

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

FLAT TOP 2 FIRE

**BLM/TWIN FALLS DISTRICT/SHOSHONE FIELD OFFICE
IDAHO STATE OFFICE**

FIRE BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Fire Name	Flat Top 2
Fire Number	G40J
District/Field Office	Twin Falls/Shoshone
Admin Number	LLIDT03000
State	Idaho
County(s)	Lincoln
Ignition Date/Cause	8-05-2012/Lightning
Date Contained	8-12-2012

Jurisdiction	Acres
BLM	133,969
National Park Service	1,264
State	3,955
Private	1,766
Other	0

Total Acres	140,954
Total Costs	\$3,673,000
Costs to LF20000ES	\$3,324,000
Costs to LF32000BR	\$349,000

Status of Plan Submission (check one box below)

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

PART 1 - PLAN SUMMARY

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE FIRE

The Flat Top 2 fire started as a lightning strike in the Poison Lake grazing allotment north of Kimama, Idaho. The Wildhorse, Kimama, Kimama sheep, Riverwood and Pagari grazing allotments were also affected. The fire burned a total of 140,954 acres in Lincoln and Minidoka counties. Of those acres that burned 133,969 were on BLM administered land, 3,955 acres on Idaho State land, and 1,766 acres on private land. The fire also burned 28,835 acres of the Craters of the Moon National Monument, primarily in the eastern portion of the fire.

The fire burned in low-elevation basin big and Wyoming big sagebrush habitat. The mix of vegetation communities in the burn area provided year round habitat for mule deer, elk and pronghorn. The fire burned a total of 95,732 acres of sage-grouse Preliminary Priority Habitat (PPH). Fire intensities were the highest in sage grouse PPH.

The majority of proposed treatments will be focused in the Craters of the Moon National Monument within the Wildhorse and Poison Lake allotments which are vulnerable to cheatgrass and noxious weed expansion and are classified as sage grouse PPH. This area is priority for Emergency Stabilization (ES) and Burned Area Rehabilitation (BAR) efforts.

The Wildhorse allotment has a long history of large wildfires. The majority of burn area in the Wildhorse allotment area has been treated in past rehabilitation or rangeland improvement projects. Fire intensities were relatively light to moderate in this area with large unburned patches. These past rehabilitation efforts have generally been successful and should recover without additional herbaceous or sagebrush seeding treatments.

LAND USE PLAN CONSISTENCY

The following treatments are proposed under this ES and BAR plan.

Emergency Stabilization

- S2 Ground Seeding
- S3 Aerial Seeding (Sagebrush)
- S3 Aerial Seeding (Grass and Forb)
- S5 Weed Control
- S7 Fence, Gate, Cattleguard
- S12 Livestock Closure
- S13 Monitoring

Burned Area Rehabilitation

- R5 Weed Control
- R7 Fence, Gate, Cattleguard

The applicable land use plans for the ES and BAR project area are the 1985 Monument Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and the 2006 Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan (Craters MP) which provides a framework for cooperative management of Monument lands by the National Park

Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

Monument RMP

The Monument RMP states that lands administered by the BLM in this area will be managed in order to:

- 1) Maintain or improve wildlife habitat for crucial mule deer winter range;
- 2) Improve poor or fair condition rangeland;
- 3) Maintain, improve, protect, and restore watershed conditions; and
- 4) Control the spread of noxious weeds on public lands and eradicate them where possible and economically feasible.

Craters Management Plan

The 2006 Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan (Craters MP) provides a framework for cooperative management of Monument lands by the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management. The Record of Decision adopting the Management Plan was signed on September 12, 2006 by the Idaho BLM State Director and the NPS Northwest Regional Director.

The key components of the approved MP related to ESR activities include:

- Emphasizing the protection of vegetative resources in North Laidlaw Park
- Maintaining a road network suitable for aggressive fire suppression and restoration activities within the Monument
- Promoting a proactive Integrated Weed Management Program
- Proactively protecting and restoring sagebrush steppe communities

In addition, the Craters MP states:

“In the event of a wildland fire, burned areas would be rehabilitated when necessary to restore the appropriate mosaic of sagebrush species and subspecies, along with a diverse perennial understory, and to suppress invasive and noxious weeds.”

“Use of native plants would be emphasized in rehabilitation and restoration projects, and only native plants would be used for rehabilitation or restoration projects within the Pristine Zone”.

The proposed treatments in this ES and BAR plan conform to the Monument RMP and Craters MP. The ES/BAR team developed objectives and treatments which respond to the identified issues and concerns. The BLM would evaluate this plan based on the success or failure in meeting these objectives.

The project is also in conformance with the analysis of Alternative E, the selected alternative, in the 2008 Final Fire, Fuels and Related Vegetation Management Direction Plan Amendment (FMDA) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Final FMDA/EIS amends all Land Use Plans for the Shoshone Field Office except the Craters Management Plan, to provide direction and guidance for fire/fuels and related vegetation management.

The treatments outlined in this plan are also consistent with the treatments analyzed in the Shoshone and Burley Field Office Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan and EA #ID-077-2004-008.

