Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Humboldt River Field Office, LLNVW01000

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2013-0006-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER:

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Hanson (G5M4) Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION

Aerial Seeding
T. 42 N., R. 39 E., sec.20, 29, 32, portions of 17, 16, 21, 22, 28, 33
T. 41 N., R. 39 E., sec.5, portions of 6, 4, 7, 8, 9

Ground Seeding
T. 42 N., R. 39 E., portions of sec. 17, 16, 20, 21, 22, 28, 27, 32,33
T. 41 N., R. 39 E., portions of sec. 6, 7, 8

Invasives Mgmt.
T. 42 N., R. 39 E., portions of sec. 17, 16, 20, 21, 22
T. 41 N., R. 39 E., portions of sec. 6, 7, 8

APPLICANT (if any): Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

The Hanson fire was ignited by lightning on 8/10/2012.

Resource Type	***Acres/Miles Burned***
Preliminary Priority Sage-grouse Habitat	6,294 ac
Preliminary General Sage-grouse Habitat	2,098 ac
Year-round Pronghorn Habitat	8,421 ac
Crucial Winter Mule Deer Range	4,251 ac
Summer Mule Deer Range	1,472 ac
Agricultural Mule Deer Range	1,133 ac
Bighorn Sheep Habitat	415 ac
Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Recovery Stream	4 miles

Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Recovery Watershed	3,172 ac
Allotment Fence	10 miles
Allotments:	
Abel Creek	2,879 ac
Singas	2,072 ac
Hanson Creek	1,712 ac
Fort Scott	75 ac

There are 554 acres of BLM lands infested with Medusahead rye within the fire perimeter. Approximately 80% of these infestations were treated with Plateau herbicide during the Fall of CY2011 (as per DNA# DOI-BLM-NV-W010-0200-DNA). Control was highly effective, but not complete due to sagebrush cover and soil seed bank.

Residential structures exist immediately adjacent to Singas and Hanson creeks at the canyon mouths. These private landowners, their residences, and associated property improvements may be at risk from potential landslide or flood damage. Sedimentation produced by severely burned slopes could potentially provide risk to private landholder irrigation improvements.

A. Description of the Proposed Action with attached map(s) and any applicable mitigation measures.

Soil Stabilization

This project proposes to perform stream stabilization in select target areas (as determined by ID team specialists) within a 276 acre project area. Actual implementation acres are expected to be less than 20.

Treatments would possibly include installing live willow stakes to create filters; filters would penetrate the soil approximately 10-18” and would be installed in target areas approximately 30’-100’(at maximum). Wood-fiber or straw mulch may be utilized to reduce surface erosion and enhance seed germination and seedling establishment broadcasted seed.

Other structures could include installing in-stream rock structures from local sources, and placing brush/tree skeletons into the stream bank to reduce sedimentation and soil erosion.

Closures

Full or partial closures would be implemented for the Abel Creek, Singas, Hanson Creek, and Fort Scott allotments. Closures would be in effect until the objectives have been met. Closure objectives are defined in the pending Notice of Grazing Closure Final

Decision issued to the permitees by the Field Office Manager. Existing allotment and pasture fences damaged by the fire would be repaired in accordance with the current permanent fence specifications between October 2012 and April 2014.

Aerial Seeding

This project proposes to aerially seed approximately 6439 acres of Sage Grouse Preliminary Priority Habitat (PPH) and/or Preliminary General Habitat (PGH) with native seeds based on availability, adaptation, and probability of success consistent with the National Technical Team 2011 Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures; the proposed seed mix would include yarrow and Lewis flax. Other site-adapted native species may be added to, or used as substitutions for yarrow and Lewis flax, depending on cost and availability. This seeding would occur between December 2012 and March 2013.

Up to 2,400 acres within the 6,439 acre PPH/PGH seeding would also include both mountain and Wyoming sagebrush. The seeding would likely be split between 3 years, and 3 different areas due to funding and seed availability (i.e. 800 acres of sagebrush would be seeded between December 2012 and March 2013, 800 additional acres would be seeded between December 2013 and March 2014, and the final 800 acres of seeding would occur between December 2014 and March 2015).

Approximately 3,300 acres within the 6,439 PPH/PGH seeding could include forage kochia. This seeding would be restricted to the eastern portion of the 6,439 acre area where native seed establishment success could be low, and where the spread of invasive species would be most likely; this treatment would be intended to limit the expansion or dominance of invasive species by providing a competitive perennial, which is consistent with the IM-2012-043 Greater Sage-Grouse Interim Management Policies and Procedures. This seeding would occur between December 2012 and February 2013, and would fully depend on seed availability.

Proposed aerial seeding areas are identified on the attached maps.

Ground Seeding

This project proposes to drill seed (272acres) or broadcast and harrow seed (709 acres) a total of 981 acres with competitive perennial grasses and forbs which could include (depending on seed availability), bottlebrush squirreltail, crested wheatgrass or Siberian wheatgrass, Sandberg's bluegrass, fourwing saltbush, forage kochia, and shadscale, or other natives. This activity would be coordinated with chemical control of invasive annual plant species. This treatment would occur between October 2012 and February 2013.

Proposed drill/harrow seeding areas are identified on the attached maps.

Invasive Plants and Noxious Weeds Management

Noxious weeds and non-native invasive plants would be inventoried within the proposed project area. Located infestations, if any, would be treated with BLM approved herbicides as appropriate, and in compliance with BLM operating procedures and label requirements for BLM approved herbicides. Approximately 200 acres are identified for treatment: 200 acres are anticipated/proposed for treatment in year one, and 200 acres (either re-treatment or new infestation treatments) each in year two and three (all treatments would be initiated in early spring or mid-to-late fall).

