

**BLM IDAHO POST-FIRE RECOVERY PLAN  
EMERGENCY STABILIZATION AND BURNED AREA  
REHABILITATION**

**PLAN TEMPLATE 2010  
SOUTH INDIAN FIRE (G1MJ)**

**BLM Boise District Office**

**IDAHO STATE OFFICE**

**FIRE BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Fire Name	South Indian
Fire Number	G1MJ
District/Field Office	Boise District Office, Twin Falls District Office
Admin Number	LLIDB00000
State	IDAHO
County(s)	OWYHEE
Ignition Date/Cause	07/09/2012 Lightning
Date Contained	07/10/2012
Jurisdiction	<i>Acres</i>
State	2760
Private	617
BLM	10718
<b>Total Acres</b>	<b>14095</b>
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$164,000</b>
Costs to LF20000ES (2822)	\$148,000
Costs to LF32000BR (2881)	\$16,000

**Status of Plan Submission** (check one box below)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Initial Submission of Complete Plan
<input type="checkbox"/>	Updating or Revising the Initial Submission
<input type="checkbox"/>	Amendment

## **PART 1 - PLAN SUMMARY**

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON FIRE.**

The South Indian Fire burned approximately 14,095 acres, consisting of 10,718 acres of public land, 2,760 acres of state land (a portion of which lies in Bruneau Dunes State Park), and 617 of private land. The fire burned 7,476 acres (7,021 BLM acres) or 52% of the Browns Gulch Grazing Allotment, 1,845 acres (451 BLM acres) or 6% of the Bruneau Arm Grazing Allotment, 1,629 acres (993 BLM acres) or 26% of the Flat Iron Grazing Allotment, 579 acres (579 BLM acres) or less than 1% of the West Saylor Creek Grazing Allotment, and 172 acres (172 BLM acres) or less than 1% of the Bruneau Hill Grazing Allotment. Six hundred forty-four acres within the burned area is mapped as potential habitat for slickspot peppergrass (*Lepidium papilliferum*), a threatened plant species under the Endangered Species Act. Other special status species historically present include the Northern Leopard Frog (*Rana pipiens*), Trumpeter Swan (*Cygnus buccinator*), Longnose Snake (*Rhinocheilus lecontei*), Ferruginous Hawk (*Buteo regalis*), Bruneau Dunes Tiger Beetle (*Cicindela waynei*), Matted Cowpie Buckwheat (*Eriogonum shockleyi* var. *shockleyi*), and the Greeley's Wavewing (*Cymopterus acaulis* var. *greeleyorum* (Idaho Natural Heritage Program, February 2010).

The fire occurred within the Unwooded Alkaline Foothills Level IV Ecoregion of Idaho (McGrath et al. 2002). Ecoregions stratify the environment by its probable response to disturbance (Bryce et al. 1999), and are critical for structuring and implementing ecosystem management strategies across geographical areas (Omernik et al. 2000). The Unwooded Alkaline Foothills Ecoregion is characterized as having sandy alkaline soils with either a saltbush/greasewood or sagebrush overstory. Much of this ecoregion has been impacted by past wildfires with cheatgrass dominated sites and old crested wheatgrass seedings common.

The majority of the burned area is a Sandy Loam 8-12 inch ecological site (SSURGO, 2008) characterized by a Wyoming big sagebrush/indian ricegrass plant community. Pre-fire vegetation included cheatgrass dominated sites and old crested wheatgrass seedings with a cheatgrass understory. Remnant sagebrush, rabbitbrush, indian ricegrass, Sandberg's bluegrass, and Thurber's needlegrass plants were also present. Over 11,000 acres within the fire perimeter have previously burned at least once in the past with over half of the acres having burnt 3 or more times (101 acres burned seven times according to BLM records).

This fire occurred within the BLM Boise District Four Rivers Field Office - Morley Neson Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area however livestock grazing management on public lands is administered out of the BLM Twin Falls District Jarbidge Field Office.

### **LAND USE PLAN CONSISTENCY**

## **S5 - Noxious Weeds**

The applicable land use plans for the ES&BAR project area are the 1987 Jarbidge Resource Management Plan (RMP) and the 2008 Snake River Birds of Prey NCA RMP. The burned area is located in the Jarbidge RMP Multiple Use Areas (MUA)-5 (Snake River Birds of Prey) and MUA-6 (Saylor Creek West). The treatments outlined in this plan are also consistent with the treatments analyzed in the Boise District Office and Jarbidge Field Office Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) and Environmental Assessment (EA) #ID-090-2004-050.