COST SUMMARY TABLES

Emergency Stabilization (LF20000ES):

Action/ Spec. #	Planned Action	Unit (acres, WMs, number)	# Units	Unit Cost (If Applicable)	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	Totals by Spec.
S1	Planning (Project Mgmt)	WM's	3		\$0	\$25,000	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$65,000
S2	Ground Seeding	Acres	14,202	\$107.17	\$1,235,000	\$287,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,522,000
S3	Aerial Seeding (Sagebrush)	Acres	50,000	\$16.36	\$750,000	\$68,000	\$0	\$0	\$818,000
S3	Aerial Seeding(Grass and Forb)	Acres	12,189	\$57.67	\$508,000	\$195,000	\$0	\$0	\$703,000
S5	Noxious Weeds	Acres	133,969	\$0.78	\$0	\$105,000	\$0	\$0	\$105,000
S12	Closures (area, OHV, livestock)	No.	1	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
S13	Monitoring	Acres	133,969	\$0.83	\$0	\$37,000	\$37,000	\$37,000	\$111,000
TOTAL COSTS (LF20000ES)					\$2,493,000	\$717,000	\$57,000	\$57,000	\$3,324,000

Burned Area Rehabilitation (LF32000BR):

Action/ Spec. #	Planned Action	Unit (acres, WMs, number)	# Units	Unit Cost (If Applicable)	FY13	FY14	FY15	Totals by Spec.
R1	Planning (Project Mgmt)	WM's	1		\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$6,000
R5	Noxious Weeds	Acres	133,969	\$	\$	\$105,000	\$105,000	\$210,000
R7	Fence Repair	Miles	21	\$	\$133,000	\$0	\$0	\$133,000
TOTAL COSTS (LF32000BR)					\$135,000	\$107,000	\$107,000	\$349,000

PART 2 – POST-FIRE RECOVERY ISSUES AND TREATMENTS

Issues relate to resource problems caused by the wildfire and include both the immediate wildfire effects as well as effects predicted to occur as a result of the wildfire. Determining the appropriate funding code must be based on the scope of the issue, purpose of the treatment, and the availability of funds.

EMERGENCY STABILIZATION ISSUES AND TREATMENTS

Emergency Stabilization Objectives: “determine the need for and to prescribe and implement emergency treatments to minimize threats to life or property or to stabilize and prevent unacceptable degradation to natural and cultural resources resulting from the effects of a fire.” 620DM3.4

Emergency Stabilization Priorities: 1). Human Life and Safety, and 2). Property and unique biological (designated Critical Habitat for Federal and State listed, proposed or candidate threatened and endangered species) and significant heritage sites. 620DM3.7

ES Issue 1 - Human Life and Safety. Not applicable.

ES Issue 2 - Soil/Water Stabilization.

Livestock Closure

The Flat Top 2 burn area would be rested from livestock grazing until monitoring shows that rehabilitation objectives have been met. This rest would provide the opportunity for existing vegetation resources to stabilize the burn area and seeding efforts to establish. The burn area affected the Wildhorse, Kimama, Kimama sheep, Pagari, Riverwood and Poison Lake grazing allotments.

Treatment/Activity: S12 Livestock Closure

- A. *Treatment Activity Description.* The Flat Top 2 burn area would be rested from livestock grazing until monitoring shows that ES/BAR rehabilitation objectives have been met.
- B. *How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?* The purpose of this treatment is to rest the burn area from livestock grazing to provide the opportunity for existing vegetation resources to stabilize the burn area and seeding efforts to establish. Establishment of a perennial plant community would inhibit the expansion of annual vegetation and stabilize soil resources.
- C. *Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?* No costs under ES are associated with the livestock closures.

ES Issue 3 - Habitat for Federal/State Listed, Proposed, or Candidate Species.

Wildlife Habitat

The Flat Top 2 burn negatively affected over 95,732 acres of sage grouse PPH. The burn also negatively affected deer, elk and pronghorn year round habitat. Fire intensities were the highest in sage grouse PPH. Proposed sagebrush habitat rehabilitation will be focused in this area due to high fire intensities and associated negative impacts. Sage grouse, mule deer, pronghorn are dependent on sagebrush plant communities for their year round habitat needs, especially winter browse. Due to the wildfire impacts, current conditions are not optimum for sage grouse or big game habitat. Habitat conditions are not expected to recover naturally without a seeding effort.

Treatment Activity: S3 Aerial Seeding

- A. *Treatment/Activity Description.* Approximately 100,000 acres of the Flat Top 2 fire would be aerial seeded with basin big and Wyoming big sagebrush in the winter of 2012/2013 (FY13). The sagebrush seeding would be strip seeded. Strip seeding of sagebrush allows for complete coverage of the burn area at a more economical cost and in the long term establishes a desirable mosaic habitat pattern.

Flat Top 2 Sagebrush Aerial Seed Mix	
Species and Variety	Seed Rate Lbs/Acre
1. 'Basin' Big Sagebrush	0.50 (bulk)
2. 'Wyoming' Big Sagebrush	0.50 (bulk)

- B. *How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?* The objective of this treatment is to reestablish a desirable perennial plant community that more closely matches the structural and species composition and diversity of the native plant community to help achieve a healthy functioning rangeland. Accelerating the rate of reestablishment of sagebrush is important to maintaining the value of the area as sage grouse, mule deer and antelope wintering habitat. Sagebrush is also an important component of suitable habitat for a number of sensitive sagebrush obligate species. The wildfire intensity impacted existing sagebrush cover which would not recover naturally without providing additional seed source.
- C. *Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?* Contracting costs for aerial application are typical for the Shoshone Field Office area. Sagebrush seed costs can vary from year to year dependent on availability, but generally average about \$10/acre.

ES Issue 4 - Critical Heritage Resources. Not Applicable.

ES Issue 5 - Invasive Plants and Weeds.

The following is a list of common pre-burn vegetation in order of dominance. The list was developed using field surveys of unburned islands of vegetation and range management trend monitoring plot data. Vegetation data collected in 2012 utilizing the sage grouse habitat assessment framework was also utilized in determining this list. This list is for vegetation

determined to be in the burn areas not previously treated, in sage grouse PPH and in poor to fair ecological condition.

