn-out area delineations, stile installation and pedestrian trails will re-enforce appropriate access points and access type. Scarification and planting of some native container stock will accelerate recovery of impacted areas.

**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).**

<b>NEPA/Other Related Documents</b>	<b>Sections/Pages</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>
Snake River Birds of Prey (Swan Falls) Roadway Reconstruction and Rehabilitation (ID-090-00-58)	Sect. 1.0 (Purpose & Need) page 1; Sect. 2.0 (Proposed Action and Alternatives); pages 2 and 4) Sect. 3.0 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) pages 3-6.	2008
Kuna Management Framework Plan.	Wildlife – Terrestrial and Aquatic Sections.	1983

**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?**

Yes. The Snake River Birds of Prey (Swan Falls) Roadway Reconstruction and Rehabilitation (ID-090-00-58) identified the actions and types of developments such as “blocking of roads and trails...” installation of signs and seeding as commonly used tools to achieve the objectives to protect and restore disturbed areas. The project area is specifically identified in the EA as an area to be improved or restored.

**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?**

Yes. The range of alternatives analyzed in the The Snake River Birds of Prey (Swan Falls) Roadway Reconstruction and Rehabilitation (ID-090-00-58) EA is appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given the existing environmental situation or circumstances. The range of alternatives analyzed in the EA considered all treatments except for a fence, vehicle-turn out areas, stile placement and installation of containerized plant stock. However, the fence, vehicle turn-out areas designations and stile placement act as augmentative treatments that are required to meet the original objectives identified in the EA. In addition, the use of containerized plant stock will also increase the ability to meet these objectives, by providing live, native plant material to augment the often less reliable success of plant recruitment via seed.

**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?**

Yes, The Snake River Birds of Prey (Swan Falls) Roadway Reconstruction and Rehabilitation (ID-090-00-58) EA analysis is adequate. There are no new circumstances that would be considered significant and the existing NEPA analysis is adequate. As per the specialist's reports no adverse impact to any special status or threatened and endangered species e.g. *Lepidium papilliferum* (slickspot peppergrass) or *Physa natricina* (Snake River Physa) would occur. The methodology and analytical approach used in the EA is appropriate because it addresses the implementation of treatment actions that can result in successful, cost

effective protection and restoration of the areas impacted by unauthorized OHV use. The additional treatments act as adaptive management follow-up treatments that are required to meet initially identified resource objectives.

**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, the direct, indirect effects of the currently proposed action are confined to the same project footprint as previously analyzed in the The Snake River Birds of Prey (Swan Falls) Roadway Reconstruction and Rehabilitation (ID-090-00-58) EA. In addition, no current or future projects are occurring, or are planned within the broader general geographical area, e.g. between Swan Falls Dam and Dedication Point. No additional cumulative impacts would occur as a result of this project.

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

Yes. Public review opportunities for this type and scope of project has been available through the planning and public scoping meetings for the following plans; Kuna Management Framework Plan 1983, The Snake River Birds of Prey NCA Management Plan (1995), and the Snake River Birds of Prey NCA RMP 2008.

**E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted**

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Jared Fluckiger	Recreation Planner	Recreation; VRM; ACEC;
Anne Halford	Restoration Ecologist	Restoration
Jill Holderman	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife; T&E Species
Mark Steiger and Amy Stillman	Botanists	Botany; T&E Species
Dean Shaw	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources
Jon Beck	NEPA Specialist	Planning & Environ. Coord.

Note: Refer to the EA for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

**F. Mitigation Measures:** 1) Fence construction - To avoid impacting intact biological crust and native vegetation structural and compositional components, fence wire should be strung using the adjacent road and not driving along the fence line with ATV equipment. All material and equipment can be easily staged along the road and carried directly to the fence line.

The current visual barrier that the existing greasewood shrubs provide, is essential in reinforcing the effectiveness of the fence to discourage access. By using the existing road to stage the fence construction, increased disturbance that would encourage weed invasion and impact existing vegetation barriers would be reduced.

2) Site and trail scarification. Due to the loose soil characteristics of the impacted area 4-6" should be the maximum depth of scarification and this should occur by either manually applying water to the site pre-scarification, or timing the scarification to immediately follow a rain event.

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

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/ Anne S. Halford 6/13/2011  
Preparer Date

/s/ Jon Beck 6/13/2011  
NEPA Specialist Date

/s/ Terry Humphrey 6/13/2011  
Four Rivers Field Office 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 4 and the program-specific regulations.