Treatments may include one or more of the following chemicals depending on species present in project location:

Imazipyr
Glyphosate
2,4-D
Picloram
Dicamba
Metsulphuron methyl
Clorsulphuron

Imazapic may be utilized on all ground seeding treatments to suppress Medusahead rye and advantage seeded perennial plants. Two applications are planned, with the first occurring during the fall of calendar-year 2012 or 2013, and the second occurring during the fall of calendar-year 2014.

Proposed application of Imazapic coincides with drill/harrow seedings shown on attached maps.

Monitoring

All treatments would be monitored using established protocols for treatment efficacy and efficiency.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name*_ Paradise Denio Management Framework Plan (MFP)
Date Approved__1982_____

Other document_ Winnemucca District Fire Management Plan ___
Date Approved__September 2004__

*List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto)

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

The proposed treatments are in conformance with **the Paradise-Denio MFP:**

Wildlife MFPIII Decisions WL-1.21 P.D.: Maintain and improve habitat for sensitive, protected, threatened and endangered species listed on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Endangered and Threatened List, BLM-Nevada Department of Wildlife Sensitive Species List and those existing Federal and state laws and regulations.

Paradise-Denio MFP, Standard Operating Procedures: .45 Soil-Water-Air
"Consider rehabilitation areas which have had protective vegetative cover destroyed by wildfire…Utilize seeding or other watershed stabilization techniques as required. Rehabilitation must be protected from grazing until adequate seedling establishment has been attained."

The proposed treatments are in conformance with the **Winnemucca Field Office Fire Management Plan, 2004,** which states:

1. "Break up monocultures through the use of chemical, biological, and/or mechanical means to stop the spread of the affected area especially in areas that border important habitats."

2."Seed areas with perennial grass species to reduce the dominance of cheatgrass…Non-fire fuels treatments would be utilized to achieve resource goals and objectives based on site-specific habitat conditions"

The proposed action in is conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objective, terms, and conditions):

Paradise-Denio MFP (1982)
Although not specifically addressed, weed treatments conform to wildlife, range, and watershed objectives **(WLA 1.12, RM2.1**), which includes improving and maintaining habitat quantity, quality, diversity, and production by artificial methods when appropriate.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

- **Vegetation Treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States Environmental Impact Statement** Record of Decision 1991.
- **Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment** EA# NV-020-04-21, Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact 8/19/04.

- **Vegetation Treatment Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in Seventeen Western States Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Statement,** Record of Decision 9/29/07.
- **Integrated Weed Management Environmental Assessment** NV-020-02-19, Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact 8/27/02.
- **Santa Rosa Fuelbreak Project Environmental Assessment** No.: DIO-BLM-NV-WO10-2010-0003-EA
  First Decision (February 2010) Second Decision (May 2010)
- **Paradise Fuelbreak Maintenance Environmental Assessment** No.: DOI-BLM-NV-WO10-2010-0009-EA (July 2010)

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).

- **IM NV 2012-043 Greater Sage-Grouse Interim Management Policies and Procedures** (December 2011)
- **A Report on National Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures.** Produced by: Sage-grouse National Technical Team, 12/21/2011 (pp 27)
- **Biological Opinion for the Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan** (August 2004)

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA documents(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?

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes, the Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan EA NV-020-04-21 (DR/FONSI 8/19/04), addresses the proposed treatments including drill seeding, broadcast seeding, aerial seeding, fence repair, and stream stabilization. Control of noxious weeds is analyzed in the Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan EA NV-020-04-21 (DR/FONSI 8/19/04), Integrated Weed Management EA NV-020-02-19 (DR/FONSI 8/27/02) and the Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States EIS (ROD 9/29/07).

The majority of the project acres were known habitat for Greater Sage Grouse before the Hanson fire occurred. Greater Sage Grouse are a candidate species for listing under the Endangered Species Act, and are currently a BLM sensitive species. Effects to Sage Grouse and Sage Grouse habitat from ESR activities were analyzed in the Winnemucca District Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan, which states that one of the principle

functions of the ESR program is "to restore habitats that fall within sage-grouse/sagebrush obligate species use areas."

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents are appropriate with respect to the current proposed action and current environmental concerns, interests, resource values and circumstances.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and 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?

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes, the existing analysis is adequate and there is no new information or circumstances known at this time.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes, the analytical approach used in the existing NEPA documents continues to be appropriate for the current proposed action.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes, public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents are adequate. In addition, there has been coordination with Nevada Department of Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and Native American consultation.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name /Title	Resource/Agency Represented	Signature/Date	Comments (Attach if more room is needed)
Wes Barry	Range	/s/ 10/30/2012	None
Rob Burton	Veg/Soils	/s/ 10/30/2012	None
Mark Hall	NAC and Cultural	/s/ 10/22/2012	None
John McCann	Hydrology/Riparian	/s/ 11/06/2012	See note on maps
Nancy Spencer-Morris	Wildlife	/s/ 10/31/2012	No additional comments
Greg Lynch	Fisheries	/s/ 11/5/2012	None
Allie Henson	GIS	/s/ 10/26/2012	None
Eric Baxter	ESR Lead	/s/ 10/29/2012	None
NEPA	Zwaantje Rorex	/s/ 11/6/2012	None
Wild Horse and Burro	Melanie Mirati	/s/ 10/31/2012	None
			None

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.

☐ **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' compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

_____Eric Baxter /s/_____10/29/2012_____
Signature of Project Lead

_____Zwaantje Rorex /s/_____ _____11/6/2012_____
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

_____Edward Seum /s/_____11/8/2012_____
Signature of the Responsible Official 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.