The burned area contains 644 acres of potential habitat for slickspot peppergrass. On August 26, 2009, Idaho BLM signed a Conservation Agreement (CA) with the Idaho Fish and Wildlife Office of the Service. In this CA, BLM agreed to develop and implement activities that provide for the conservation and recovery of slickspot peppergrass. On September 16, 2009, BLM initiated consultation with the Service on existing land use plans. On November 30, 2009, the Service issued a Biological Opinion (LUP BO) which further recommended implementation of conservation measures contained within the CA, which was attached as an appendix to the BO.

In addition, programmatic conference reports were prepared in 2006 by the Boise District Office for Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment (144-2006-IC-0918) and Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (14420-2006-IC-0975) programmatic actions. These programmatic actions were developed to include all field offices in the Boise District, which, at that point in time, included the Jarbidge Field Office. These Conference Reports were confirmed December 15, 2009 (14420-2010-TA-0103).

The potential habitat in the burned area is broadly defined by soil type and elevation; inventories to determine if slickspots or slickspot peppergrass occurs in the burned area have not been performed. Since it is unknown if slickspots or slickspot peppergrass are located in the burned area, project design features that address conservation measures contained in the LUP BO and Conference Reports are included to: 1) allow rest from grazing to promote vegetation recovery, and 2) reduce the potential for introduction and spread of noxious weeds in the burned area. Specific programmatic conservation measures addressed in this plan are:

- 1) Implement Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ES&R) activities to consider slickspot peppergrass habitat rehabilitation (LUP BO, p. 84-85).
  - a. As needed, protect disturbed and recovering areas using temporary closures or other measures. BLM will continue to rest areas from land use activities to meet ES&R objectives, defined through the ES&R plans (LUP BO, p. 84, ES&R Conference Report p. 2).
  - 2) Although non-chemical methods will be the preferred approach in occupied habitat, when appropriate, projects involving the application of pesticides (including herbicides, fungicides, and other related chemicals) in slickspot peppergrass habitat and potential habitat that may affect the species will be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications will support conservation and minimize risks of exposure (LUP BO, p. 70-71).

- a. Apply appropriate spatial and temporal buffers to avoid species' exposure to harmful chemicals.
- b. Explore opportunities to eradicate competing nonnative invasive plants in occupied habitat where slickspots are being invaded by such plants.
- c. Implement appropriate revegetation and weed control measures to reduce risks of nonnative invasive plant infestations following ground/soil disturbing actions in slickspot peppergrass habitat.

The control of noxious weeds is consistent with the NCA RMP Upland Vegetation Objectives and Management Actions which state: "Treat approximately 4,000 acres for noxious weed infestations annually. Restored areas and special status plant habitats have priority for treatment" (NCA RMP, p. 2-10). The proposed noxious weed treatments address the Jarbidge RMP objectives to improve lands in poor ecological condition and maintain existing vegetative improvements (Jarbidge RMP, p. II-28, II-31). They also address Jarbidge RMP Resource Management Guidelines to control the spread of noxious weeds on public lands where possible, where economically feasible, and to the extent that funds are prioritized for that purpose (p. II-94). Weed control treatments would improve recovery of existing seedings by reducing noxious weed competition. Therefore, the proposed noxious weed treatments are in conformance to the NCA and Jarbidge RMPs. Treatments are also consistent with the treatments analyzed in the NFRP and Boise District and Jarbidge Field Offices Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment EA #ID-100-2005-EA-265 (Noxious Weed EA). Design features were included to address existing consultations for slickspot peppergrass. These include training of weed treatment staff for slickspot and slickspot peppergrass detection and implementation of treatment buffers should occupied slickspots be found.

### **S7 - Fence/Gate/Cattleguard**

The applicable land use plans for the ES&BAR project area are the 1987 Jarbidge Resource Management Plan (RMP) and the 2008 Snake River Birds of Prey NCA RMP. The burned area is located in the Jarbidge RMP Multiple Use Areas (MUA)-5 (Snake River Birds of Prey) and MUA-6 (Saylor Creek West). The treatments outlined in this plan are also consistent with the treatments analyzed in the Boise District Office and Jarbidge Field Office Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) and Environmental Assessment (EA) #ID-090-2004-050.

