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)
Cave Canyon Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation Plan
#DOI-BLM-ID-T020-2012-0032-DNA

Fire Name	Cave Canyon
Fire Number	G4ZV
District/Field Office	Twin Falls/Burley
Admin Number	LLIDT02000
State	Idaho
County(s)	Cassia
Ignition Date/Cause	8/5/2012/Lightning
Date Controlled	8/19/2012
Jurisdiction	***Acres***
BLM	27,948
State	2,383
Private	2,384
Other	USFS – 56,235
Total Acres	88,950
Total Costs	$4,247,000
Costs to LF2200000	$3,835,000
Costs to LF3200000	$412,000

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: Cave Canyon Fire Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation Plan.

Location of Proposed Action: 6 miles west of Oakley, ID.

Meridian	Township	Range	Affected Sections
Boise	T12S	R19E, 20E, 21E	Various
Boise	T13S	R21E	Various
Boise	T14S	R21E	Various

Description of the Proposed Action: The proposed action is to implement the Cave Canyon Emergency Stabilization (ES) and Burned Area Rehabilitation (BAR) Plan as prescribed by the Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) and Environmental Assessment and outlined in the ES&BAR plan. The proposed action entails 27,948 acres of vegetation treatment by implementing aerial seeding, ground seeding, soil stabilization, detection and control of noxious weeds, cultural stabilization, 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&BAR project is the 1985 Cassia Resource Management Plan (Cassia RMP) 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 Cassia RMP (p.7) states “Sufficient vegetation is reserved for purpose of maintaining plant vigor, stabilizing soil, providing, cover for wildlife and other non-consumptive uses.” The FMDA (Record of Decision, 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 help to maintain or restore healthy plant communities in conformance with the LUP as amended.

The Cassia RMP (p. 7) also states “A variety of range improvements, grazing systems and other range management practices will be considered in conjunction with livestock management on individual allotments.” Repairing or replacing range improvements damaged during a wildfire are consistent with using a variety of range improvement to manage livestock.

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 Cassia RMP 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 ESR 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 aerial seeding, ground seeding, controlling noxious weeds, replacing or repairing fences, and temporarily resting areas from livestock grazing are analyzed in the 2005 NFRP and Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands Final EIS. 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.

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Dustin Smith	Fire Use Specialist	Fuels
Scott Uhrig	Fire Rehabilitation Specialist	Operations
Jason Theodozio	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range
Suzann Henrikson	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources

Jesse Rawson	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Katherine Farrell	P&E Coordinator	Planning

CONCLUSION

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the Cassia RMP 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
Michael Courtney FIELD MANAGER	DATE