

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
Fir Grove Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation Plan
DOI-BLM-ID-T030-2013-0028-DNA
Bureau of Land Management
Idaho State Office
Twin Falls District
Shoshone Field Office

Fire Name	FIR GROVE
Fire Number	HS1N
District/Field Office	TWIN FALLS/SHOSHONE
Admin Number	LLIDT0300
State	IDAHO
County(s)	CAMAS/GOODING
Ignition Date/Cause	07-28-2013 / LIGHTNING
Date Contained	07-30-2013
Jurisdiction	<i>Acres</i>
BLM	5,578
State	310
Private	1,255
Other	0
Total Acres	7,143
Total Costs	\$108,000
Costs to LF2200000	\$0
Costs to LF3200000	\$108,000

A. BLM Office: Shoshone Field Office **Lease/Serial/Case File No.**

Proposed Action Title/Type: Fir Grove Emergency Stabilization (ES) and Burned Area Rehabilitation (BAR) Plan

Location of Proposed Action: Hash Springs, Schooler Creek, North Gooding, North Shoshone, and Gwin Ranch Grazing Allotments

Meridian	Township	Range	Affected Sections
Boise	T2S, T3S	R15E	Various

Description of the Proposed Action: The proposed action is to implement the Fir Grove Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation plan as prescribed by the Shoshone Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan and Environmental Assessment and outlined in the ES/BAR plan. The proposed action entails implementing detection and control of noxious weeds on 5,578 acres, hand planting of sagebrush seedlings, 7.2 miles of fence repair, a livestock grazing closure, and monitoring.

Applicant (if any): N/A

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

1. Bennett Hills Management Framework Plan, 1976
2. Fire, Fuels and Related Vegetation Management Direction Plan Amendment, 2008

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions.

The applicable land use plan for the ES project area is the 1976 Bennett Hills Management Framework Plan (MFP). The Bennett Hills MFP states that lands administered by the BLM in this area will be managed in order to:

- 1) Maintain or increase the percent of perennial grass, forbs, and shrubs in the plant community. Consideration is also given to maintaining the remaining native perennial plant communities.

The emergency stabilization treatments outlined here are consistent with the goals and objectives identified in the 1979 Final Shoshone Environmental Grazing Statement and the Allotment Management Plans and rangeland management agreements for the affected grazing allotment.

The proposed treatments in this ES/BAR plan conform to the Bennett Hills MFP. The ESR team developed objectives and treatments which respond to the identified issues and concerns. The BLM would evaluate this plan based on the success or failure in meeting these objectives.

The project is also in conformance with the analysis of Alternative E, the selected alternative, in the 2008 Final 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 Shoshone Field Office except the Craters of the

Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan, to provide direction and guidance for fire/fuels and related vegetation management.

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. Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM lands in the 17 Western States Programmatic EIS. September 29, 2007.
2. Shoshone Noxious Weed Control EA (ID-050-EA-92-031), March 25, 1992
3. Burley and Shoshone Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP), May 24, 2005

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

1. Biological Assessment for the Burley and Shoshone Field Office NFRP and Concurrence, OALS #1-4-04-I-633.

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, the proposed action is a feature of the proposed actions outlined in the 2005 NFRP.

Documentation of answer and explanation: An interdisciplinary resource team review of this fire has 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 MFP. The primary purpose of the ES/BAR plan is to stabilize soils from erosion impacts by assuring that the pre-existing native plants and proposed seeded plants are protected from grazing use, and allowed to recover, maximize growth, and provide a source of live and litter ground cover for the protection of the soil.

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, the range of alternatives in the existing NEPA documents is appropriate considering the current proposed action.

Documentation of answer and explanation: The range of alternatives analyzed in the NFRP is appropriate with respect to the Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation activities. Two alternatives to the proposed action were analyzed in the

NFRP EA. They included an alternative action that would not implement ES and BAR 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 Burley (1990) and Shoshone (1989) NFRPs. The current proposals follow the NFRP proposed action with the overall objective of stabilizing and rehabilitating the burned area to its previous native and/or seeded condition in the shortest time frame to enhance and protect the watershed, soil, wildlife habitat, and livestock forage values of the area.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate 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 the proposed action?

Yes, the existing analysis is still valid.

Documentation of answer and explanation: The NFRP was approved on May 24, 2005. No new information that would change the proposed action or invalidate the analysis contained in the NFRP has been identified. During the interdisciplinary review, team members consulted the most recent list of Threatened and Endangered species (July 16, 2013) and BLM sensitive species for the Shoshone Field Office.

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, the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from the ES/BAR project are similar to those analyzed in the 2005 NFRP EA.

Documentation of answer and explanation: The current proposed action would result primarily in impacts to soils and vegetation. These impacts were considered in the NFRP on pages 40-44. Noxious weed treatments would long term provide for soil stability and native vegetation recovery and reduce the wind erosion potential. With native vegetation recovery and weed control efforts the area susceptible to wind and water erosion would be reduced.

The NFRP adequately analyzed the actions proposed in the ES/BAR plan and it is anticipated that the cumulative impacts of the actions are not substantially different as analyzed in the NFRP. Therefore, there will not be any additional cumulative effects to consider under the plan.

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

Yes, the public involvement and interagency review of the NFRP is adequate for the current proposed actions.

Documentation of answer and explanation: 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 of 2003. The 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. The ES/BAR plan along with the Decision Record would be posted on the Idaho BLM's NEPA website and is available upon request.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet.

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Joe Russell	Fire Ecologist	Fuels
Scott Uhrig	Fire Rehabilitation Specialist	Operations
Claire Josaitis	Range Management Specialist	Range
Lisa Cresswell	Archaeologist/NEPA Coordinator	Cultural/NEPA
Danelle Nance	Natural Resource Specialist	Botany
Gary Wright	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife

F. Mitigation Measures:

The natural recovery of the burn on public lands will be monitored and managed to keep livestock from grazing for a minimum of two growing seasons to allow for recovery and maximum production of the existing plant community. Cultural resource inventories will be completed prior to ground disturbing activities to avoid any potential adverse effects to significant cultural sites.

CONCLUSION

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the Bennett Hill MFP and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLMs compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

/s/ Joseph E. Russell
 Joseph E. Russell
 Project Lead

10/17/13
 Date

/s/ Lisa Cresswell
 Lisa Cresswell
 NEPA Coordinator

10/17/13
 Date

/s/ Elizabeth Maclean
 Elizabeth Maclean
 Shoshone Field Office Manager

10/17/13
 Date