Existing pasture and allotment fences would be repaired to ensure that livestock remain within their area of authorized use and off the burned area until resource objectives are met. The NFRP states that gates, cattleguards, fences, and other control features would be repaired and/or constructed as needed to protect treatments during the recovery period or the seeding establishment period (NFRP, p. 17). The BLM ES&BAR Handbook allows for repair or reconstruction of existing BLM-approved fences, as well as temporary fence to protect new seedings and natural recovery areas (H-1742-1, p. 31). Therefore, the proposed treatment conforms to the NFRP and current BLM policy.

### **S12 - Closures (area, OHV, livestock)**

The applicable land use plans for the ES&BAR project area are the 1987 Jarbidge Resource

Management Plan (RMP) and the 2008 Snake River Birds of Prey NCA RMP. The burned area is located in the Jarbidge RMP Multiple Use Areas (MUA)-5 (Snake River Birds of Prey) and MUA-6 (Saylor Creek West). The treatments outlined in this plan are also consistent with the treatments analyzed in the Boise District Office and Jarbidge Field Office Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) and Environmental Assessment (EA) #ID-090-2004-050.

Livestock grazing closure is consistent with the NCA RMP Livestock Grazing Standard Operating Procedures which state: "Grazing management practices will be designed and scheduled to support vegetation management projects. Areas treated for restoration or rehabilitation purposes will be rested from livestock grazing for whatever time is necessary for adequate recovery and/or seedling establishment, up to ten (10) years" (NCA RMP, p. 2-17). The Jarbidge RMP (II-89) states under the Fire Management Section that "all grazing licenses issued that include areas recently burned and/or seeded will include a statement concerning the amount of rest needed in the seedings or burned area. Normally two years of rest will be necessary to protect these areas. This rested area may include remnant stands of desirable species that survived the fire." The NFRP states that livestock grazing would be deferred for at least two growing seasons, or until resource objectives are met, through the closure of pastures, resting whole allotments, or construction or reconstruction of protective fences as needed (NFRP, pp. 17, 19). The BLM ES&BAR Handbook (H-1732-1) states that livestock are to be excluded from burned areas until monitoring results, documented in writing, show ES&BAR objectives have been met (H-1742-1, p. 35). Closing the burned area would improve the potential natural recovery of existing seedings by eliminating livestock use of recovering plants. Livestock use would be resumed when ES&BAR objectives are met. Therefore, the proposed treatment conforms to the NCA and Jarbidge RMPs, NFRP, and current BLM policy.

As a result of a Memorandum Decision and Order by Chief Judge Winmill dated July 22, 2011, the Bruneau Hill Allotment is managed under an Interim Grazing Management Plan until the grazing permit renewal is complete. In addition, the Browns Gulch Allotment is managed under the interim grazing measures in the Stipulated Settlement Agreement ordered by Chief Judge Winmill on October 20, 2005, and modified on January 20, 2011.

### **S13 - Monitoring**

#### **R5 - Noxious Weeds**

The applicable land use plans for the ES&BAR project area are the 1987 Jarbidge Resource Management Plan (RMP) and the 2008 Snake River Birds of Prey NCA RMP. The burned area is located in the Jarbidge RMP Multiple Use Areas (MUA)-5 (Snake River Birds of Prey) and MUA-6 (Saylor Creek West). The treatments outlined in this plan are also consistent with the treatments analyzed in the Boise District Office and Jarbidge Field Office Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) and Environmental Assessment (EA) #ID-090-2004-050.

The burned area contains 644 acres of potential habitat for slickspot peppergrass. On August 26, 2009, Idaho BLM signed a Conservation Agreement (CA) with the Idaho Fish

and Wildlife Office of the Service. In this CA, BLM agreed to develop and implement activities that provide for the conservation and recovery of slickspot peppergrass. On September 16, 2009, BLM initiated consultation with the Service on existing land use plans. On November 30, 2009, the Service issued a Biological Opinion (LUP BO) which further recommended implementation of conservation measures contained within the CA, which was attached as an appendix to the BO.

In addition, programmatic conference reports were prepared in 2006 by the Boise District Office for Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment (144-2006-IC-0918) and Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (14420-2006-IC-0975) programmatic actions. These programmatic actions were developed to include all field offices in the Boise District, which, at that point in time, included the Jarbidge Field Office. These Conference Reports were confirmed December 15, 2009 (14420-2010-TA-0103).

