

Worksheet Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) or Little Lost Outfitters Commercial Hunting Special Recreation Permit

U.S. Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

BLM Office: Upper Snake Field Office (USFO)

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-ID-I010-2013-0028-DNA

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: ID-310-RE-13-006

Proposed Action Title/Type: Special Recreation Permit (SRP)

Location of Proposed Action: Little Lost Drainage, Idaho Department of Fish and Game Hunting Unit 51. Hunts will be conducted on BLM-managed lands in areas such as Donkey Hills, Hawley Mountain, Birch Creek Pass, Jump-off Canyon, and Pass Creek.

Description of the Proposed Action:

Renew and issue a SRP for outfitting and guiding commercial big game hunting trips within the Little Lost River Drainage. Guided hunting trips focuses on harvesting deer, elk, mountain lion, pronghorn, moose, and bear. The trip duration averages approximately one week, averaging 2 clients per trip. The permit would be issued for a five-year period.

Commercial use is defined as recreational use of the public lands and related waters for business or financial gain. An activity or service is considered commercial use if anyone collects a fee or receives compensation for services. Commercial use can also be characterized in situations where duty of care or expectation of safety is owed participants by service providers as a result of compensation.

Applicant (if any): Little Lost Outfitters

Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name: *Little Lost/Big Lost Framework Management Plan* Date Approved: March 1981
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 (objectives, terms, and conditions) and, if applicable, implementation plans decisions: Little Lost/Big Lost Framework Management Plan: Final Management Decisions for the Planning Unit, Objective 5 (page 11), “Maintain or enhance the present quality of hunting, fishing, and wildlife observation opportunities in the unit.”

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

This proposed action is addressed in the following existing BLM EA/EIS:

Name/Number of NEPA Document:

Special Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004) EA number ID-074-2004-0042 also states that commercial SRP applications would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Other documentation relevant to the proposed action:

Post evaluations document that the permitted outfitter is compliant with SRP stipulations.

NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

Yes, the proposed action to allow hunting within the Little Lost Drainage under a SRP complies with the alternative selected and analyzed in *Special Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004) EA number ID-074-2004-0042*.

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, resource values, and circumstances?

Yes, section 2, page 2 of the *Special Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004)* describes the alternatives considered when issuing SRPs on BLM-administered lands within the USFO. The action alternative is described in detail and the alternative considered but not carried through for full analysis is presented. A description of the No Action Alternative (no change from current management) is also included as required by CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1502.14d).

Two alternatives were developed by the Interdisciplinary (ID) team on issues identified during internal scoping. A full analysis of the two alternatives is described in the EA (pages 5-11) including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts (pages 11-13).

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

Yes, there has been no significant change in circumstances or significant new information germane to the proposed action. No new information is presented under the proposed action to warrant any further analysis. The proposed action is adequately analyzed under the existing NEPA document *Special Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004) EA number ID-074-2004-0042*.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Yes, the Environmental Assessment provides sufficient detailed assessments of all alternatives including the Proposed Action Alternative to sustain the action of issuing a permit for a commercial guided hunting.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Yes, the direct and indirect impacts of guided hunting trips that would occur in the Little Lost drainage are unchanged from those identified in the existing *Special Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004)*. The current NEPA document specifically analyses impacts related to this activity at the identified locations.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Yes, the cumulative impacts of the proposed action are essentially the same as those identified in the existing document. The direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts section of the *Special Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004)* accurately describes impacts associated with guided hunting and may be found within pages 11 through 13 of the NEPA document.

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

Yes, section 5, page 13 of the *Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004)* lists the individual resource specialists who participated in the preparation of the EA. Also, public involvement during the broader EA process was in accordance with NEPA timelines. The final EA was available to the public for a thirty day comment period and no comments were received either positive or negative from any constituents or members of the public. The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes were consulted during the process and did not provide comments related to the EA.

Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Shannon Bassista	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation
Joshua Gibbs	BLM USFO NEPA Specialist	NEPA
Marissa Guenther	Archaeologist	Cultural
Dan Kotansky	Supervisory Hydrologist	Hydrology, Hazmat
Devin Englestead	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Deena Teel	Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist	ACEC, Riparian
Monica Zimmerman	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation

Mitigation Measures:

Issue a Special Recreation Permit that would require the permittee to abide by all standard Special Recreation Permit Stipulations and additional USFO permit stipulations. The additional USFO stipulations are:

1. Any use of public lands is subject to the condition that upon leaving, the lands must be restored as closely as possible to the pre-existing condition.
2. All garbage and waste must be removed upon leaving public lands.
3. When feed for livestock is provided by the permittee, it must be certified weed-seed free feed.
4. All animals must be under control at all times to protect wildlife, other livestock, and range forage.
5. Do not tie, corral, or picket animals within 200 feet of any lake, stream, main trail or recreation site. If it is necessary to keep stock tied up for an extended length of time, select a site where damage to vegetation is minimized.
6. Do not lead, ride, tie, corral, or picket animals within 100 feet of any archaeological site.
7. Stock may not travel in streams except when crossing.

CONCLUSION

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

Preparer: Shannon Bassista /s/ Shannon Bassista 4/1/2013

NEPA Reviewer: Deena Teel /s/ Deena Teel 4/2/2013

Upper Snake Field Manager: Jeremy Casterson /s/ Jeremy Casterson 04/2/2013