



**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

**NEPA Log Number:** DOI-BLM-ID-B010-2012-0040-DNA

**Lease/Serial Case File No.:**

**Proposed Action Title/Type:** Stout Fire (G1UM) ESR Plan

**Location/Legal of Proposed Action:** T02, 03S; R08, 09E multiple sections

**Applicant (if any):** N/A

**Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:**

*S2 Ground Seeding* - Approximately 2,938 acres of the burned area would be drill seeded with perennial grass species adapted to the ecological sites. The two species will be drill seeded in alternate seed carts in a three drill cart configuration. The Siberian wheatgrass will be in two out of three drills covering 2/3 of the seeding area at a rate of 15 bulk pounds (12.1 PLS pounds), which is 61.2 seeds per square foot. The Snake River wheatgrass will be in one out of the three drills covering 1/3 of the area at a rate of 15 bulk pounds (11.5 PLS pounds), which is 44.8 seed per square foot. The total seeds per square foot for ground and aerial seeding within the aerial strips is a maximum of 70.1 seeds per square foot. ESR Topic Guidelines are to limit seeding rates in combination to fewer than 80 seeds per square foot.

*S3 Aerial Seeding* - Approximately 3,000 acres will be broadcast seeded with sagebrush using aerial application methods. The seed will be applied in strips rather than covering the entire area, which will increase the amount of seed applied to treated areas across the burned area without increasing costs. The acres for the seed mix table have been adjusted to accurately calculate acres that will be seeded, rather than total acres. This treatment is necessary to re-establish suitable preliminary priority habitat for Greater sage-grouse and viable winter range for elk and deer.

*R3 Aerial Seeding* - Approximately 7841 acres will be broadcast seeded with sagebrush (mixes 2, 3) or forage kochia (mix 4) using aerial application methods. The seed will be

applied in strips rather than covering the entire area which will increase the amount of seed applied to treated areas across the burned area without increasing costs. The acres entered into the seed mix tables reflect actual acres seeded, not total acres covered, to for accurate calculations. This treatment is necessary to re-establish a viable winter range for elk and deer and suitable habitat for Greater sage-grouse. The forage kochia will be seeded in a 200 ft strip in the burned area along Highway 21 to provide long term protection to the ESR treatments from ignition starts off the highway.

*R4 Seedling Planting* - 50,000 seedlings (40K bitterbrush, 10K sagebrush) a year for three years will be planted in strategic locations in the burned area to provide multiple age classes of shrubs in the burned area. The locations for the antelope bitterbrush and Wyoming big sagebrush seedlings will provide connectivity of habitat between the widely distributed unburned islands inside the fire perimeter and to habitat outside the fire perimeter. The planting sites will be located in draws where bitterbrush grew naturally pre-fire to provide optimum potential for growth and success.

*S5/R5 Noxious Weeds* -Rush skeletonweed diffuse knapweed, scotch thistle, and perennial pepperweed have been documented in and adjacent to the burned area. Noxious weed inventory and spot herbicide treatment would occur during the first year following the fire within the burned area under ES. Noxious weeds would be treated with BLM approved chemicals in accordance with the Noxious Weed EA and 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 followed for vegetation treatments using herbicides.

*S7 Fence/Gate/Cattleguard* - Approximately 12 miles of allotment and pasture boundary fence burned in the fire and is in need of repair to restrict livestock from the burned area during recovery and seed establishment and provide soil stabilization.

*S12/R12 Closures (area, OHV, livestock)* - The burned areas will be closed to livestock use until resource objectives have been achieved. The closure will provide remaining perennial plants an opportunity to recover without added disturbance and seeded plants the opportunity to become established without livestock grazing or trampling. The combined use from wildlife and livestock during the recovery period would result in weakened plant vigor and possibly mortality.

The majority of the burned area will be closed to motorized recreational vehicles while the soil and vegetation recovers. This closure will be accomplished by a Federal Register Notice/Emergency Closure, signage, gate closures, and BLM and Idaho State Fish and Game law enforcement patrols to notify the public of the vehicle closure. Signs would be placed at access points along two-track road leading into and across the burned area. Increased patrols would occur during peak use periods of hunting and antler collecting with regular patrols

occurring throughout rest of year to monitor and enforce closure. Public access would still be allowed to foot traffic with access being through a turn style gate at lower main closure.

S13 *Monitoring* - Monitoring will be conducted on treatments and is described in detail in the Monitoring section of the plan.