The potential habitat in the burned area is broadly defined by soil type and elevation; inventories to determine if slickspots or slickspot peppergrass occurs in the burned area have not been performed. Since it is unknown if slickspots or slickspot peppergrass are located in the burned area, project design features that address conservation measures contained in the LUP BO and Conference Reports are included to: 1) allow rest from grazing to promote vegetation recovery, and 2) reduce the potential for introduction and spread of noxious weeds in the burned area. Specific programmatic conservation measures addressed in this plan are:

- 1) Implement Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ES&R) activities to consider slickspot peppergrass habitat rehabilitation (LUP BO, p. 84-85).
  - a. As needed, protect disturbed and recovering areas using temporary closures or other measures. BLM will continue to rest areas from land use activities to meet ES&R objectives, defined through the ES&R plans (LUP BO, p. 84, ES&R Conference Report p. 2).
  - 2) Although non-chemical methods will be the preferred approach in occupied habitat, when appropriate, projects involving the application of pesticides (including herbicides, fungicides, and other related chemicals) in slickspot peppergrass habitat and potential habitat that may affect the species will be analyzed at the project level and designed such that pesticide applications will support conservation and minimize risks of exposure (LUP BO, p. 70-71).
    - a. Apply appropriate spatial and temporal buffers to avoid species' exposure to harmful chemicals.
    - b. Explore opportunities to eradicate competing nonnative invasive plants in occupied habitat where slickspots are being invaded by such plants.
    - c. Implement appropriate revegetation and weed control measures to reduce risks of nonnative invasive plant infestations following ground/soil disturbing actions in slickspot peppergrass habitat.

The control of noxious weeds is consistent with the NCA RMP Upland Vegetation Objectives and Management Actions which state: "Treat approximately 4,000 acres for noxious weed infestations annually. Restored areas and special status plant habitats have priority for treatment" (NCA RMP, p. 2-10). The proposed noxious weed treatments address the Jarbidge RMP objectives to improve lands in poor ecological condition and maintain existing vegetative improvements (Jarbidge RMP, p. II-28, II-31). They also

address Jarbidge RMP Resource Management Guidelines to control the spread of noxious weeds on public lands where possible, where economically feasible, and to the extent that funds are prioritized for that purpose (p. II-94). Weed control treatments would improve recovery of existing seedings by reducing noxious weed competition. Therefore, the proposed noxious weed treatments are in conformance to the NCA and Jarbidge RMPs. Treatments are also consistent with the treatments analyzed in the NFRP and Boise District and Jarbidge Field Offices Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment EA #ID-100-2005-EA-265 (Noxious Weed EA). Design features were included to address existing consultations for slickspot peppergrass. These include training of weed treatment staff for slickspot and slickspot peppergrass detection and implementation of treatment buffers should occupied slickspots be found.

**COST SUMMARY TABLES**

**Emergency Stabilization (LF20000ES)**

Action/ Spec #	Planned Action	Unit (Acres, WMs, Number)	# Units	Unit Cost (If Appl.)	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	Totals by Spec.
S1	Planning (Project Management)				\$ 0	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$30,000
S2	Ground Seeding								
S3	Aerial Seeding								
S4	Seedling Planting								
S5	Noxious Weeds	Acres	150	\$ 60.00	\$ 0	\$9,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$9,000
S6	Soil Stabilization (Other than seedling, planting)								
S7	Fence/Gate/Cattleguard	Miles	30	\$2,033.33	\$ 0	\$61,000	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$61,000
S8	Road/Trail Water Diversion								
S9	Cultural Protection (Stabilization/Patrol)								
S10	Tree Hazard Removal								
S11	Facilities								
S12	Closures (area, OHV, livestock)								
S13	Monitoring	Acres	10,718	\$ 4.48	\$ 0	\$19,000	\$15,000	\$14,000	\$48,000
S14	Other Treatments								
	<b>TOTAL COSTS (LF20000ES)</b>				<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$99,000</b>	<b>\$25,000</b>	<b>\$24,000</b>	<b>\$148,000</b>
<b>OTHER FUND CODE TOTALS:</b>									
	TOTAL COSTS (???)								
	TOTAL COSTS (???)								
	TOTAL COSTS (???)								

