

Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Humboldt River Field Office, LLNVW01000

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2012-0022-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: GHP9

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE : Revision of the Big Antelope Rehabilitation Plan

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Chimney Reservoir/Dry Hills North USGS 24K Quad
T. 40 N., R. 43 E., secs. 05, 08, 17, 20, 29, 32

APPLICANT (if any): Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

A. Description of the Proposed Action with attached map(s) and any applicable mitigation measures.

Big Antelope Fire:

The Big Antelope fire was ignited during an unpredicted lightning event on the flats within Eden Valley in the summer of 2011; it quickly spread into the drainages throughout the northern tip of the Osgood range. The entire fire was within year-round and summer pronghorn habitat as well as a mule deer use area.

The Big Antelope Fire, China Garden Fire, Eden Valley Fire, and Host Springs Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (DNA DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2012-0002-DNA) (Decision Record November 10, 2011) (Big Antelope Fire Rehab Plan) approved the implementation of the following treatments for the Big Antelope fire area:

- Aerially seeding 1,026 acres of burned drainages with Wyoming big sagebrush and Forage kochia;
- Wild horse relocation from Osgood Mountain Herd Area to the Snowstorm Mountain Herd Management Area;
- Grazing closure for Bullhead, Hot Springs Peak, Scott Springs, and Osgood Allotments;
- Construction of 5 miles of temporary fence along the northeast and eastern boundary of the burned area within the Hot springs Peak Allotment and construct one mile of fence along the southeastern border of the fire within the Scott Springs Allotment;
- Reparation of 3 miles of fire-damaged perimeter fence within affected allotments;
- Class III cultural inventory on areas where ground disturbance is proposed and avoid cultural resources;
- Noxious weed inventory and treatment of infestations with BLM approved herbicides as appropriate and monitor for full implementation and effectiveness success.

Proposed Treatments:

The BLM is proposing to increase the length of the fence implemented through the Big Antelope Fire Rehab Plan by constructing 5.39 miles of temporary fence along the eastern boundary of the fire (see map area). Three gates would be constructed along the route to provide access on two-track roads.

Project dimensions (length, width, height, depth): Total 5.39 miles long x 5' off of the existing road bed.

The fence specifications would be as follows:

3-strand barbed wire temporary fence;

Type of top wire: 12.5 gauged barbed

Type of intermediate wire: 12.5 gauged barbed

Type of bottom wire: 12.5 gauged barbless

5'6" t-posts would be installed every 20 feet and pounded into the ground approximately 1'6"

EZ-panels (temporary H-braces) would be installed every .25 mile or at any point where the fence has a corner.

Gates: gates would be temporary barbed wire with potential to open 12-14' wide based on the width of the road (coordinates provided on the map).

The BLM would monitor water availability on a weekly basis to ensure other water sources remain available for Wild Horses. This weekly monitoring would need to occur until all temporary fences associated with this rehabilitation plan are removed.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Paradise-Denio Management Framework Plan (MFP)

Date Approved: 1982

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

Paradise-Denio MFP (1982)

Wildlife MFP Decisions WL-1.21 P.D.: Maintain and improve habitat for sensitive, protected, threatened and endangered species listed on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Endangered and Threatened List, BLM-Nevada Department of Wildlife Sensitive Species List and those existing Federal and state laws and regulations.

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 (objective, terms, and conditions):

Paradise-Denio MFP (1982)

Although not specifically addressed, weed treatments conform to wildlife, range, and watershed objectives (WLA 1.12, RM2.1), which includes improving and maintaining habitat quantity, quality, diversity, and production by artificial methods when appropriate.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

- **Vegetation Treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States Environmental Impact Statement, Record of Decision 1991.**
- **Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment EA# NV-020-04-21, Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact 8/19/04.**

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).

Biological Assessment for the Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan (August 2004)

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA documents(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 Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan EA NV-020-04-21 (DR/FONSI 8/19/04), addresses the proposed treatments including installation of temporary fencing.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents are appropriate with respect to the current proposed action and current environmental concerns, interests, resource values and circumstances.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The existing analysis is adequate and there is no new information or circumstances known at this time.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes the analytical approach used in the existing NEPA documents continues to be appropriate for the current proposed action.

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, public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents are adequate. In addition, there has been coordination with Nevada

Department of Wildlife, and livestock grazing permittees.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

The BLM coordinated with the Nevada Department of Wildlife on the planned treatments.

Name	Title	Resource Represented	Signature/Date	Comments
Allie Henson	ES&R, Weeds & Forestry Lead (detail)	ES&R & Weeds	\\ [Allie Henson] 3/13/2012	
Amanda DeForest	Assistant Field Manager Natural Resources	Wildlife, Special Status Species, T&E Species	\\ [A. Deforest] 3/6/2012	
Calvin Jennings	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources/Paleontological Resources	\\ [Calvin Jennings] 3/13/2012	
Mark Hall	Archaeologist	Native American/Religious Concerns	\\ [Mark E. Hall] 3/19/2012	None
Zach Reichold	Wild Horse and Burro Specialist	Wild Horse and Burro	\\ [A. Deforest] 3/16/2012	Water needs to be monitored on a weekly basis for W. H.
Wes Barry	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range	\\ [Wes A. Barry] 3/14/2012	
Derek Messmer	Supervisory Vegetation Management Specialist	Fire management/Project Lead	\\ [Derek Messmer] 3/19/2012	
Kristine Struck		LWC	\\ [Kristine Struck] 3/5/2012	
Zwaantje Rorex	NEPA Coordinator	NEPA Coordination	\\ [Zwaantje Rorex] 3/22/2012	
Julie Mckinnon	Realty Specialist	Realty	\\ [Julie McKinnon] 3/15/2012	

Conclusion *(If you found that one or more of these criteria are not met, you will not be able to make the following conclusion)*

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 the BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.

\s\ [Allie Henson]
Signature of Project Lead

\s\ [Zwaantje Rorex]
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

\s\ [Michael Truden]
Signature of the Responsible Official Date