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

<b>LUP/Document<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Sections/Pages</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>
1987 Jarbidge Resource Management Plan		March, 1987
1983 Kuna Management Framework Plan		March, 1983

<sup>1</sup>List 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 Jarbidge RMP and Kuna MFP. even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

- The 1987 Jarbidge RMP, Wildlife Management section, states “Wildlife habitat will be managed to maintain or increase wildlife numbers over the long term, and the total acres of unsatisfactory crucial habitat will be reduced over the long term.” Under the Resource Management Guidelines section the plan states, “Minimize soil erosion by maintaining good, perennial vegetation cover on all sites. Manage native perennial range to attain good ecological condition. Rehabilitated or manipulated sites are considered to be in good condition from a watershed standpoint when at least 75% (by weight) of the sites potential for production is composed of perennial vegetation”. The same section also states, “Protect and enhance endangered, threatened and sensitive species habitats in order to maintain or enhance existing and potential populations within the planning area”. It goes on to say, “Seed mixtures for range improvement projects and fire rehabilitation projects will include a mixture of grasses, forbs and shrubs that benefit sage grouse. Rehabilitation of areas, particularly large areas, that have a high potential for fires or have a high frequency of fires, will utilize irregular buffer strips with seed mixtures that are fire resistant and/or meet watershed protection, wildlife and riparian objectives. These buffer strips will receive first priority for seeding prior to reseeding rest of burned area”.
- The Kuna Management Framework Plan (KMFP) states under Watersheds, “...Manage all watersheds to achieve stable or moderate soil surface factor conditions and where feasible/economical, strive for maintaining or establishing good perennial vegetation cover.” Under Range Management, “...reduce invasion of less desirable species, improve range condition, and increase grazing capacity...” And under Wildlife-Terrestrial, “...Manage the adjacent vegetative cover to nesting birds of prey species to provide adequate food and cover for the birds’ major prey species.”

**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).**

<b>NEPA/Other Related Documents</b>	<b>Sections/Pages</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>
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 ( <a href="http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/more/veg_eis.html">http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/more/veg_eis.html</a> )	Record of Decision and Appendix B - Standard Operating Procedures	June, 2007
Boise District Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment EA	All	February 6, 2007
Idaho's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management	All	August 1997
Boise District and Jarbidge Field Office Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan EA	All	May 12, 2005

**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 were analyzed under the 2005 Boise District and Jarbidge Field Office Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment (NFESRP EA). These included; ground and aerial seeding, herbicide uses for noxious weed treatments, and livestock management actions. An interdisciplinary team review of this fire determined that the resource values, concerns, and rehabilitation needs are substantially similar to those discussed and approved in the NFESRP EA and best meet the vegetative, watershed, and soil objectives of this Plan and the Bruneau Framework Management Plan (MFP).

- 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. An alternative action to not implement ESR treatments, was considered but eliminated from detailed analysis because it was not consistent with BLM policy or the Purpose and Need

Statement of the EA. The No Action Alternative which would continue to use existing 1987/1988 NFESRP EAs was analyzed as an alternative to the Proposed Action. The overall objective of the Purposed and Need of the NFESRP EA 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 actions of the Stout ES&R plan are designed to accomplish that objective for the area burned by the Stout Fire (G1UM).

**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, especially the seeding of shrubs, will stabilize soils and protect habitat for the Greater sage-grouse by re-establishing the shrub-steppe plant community. The proposed treatments are covered under the Biological Assessment for the 2005 NFESRP EA, which addresses the proposed treatments; the subsequent Biological Opinion is in concurrence with the Assessment.

The livestock closure and motorized vehicle closure will minimize potential displacement impacts to wintering big game from remaining patches of suitable habitat within the burned area. All temporary fences will be constructed consistent with the NFESRP EA (p. 24) in big game habitat. The analysis in the NFESRP EA (p. 65) is valid.

Based on the new information gained during recent inventory and survey of the burn area, existing analysis from the NFESRP EA is adequate. The proposed actions within the treatment area and their effects to the above species were analyzed in the plan and found to be insignificant.

**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 drill seeding, aerial seeding, noxious weed treatment, and infrastructure repair. 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 EA 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**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Resource/Agency Represented</b>
Shoshone-Piute Tribes	Wings and Roots	Native American Nation

**Boise District Staff Consulted**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency Represented/Duty Station</b>
Kathi Kershaw	Fuels Botanist/Ecologist	BLM – Boise District
Robert Bennett	Operations	BLM – Boise District
Alex Webb	Operations	BLM – Boise District
Lara Hannon	Ecologist	BLM – Four Rivers Field Office
Mike Barnum	Rangeland Mgt. Specialist	BLM - Four Rivers Field Office
Mark Steiger	Botanist	BLM – Four Rivers Field Office
Joseph Weldon	Wildlife Biologist	BLM – Four Rivers Field Office
Seth Flanigan	NEPA 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/ Kathi Kershaw  
Kathi Kershaw  
Preparer

09/28/2012  
Date

/s/ Seth Flanigan  
Seth Flanigan  
NEPA Specialist

10/1/2012  
Date

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

9/28/2012  
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.