

**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-W010-2013-0017-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: G40F

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TITLE: Slumbering (G40F) Fire Emergency Livestock Closure

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T 38 N, R 35 E, Portions of Sections 6 & 7. T 39 N, R 35 E, Portions of Sections 31-33.

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

<i>Resource Type</i>	<i>Acres/Miles Burned</i>
Year-round Pronghorn Habitat	2,249 acres
Daveytown	2,199 acres
Morman Dan	50 acres (private)

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON FIRE

During the summer of 2012 the Slumbering Fire burned approximately 2,444 acres in the Daveytown Allotment, which is within the jurisdiction of the Humboldt River Field Office (HRFO). After an interdisciplinary review it was determined that grazing closure was needed to maintain and/or restore important resources affected by the fire. These resources include such things as vegetation structure, vegetative composition, wildlife habitat, and forage for wildlife and livestock.

The Slumbering Fire ignited on August 5, 2012 by a lightning strike in the southwest corner of the Daveytown Allotment. Values immediately in danger include habitat for antelope (*Antilocapra americana*).

The area is predominately dominated by two ecological sites, a Loamy 5-8" P.Z. and a Droughty Loam 8-10" P.Z. The potential native vegetative plant community for the Loamy 5-8" P.Z. is dominated by shadscale, bud sagebrush, and Indian ricegrass. The potential composition is approximately 25% grasses, 5% forbs and 70% shrubs. The approximate ground cover is 10-15 percent. The potential native vegetative plant community for the Droughty Loam 8-10" P.Z. is dominated by Wyoming sagebrush, spiny hopsage, Thurber's needlegrass and Indian ricegrass. Sandburg's bluegrass and bottlebrush squirreltail are important on this site. The potential

composition is approximately 50% grasses, 5% forbs and 45% shrubs. The approximate ground cover is 15-25 percent.

The Slumbering Fire has increased the potential of wind and water erosion and the spread of noxious weeds and/or invasive and non-native plant species. Damage to vegetation structure, vegetative composition, wildlife habitat, and forage for wildlife and livestock resources could reduce ecological condition and rangeland health.

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

Closures

A partial closure/AUM reduction would be implemented for the Daveytown allotment. 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 permittees 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. Areas associated with the Slumbering Fire would remain closed to livestock grazing until vegetation objectives are achieved.

Monitoring

Vegetation would be monitored. Once vegetation objectives are met, the burned area will be opened and the temporarily suspended AUMs will be restored.

**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 is in 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.**

- **Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment** EA# NV-020-04-21, Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact 8/19/04.

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).

- **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.

**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 is 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**

<b>Name /Title</b>	<b>Resource/Agency Represented</b>	<b>Signature/Date</b>	<b>Comments (Attach if more room is needed)</b>
Morgan Lawson	Range	/s/ M. Lawson 12/14/2012	
Rob Burton	Veg/Soils	/s/ R. Burton 12/14/2012	
Mark Hall	NAC and Cultural	/s/ Mark E Hall 12/14/2012	No Comments
John McCann	Hydrology/Riparian	/s/ J. W. McCann 12/17/2012	See pg 1
Nancy Spencer-Morris	Wildlife	/s/ Nancy Spencer-Morris 12/18/2012	None
Greg Lynch	Fisheries	/s/ Greg Lynch 12/17/2012	No Comments
Allie Henson	GIS	/s/ Allie Henson 12/14/2012	
Eric Baxter	ESR Lead	/s/ Eric N Baxter 12/14/2012	
NEPA	Zwaantje Rorex	/s/ Zwaantje Rorex 12/18/2012	

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.

/s/ Bret Allen 12/18/2012

Signature of Project Lead

/s/ Zwaantje Rorex 12/18/2012

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ Ken Loda, Acting FM-HRFO

Signature of the Responsible Official

Date: 18 Dec. '12

**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.