**Burned Area Rehabilitation (LF32000BR)**

Action/ Spec #	Planned Action	Unit (Acres, WMs, Number)	# Units	Unit Cost (If Appl.)	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	Totals by Spec.
R1	Planning (Project Mgmt)								
R2	Ground Seeding								
R3	Aerial Seeding								
R4	Seedling Planting								
R5	Noxious Weeds	Acres	150	\$ 106.67	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$9,000	\$7,000	\$16,000
R6	Soil Stabilization (Other than seedling, planting)								
R7	Fence/Gate/Cattleguard								
R8	Road/Trail Water Diversion								
R9	Cultural Protection (Stabilization/Patrol)								
R10	Tree Hazard Removal								
R11	Facilities								
R12	Closures (area, OHV, livestock)								
R13	Monitoring								
R14	Additional Treatments								
	<b>TOTAL COSTS (LF32000BR)</b>				<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$9,000</b>	<b>\$7,000</b>	<b>\$16,000</b>
OTHER FUND CODE TOTALS:									
	TOTAL COSTS (???)								
	TOTAL COSTS (???)								
	TOTAL COSTS (???)								

## **PART 2 - POST-FIRE RECOVERY ISSUES**

### **EMERGENCY STABILIZATION ISSUES**

#### **1 - Human Life and Safety**

N/A

#### **2 - Soil/Water Stabilization**

#### **3 - Habitat for Federal/State Listed, Proposed, or Candidate Species**

N/A

#### **4 - Critical Heritage Resources**

N/A

#### **5 - Invasive Plants and Weeds**

Noxious weeds including rush skeletonweed and scotch thistle are known to occur within the fire's perimeter and perennial pepperweed can be found within a mile of the fire's boundary. Spot treatments are needed to avoid an increase in the number and vigor of these plants post-fire. Control of these weeds will aid native and past seeded vegetation recovery.

### **BURNED AREA RECOVERY ISSUES**

#### **1 - Lands Unlikely to Recover Naturally**

N/A

#### **2 - Weed Treatments**

Noxious weeds including rush skeletonweed and scotch thistle are known to occur within the fire's perimeter and perennial pepperweed can be found within a mile of the fire's boundary. Spot treatments in year two and three post-fire are needed to avoid an increase in the number and vigor of these plants. Control of these weeds will aid native and past seeded vegetation recovery.

#### **3 - Tree Planting**

N/A

#### **4 - Repair/Replace Fire Damage to Minor Facilities**

N/A

## **PART 3 - DESCRIPTION OF TREATMENTS**

### **Issue 2 - Soil/Water Stabilization**

#### ***S7 Fence/Gate/Cattleguard***

##### **A. Treatment/Activity Description**

The objective of this treatment is to repair or replace approximately 30 miles of allotment and/or pasture 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.

##### **B. How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?**

The wildfire damaged fences associated with the livestock management of the affected allotments. Reconstruction and repair of management fences damaged by the fire would maintain the future integrity of the existing livestock grazing system. Repair of damaged management fences would also help to manage vegetation recovery.

##### **C. Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?**

This treatment is reasonable and cost effective because it would utilize existing fences and gates while allowing unburned areas to be available to grazing. Damaged wood stretch points and corners would be replaced with galvanized steel pipe thus increasing the longevity of the structures and resistance to future wildfire damages.

#### ***S12 Closures (area, OHV, livestock)***

##### **A. Treatment/Activity Description**

The South Indian Fire burned area would be rested from livestock grazing until monitoring shows that ES&BAR objectives have been met. A temporary livestock closure on the Browns Gulch allotment would be achieved through the Annual Grazing Plan (AGP). In all other affected allotments, deferment of pasture use or controlling location of water and supplements away from the burned area would be accomplished through Grazing Agreements or an AGP. Each allotment would be checked periodically for compliance with the AGP or Grazing Agreement.

##### **B. How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?**

The purpose of this treatment is to rest the burned area from livestock grazing to provide the opportunity for recovery of on-site vegetation. Recovery and maintenance of on-site perennial plants would help to inhibit the expansion of annual invasive vegetation and noxious weeds and stabilize soil resources.

C. Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?

There are no costs associated with the livestock closure.

***S13 Monitoring***

A. Treatment/Activity Description

See Monitoring Section

B. How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?

C. Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?

**Issue 5 - Invasive Plants and Weeds**

***S5 Noxious Weeds***

A. Treatment/Activity Description

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 ES. Noxious weeds would be treated with the 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 Record of Decision includes a list of standard operating procedures that would be used for vegetation treatments using herbicides.

