



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-B010-2012-0042-DNA

Lease/Serial Case File No.:

Proposed Action Title/Type: Hollow Fire #G3ZW ES&R Plan

Location/Legal of Proposed Action: T5N. R1W., T6N. R1W., various sections

Applicant (if any):

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

Fence Repair - Approximately 9 miles of allotment/pasture boundary fence damaged or destroyed by the fire would be repaired. 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 Hollow 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 Lower Cruickshank pasture of the Little Emmett allotment and by controlling location of water and supplements with periodic compliance checks for all other affected allotments/pastures.

Noxious Weeds - Rush skeletonweed, whitetop, and perennial pepperweed are known to occur within and adjacent to the burned area boundary. Noxious weed inventory and spot herbicide treatment would occur for three years following the fire within the burned area. 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).

Facilities - Approximately 20 carsonite posts with signs marking Goodale's Cutoff historical trail would be replaced.

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

LUP/Document¹	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Cascade Resource Management Plan (RMP)	Fire Management, Rehabilitation, Greenstripping and Reduction Actions/Procedures	1987

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 LUP and is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

The 1987 Cascade RMP, Fire Management, Rehabilitation, Greenstripping and Reduction Actions/Procedures, (3.) states “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 enable recovery of these areas.” The construction of protective fencing, although not addressed in the 1987 Cascade RMP, is consistent with RMP Objectives and Actions.

Under Objectives for Vegetative Resources, the RMP also states; “Protect candidate or sensitive plants”, and Actions for this Objective include; “Develop and implement management actions for areas found containing candidate or sensitive plants. Fence selected areas where harmful disturbance is likely. Monitor suspected areas”.

The control of noxious weeds is consistent with Cascade RMP, Resource Management Guidelines, Weeds (Control of Noxious), “BLM districts will work with respective County governments to monitor the location and spread of noxious weeds and to maintain up-to-date inventory records.” BLM will 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.” The control of noxious weeds is in compliance with State and county laws.

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
Boise District Office Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment (EA) # ID-090-2004-050	All	May 12, 2005

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
Programmatic Biological Assessment and Addendum for the Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan for Boise District and Jarbidge Field Office of the Twin Falls District – Ada, Adams, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, Owyhee, Payette, Twin Falls, Valley, and Washington Counties, Idaho	All	July 13, 2006
Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment Program Biological Assessment and Addendum for Boise District and Jarbidge Field Office of the Twin Falls District – Ada, Adams, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, Owyhee, Payette, Twin Falls, Valley, and Washington Counties, Idaho	All	August 17, 2005
Conservation Agreement for Slickspot Peppergrass (<i>Lepidium papilliferum</i>)	All	August 27, 2009
Candidate Conservation Agreement for Slickspot Peppergrass (<i>Lepidium papilliferum</i>)	All	December, 2003
Boise District Noxious and invasive Weed Treatment EA	All	Feb 6, 2007

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, infrastructure repair, 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 vegetation, watershed, and soil objectives of this Plan and the Cascade 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 Hollow ESR Plan are designed to accomplish that objective for the area burned by the Hollow Fire (G3ZW).

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 Hollow Fire 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.

The slickspots within and adjacent to the burned area were surveyed for LEPA in May and June 2012 prior to the wildfire. No LEPA plants were found during this survey and slickspots were found to be heavily invaded by cheatgrass. 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 Hollow 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 livestock allotment closure, noxious weed treatment, infrastructure repair, and facilities 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 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

Hollow Fire ESR Plan

Name	Title	Agency Represented/Duty Station
Sarah Heide	Fire Ecologist	BLM - Boise District
Mark Steiger	Botanist	BLM-Four River FO
Dean Shaw	Archeologist	BLM-Four Rivers FO
Martin Espil	Rangeland Management Specialist	BLM-Four Rivers FO
Lara Hannon	Ecologist	BLM-Four Rivers FO
Rob Bennett	Operations	BLM-Boise District
Alex Webb	GIS	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.

The 1988 ROD for the 1987 Cascade RMP states that “ appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design specifications of individual management actions and resource management guidelines for the resource management plan. All practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental impacts from implementation of the plan have been adopted”.

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/ Terry A. Humphrey
Four Rivers Field Manager

 9/24/2012
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.