



United States Department of the Interior  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
Burley Field Office  
15 East 200 South  
Burley, Idaho 83318  
(208) 677-6600



**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)  
West Hollister Fire Temporary Protection Fence  
#DOI-BLM-ID-T020-2013-0032-DNA**

**A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures.**

**BLM Office:** Burley Field Office

**Lease/Serial/Case File No.** N/A

**Proposed Action Title/ Type:** West Hollister Fire Temporary Protection Fence

**Location of Proposed Action:** One mile northwest of Hollister, Idaho

Meridian	Township	Range	Affected Sections
Boise	T. 12 S.	R. 16 E.	7 and 12

**Description of the Proposed Action:** Approximately 1½ miles of temporary fence would be constructed to exclude livestock from grazing the crested wheatgrass seeding burned in the HMJ1 West Hollister fire. (See Map 1)

**B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance.**

The applicable land use plan for this project is the 1982 Twin Falls Management Framework Plan (MFP) as amended in 2008 by the Fire, Fuels and Related Vegetation Management Direction Plan Amendment (FMDA).

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:

The project is in conformance with the analysis of Alternative E, the selected alternative in the 2008 Fire, Fuels and Related Vegetation Management Direction Plan Amendment (FMDA) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The final FMDA and EIS amends all LUP's for the Burley Field Office except the Craters RMP, to provide direction and guidance for fire/fuels and related vegetation management. Protection of vegetation after a wildfire is in conformance with this plan.

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

The proposed action is addressed in the following NEPA documents.

1. Burley and Shoshone Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) Environmental Assessment (#ID-007-2004-EA-008), May 24, 2005.

#### **D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

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

Yes.

**Documentation of answer and explanation:** An interdisciplinary resource team review of this fire revealed that the resource values, concerns, stabilization and rehabilitation needs are essentially the same as those analyzed in the 2005 NFRP and best meet the wildlife, watershed, and soil objectives in the Twin Falls MFP and FMDA. The project is within the same analysis area considered in the 2005 NFRP.

**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, and resource values, and circumstances?**

Yes.

**Documentation of answer and explanation:** The range of alternatives analyzed in the NFRP is appropriate with respect to the proposed project. In addition to the proposed action, two alternatives to the proposed action were analyzed in that EA. They included an alternative action that would not implement ESR treatments, but was eliminated from detailed analysis because it was not consistent with BLM policy, and the No Action Alternative which would have continued to use the outdated Burley (1990) and Shoshone (1989) NFRPs. The current proposal follows the NFRP proposed action with the overall objective of stabilizing and rehabilitating the burned area in the shortest time frame to enhance and protect the watershed, soil, wildlife habitat, and livestock forage values of the area. A temporary fence would protect those values.

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

Yes.

**Documentation of answer and explanation:** No new information changed the situation in the project area since development and analysis of the Shoshone and Burley NFRP. The most recent BLM Special Status species list (including, threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant and animal species) was utilized by the ID team reviewing this project proposal and circumstances have not changed.

**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?**

Yes.

**Documentation of answer and explanation:** The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of replacing or repairing fences, and temporarily resting areas from livestock grazing through temporary fences were analyzed in the 2005 NFRP. The effects of this proposed action are similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents.

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

Yes.

**Documentation of answer and explanation:** The public involvement and interagency review of the NFRP is adequate for the current proposed action. Scoping letters informing the public of the purpose and need for action were sent to approximately 700 interested publics including organizations, and federal and state agencies beginning in November 2003. The general public and other agencies included interest from ranchers, academia, conservation groups, the Tribes, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, and ESA consultation with the USFWS.

**E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted.**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Resource Represented</b>
Dustin Smith	Fire Use Specialist	Fuels
Nancy Ady	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range
Suzann Henrikson	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources
Jeremy Bisson	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the Twin Falls MFP as amended and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed actions and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Jim Tharp for  
**Michael Courtney**  
 Burley Field Manager

8/12/2013  
**Date**