

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-W010-2013-0045-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: Kirk Mader (2703470)

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Buckskin Fire Emergency Grazing Closure

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

T. 45 N., R. 38 E., sec. 27 1/4 S

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

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON FIRE

The Buckskin Fire ignited on August 13, 2012 adjacent to Highway 95. Areas immediately consumed or impacted by the fire include pronghorn (*Antilocapra Americana*) summer range, mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) summer range and crucial mule deer winter range. Approximately 77 acres of the Flat Creek Allotment were impacted by the fire. Over nine miles of allotment/pasture boundary fences were damaged by the fire. Several water developments and guzzlers were also within the fire perimeter.

Almost 40% of the fire was located within a Loamy 8-10 precipitation zone (P.Z.) (R024XY005NV) including the lower mountains, hills and fan piedmonts with elevations ranging from 4500-6500'; potential vegetation included Wyoming big sagebrush and Thurber's needlegrass. 30% of the fire was located on the summits and side slopes of a Loamy 10-12 P.Z. (R024XY013NV) ecological site with elevations between 5500-7000'; vegetation consisted of sagebrush (Wyoming, Mountain, and Basin) as well as bluebunch wheatgrass and Thurber's needlegrass. 15% of the fire burned on the side slopes of hills on a South Slope 8-12 P.Z. (R025XY015NV) ecological site between 5500-6500' in elevation; dominant vegetation included Wyoming big sagebrush and bluebunch wheatgrass. The remainder of the fire perimeter included several other ecological sites which were impacted to a lesser degree.

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

Livestock grazing would be temporarily suspended within the burned portions of the Flat Creek Allotment. Before livestock are allowed back onto the burned portion of the allotment, the following management objective must be met:

- Perennial vegetative cover must meet or exceed 50% of the lowest potential perennial ground cover for the appropriate ecological site

Vegetation monitoring would begin one year post fire and after the growing season. Data collected will indicate trend of the vegetative regrowth, establishment and the potential for these areas to meet the set criteria. If the establishment criteria are not met after the second growing season of the grazing closure, the areas potential to meet the criteria would be evaluated. Some of the factors to be considered in this evaluation would be: vegetation trends as determined by monitoring data, the amount of total precipitation, amount of growing season precipitation and the benefits of additional growing seasons of rest.

Monitoring

Monitoring would be conducted before any reintroduction of livestock to the closure area, and annually thereafter in accordance with the monitoring schedule developed for the Flat Creek Allotment.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Paradise-Denio Management Framework Plan (MFP)

Date Approved: 1982

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

*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:

This treatment is congruent with the *Standard Operating Procedures outlined in the Paradise - Denio MFP, 1982*, which states:

1. Section .46 Wildlife-Aquatic Wildlife states: “Fire rehabilitation measures will include...Closure to livestock and/or wild horse use (allotment or pasture closure, or protective fencing).”

2. Section .45 Soil-Water-Air advises: “Rehabilitation must be protected from grazing until adequate seedling establishment has been attained. A minimum of two years is normally required for seedling establishment.”

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, stabilization and rehabilitation treatments conform to wildlife and watershed objectives WL-1, which state in part; “Provide for improvement or maintenances of wildlife habitat in the planning area in order to assure that sufficient quantity, quality and diversity of habitat exists to accommodate the needs of all species of wildlife...”

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, Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Record 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 Assessment 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), a district wide EA, addresses allotment closure to livestock grazing, “closure may be required to allow for effective recovery and the ability of permittees to adjust their livestock operations to the loss of all or a part of their permitted use area define the nature of wildfire effects”.

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, 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 analyses are adequate in regard to the proposed action. Sage Grouse were identified as a BLM sensitive species in the relevant analysis document and no change to that status has since occurred. The proposed action and analysis of that action meets the requirements of IM 2012-043, "Greater Sage-Grouse Interim Management Policies and Procedures (December 2011) and IM 2012-044, "Sage Grouse National Technical Team-Report on National Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures" (December 2011) which guide policy in Sage Grouse habitat.

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 the livestock grazing permittee. This DNA will be made available on the Winnemucca District Office webpage and in the ePlanning Register. Any decision based on this DNA will be sent to the allotment affected interests.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name /Title	Resource/Agency Represented	Signature/Date	Comments (Attach if more room is needed)
Garrett Noles	Range	/s/ Garrett Noles 4/29/2013	
Rob Burton	Veg/Soils	/s/ Rob Burton 4/29/2013	
Garrett Noles	NAC	/s/ Garrett Noles 4/29/2013	
John McCann	Hydrology/Riparian	/s/ John McCann 4/29/2013	No comment
Nancy Spencer-Morris	Wildlife	/s/ Nancy Spencer-Morris 4/29/2013	
Greg Lynch	Fisheries	/s/ Greg Lynch 4/29/2013	
Allie Brandt	GIS	/s/ Allie Brandt 4/29/2013	No comment
Eric Baxter	Invasive, Non-Native species (plants & animals)	/s/ Eric Baxter 4/29/2013	
Mark Turney	Public Outreach	/s/ Mark Turney 5/9/2013	
Kristine Struck	Wilderness and Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	/s/ Kristine Struck 4/29/2013	Also reviewed WSA & LWC

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/ Garrett Noles 5/9/2013
Signature of Project Lead

/s/ Lynn B Ricci 5/9/2013
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ Vern Graham 5/13/2013
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.