



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, Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-ID-B011-2012-0020-DNA

Lease/Serial Case File No.: G1MJ

Proposed Action Title/Type: South Indian (G1MJ) ESR Plan

Location/Legal of Proposed Action: T.6S, R.6E; T.6S, R.7E Multiple sections

Applicant (if any): N/A

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

- **Fence Repair.** The objective of this treatment is to repair or replace approximately 30 miles of allotment boundary fence damaged or destroyed by the fire. Damaged wood corners and braces would be replaced with galvanized steel posts. Damaged wire would also be repaired. The management fences would be constructed to BLM fence standards for wildlife.
- **Livestock Allotment Closure.** The South Indian Fire burned area would be rested from livestock grazing until monitoring shows that ES&BAR objectives have been met. Livestock closure would be achieved with a grazing decision to temporarily close the Browns Gulch Allotment and by deferment of pasture use or controlling location of water and supplements with periodic compliance checks for all other affected allotments.
- **Noxious Weeds.** Rush skeletonweed and scotch thistle are known to occur within the burned area boundary. These and other noxious weeds have high potential for establishment in the burned area. Noxious weed inventory and spot herbicide treatment would occur the first year following the fire within the burned area under the Emergency Stabilization program and the second and third year under the Burned Area Rehabilitation program. Noxious weeds would be treated with BLM-approved chemicals in accordance with the Noxious Weed EA and the Record of Decision for Vegetation Treatments Using

Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States, approved September 29, 2007(Vegetation Treatment EIS). Appendix B of the Vegetation Treatment EIS Record of Decision includes a list of standard operating procedures that would be used for vegetation treatments using herbicides.

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

LUP/Document¹	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area RMP	Section 2.5 page 2-8 Section 2.6 page 2-9 Section 2.18 page 2-28	February 2008
Jarbridge RMP	Resource Management Guidelines page II-88	March 1987
Boise District Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan	All	2005

¹List 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 Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area RMP because it is specifically provided for in the following decisions:

These proposed activities meet the following RMP objectives and management actions:

- Watersheds have stable vegetation communities that provide for proper hydrologic function, nutrient cycling, energy flow, and soil stability (Soil Resources Section 2.5 page 2-8);
- Limit further loss of existing native shrub habitat to no more than 30,000 acres and increase the acres of restored shrub habitat (Upland Vegetation Section 2.6 page 2-9);
- Evaluate all burned areas for emergency stabilization and rehabilitation with the goal of restoring shrub and perennial grass communities (Wildland Fire Ecology and Management Section 2.18 page 2-28).

The proposed treatments in the ESR plans conform to the 2008 Snake River Birds of Prey NCA Resource Management Plan. The interdisciplinary team developed objectives and treatments which respond to the identified issues and concerns. The BLM will evaluate the plan based on the success or failure in meeting these objectives.

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
Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) and the Vegetation Treatments on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Report	All	June, 2007
Boise District Noxious and invasive Weed Treatment EA	All	Feb 6, 2007
Idaho's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management	All	August 1997
USFWS/BLM Conservation Agreement for Slickspot Peppergrass (<i>Lepidium papilliferum</i>)	All	August, 2009
USFWS/BLM Candidate Conservation Agreement for Slickspot Peppergrass (<i>Lepidium papilliferum</i>)	All	December, 2003

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, a range of proposed actions was analyzed under the Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment (NFESRP EA) for the Boise District BLM. These included ground and aerial seeding, herbicide uses for noxious weed treatments, and livestock management actions. An interdisciplinary team review of this fire has determined that the resource values, concerns, and rehabilitation needs are substantially similar to those discussed and approved in the Boise District NFESRP of May 2005 and best meet the vegetative, watershed, and soil objectives of the Plan and the Snake River Birds of Prey NCA RMP.

- 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 NFESRP EA is appropriate for this action. Two alternatives to the proposed action were analyzed in the EA (p. 8-30). They included an alternative that would not implement ESR treatments; however, this was eliminated from

detailed analysis because it was not consistent with BLM policy and the No Action Alternative, which would continue to use existing 1987/1988 NFESRP's. The overall objective of the EA's Proposed Action is to stabilize and return a burned site to its previous native and/or seeded condition in the shortest time frame to enhance and protect the watershed, soil, wildlife habitat, and livestock forage values of the area. The proposed activities in the South Indian ESR Plan are designed to accomplish that objective for the area burned by the South Indian Fire (G1MJ).

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 proposed treatments in the South Indian ESR Plan are within the scope of environmental analysis completed for the Boise District NFESRP and associated Biological Assessment and USFWS concurrence letter, and 2009 Conservation Agreement (CA) for slickspot peppergrass.

Based on the new information gained during recent inventory and survey of the burn area, existing analysis from the NFESRP is adequate. The proposed activities included for emergency stabilization and rehabilitation of the South Indian Fire were analyzed in the Plan, and not found to be significant.

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 analyses of the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action remain unchanged from those outlined in the existing NEPA document. The impacts outlined in the document directly correlate to those impacts expected from the current proposed actions of noxious weed treatment, infrastructure repair, and livestock grazing closure. The direct and indirect impact analysis does not analyze the impacts of the fire and the resulting loss of habitat, which is outside the scope of the document. The NFESRP EA analyzes site specific impacts to resources such as vegetation, wildlife, soils, and sensitive species as a result of the proposed treatments outlined in the ES and BAR plans. All specific design features outlined in the NFESRP will be followed during implementation of the emergency stabilization and rehabilitation treatments.

The cumulative impacts analyzed in the existing NEPA document are adequate with the addition of the proposed action. Special status and non-status plants and animals would be

protected by the general and species specific design features, and would benefit from a return to more natural fire cycles and improved ecosystem function including better habitat/population connectivity, migratory corridors, habitat structure, forage and suitability.

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

Yes, The public involvement and interagency review of the existing NEPA document is adequate for the current proposed action. The EA states on page 77 that “scoping letters informing the public of the purpose and need for action were sent to 1,077 interested publics including organizations, and federal and state agencies in October, 2003”. The general publics and other agencies included interest from ranchers, academia, conservation groups, Tribal governments, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, and ESA consultation with the USFWS.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Barbara Chaney	Biologist	US Fish and Wildlife Service
County Commissioners	Local Policymakers	Owyhee County
Shoshone Piute Tribes	Wings and Roots	Native American Nation

South Indian Fire ESR Plan Staff

Name	Title	Agency Represented/Duty Station
Sarah Heide	Fuels Specialist	BLM – Boise District
Cindy Fritz	Operations	BLM – Boise District
Julie Hilty	Fire Ecologist	BLM – Twin Falls District
Dan Strickler	Rangeland Mgt. Specialist	BLM - Jarbidge Field Office
Mike Barnum	Rangeland Mgt. Specialist	BLM – Four Rivers Field Office
Mark Steiger	Botanist	BLM – Four Rivers Field Office
Seth Flanigan	NEPA Specialist	BLM – Boise District
Alex Webb	GIS Specialist	BLM – Boise District

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: 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.

No mitigation measures have been identified.

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/ Sarah C. Heide
Preparer

9/20/2012
Date

/s/ Seth Flanigan
NEPA Specialist

9/21/2012
Date

/s/ Patricia Roller
NCA Field Manager

9/21/2012
Date

/s/ Brian Davis
Jarbidge Field Manager

9/21/12
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.