Common Pre-burn Vegetation in Order of Dominance:

Wyoming Big sagebrush, *Artemisia tridentata ssp. wyomingensis*
Basin Big Sagebrush, *Artemisia tridentata ssp. tridentata*
Sandberg bluegrass, *Poa secunda*
Cheatgrass, *Bromus tectorum*
Bitterbrush, *Purshia tridentata*

Vegetation data collected in 2012 documented a list of sage grouse preferred forbs within the Craters of the Moon Monument that include *Phlox sp.*, *Chaenactis douglasii*, *Erigeron sp.*, *Lomatium sp.*, *Astragalus sp.*, *Crepis sp.*, *Agoseris sp.*, *Antennaria sp.*, *Linum sp.*, and *Allium sp.* Exotic non-native forbs such as *Lactuca serriola*, *Tragopogon dubius*, are common weedy species, but still sage grouse preferred. Vegetation data showed a general lack of mid-bunch grasses in the plant community.

Ecological Site(s):

Loamy 8-12 Wyoming Big Sagebrush/Bluebunch Wheatgrass
Sandy Loam 8-10 Basin Big Sagebrush/Indian Ricegrass

Soil-vegetation correlation information indicates that the burn area is located primarily on a sandy loam 8-10" basin big sagebrush/Indian ricegrass ecological site or a loamy 8-12" Wyoming big/ bluebunch wheatgrass ecological site. The potential natural plant communities on these sites would be comprised of a big sagebrush shrub overstory with principal understory plants dominated by bluebunch wheatgrass or Indian ricegrass.

Cheatgrass is the most common invasive species and would dominate portions of the burn area without treatment. Re-vegetation with desirable, competitive species would provide effective competition against annual vegetation and noxious weeds in the long term.

Fire Intensity and Vegetation

The majority of the fire was characterized by moderate fire intensity. Vegetation in previously seeded areas was primarily a mixture of introduced and native perennial grasses and either Wyoming or basin big sagebrush. Areas with a dense overstory of sagebrush and a predominately exotic annual vegetation understory had higher intensities. The higher intensity burn areas removed most of the plant cover and have exposed soils to accelerated soil erosion. These areas are a major concern due to wind erosion and the expansion of cheatgrass and noxious weeds.

Treatment/Activity: S2 Ground Seeding

A. *Treatment/Activity Description.* Approximately 9,475 acres within the Wildhorse allotment would be drill seeded with a mixture of grasses, forbs and shrubs. Seed would be applied at

the rates shown in the following table. This area of the Wildhorse allotment is within the Craters of the Moon National Monument and sage grouse PPH.

Wildhorse Drill Seed

Species and Variety	Seed Rate Lbs/Acre
Grasses	
1. 'Anatone' Bluebunch Wheatgrass*	3.00
2. 'Discovery' Snake River Wheatgrass*	1.00
3. 'Vavilov II' Siberian Wheatgrass	1.50
4. 'Trailhead' Basin Wildrye*	1.00
5. 'Sherman' Big Bluegrass*	0.20
Forbs	
1. 'Eski' Sainfoin	2.00
2. 'Maple Grove' Lewis Flax*	0.10
Shrubs	
1. Bitterbrush♦	0.30
* Native Cultivar / ♦ Wildland Collected	

Approximately 4,727 acres in the Poison Lake allotment would be drill seeded with a mixture of grasses, forbs and shrubs. Seed would be applied at the rates shown in the following table. The Poison Lake allotment is within the Craters of the Moon National Monument and sage grouse PPH.

Poison Lake Drill

Species and Variety	Seed Rate Lbs/Acre
Grasses	
1. 'Vavilov' II Siberian Wheatgrass	4.00
2. 'Discovery' Snake River Wheatgrass	1.50
3. 'Alkar' Tall Wheatgrass	1.00
4. 'Sherman' Big Bluegrass	0.20
Forbs	
1. 'Eski' Sainfoin	2.00
2. 'Appar' Blue Flax	0.10
Shrubs	
1. Bitterbrush	0.30

- B. *How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?* The objective of this treatment is to reestablish a desirable herbaceous perennial plant community that more closely matches the structural and species composition and diversity of the native plant community to help achieve a healthy, functioning rangeland. Establishment of a perennial plant community would inhibit the expansion of annual vegetation and noxious weeds.
- C. *Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?* The ground seeding costs can vary year to year (approximately \$50-100/acre) but are typical for projects of this type.

Noxious Weeds

Diffuse knapweed, rush skeletonweed and leafy spurge are the primary noxious weeds of concern with high potential to increase within the burned area and surrounding rangeland. These weeds were documented during the fire reconnaissance surveys. Leafy spurge has been treated in this area for the last 20 years utilizing a helicopter because of the rugged terrain. Biocontrol for knapweed and leafy spurge has also been implemented in the past. Russian knapweed and scotch thistle are prevalent in patchy, scattered occurrences, as well.

Approximately 12,189 acres north of Black Ridge Crater is a major source for rush skeletonweed and diffuse knapweed. Leafy spurge is also present in this area. Increased fire frequency ($\approx 91\%$ or 11,081 acres has burned 3 times since 1992 including this year) in this area has contributed to the dominance of these weeds. The majority of this area is adjacent to sage grouse PPH. The area is comprised of lava ridges and outcrops and is not treatable by drill seeding. The rugged terrain along with sandy soils is conducive to aerial seeding with mostly small seeded species because of the high incidence of more productive microsites for seed germination. Sandy soils are favorable for aerial seeding without seed coverage. Predicted accelerated soil movement in the sandy soils would aid in coverage of aeri ally applied seed. The extreme rockiness also provides safe sites for seed to germinate. Aerial seedings on similar sites within the Wildhorse allotment in 1992 and 1996 were successful in establishing perennial herbaceous vegetation. Establishing a competitive perennial herbaceous plant community will slow the increase of noxious weeds. Without a seeding effort, noxious weeds will continue to increase, negatively affecting sage grouse PPH and big game habitat.

