



Bureau of Land Management

Boise District Office
Owyhee Field Office
20 First Avenue West
Marsing, ID 83639
<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: Owyhee Field Office

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-ID-B030-2013-0025-DNA

Lease/Serial Case File No.:

Proposed Action Title/Type: **BONJOUR (aka BOU-JOR) #HS3J Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan**

Location/Legal of Proposed Action: **6S 4W Sec 19, 29-32 and 6S 5W Sec 24, 25**

Applicant (if any):

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

S5/R5 Noxious Weeds - Leafy spurge has been identified by the district noxious weed program as present within the fire perimeter. Biological control agents, flea beetle (*Apthona* spp.), for leafy spurge were released in the area in 2002 and were generally well established prior to the fire, however the fire is likely to have severely damaged populations. BLM noxious weed personnel will inventory the fire for leafy spurge infestations, as well as other noxious weeds. Weed infestations will be inventoried, recorded with GPS, treated (chemical or biological as appropriate), monitored and retreated as necessary. Biological control populations will be augmented with both new releases and redistribution of existing nearby populations. Treated infestations will be monitored over a three year period documenting treatment effectiveness and expansion. Noxious weed populations persisting within the burned fire perimeter after the three year period will be transitioned to the District Noxious weed program for future inventorying and treatments. All actions would be in accordance with the Boise District Noxious Weed EA, Environmental Assessment #ID100-2005-EA-265.

S7 Fence/Gate - The objective of this treatment is to repair and/or replace approximately 4 miles of interior livestock management fencing damaged by the fire. Damaged wood corners and

braces would be replaced with steel posts. Damaged wire would also be repaired. The management fences would be constructed to BLM fence standards.

S12/R12 Closures - The burned BLM acres will be closed to livestock grazing until plan objectives have been achieved.

S13/R13 Monitoring - Monitoring will be conducted on treatments and is described in detail in the Monitoring section of this plan.

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

LUP/Document¹	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Owyhee Resource Management Plan	Objectives, Management Actions, and Allocations pp 9-48	December 30, 1999

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following 1999 Owyhee LUP decisions:

- Improve unsatisfactory and maintain satisfactory watershed health/condition on all areas (SOIL 1 pages 9-10).
- Improve unsatisfactory and maintain satisfactory vegetation health/condition on all areas (VEGE 1 pages 12-13).
- Maintain or enhance the condition, abundance, structural stage and distribution of plant communities and special habitat features to support a high diversity and desired populations of wildlife (WDLF 1 pages15-17).
- Decrease soil erosion and sediment yield, restore forage values, and restore upland habitat values and riparian values using fire rehabilitation procedures following a wildfire (FIRE 2 pages 25-28).
- Protect and enhance habitat for a diversity of special status species through implementation of management actions identified in objectives SOIL 1 and 2, WATR 1 and 2, VEGE 1, RIPN 1, FORS 1 and 2, WDLF 1, FISH 1 and 2, RECT 3, WNES 1 and 2, HAZM 1, and ACEC 1 (SPSS 1 pages 20-21).

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

NEPA/Other Related Documents	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) and the Vegetation	Record of Decision and Appendix B - Standard Operating Procedures	June, 2007

NEPA/Other Related Documents	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Treatments on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Report (http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/more/veg_eis.html)		
Boise District Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment EA	All	February 6, 2007
Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management	All	August 1997
Boise District and Jarbidge Field Office Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan EA	All	May 12, 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, a range of proposed actions were analyzed under the Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment (NFESRP EA) for the Boise District BLM. These included; herbicide use for noxious weed treatments and livestock management actions. An interdisciplinary team review of this fire has determined that the resource values, concerns and rehabilitation needs are substantially similar to those discussed and approved in the Boise District NFESRP EA, May 2005 and best meet the vegetative, watershed, and soil objectives of the Plan.

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?**

Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the NFESRP EA is appropriate for this action. Two alternatives to the proposed action were analyzed in the NFESRP EA (p 8-30). They included an alternative action that would not implement ESR treatments, but was eliminated from detail analysis because it was not consistent with BLM policy and the No Action Alternative, which would continue to use existing 1987/1988 NFESRP's. The overall objective of the Proposed Action of the NFESRP EA is to stabilize and return a burned site to its previous native and/or seeded condition in the shortest timeframe to enhance and protect the watershed, soil, wildlife habitat, and livestock forage values of the area. The proposed actions of the Bonjour ES&R plan are designed to accomplish that objective for the area burned by the BonJour Fire (HS3J).

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (e.g., 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 would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Yes, the proposed treatments will promote soil stabilization and protect habitat for the Greater sage-grouse by reducing the potential for soil movement. The proposed treatments are covered under the Biological Assessment for the 2004 Normal Fire Emergency Rehabilitation Plan addresses the proposed treatments, and the subsequent Biological Opinion is in concurrence with the Assessment.

The livestock closure will minimize potential displacement impacts to wintering big game from remaining patches of suitable habitat within the burned area. The analysis in the NFESRP EA (p. 65) is valid.

Based on the new information gained during recent inventory and survey of the burn area, existing analysis from the Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan is adequate. The proposed actions within the treatment area and their effects to the above species were analyzed in the plan and found to be insignificant.

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 analyses of the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action remain unchanged from those outlined in the existing NEPA document. The impacts outlined in the document directly correlate to those impacts expected from the current proposed actions of noxious weed treatment, and infrastructure repair. The direct and indirect impact analysis does not analyze the impacts of the fire and the resulting loss of habitat, which is outside the scope of the document. The NFESRP EA analyzes site specific impacts to resources such as vegetation, wildlife, soils, and sensitive species as a result of the proposed treatments outlined in the ESR plans. All specific design features outlined in the NFESRP EA will be followed during implementation of the emergency stabilization and rehabilitation treatments.

The cumulative impacts analyzed in the existing NEPA document are adequate with the addition of the proposed action. Special status and non-status plants and animals would be protected by the general and species specific design features, and would benefit from a return to more natural fire cycles and improved ecosystem function including better habitat/population connectivity, migratory corridors, habitat structure, forage and suitability.

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 existing NEPA document is adequate for the current proposed action. The EA states on page 77 that “scoping letters informing the public of the purpose and need for action were sent to 1,077 interested publics including organizations, and federal and state agencies in October, 2003.” The general publics and other agencies included interest from ranchers, academia, conservation groups, Tribal governments, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, and ESA consultation with the USFWS.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Mike Spicer	Rangeland Management Specialist	BLM Owyhee Field Office
Beth Corbin	Botanist/Ecologist	BLM Owyhee Field Office
Kelli Barnes	Cultural Resource Specialist	BLM Owyhee Field Office
Brad Jost	Wildlife Biologist	BLM Owyhee Field Office
Robert Bennett	ESR Operations	BLM Boise District
Kathi Kershaw	Resource Coordinator	BLM Boise District

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.

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 have been identified.

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.

/s/ Kathi G. Kershaw
Kathi G. Kershaw -Preparer

October 31, 2013
Date

/s/ Seth Flanigan
Seth Flanigan - NEPA Specialist

October 31, 2013
Date

/s/ Michele McDaniel, Acting for
Loretta Chandler - Owyhee Field Manager

October 31, 2013
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.