



**United States Department of the Interior**  
**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**  
**Burley Field Office**  
**15 East 200 South**  
**Burley, Idaho 83318**  
**(208) 677-6600**



**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**  
**East Hollister Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation Plan**  
**#DOI-BLM-ID-T020-2012-0028-DNA**

<b>Fire Name</b>	East Hollister
<b>Fire Number</b>	G4ZK
<b>District/Field Office</b>	Twin Falls/Burley
<b>Admin Number</b>	LLIDT02000
<b>State</b>	Idaho
<b>County(s)</b>	Twin Falls
<b>Ignition Date/Cause</b>	8/5/2012/Lightning
<b>Date Controlled</b>	8/6/2012
<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<i>Acres</i>
<b>BLM</b>	393
<i>State</i>	0
<i>Private</i>	175
<i>Other</i>	0
<b>Total Acres</b>	568
<b>Total Costs</b>	\$79,000
<b>Costs to LF2200000</b>	\$56,000
<b>Costs to LF3200000</b>	\$23,000

**A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures.**

**BLM Office:** Burley Field Office      **Lease/Serial/Case File No.** N/A

**Proposed Action Title/Type:** East Hollister Fire Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation Plan.

**Location of Proposed Action:** 3 miles north of Hollister, ID.

Meridian	Township	Range	Affected Sections
Boise	T12S	R16E	4, 9 and 10

**Description of the Proposed Action:** The proposed action is to implement the East Hollister Emergency Stabilization (ES) and Burned Area Rehabilitation (BAR) Plan as prescribed by the Burley Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan and Environmental Assessment and outlined in the ES and BAR plan. The proposed action entails 393 acres of vegetation treatment by implementing drill seeding, detection and control of noxious weeds, repair and replacement of livestock management fences and temporarily resting the burned area from livestock grazing, and monitoring.

**B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance.**

The applicable land use plan for this ES and BAR project is the 1982 Twin Falls Management Framework Plan (MFP) as amended in 2008 by the Fire, Fuels and Related Vegetation Management Direction Plan Amendment (FMDA).

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions.

The FMDA (ROD, p. 4) indicates one of BLM’s goals is to “maintain or restore vegetation that would support special status species (SSS) and healthy, diverse, and sustainable vegetation communities.” The FMDA (ROD pp. 14-15) establishes a broad management goal to decrease acres with cheatgrass, weeds, and/or other undesirable species. Temporarily closing areas to livestock grazing and controlling noxious weeds both helps to maintain or restore healthy plant communities in conformance with the LUP as amended.

The project is in conformance with the analysis of Alternative E, the selected alternative in the 2008 Fire, Fuels and Related Vegetation Management Direction Plan Amendment (FMDA) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Final FMDA and EIS amends

all LUP's for the Burley Field Office except the Craters MP, to provide direction and guidance for fire/fuels and related vegetation management.

### **C. Identify applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

The proposed action is addressed in the following NEPA documents.

1. Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM lands in the 17 Western States Programmatic EIS, September 29, 2007.
2. Burley Field Office Noxious Weed Management Plan, Environmental Assessment (#ID-020-88-16).
3. Burley and Shoshone Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) Environmental Assessment (#ID-007-204-008), May 24, 2005.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report.)

1. Biological Assessment for the Burley and Shoshone Field Office NFRP and Concurrence, OALS #1-4-04-I-633.

### **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.**

**Documentation of answer and explanation:** An interdisciplinary resource team review of this fire revealed that the resource values, concerns, stabilization and rehabilitation needs are essentially the same as those analyzed in the 2005 NFRP and best meet the wildlife, watershed, and soil objectives in the Twin Falls MFP and FMDA. The primary purpose of the ES&BAR Plan is to evaluate actual and potential long-term post-fire impacts to cultural and natural resources and identify those areas unlikely to recover naturally from severe wildland fire damage and to repair or replace minor facilities

damaged by wildland fire. The project is within the same analysis area considered in the 2005 NFRP.

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values, and circumstances?**

**Yes.**

**Documentation of answer and explanation:** The range of alternatives analyzed in the NFRP is appropriate with respect to the proposed ES&BAR plan. In addition to the proposed action, two alternatives to the proposed action were analyzed in that EA. They included an alternative action that would not implement ES&BAR treatments, but was eliminated from detailed analysis because it was not consistent with BLM policy, and the No Action Alternative which would have continued to use the outdated Burley (1990) and Shoshone (1989) NFRPs. The current proposals follow the NFRP proposed action with the overall objective of stabilizing and rehabilitating the burned area in the shortest time frame to enhance and protect the watershed, soil, wildlife habitat, and livestock forage values of the area.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, or updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

**Yes.**

**Documentation of answer and explanation:** No new information has been provided since development and analysis of the Shoshone and Burley NFRP. The most recent BLM Special Status species list (including, threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant and animal species) was utilized in development of the ES&BAR plan.

**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.**

**Documentation of answer and explanation:** The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of seeding, controlling noxious weeds, replacing or repairing fences, and temporarily resting areas from livestock grazing are analyzed in the 2005 NFRP, Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands Final EIS, and Burley Field Office Noxious Weed Management Plan. The effects of this proposed action are similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents.

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

**Yes.**

**Documentation of answer and explanation:** The public involvement and interagency review of the NFRP is adequate for the current proposed action. Scoping letters informing the public of the purpose and need for action were sent to approximately 700 interested publics including organizations, and federal and state agencies beginning in November 2003. The general public and other agencies included interest from ranchers, academia, conservation groups, the Tribes, 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 Represented</b>
Dustin Smith	Fire Use Specialist	Fuels
Scott Uhrig	Fire Rehabilitation Specialist	Operations
Jason Theodozio	Range Management Specialist	Range
Suzann Henrikson	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources
Jeremy Bisson	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Katherine Farrell	P&E Coordinator	Planning

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the Twin Falls MFP as amended and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed actions and constitute BLM’s compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

/s/ Michael C Courtney

9/17/2012

FIELD MANAGER

DATE