The current state of the noxious weed infestation is treatable if done within the next three growing seasons. Without a noxious weed control effort, rush skeletonweed and diffuse knapweed will significantly increase negatively affecting big game habitat, sage grouse PPH and livestock forage capabilities. If an emergency treatment is not implemented the economic impact to natural resources and the local economy will be significant. The costs to suppress noxious weeds after a significant expansion has occurred increases exponentially. Spot herbicide spraying and biological control would be proposed to suppress the expansion of these weeds. Weed control would be conducted the first year under ES.

Treatment Activity: S3 Aerial Seeding

- A. *Treatment/Activity Description.* Approximately 12,189 acres north of the Black Ridge Crater would be aerially seeded with the seed mix in the following table.

Black Ridge Crater Aerial Seed	
Species and Variety	Seed Rate Lbs/Acre
Grasses	
1. 'Vavilov II' Siberian Wheatgrass	5.00
2. Sand Dropseed	1.00
3. 'Alkar' Tall Wheatgrass	1.50
4. 'Sherman' Big Bluegrass	1.00
5. 'Appar' Blue Flax	0.20

- B. *How does this treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?* The objective of this treatment is to reestablish a desirable perennial plant community that more closely matches the structural and species composition and diversity of the native plant community to help achieve a healthy, functioning rangeland. High fire frequency in the proposed seeding area has resulted in a plant community dominated by invasive plants and noxious weeds. Continued dominance and expansion of the exotic plant community within the proposed seeding area will have a negative effect on immediately adjacent sage grouse PPH. The exposed sandy soils provide an opportunity to establish a perennial herbaceous seeding to compete against invasive plants and noxious weeds. A perennial plant community will reduce fire frequency and protect and expand sage grouse PPH in the long term.
- C. *Why is this treatment/activity reasonable, within policy and cost effective?* Recent aerial seeding rehabilitation projects in the Wildhorse allotment have proven successful on rocky and sandy soil sites. Aerial seedings on similar sites within the Wildhorse allotment in 1992 and 1996 were successful in establishing perennial herbaceous vegetation. The use of competitive species with increased seedling vigor increases the probability of success.

Treatment Activity: S5 Noxious Weeds

- A. *Treatment/Activity Description.* Noxious weed inventory and control within the burned area would be done in the first year following the fire to directly treat the expected weeds. All actions would be in accordance with the Shoshone District Noxious Weed Management Plan, Environmental Assessment #ID050-EA-92031. Diffuse knapweed, rush skeletonweed and leafy spurge are the primary noxious weeds targeted.
- B. *How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?* The objective of this treatment is to identify and control the expected noxious weed increase using spot herbicide application on the burned area. In addition, biological control agents for knapweed and leafy spurge would be utilized in areas not easily accessible to spraying equipment (rocky outcrops). Knapweed, rush skeletonweed and leafy spurge infestations are present in the area and are expected to increase due to the removal of existing plant cover by the wildfire. Treatments would be conducted for one year under ES.
- C. *Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?* Weed treatments in this Field Office typically run about \$3.21 per acre. Field work would be combined with

other weed treatments in the area for cost efficiency.

BURNED AREA REHABILITATION ISSUES AND TREATMENTS

Burned Area Rehabilitation Objectives. 1) To evaluate actual and potential long-term post-fire impacts to critical cultural and natural resources and identify those areas unlikely to recover naturally from severe wildland fire damage; 2) To develop and implement cost-effective plans to emulate historical or pre-fire ecosystem structure, function, diversity, and dynamics consistent with approved land management plans, or if that is infeasible, then to restore or establish a healthy, stable ecosystem in which native species are well represented; and 3) To repair or replace minor facilities damaged by wildland fire. 620DM3.4

Burned Area Rehabilitation Priorities. 1) To repair or improve lands damaged directly by a wildland fire; and 2) To rehabilitate or establish healthy, stable ecosystems in the burned area. 620DM3.8

BAR Issue 1 - Lands Unlikely to Recover Naturally. Not Applicable.

BAR Issue 2 - Weed Treatments.

Noxious Weeds

Diffuse knapweed, rush skeletonweed and leafy spurge are the primary noxious weeds of concern with high potential to increase within the burned area and surrounding rangeland. Russian knapweed and scotch thistle are prevalent in patchy, scattered occurrences, as well. These weeds were documented during the fire reconnaissance surveys. The current state of the infestation is treatable if done within the next three growing seasons. Without a noxious weed control effort noxious weeds will significantly increase negatively affecting sage grouse and big game habitat and livestock forage capabilities. If an emergency treatment is not implemented the economic impact to natural resources and the local economy will be significant. The costs to suppress noxious weeds after a significant expansion has occurred increases exponentially. Spot herbicide spraying and biological control would be proposed under rehabilitation to suppress the expansion of these weeds. Weed control would be conducted the first year under ES.

Treatment Activity: R5 Noxious Weeds

- A. *Treatment/Activity Description.* Noxious weed inventory and control within the burned area would be done the second and third year following the fire to directly treat the expected weeds. All actions would be in accordance with the Shoshone District Noxious Weed Management Plan, Environmental Assessment #ID050-EA-92031. Diffuse knapweed, rush skeletonweed and leafy spurge are the primary noxious weeds targeted.
- B. *How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?* The objective of this treatment is to identify and control the expected noxious weed increase using spot herbicide application on the burned area. In addition, biological control agents for knapweed and leafy spurge would be utilized in areas not easily accessible to spraying equipment (rocky outcrops). Noxious weed infestations are present in the burn area and are expected to

increase due to the removal of existing plant cover by the wildfire. Noxious weed control would be conducted the second and third year under BAR.