Design features for weed treatments:

Slickspot peppergrass potential habitat

- Weed treatment staff will be trained to identify slickspots and slickspot peppergrass.
- Should slickspots containing slickspot peppergrass (aka, occupied slickspots) be located within the burned area, weed treatment staff will notify the Four Rivers Field Office Botanist to map the population area.
- Within an element occurrence, herbicide application will use only hand sprayers. A 10-foot no-herbicide treatment buffer will be established around occupied slickspots. Within the buffer zone, weeds will be treated using hand-pulling or cutting and bagging.

B. How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?

Disturbance associated with the fire and fire suppression, including use of heavy equipment to create dozer lines, increases the potential for invasion and spread of noxious weeds due to vegetation removal and soil surface disturbance.

C. Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?

Inventory and treatment of new noxious weed populations is more cost-effective than waiting until the population has had opportunity to establish and spread. Field work would be combined with other noxious weed treatments for cost efficiency.

**Issue 2 - Weed Treatments**

***R5 Noxious Weeds***

A. Treatment/Activity Description

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 in the second and third years following the fire under BAR. Noxious weeds would be treated with the BLM-approved chemicals in accordance with the Noxious Weed EA and Vegetation Treatment EIS (See Treatment S5 above).

B. How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?

Disturbance associated with the fire and fire suppression, including use of heavy equipment to create dozer lines, increases the potential for invasion and spread of noxious weeds due to vegetation removal and soil surface disturbance.

C. Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?

Inventory and treatment of new noxious weed populations is more cost-effective than waiting until the population has had opportunity to establish and spread. Field work would be combined with other noxious weed treatments for cost efficiency.

## **PART 4 DETAILED TREATMENT COST TABLE**

## PART 5 - SEED LISTS

### DRILL SEED

Species	Scientific Name	% PLS	PLS Seeds / sq. ft.	PLS Seeds / ac.	Seeds / lb (bulk)	Total Seeds / Acre (Bulk)	Drill Seedings (Acre)	Lbs / Acre	Total Lbs.	Cost / Lb	Total Cost
TOTALS:			0	0	0	0		0.0		\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00

### AERIAL SEED

Species	Scientific Name	% PLS	PLS Seeds / sq. ft.	PLS Seeds / ac.	Seeds / lb (bulk)	Total Seeds / Acre (Bulk)	Aerial Seedings (Acre)	Lbs / Acre	Total Lbs.	Cost / Lb	Total Cost
TOTALS:			0	0	0	0		0.0		\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00

### SEEDLINGS

Seedling Species	Scientific Name	Acres of Seedlings planted.	# of Seedlings per Acre	Total # of Seedlings	Cost / Seedling	Total Cost
TOTALS:		0.0	0	0		\$ 0.00

## PART 6 - NATIVE/NON-NATIVE PLANT WORKSHEET

### **A. Proposed Native Plants in Seed Mixtures (Both ES & BAR Treatments)**

**1. Are the native plants proposed for seeding adapted to the ecological sites in the burned area?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

**2. Is seed or seedlings of native plants available in sufficient quantity for the proposed project?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

**3. Is the cost and/or quality of the native seed reasonable given the project size and approved field unit management and Plan objectives?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

**4. Will the native plants establish and survive given the environmental conditions and the current or future competition from other species in the seed mix or from exotic plants?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

**5. Will the existing or proposed land management practices (e.g. wildlife populations, recreation use, livestock, etc.) maintain the seeded native plants in the seed mixture when the burned area is re-opened?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

### **B. Proposed Non-native Plants in Seed Mixtures (Both ES & BAR Treatments)**

**1. Is the use of non-native plants necessary to meet objectives, e.g., consistent with applicable approved field unit management plans?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

**2. Will non-native plants meet the objective(s) for which they are planted without unacceptably diminishing diversity and disrupting ecological processes (nutrient cycling, water infiltration, energy flow, etc.) in the plant community?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

**3. Will non-native plants stay on the site they are seeded and not significantly displace or interbreed with native plants?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

**C. Proposed Seed Species - Native & Non-Natives (Both ES & BAR Treatments)**

**PART 7 - COST-RISK ANALYSIS**

**A. Probability of Treatments Successfully Meeting Objectives**

Action/ Spec #	Planned ES Action (LF2000ES)	Unit (acres, WMs, Number)	# Units	Total Cost	% Probability of Success
S5	Noxious Weeds	Acres	150	\$9,000.00	75%
S7	Fence/Gate/Cattleguard	Miles	30	\$61,000.00	100%
S13	Monitoring	Acres	10718	\$48,000.00	100%
				<b>\$118,000.00</b>	

Action/ Spec #	Planned BAR Action (LF3200BR)	Unit (acres, WMs, Number)	# Units	Total Cost	% Probability of Success
R5	Noxious Weeds	Acres	150	\$16,000.00	75%
				<b>\$16,000.00</b>	

**B. Cost Risk Summary**

1. Are the risks to natural resources and private property acceptable as a result of the fire if the following actions are taken?

