

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

---

**OFFICE** Humboldt River Field Office, Winnemucca District Office

**TRACKING NUMBER:** DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2012-0015-DNA

**CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER:** 7000

**PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE :** A Systems Approach to Seedling Establishment on Degraded Rangeland: Managing ecological processes driving recruitment bottlenecks./USDA-NIFA funded Rangeland Research program on seedling establishment (NIFA Award 2011-38415-31158)

**LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:**

National Canyon T. 46 N., R. 38 E., sec. 15, SE 1/4 NW 1/4  
Orovada T. 42 N., R. 37 E., sec. 02, SE 1/4 SW 1/4  
Paradise T. 40 N., R. 39 E., sec. 17, SE 1/4 SE 1/4  
Four Corners T. 33 N., R. 38 E., sec. 22, SW 1/4 SW 1/4  
Rose Creek a T. 35 N., R. 36 E., sec. 32, SW 1/4 SE 1/4  
Rose Creek b T. 35 N., R. 36 E., sec. 06, SW 1/4 SE 1/4

**APPLICANT :** Dr. Jeremy James, Research Ecologist, Eastern Oregon Agricultural Research Center, Burns, OR

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

Project Description:

The broad objective of this work is to evaluate seeding success along precipitation and soil texture gradients in the Great Basin.

Sites:

We have identified 5 key sites in the Winnemucca District distributed over precipitation and soil gradients that would be ideal for this project. All sites have experienced previous disturbance, principally wildfire, and are now dominated by cheatgrass with little native shrub or grass existing.

Site design and seeding preparation:

Each site would be a 150 x 150 m (492.1ft. X 492.1ft) plot. A wire enclosure fence would be constructed around the plot perimeter incorporating 3 strands barbed wire for the top and one smooth wire for the bottom (Antelope safe), strung at 1 foot increments

above the ground. Wood corner posts and supports would be buried 2-3 feet deep on the four corners and t-posts used to support wire between corners.

In spring 2012 during active cheatgrass growth Glyphosate would be sprayed on half of the plot to kill cheatgrass. Glyphosate would be used in accordance with the label directions and in compliance with Nevada/Oregon/Washington BLM herbicide policies. Prior to seeding in fall 2012, seedbeds would be lightly tilled to a depth of 2" and the seedbed firmed with a roller as recommended by standard rangeland planting guides. In fall 2012 plots would be seeded with a Great Plains grain drill with furrow depth set at ½ inch.

#### Seeding

Four species would be seeded in monoculture in fall 2012. These are crested wheatgrass (Hycrest II), bluebunch wheatgrass, bottlebrush Squirreltail and Sandberg's bluegrass.

#### Measurements

We would measure seedling emergence and persistence starting spring 2013 and continuing through three years. We would measure soil moisture and temperature using data loggers and also install a tipping bucket rain gauge to measure actual precipitation at each site. Loggers would be powered with solar panels (2 x 3 feet) placed 2 feet above the ground.

### **B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance**

LUP Name\*\_\_ **Paradise-Denio Management Framework Plan (P-D MFP) Date Approved\_\_1982.**

Other document\_ **Winnemucca Field Office Fire Management Plan (FMP, 2004), Non-Fire Fuels Treatment Objectives and Strategies \_Date Approved\_\_2004\_\_\_\_\_**

P-D MFP:

The proposed action is in conformance with the P-D MFP, because it is specifically provided for in the following District Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) located at P-D MFP, Appendix I:

SOP .45 Soil -Water-Air #2 states: "Consider rehabilitating areas which have had protective vegetative cover destroyed by wildfire, flood, or mechanical disturbance. For wildfires, treatment should be initiated on the ground Within 90 days of the fire. For others, action should begin as soon as possible after the event. utilize seeding and other watershed stabilization techniques as required. Seed mixture should include native perennial grasses and/or exotic species which have previously been introduced into the ecosystem. Rehabilitation must be protected from grazing until adequate seedling establishment has been attained. A minimum of two years is normally required for seedling establishment."

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): NA

FMP, 2004:

1. “Break up monocultures through the use of chemical, biological, and/or mechanical means to stop the spread of the affected area especially in areas that border important habitats.”
2. “Seed areas with perennial grass species to reduce the dominance of cheatgrass... Non-fire fuels treatments would be utilized to achieve resource goals and objectives based on site-specific habitat conditions”

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

List by name, number and date (DR/FONSI or ROD) all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

**Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in Seventeen Western States Programmatic EIS, ROD September 2007.**

**Winnemucca Field Office Integrated Weed Management EA # NV-020-02-06-EA-15, DR/FONSI August 2002.**

**BLM, Winnemucca District, Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan, EA #NV-020-04-21, DR/FONSI August, 2004.**

**Santa Rosa Fuelbreak Project EA # DIO-BLM-NV-WO10-2010-0003-EA, First DR/FONSI February 2010, Second DR/FONSI May 2010.**

**Paradise Fuelbreak Maintenance EA # DOI-BLM-NV-WO10-2010-0009-EA, DR/FONSI July 2010.**

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).

**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)?**

Yes, the proposed action is essentially similar to those analyzed in the above listed NEPA documents.

**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)?**

The geographic and resource conditions are sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the above existing documents.

**If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

No substantial differences in locations or actions, that are substantial, are apparent.

**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?**

Yes, current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values are sufficiently similar to those analyzed in existing NEPA documents.

**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)?**

Yes, existing analysis is valid, given no new information or circumstances concerning this and similar actions has come forward.

**Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

Yes, given the type of action proposed at the locations identified one could reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action.

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

Yes, the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action would be similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents listed above.

**5. Are the public involvement and interagency reviews associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?**

Yes, adequate public involvement and interagency review has taken place with the above listed existing NEPA documents.