- C. *Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?* Weed treatments in this Field Office typically run about \$3.21 per acre. Field work would be combined with other weed treatments in the area for cost efficiency.

BAR Issue 3 - Tree Planting. Not applicable.

BAR Issue 4 - Repair/Replace Fire Damage to Minor Facilities.

Livestock Management Fences

Approximately 21 miles of interior pasture fence was damaged or destroyed by the fire. Primary damage occurred in the Poison Lake and Riverwood allotments. Damaged wire, corners and braces would be repaired or replaced. The repairs would be needed to maintain the integrity of the grazing systems and keep adjacent livestock grazing from entering the burn area during the rest period.

R7 Fence/Gate/Cattleguard

- A. *Treatment/Activity Description.* The objective of this treatment is to repair or replace approximately 21 miles of interior livestock management fence damaged 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.
- 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 allotment. 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?* Fence repair contracts typically run \$5,000 per mile. This cost is typically lower than construction of new fence. Damaged wood stretch points and corners would be replaced with galvanized steel pipe thus increasing the longevity of the structures and would be resistant to future wildfire damages.

PART 3 – DETAILED TREATMENT COST TABLES

Flat Top 2-G40J-Emergency Stabilization		Units	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	Total Costs
S1	<i>Planning (Plan Prep/Project Mgmt.)</i>						
	National Office ESR Support	WM's		5,000	5,000	5,000	15,000
	Project Management Field Office	WM's		10,000	5,000	5,000	20,000
	Project Management State Office	WM's		10,000	10,000	10,000	30,000
	GIS	WM's					0
	Aerial Photography	Total					0
	Travel/Vehicles	Total					0
	Training	Total					0
	Supplies/Material	Total					0
	Total		0	25,000	20,000	20,000	65,000
S2	<i>Ground Seeding (drill)</i>						
	Labor	WM's		128,000			128,000
	Travel/Vehicles	Total		4,000			4,000
	Equipment Rental	Total		33,000			33,000
	Equipment Mobilization	Total		6,000			6,000
	Supplies/Materials	Total		4,000			4,000
	Contract	Total					0
	Contract Administration	WM's		8,000			8,000
	Vale Drill Use Rate & FOR	Total		86,000			86,000
	Seed	Total	880,000				880,000
	Seed Mixing	WM's		10,000			10,000
	Seed Testing	Total		3,000			3,000
	Seed Storage	Total		5,000			5,000
	Clearances	Total	355,000				355,000
	Supplies/Materials	Total					0
	Contract Administration	WM's					0
	Total		1,235,000	287,000	0	0	1,522,000
S3	<i>Aerial Seeding</i>						
grass	Contract	Total		183,000			183,000
	Contract Administration	WM's		4,000			4,000
	Travel/Vehicles	Total		1,000			1,000
	Seed	Total	508,000				508,000
	Seed Mixing	WM's		5,000			5,000
	Seed Testing	Total		2,000			2,000
sage	Contract	Total		60,000			60,000
	Contract Administration	WM's		4,000			4,000
	Travel/Vehicles	Total		1,000			1,000
	Seed	Total	750,000				750,000
	Seed Storage	Total		2,000			2,000
	Seed Testing	Total		1,000			1,000
	Total		1,258,000	263,000	0	0	1,521,000
S5	<i>Noxious Weeds</i>						

Flat Top 2-G40J-Emergency Stabilization		Units	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	Total Costs
	Labor	Acres		40,000			40,000
	Travel/Vehicles	Total		5,000			5,000
	Supplies/Materials	Total		10,000			10,000
	Contract	Total		50,000			50,000
	Total		0	105,000	0	0	105,000
S12	<i>Closures (OHV, Livestock, Area)</i>						
	Labor	WM's					0
	Travel/Vehicles	Total					0
	Supplies/Materials	Total					0
	Contract	Total					0
	Contract Administration	WM's					0
	Total		0	0	0	0	0
S13	<i>Monitoring</i>						
	Labor	WM's		30,000	30,000	30,000	90,000
	Travel/Vehicles	Total		4,000	4,000	4,000	12,000
	Supplies/Materials	Total		3,000	3,000	3,000	9,000
	Contract	Total					0
	Contract Administration	WM's					0
	GIS	WM's					0
	Total		0	37,000	37,000	37,000	111,000
	EMERGENCY STABILIZATION TOTALS		\$2,493,000	\$717,000	\$57,000	\$57,000	\$3,324,000

Flat Top 2-G40J-Burned Area Rehabilitation		Units	FY13	FY14	FY15	Total Costs
R1	<i>Planning (Plan Prep/Project Mgmt)</i>					
	Project Management State Office	WM's				0
	Project Management Field Office	WM's	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000
	Plan Preparation	WM's				0
	GIS	WM's				0
	Aerial Photography	Total				0
	Travel/Vehicles	Total				0
	Training	Total				0
	Supplies/Material	Total				0
	Total		2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000
R5	<i>Noxious Weeds</i>					
	Labor	WM's		40,000	40,000	80,000
	Travel/Vehicles	Total		5,000	5,000	10,000
	Supplies/Materials	Total		10,000	10,000	20,000
	Contract	Total		50,000	50,000	100,000
	Total		0	105,000	105,000	210,000
R7	<i>Fence/Gate/Cattle Guard</i>					
	Fence Material	Total	42,000			42,000
	Travel/Vehicles	Total	3,000			3,000
	Contract	Total	84,000			84,000
	Contract Administration	WM's	4,000			4,000
	Total		133,000	0	0	133,000
R11	<i>Facilities/Improvements</i>					
	Labor	WM's				0
	Travel/Vehicles	Total				0
	Supplies/Materials	Total				0
	Contract	Total				0
	Contract Administration	WM's				0
	Total		0	0	0	0
	BURNED AREA REHABILITATION TOTALS		135,000	107,000	107,000	349,000