Proposed Action Yes  No  Rationale for Answer:

Noxious weed treatments would reduce potential for expansion of noxious weeds in and adjacent to the burned area. Livestock closure and repair of burned fences would increase potential for vegetation recovery and, thus, the biological and physical stability of the burned area.

No Action Yes  No  Rationale for Answer:

: Failure to treat noxious weeds and rest the burned area would compromise vegetation recovery and reduce wildlife values and soil stability.

Alternative(s) Yes  No  Rationale for Answer:

N/A

2. Is the probability of success of the proposed action, alternatives or no action acceptable given their costs?

Proposed Action Yes  No  Rationale for Answer:

Monitoring and observations of weed treatments in similar locations indicate that success would be high. Normal climatic conditions and exclusion of livestock grazing would increase potential for vegetation recovery.

No Action Yes  No  Rationale for Answer:

The burned area and surrounding lands have high potential for expansion of noxious weeds. This potential would increase without treatment and recovery of on-site vegetation.

Alternative(s) Yes  No  Rationale for Answer:

N/A

3. Which approach will most cost-effectively and successfully attain the objectives and therefore is recommended for implementation from a Cost/Risk Analysis standpoint?

Proposed Action

Alternative(s)

No Action

Comments:

The money needed for fence repair, temporary livestock grazing allotment closure, and noxious weed control will be much less than both the monetary and ecological cost of doing nothing immediately post fire and then trying to replace lost soil and/or remove a major weed infestation later.

### C. Risk of Resource Value Loss or Damage

#### No Action - Treatments not Implemented

Resource Value	N/A	None	Low	Med	High
Unacceptable Loss of Topsoil					X
Weed Invasion					X
Unacceptable Loss of Vegetation Diversity				X	
Unacceptable Loss of Vegetation Structure				X	
Unacceptable Disruption of Ecological Processes					X
Off-site Sediment Damage to Private Property				X	
Off-site Threats to Human Life		X			
Other-loss of Access Road Due to Plugged Culverts	X				

#### Proposed Action - Treatments Successfully Implemented

Resource Value	N/A	None	Low	Med	High
Unacceptable Loss of Topsoil			X		
Weed Invasion			X		
Unacceptable Loss of Vegetation Diversity			X		
Unacceptable Loss of Vegetation Structure			X		
Unacceptable Disruption of Ecological Processes			X		
Off-site Sediment Damage to Private Property		X			
Off-site Threats to Human Life		X			
Other-loss of Access Road Due to Plugged Culverts	X				

## **PART 8 - MONITORING PLAN**

### **S5 - Noxious Weeds**

#### **Identify the objective of the treatment:**

Objective is to identify all existing and new infestations of noxious weeds. New infestations will be treated and objective is to eliminate them from the treatment area. Existing noxious weeds will be treated to contain the infestation and prevent it from expanding on site.

#### **Describe how implementation will be monitored:**

Implementation will be self-monitored by BLM noxious weed specialists conducting the inventory and work. Species identified, treatment and GPS location would be recorded.

#### **Describe how effectiveness will be monitored, how it will be measured, and within what time period:**

Effectiveness will be monitored by revisiting the treated sites 2013-2014 to evaluate mortality and inventory for additional weed populations

### **S7 - Fence/Gate/Cattleguard**

#### **Identify the objective of the treatment:**

The objective of this treatment is to repair or replace approximately 30 miles of allotment boundary and interior pasture 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 fences would be constructed to BLM fence standards for wildlife.

#### **Describe how implementation will be monitored:**

Implementation is monitored through contract administration. Any changes from the planned implementation would be documented in the project file.

#### **Describe how effectiveness will be monitored, how it will be measured, and within what time period:**

Repair or replacement of existing fence would be monitored through contract administration and documented in the project file. Work would be completed within the first year following the fire.

