Bureau of Land Management
Boise District Office
Bruneau Field Office
3948 Development Ave.
Boise, Idaho 83705
http://www.id.blm.gov

Determination of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management

A. BLM Office: Bruneau Field Office

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-ID-B020-2013-0015-DNA

Lease/Serial Case File No.: SRP # ID120-13-005

Proposed Action Title/Type: Issuance of Commercial Special Recreation Permit

Location/Legal of Proposed Action: IDFG Game Management Unit 41-1 (west of pipeline, south of Mud Flat Road). Please see attached map.

Applicant: White Cloud Outfitters

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:
The Proposed Action is to issue a one-time Special Recreation Permit for White Cloud Outfitters to conduct guide and outfitter services on BLM lands for a client who has obtained a permit to hunt for bighorn sheep within Game Management Unit (GMU) 41-1. This private individual has chosen to use a guide and outfitter (White Cloud Outfitters) to assist with this hunt. Issuance of the SRP would be coordinated with the Idaho Outfitters and Guides Licensing Board (IOGLB) in conformance with the Memorandum of Understanding between BLM and IOGLB. Special Recreation Permits may be issued in accordance with the BLM Special Recreation Permit Policy (43 CFR 8372). Hunting operations would be held within the Bruneau Field Office (BFO) and/or Four Rivers Field Office (FRFO) depending on the area the permit/hunting tag holder selects. The proposed hunt would be conducted between August 30 and October 8, 2013. Motorized travel outside Wilderness would be restricted to existing and/or designated routes; no motorized or mechanized travel would be allowed within Wilderness. Leave No Trace camping practices will be observed. Other stipulations would be included with the authorization (attached).

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

LUP/Document[1]	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Bruneau MFP	Recreation Objective #1	1983
Owyhee RMP	Recreation/ Pages 35-41	1999

[1]List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans, Management Framework Plans, or applicable amendments) and activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action.

NEPA/Other Related Documents[1]	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Environmental Assessment ID-010-86-29 Outfitter/Hunting Guide Services - Owyhee, Bruneau, and Jarbidge Resource Areas	All	1986
Owyhee Canyonlands Wilderness and Wild & Scenic Rivers Draft Management Plan and Environmental Assessment	54, 83-84	Draft

[1]List applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action or documentation relevant to the proposed action (i.e., source drinking water assessment, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, rangeland health standard assessment and determination, or monitoring report).

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. **Is the current Proposed Action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current Proposed Action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?**

   Documentation of answer and explanation:

The proposed action is the same action as that previously analyzed and in the same location as previously analyzed.

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?**

   Documentation of answer and explanation:

The range of alternatives includes authorizing outfitting operations (preferred alternative), limiting the number of authorized outfitters to one or two, and not authorizing new outfitted hunting. The range of alternatives is appropriate with respect to the current proposed action. The

Idaho Department of Fish and Game has already issued the permit to the applicant's client for this sheep hunt.

3. **Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (i.e., riparian proper functioning condition reports; rangeland health standards assessments; inventory and monitoring data; most recent USFWS 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?**

   Documentation of answer and explanation:

The existing analysis and conclusions are adequate. While portions of GMU 41-1 have been designated as Wilderness since the original analysis was conducted, the management of those areas has not changed significantly compared to when the same areas were managed as Wilderness Study Areas. As a result, this new circumstance is insignificant with regard to the analysis of the proposed action. There is not any other new information or circumstances known that would affect the analysis of impacts of or conclusions regarding guided hunting operations.

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

   Documentation of answer and explanation:

The analytical approach used in the EA is appropriate for the proposed action.

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 analyze site-specific impacts related to the current Proposed Action?**

   Documentation of answer and explanation:

Direct and indirect impacts of outfitted hunting are substantially unchanged from those identified in EA # 010-86-29, and site-specific impacts of travel and camping are documented in that assessment. Stipulations required in the permit minimize these impacts.

6. **Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?**

   Documentation of answer and explanation:

The cumulative impacts of these hunts are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document. This hunt does not represent an increased level of use or a new location of use. A permit for this hunt has already been issued to the applicant's client by the

Idaho Department of Fish and Game. The hunt will occur whether or not BLM allows a commercial outfitter to assist the client with the hunt; thus, any impacts from the hunt will occur whether or not BLM issues this permit.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current Proposed Action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document are adequate for the current proposed action. We are aware of no current issues or controversies related to guided hunting in this area.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:

Name	Title	Resource Represented
David Draheim	Bruneau FO Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, Wilderness
Jared Fluckiger	Birds of Prey NCA Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation
Bruce Schoeberl	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife and Special Status Wildlife Species
Holly Beck	Botanist	Special Status Plants
Lois Palmgren	Archaeologist	Historic and Cultural Resources
James “Dave” Mays	Fisheries Biologist	Riparian and Fisheries Resources

F. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures have been incorporated and implemented.

A copy of the permit stipulations is attached.

G. Conclusion

[X] 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'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.

/s/ *Dave Draheim*_____	_8/1/2013_____
Preparer	Date
/s/ *Seth Flanigan* _____	8/1/2013_____
NEPA Specialist	Date
/s/ *Aimee D.K. Betts* (Acting)_____	___8/1/2013_____
Bruneau Field Manager	Date
/s/ *Patricia Roller*_____	___8/1/2013_____
Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area Manager	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.