PART 4 – SEED LISTS

POISON LAKE DRILL SEED

Species	% PLS	Seeds/lb (bulk)	Total Seeds/Acre (Bulk)	PLS Seeds/acre	PLS Seeds/sq.ft.	Drill Seeding [Acres]	Lbs/Acre	Total Lbs.	Cost / Lb.	Total Cost
Siberian Wheatgrass	.85	220,000	880,000	748,000	17.17	4,727	4.00	18,900	\$5.00	94,500.00
Snake River Wheatgrass	.85	170,000	255,000	216,750	4.97	4,727	1.50	7,100	\$10.00	71,000.00
Tall Wheatgrass	.85	80,000	80,000	68,000	1.56	4,727	1.00	4,750	\$4.00	19,000.00
Big Bluegrass	.70	917,000	183,400	128,380	2.94	4,727	0.20	950	\$5.00	4,750.00
Sainfoin	.85	28,000	56,000	47,600	1.09	4,727	2.00	9,450	\$3.00	28,350.00
Blue Flax	.78	420,000	42,000	32,760	.75	4,727	0.10	500	\$8.00	4,000.00
Bitterbrush	.85	15,000	4,500	3,825	0.08	4,727	0.30	1,400	\$15.00	21,000.00
Totals					28.56		9.1	43,050		\$242,600

WILDHORSE DRILL SEED

Species	% PLS	Seeds/lb (bulk)	Total Seeds/Acre (Bulk)	PLS Seeds/acre	PLS Seeds/sq.ft.	Drill Seeding [Acres]	Lbs/Acre	Total Lbs.	Cost / Lb.	Total Cost
Siberian Wheatgrass	.85	220,000	330,000	280,500	6.44	9,475	1.50	14,200	\$5.00	\$71,000.00
Bluebunch Wheatgrass	.85	170,000	510,000	433,500	9.95	9,475	3.00	28,450	\$10.00	\$284,500.00
Snake River Wheatgrass	.85	170,000	170,000	144,500	3.31	9,475	1.00	9,500	\$10.00	\$95,000.00
Basin Wildrye	.76	130,000	130,000	98,800	2.26	9,475	1.00	9,500	\$7.00	\$66,500.00
Big Bluegrass	.70	917,000	183,400	128,380	2.94	9,475	.20	1,900	\$5.00	\$9,500.00
Sainfoin	.85	28,000	56,000	47,600	1.09	9,475	2.00	18,950	\$3.00	\$56,850.00
Lewis Flax	.78	420,000	42,000	32,760	.75	9,475	.10	950	\$12.00	\$11,400.00
Bitterbrush	.85	15,000	4,500	3,825	0.08	9,475	0.30	2,850	\$15.00	\$42,750.00
Totals					26.82		9.1	86,300		\$637,500.00

BLACK RIDGE CRATER AERIAL SEED

Species	% PLS	Seeds/lb (bulk)	Total Seeds/Acre (Bulk)	PLS Seeds/acre	PLS Seeds/sq.ft.	Aerial Seeding [Acres]	Lbs/Acre	Total Lbs.	Cost / Lb.	Total Cost
Siberian Wheatgrass	.85	220,000	1,100,000	935,000	21.46	12,189	5.00	61,000	\$5.00	\$305,000.00
Sand Dropseed	.85	5,298,000	5,298,000	4,503,300	103.38	12,189	1.00	12,200	\$4.00	\$48,800.00
Tall Wheatgrass	.85	80,000	120,000	102,000	2.34	12,189	1.50	18,300	\$4.00	\$73,200.00
Big Bluegrass	.70	917,000	917,000	641,900	14.73	12,189	1.00	12,200	\$5.00	\$61,000.00
Blue Flax	.78	420,000	84,000	65,520	1.50	12,189	0.20	2,450	\$8.00	\$19,600.00
Totals					143.41		10.7	106,150		\$507,600.00

AERIAL SEED SAGEBRUSH

Species	% PLS	Seeds/lb (bulk)	Total Seeds/Acre (Bulk)	PLS Seeds/acre	PLS Seeds/sq.ft.	Aerial Seeding [Acres]	Lbs/Acre	Total Lbs.	Cost / Lb.	Total Cost
Basin Big Sagebrush	.12	2,500,000	1,250,000	150,000	3.44	50,000	0.50	25,000	\$15.00	\$375,000.00
Wyoming Big Sagebrush	.12	2,500,000	1,250,000	150,000	3.44	50,000	0.50	25,000	\$15.00	\$375,000.00
Totals					6.88		1.00			\$750,000.00

PART 5 - 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: The proposed native species are all adapted to the ecological sites within the proposed seeding area. All of these species have been extensively utilized in similar ecological sites within the Shoshone Field Office management area.

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

Yes No

Rationale: Native seed proposed for use is generally available in the required quantities. Drill seeding would not occur until the fall of 2012 which should allow seed quantities to be more available.

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

Yes No

Rationale: The native seed proposed for use has been increasingly utilized in recent years for stabilization, rehabilitation and restoration. The demand has resulted in increased production and decreased price.

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: The native taxa proposed for seeding have exhibited the ability to establish and persist in similar ecological sites in the Shoshone Field Office management area.

5. Will the current or proposed land management (e.g. wildlife populations, recreation use, livestock, etc.) after the seeding establishment period maintains the seeded native plants in the seed mixture?

Yes No

Rationale: The seeded area will receive a minimum of two growing seasons of rest for establishment prior to resumption of livestock use. The current livestock management grazing system should effectively maintain the plant community over the long term.