### **S12 - Closures (area, OHV, livestock)**

**Identify the objective of the treatment:**

Exclusion of livestock is critical for the recovery of burned vegetation. The burned area would be closed to promote recovery of existing seedings, consistent with the NFRP.

**Describe how implementation will be monitored:**

Resumption of livestock grazing would ultimately depend on monitoring and meeting of natural recovery objectives. The monitoring for grazing availability and recommendations for opening the burned area to livestock would be the responsibility of an interdisciplinary team. Implementation is monitored through rangeland management administration. Post-fire grazing agreements would be issued closing the burn area to livestock grazing.

**Describe how effectiveness will be monitored, how it will be measured, and within what time period:**

Natural recovery areas would be considered recovered and available for grazing when:

1) Recovered herbaceous vegetation is providing sufficient ground cover to protect the site from accelerated erosion and expansion/conversion to annual grasses and noxious weeds. The amount of bare mineral soil (lacking cover of plants, litter, or biological soil crust) is within 10% of what would be expected for early seral stages of the ecological sites found within the burned area. Recommended study methods include line-point intercept or step point cover methods and photo points.

2) A qualitative visual assessment of the following would also be considered:

- Plant vigor (perennial plants)
- Precipitation information during the non-growing (winter) and growing (spring through early summer) seasons
- Competition with invasive annual plants and noxious weed species
- Seed production

3) An evaluation of collected monitoring data is completed documenting that reintroducing grazing to the area would not cause a downward trend in vegetation recovery.

**S13 - Monitoring****Identify the objective of the treatment:****Describe how implementation will be monitored:****Describe how effectiveness will be monitored, how it will be measured, and within what time period:****R5 - Noxious Weeds**

**Identify the objective of the treatment:**

Objective is to identify all existing and new infestations of noxious weeds. New infestations will be treated and objective is to eliminate them from the treatment area. Existing noxious weeds will be treated to contain the infestation and prevent it from expanding on site.

**Describe how implementation will be monitored:**

Implementation will be self-monitored by BLM noxious weed specialists conducting the inventory and work. Species identified, treatment and GPS location would be recorded.

**Describe how effectiveness will be monitored, how it will be measured, and within what time period:**

Effectiveness will be monitored by revisiting the treated sites 2013-2014 to evaluate mortality and inventory for additional weed populations.

## **PART 9 - MAPS**

1. - G1MJ South Indian Fire Perimeter
2. - A - Plan Map Allotements LEPA Potential
3. - A - Plan Map S7 Fence Repair
4. - A - Plan Map S5\_R5 NoxiousWeeds
5. - A - Plan Map S12\_R12 Closures (Livestock)

## **PART 10 - REVIEW, APPROVALS, and PREPARERS**

### **TEAM MEMBERS**

<b>Position</b>	<b>Team Member (Agency/Office)</b>	<b>Initial</b>	<b>Date</b>
Team Leader	Sarah Heide (BLM Boise District Office)	Initialed	07/23/2012
Rangeland Mgt. Specialist	Dan Strickler (BLM Jarbidge Field Office)		
Fire Ecologist	Julie Hilty (BLM Twin Fall District Office)		
Rangeland Mgt. Specialist	Mike Barnum (BLM Four Rivers Field Office)		
Botanist	Mark Steiger (BLM Four Rivers Field Office)		
NEPA Compliance & Planning	Seth Flanigan (BLM Boise District Office)		
GIS Specialist	Alex Webb (BLM Boise District Office)		

### **PLAN APPROVAL**

The Agency Administrator is responsible for developing, implementing, and evaluating emergency stabilizations and rehabilitation plans, treatments and activities. 620 DM 3.5C

/s/ Patricia Roller - Birds of Prey NCA

7/25/2012

/s/ Brian Davis - Jarbidge Field Office

---

FIELD OFFICE MANAGER

DATE

### **FUNDING APPROVAL**

The funding of ES treatments is approved through the appropriate administrative approval level in coordination with the National Office Budget Shop. As funding is available, ES funding requested within a plan that totals below \$100,000 may be approved by the State Director, while ES funding of \$100,000 and above must be approved by the WO. If the ES funding cap is reached, all ES funding will be approved through the National Office in coordination with State ES&R Coordinators to determine highest priority projects. Funding

of all BAR treatments is accomplished through a scoring process and is dependent on accurate entries into NFPORS. All funding is approved and allocated on a year-by-year basis.