

**DECISION RECORD AND RATIONALE  
BLM/BOISE/BFO  
JACKS FIRE (G1MK) DOI-BLM-ID-B020-2013-0001-DNA**

Applicant: (if any) <b>None - BLM Proposal</b>		Proposed Action: <b>ESR</b>	Fire #: <b>G1MK</b>	Project No.:	E.A. No.: <b>DOI-BLM-ID-B020-2013-0001</b>
State: <b>Idaho</b>	County: <b>Owyhee</b>	District: <b>Boise</b>	Field Office: <b>Bruneau</b>	Authority: <b>FLPMA</b>	
Prepared By: (signature) <i>/s/ Michael McGee &amp; /s/ TJ Clifford</i>		Title: <b>Wildlife Bio. &amp; Recreation Plnr.</b>	Field Exam Date(s): <b>07/18/2012</b>	Report Date: <b>10/31/2012</b>	

**LANDS INVOLVED**

Meridian	Township	Range	Section(s)	Subdivision(s)	Acres
Boise	T 9S & 10S	R 2, 3,&4E	T9S R2E Sec26 – Fire Origin		48,894

**RATIONALE AND PLAN CONFORMANCE**

This emergency stabilization and burned area rehabilitation (ES&BAR) plan is consistent with the Bruneau Management Framework Plan and was further analyzed using the Minimum Requirements Decision Guide Worksheet for actions within a wilderness area. The treatments outlined in the plan are consistent with the treatments analyzed in the Boise District Office Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (NFESRP) and Environmental Assessment (EA, #ID-090-2004-050) and the Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment EA (#ID100-2005-EA-265) for the Boise District. Additionally, the proposed treatments are consistent with the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act of 2009 and BLM Manual 6340 – Management of Designated Wilderness (Fire Section, 2012).

The proposed treatments address conservation measures identified in the 2006 Conservation Plan for the Greater Sage-grouse in Idaho, which recommended seeding or planting the appropriate species and subspecies of sagebrush as part of restoration or burned area rehabilitation treatments (pp. 4-19 through 4-20), re-establishing sagebrush in seeded perennial grasslands (pp. 4-85 through 4-87), and noxious weed control in burned areas (p. 4-20). Treatments are also consistent with current Bureau policy (Instruction Memorandum No. 2012-043) for enhancement and restoration of sage-grouse habitat, specifically:

- In ES&BAR plans, prioritize re-vegetation projects to: (1) maintain and enhance unburned intact sagebrush habitat when at risk from adjacent threats; (2) stabilize soils; (3) reestablish hydrologic function; (4) maintain and enhance biological integrity; (5) promote plant resiliency; (6) limit expansion or dominance of invasive species; and (7) reestablish native species.

Treatments are also consistent with current Bureau policy (Instruction Memorandum No. 2012-044) for BLM’s national sage-grouse land use planning strategy and Attachment 1 – Sage-Grouse National Technical Team – A Report on National Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures, specifically:

- Prioritize native seed allocation for use in sage-grouse habitat in years when preferred native seed is in short supply. This may require reallocation of native seed from ES&R projects outside of priority sage-grouse habitat to those inside it. Use of native plant seeds

for ES&R seedings is required based on availability, adaptation (site potential), and probability of success Richards et al. 1998). Where probability of success or native seed availability is low, non-native seeds may be used as long as they meet sage-grouse habitat conservation objectives (Pyke 2011). Reestablishment of appropriate sagebrush species/subspecies and important understory plants, relative to site potential, shall be the highest priority for rehabilitation efforts.

- Design post ES&R management to ensure long term persistence of seeded or pre-burn native plants. This may require temporary or long-term changes in livestock grazing, wild horse and burro, and travel management, etc., to achieve and maintain the desired condition of ES&R projects to benefit sage-grouse (Eiswerth and Shonkwiler 2006).

This decision will result in the most beneficial, quickest recovery, and least costly stabilization and rehabilitation efforts for the pre-existing vegetation and soil resources of the burned area.

This decision does not include the implementation of the following treatments described in the Jacks Fire ES&BAR plan:

- Tigert Spring mulch and exclosure fence treatments (discussed under S6; fence labeled R7 on map) and
- Turner Pasture let-down and temporary fence (discussed under S7).

Upon further review and field examination, the Tigert Spring mulch and fence treatments will not be implemented for the following reasons:

- Riparian areas like Tigert Spring usually respond well to even high intensity burns. This burn should improve riparian plant health and vigor within a short time period.
- The area will be rested from the pressures of livestock grazing (per the livestock grazing pasture rest treatments S12 and R12), thereby limiting the grazing/browsing impacts to local wildlife only. This treatment is expected to remain in effect for at least two years and is based on meeting vegetative recovery objectives.
- When including the whole watershed delivery to that spring, the upland contributing area is much larger than the designed 3 acres. Furthermore, a majority of the immediately adjacent slopes (within the 3-acre mulch treatment area) consists of soils with high rock content, making a mulch treatment ineffective.

The Turner Pasture let-down and temporary fence in Owens Allotment will not be implemented at this time for the following reason:

- On September 26, 2012, the honorable U.S. District Judge B. Lynn Winmill issued a Memorandum Decision and Order in the case Western Watersheds Project (WWP) v Salazar (08-CV-435-BLW). At this time, the BLM is determining the implications of that ruling for all grazing-related activities and actions in the affected allotments, including Owens Allotment.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OR APPEAL OPPORTUNITIES**

This wildfire management decision is issued under 43 CFR Part 5003.1 (or 43 CFR 4190.1 for rangelands) and is effective immediately. The BLM has made the determination that vegetation, soil, or other resources on the public lands are at substantial risk of wildfire due to drought, fuels buildup, or other reasons, or at immediate risk of erosion or other damage due to wildfire. Thus, notwithstanding the provisions of 43 CFR 4.21(a)(1), filing a notice of appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 does not automatically suspend the effect of the decision. The Interior Board of Land Appeals must decide an appeal of this decision within 60 days after all pleadings have been filed, and

within 180 days after the appeal was filed (43 CFR 4.416).

**DECISION**

It is my decision to implement the Jacks Fire ES&BAR plan pending approval of funding, except for the Tigert Spring mulch and exclosure fence treatments and the Turner Pasture let-down and temporary fence. I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with an approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required.

*/s/ Arnold L Pike*  
Approving Official Bruneau Field Office

*11/1/2012*  
Date