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

General Note: The likelihood of introducing a non-native plant species into a plant community without altering the present competitive interaction among remnant native and non-native species is remote. The proposed seeding of non-native species in this project may result in long-term disruption of ecological processes within the plant community on treated areas. However, the treatment area has already been disrupted by non-native species and the proportion of non-native to native species is low. The inclusion of non-native species is to enhance the probability of re-establishment of a perennial plant community in an environment where normal plant successional processes have been altered by invasion of exotic annual grasses and forbs, along with noxious weeds, and difficult site conditions (i.e. clay soils). Establishing a stable, diverse, multi-layered perennial plant community utilizing both native and non-native cultivars is

expected to restore resource values that might not recover naturally, considering the pre-fire plant community and site conditions.

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: The use of the proposed non-native plant species is in conformance with the goals and objectives outlined in the 2005 Shoshone and Burley Field Office Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan. The proposed use of non-native plants is not located within a Wilderness or Wilderness Study Area.

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: The proposed treatment area supported a sagebrush community with an herbaceous understory of exotic annual grasses, noxious weeds, and remnant native grasses and forbs. The natural successional processes and interspecific competition which normally occur within a native plant community have been altered by the introduction and establishment of exotic annual grasses and noxious weeds such as cheatgrass, diffuse knapweed, and rush skeletonweed. The proposed non-native plants can effectively compete with these species. Establishing a competitive perennial plant species with a mixture of native and non-native species will promote a greater degree of resiliency within the plant community and restore more natural successional processes.

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

Yes No

Rationale: The proposed introduced plant species have been used in seedings in the Shoshone Field Office management area for over 40 years. The seedings have occurred in range sites similar to those which were burned. Incidental establishment of the proposed species may occur outside of the treatment area by the seasonal movement of various animals, but this occurrence is not common nor has it been observed to result in the long-term displacement and dominance of native plant species or communities.

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

Non-native Plants	Native Plants
‘Vavilov’ Siberian Wheatgrass <i>Agropyron sibiricum</i>	‘Anatone’ Bluebunch Wheatgrass <i>Pseudoroegneria spicata</i>
‘Alkar’ Tall Wheatgrass <i>Agropyron elongatum</i>	‘Discovery’ Snake River Wheatgrass <i>Elymus waiwaiensis</i>
‘Eski’ Sainfoin <i>Onobrychis viciifolia</i>	‘Sherman’ Big Bluegrass <i>Poa ampla</i>
‘Appar’ Blue Flax <i>Linum perenne</i>	‘Trailhead’ Basin Wildrye <i>Leymus cinerius</i>
	Sand Dropseed <i>Sporobolus cryptandrus</i>
	‘Maple Grove’ Lewis Flax <i>Linum lewisii</i>
	Bitterbrush <i>Purshia tridentata</i>

PART 6–COST-RISK ANALYSIS

A. Probability of Treatments Successfully Meeting Objectives

Action/ Spec. #	Planned ES Action (LF20000ES)	Unit (acres, WMs, number)	# Units	Total Cost	% Probability of Success
S2	Ground Seeding	Acres	14,202	\$1,522,000	80
S3	Aerial Seeding (Sagebrush)	Acres	50,000	\$818,000	70
S3	Aerial Seeding (Grass and Forbs)	Acres	12,189	\$703,000	60
S5	Noxious Weeds	Acres	133,969	\$105,000	90
S12	Closures (OHV, livestock, area)	#	1	\$0	100
TOTAL COSTS:				\$3,148,000	

Action/ Spec. #	Planned BAR Action (LF32000BR)	Unit (acres, WMs, number)	# Units	Total Cost	% Probability of Success
R5	Noxious Weeds	Acres	133,969	\$210,000	90
R7	Fence/Gate/Cattleguard	Miles	21	\$133,000	100
TOTAL COSTS:				\$343,000	

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: The ground and aerial seedings would establish a perennial plant community which would effectively compete against annual vegetation. The noxious weed treatments would protect the burn area and adjacent BLM lands against further expansion of noxious weeds.

No Action: Yes No Rationale for answer: Wildlife habitat on adjacent unburned lands would be compromised with the expansion of noxious weeds.

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 recent weed control efforts in similar soils and precipitation zones indicate that success would be high. Normal climatic conditions and the exclusion of livestock grazing for on-site vegetation recovery and establishment would increase the probability of success.

No Action: Yes No Rationale for answer: The burned area has a high potential for expansion of invasive plants and noxious weeds. There is also high potential for invasion of noxious weeds into adjacent unburned areas.

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:

No Action:

Alternative(s):

Comments: None

C. Risk of Resource Value Loss or Damage

No Action - Treatments Not Implemented (check one)

Resource Value	N/A	None	Low	Medium	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 (check one)

Resource Value	N/A	None	Low	Medium	High
Unacceptable Loss of Topsoil			X		
Weed Invasion			X		
Unacceptable Loss of Vegetation Diversity			X		
Unacceptable Loss of Vegetation Structure			X		

Resource Value	N/A	None	Low	Medium	High
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 7–MONITORING PLAN

Monitoring and evaluation of ESR treatments would be implemented to ensure that treatments are properly implemented, effective, and maintained. Monitoring methods may be qualitative or quantitative, and would be commensurate with the level of treatment complexity and extent. Monitoring and evaluation information would provide adaptive management feedback to improve ESR treatment performance. Monitoring would be the responsibility of the BLM interdisciplinary team. An annual monitoring summary report would be submitted documenting treatment effectiveness.

Treatment/Activity: S2 Ground Seeding and S3 Aerial Seeding

1) Treatment Objectives:

The objective of the seeding treatments is to establish a perennial dominated plant community within 3 years. The following grass, forb, and shrub density objectives are based on ecological site potential.

