



Bureau of Land Management

Boise District Office
Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area
3948 Development Ave
Boise, ID 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: Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area (NCA)

NEPA Log Number:

Lease/Serial Case File No.: IDI-34852

Proposed Action Title/Type: Acquisition of privately-owned surface and mineral estate.

Location/Legal of Proposed Action: Lot 3 and 4, and the W1/2NW1/4 of Sec 33, T. 1 S., R. 1 W., Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho. (see map in attached EA No. 2004-82).

Applicant (if any): BLM

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

Purchase of a private in-holding within the NCA.

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

LUP/Document ¹	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
NCA RMP	2-15	09-2008

The proposed action is in conformance with the NCA RMP because it is specifically provided for on page 2-15, as follows: “As opportunities arise, acquire scattered State and private lands within the NCA to improve management.”

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

NEPA/Other Related Documents ¹	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
EA 2004-082	All	08-09-04

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? Yes**

Documentation of answer and explanation: The current proposed action is exactly the same as previously analyzed in EA No. 2004-82, with the exception that the subject EA evaluated the acquisition of three separate parcels, two of which have already been acquired. The subject parcel is the only one left to be acquired.

- 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**

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the social, political, and environmental concerns and resource values are the same today as they were in 2004, when the original EA was written.

- 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? Yes**

Documentation of answer and explanation: The EA states that the purchase of property is a paperwork function that has no direct environmental impacts. The purchase would, however, have the indirect effect of precluding residential or commercial development of the property, which would protect adjacent public lands from the off-site impacts from development and use of the private land. From the standpoint of cultural and biological resources and values, nothing has changed in the affected area since the 2004 EA was written. The area still lies within the NCA.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: The methodology and analytical approach used in EA No. 2004-82 are appropriate for the current proposed action, since the existing resources and values, and the potential impacts of the proposed action on those resources and values remain the same as originally analyzed. Because the adjacent public lands are experiencing ever increasing recreational pressures, the proposed action is even more valid and appropriate today than in 2004.

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?

Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation: The EA analyzed and documented the potential impacts of acquiring three parcels of private land, totaling approximately 170 acres. This analysis continues to be adequate, since the current proposed action will be restricted to only 104 of the original 170 acres.

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)? Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation: The resource issues and values have not changed within the NCA.

7. 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 proposed action was discussed with Congressional staffs, the Shoshone-Paiute Tribe, Sierra Club, Wilderness Society, Snake River Raptor Volunteers, Inc., and nearby private landowners. No adverse comments were received, and there was general concurrence that acquisition of NCA in-holdings is in the public interest.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:

Name	Title	Resource Represented

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.

No mitigation measures are needed.

G. Conclusion

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/ John Sullivan

02-18-2010

NCA Manager

Date