

United States Department of the Interior
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Boise District Office
3948 Development Avenue
Boise, Idaho 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-B010-2012-0010-DNA

Lease/Serial Case File No.: IDI-23085-01

Proposed Action Title/Type: Idaho City R&PP Lease Renewal for Rupert Thorne Park

Location/Legal of Proposed Action: Inside city limits of Idaho City, Boise County, Idaho.
Legal description:

Boise Meridian
T. 6 N., R. 5 E.,
sec. 26.

Applicant (if any): Idaho City

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

Idaho City has applied for a renewal of their Recreation and Public Purpose (R&PP) lease. The proposed action would re-authorize a 0.4-acre site for the continued use of a triangular sliver of land with dimensions of approximately 561 ft. x 565 ft. x 64 ft. The length of the proposed application would be for a 25-year term with the possibility of renewing the lease upon expiration. R&PP leases are subject to 43 CFR 2740 regulations and BLM personnel would also perform compliance inspections to ensure the lease is utilized for the intended purpose.

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

LUP/Document	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Cascade Resource Management Plan	Lands, p. 39	July, 1988

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP as quoted below:

“Public lands that are to be retained in federal ownership may be considered for Recreation and Public Purposes needs...”

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	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
EA No. 01-97-135	All	12/16/1986

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?**

The proposed renewal of this R&PP lease is a continuation of the existing action analyzed in the original EA. The site has already been completely developed as a portion of the Rupert Thorne City Park which has been completely transformed from its original natural condition.

- 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 ranges of alternatives analyzed within the existing EA were appropriate to the proposed action in consideration of the current environmental concerns, interests, etc. Resource surveys performed previously are still adequate considering the current environmental factors, etc.

- 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?**

It is reasonable to conclude that there is no new information or circumstances for the continued use of this 0.4-acre parcel of land as a city park. Therefore, there would be no new environmental factors to analyze when compared to the original EA.

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, indirect, and cumulative impacts from the proposed action would be identical to those analyzed in the original EA. The major direct impacts have already taken place during the original development of the site decades ago. The indirect effects of the renewal would be the continued existence of this portion of land being utilized as a portion of the Rupert Thorne City Park which people use and see on a daily basis. There are no cumulative effects to consider since no new impacts are proposed.

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

Yes, see BLM District and Field Office staff comments (below).

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Seth Flanigan	NEPA Specialist	BLM Boise District
Jeremy Bluma	Realty Specialist	BLM Boise District
Terry Humphrey	Field Manager	BLM Four Rivers Field Office

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

F. Mitigation Measures:

The original R&PP grant stipulated that Idaho City would comply with Federal and State laws and regulations concerning the use of pesticides and that the grantee will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as well as all conditions of the Recreation and Public Purpose Act of 1954, as amended.

These measures would be carried into the current permit renewal. If further measures would be required in the future to mitigate unforeseen environmental concerns, BLM has the authority to amend the standard stipulations as needed.

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 constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

/s/ *Jeremy P. Bluma*
Preparer

05/23/2012
Date

/s/ *Terry A. Humphrey*
Four Rivers Field Manager

05/23/2012
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.