The drill seed treatment would be considered successful if:

The seeded grass, forb, and shrub species reach densities of:

- 1) 3 plants per square meter for grasses;
- 2) 0.3 plants per square meter for forbs; and
- 3) 0.10 plants per square meter for shrubs (bitterbrush).

The aerial seed treatment of grasses and forbs would be considered successful if:

The seeded grass and forb species reach densities of:

- 1) 3 plants per square meter for grasses;
- 2) 0.2 plants per square meter for forbs; and

The aerial seed treatment of sagebrush would be considered effective if:

- 1) Sagebrush seedlings average 0.1 seedlings per square meter across all density plots; or
- 2) In qualitative surveys they are found to be common.

2) Describe how implementation will be monitored:

Implementation is monitored through contract administration. Any changes from the planned implementation would be noted in the project file “as built” discussion.

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

The methods used to monitor the treated area would include field observations, photo plots, and cover transects utilizing the line-point intercept and density plot methods. Plots would be randomly established through the treated area. Effectiveness monitoring of the ground seeding and aerial seeding will be done for a period of three growing seasons.

Treatment/Activity: S5 and R5 Noxious Weed Treatments

1) Treatment Objectives:

Diffuse knapweed, rush skeleton weed and leafy spurge are the primary weeds of concern in the burn area. It is expected that these weeds would expand their range as a result of the fire. Since these weed species are not uniformly distributed across the burn area a quantifiable objective cannot be determined until the first year inventory occurs.

The objective for the first growing season is to conduct an inventory of the burn area and treat any noxious weeds discovered on the burn area.

The objective for the second and third years is to decrease the acreage needing treatment as determined by the first year inventory.

2) Describe how implementation will be monitored:

During the first growing season treatment, a detailed map of location, weed species sprayed, and the amount of herbicide utilized would be documented. The second and third year objective would be measured by the number and size of locations sprayed and the amount of herbicide utilized.

3) Describe how effectiveness will be monitored, how it will be measured, and within what time period.

At the end of three years of treatment, the herbicide spray data would be summarized. If further treatment is required beyond the third year then the responsibility for treatment would be forwarded to the Twin Falls District normal weed spraying program.

Treatment/Activity: S12 Livestock Closure

1) Treatment Objectives:

Exclusion of livestock is critical for the recovery of burned vegetation or establishment and protection of new seedings. The burn area and seed treatment area would be closed to livestock grazing for a minimum period of two growing seasons to promote recovery of burned vegetation and to facilitate the establishment of seeded species as specified in the 2005 Shoshone and

Burley Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan (#ID-077-2004-008).

2) Describe how implementation will be monitored:

Resumption of livestock grazing would ultimately depend on monitoring and meeting of ES plan ground seeding and natural recovery objectives. Recovery of the treated area would be monitored for availability to grazing on a yearly basis. The monitoring for grazing availability and recommendations for opening the burn area to livestock would be the responsibility of an interdisciplinary team.

Implementation is monitored through rangeland management administration. A grazing decision would be issued closing the burn area to livestock grazing.

3) Describe how effectiveness will be monitored, how it will be measured, and within what time period.

The drill seed treatment area would be considered recovered and available for grazing when:

- The amount of bare mineral soil (lacking cover of plants, litter, or biological soil crust) is within 10% of what would be expected for the site,
- Desirable herbaceous perennial plants are producing seed, and
- Desirable perennial vegetation have developed extensive root and shoot systems to provide for soil stabilization and are sustainable under livestock grazing.

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

- 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 the site. Recommended study methods include line-point intercept or step point cover methods and photo points.

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

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

Treatment Activity: R7 Fence/Gate/Cattleguard

1) Treatment Objectives:

The objective of this treatment is to repair or replace approximately 21 miles of interior livestock management fence damaged 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.

2) Describe how implementation will be monitored:

Implementation is monitored through contract administration. Any changes from the planned implementation would be noted in the project file “as built” discussion.

3) Describe how effectiveness will be monitored, how it will be measured, and within what time period.

Repair and replacement of damaged fences will be monitored through contract administration. Repairs will be documented in a project file “as built” and filed in the project file. Repairs will be completed within the first year of the fire.

PART 8 - MAPS

1. Fire Perimeter
2. Colored Land Status Map
3. Burned Management Fences/Other Structures (guzzlers, signs, etc.)
4. Seeding or Seedling Treatment areas

PART 9 – REVIEW, APPROVALS, and PREPARERS

TEAM MEMBERS

Position	Team Member (Agency/Office)	Initial and Date
Team Leader	Joe Russell (BLM, Shoshone FO)	JR 8-21-2012
Operations	Scott Uhrig (BLM, Twin Falls DO)	SU 8-21-2012
NEPA Compliance & Planning	Lisa Cresswell (BLM, Shoshone FO)	LC 8-21-2012
Botanist	Danelle Nance (BLM, Shoshone FO)	DN 8-21-2012
Cultural Resources/Archeologist	Lisa Cresswell (BLM, Shoshone FO)	LC 8-21-2012
Rangeland Mgt. Specialist	Dan Patten (BLM, Shoshone Field FO)	DP 8-21-2012
Wildlife Biologist	Gary Wright (BLM, Shoshone FO)	GW 8-21-2012
GIS Specialist	Cassie Mavencamp (BLM, Shoshone FO)	CM 8-21-2012
Resource Advisor(s) on Fire	Dan Patten (BLM, Shoshone FO)	DP 8-21-2012

PLAN APPROVAL

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

/s/ Holly Hampton 8/21/2012
FIELD OFFICE MANAGER DATE

/s/ Holly Hampton 8/21/2012
CRATERS OF THE MOON MONUMENT 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.