

Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Humboldt River Field Office, LLNVW01000

TRACKING NUMBER: **DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2013-0077-DNA**

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: Coyote – HM3Z

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Coyote (HM3Z) Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Drill/Ground Seeding

T. 44 N., R. 42 E., sec. 18,19

Invasives Mgmt.

T. 44 N., R. 42 E., sec. 12

APPLICANT (if any): Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON FIRE.

The Coyote Fire was ignited by lightning on 7/01/2013 and contained on 7/02/2013.

The Coyote Fire occurred near the western edge of the Owyhee Desert, approximately 1.5 miles South of the North Fork of the Little Humboldt River. A total of 89 acres of BLM managed lands were burned within the William Stock Allotment, with 62 of those acres classified as Sage Grouse Preliminary General Habitat (PGH) and 27 acres classified as Sage Grouse Preliminary Priority Habitat (PPH). 100% of the fire affected area is classified as mule deer winter range, and pronghorn summer range. The fire occurred in ecological site R025XY019NV, which is typified by claypan soil, and receives an average of 10-12" of precipitation annually. Ecological site R025XY018NV, in reference condition, is generally dominated by low sagebrush, with components of bluebunch wheatgrass and Thurber's needlegrass. The Coyote Fire has not been affected in the past by documented wildfires.

A. Description of the Proposed Action with attached map(s) and any applicable mitigation measures.

Broadcast Seeding and Harrowing

The BLM proposes to broadcast seed and harrow a total of 89 acres of public land managed by BLM that was burned by the Coyote Fire in July 2013. This action would take place during the fall or winter, with a strong preference for fall or early winter application. The proposed seeding is in ecological site R025XY018NV, Claypan 10-18” P.Z. Project would seed mountain big sagebrush and potentially with Sandberg’s bluegrass and/or bluebunch wheatgrass. Other site-adapted native plant species would be utilized depending on seed and funding availability.

Objectives for ground seeding are as follows:

1. Obtain an average of 0.5 sagebrush plants per meter² by the end of the third year from fire containment, which occurred on 07/02/2013.
3. Obtain 50% or greater perennial cover of the low potential perennial plant cover for the appropriate ecological site by the end of the third year from fire containment.
4. The ground seeding will result in lower abundance (density and cover) of invasive annual plant species and a higher abundance of desirable perennial plant species than the unseeded control areas.
5. Seeded species are well established and are reproductive.

Invasive Plants and Noxious Weeds Management

Manage invasive species within the fire-affected area to limit further infestation through active treatment of previously existing and newly established infestations of noxious weeds. Up to 5 acres of noxious weed infestations would be treated annually during 2014, 2015, and 2016.

Located infestations, if any, would be treated with BLM approved herbicides as appropriate, and in compliance with BLM operating procedures and label requirements for BLM approved herbicides. Treatments may include one or more of the following chemicals depending on species present in project location:

Imazapyr
Glyphosate
2,4-D
Picloram
Dicamba
Metsulphuron methyl
Clorsulphuron

All infestations and treatments would be tracked in District GIS layers/shapefiles.

Monitoring

All treatments would be monitored using established protocols summarized below for treatment efficacy and efficiency.

All vegetation treatments would be monitored for effectiveness using point-intercept, gap intercept and frame density techniques modified from Monitoring Manual for Grasses, Shrublands, and Savanna Ecosystems (Herrick, et. al., 2005) techniques outlined in BLM Technical Reference 1734-4 (BLM 1996), to determine perennial cover, and density of seeded and non-seeded plant species during the three years following fire containment on these areas.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Paradise-Denio Management Framework Plan (MFP)

Date Approved: 1982

*List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto)

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

The proposed treatments are in conformance with **the Paradise-Denio Standard Operating Procedures**, .45 Soil-Water-Air which states in part;

1. "Consider rehabilitating areas which have had protective vegetative cover destroyed by wildfire....." "Utilize seed and other watershed stabilization techniques as required."
2. "Increase existing forage by artificial methods wherever appropriate. Land treatment is defined as vegetation manipulation (i.e. plowing, burning, spraying and/or seeding)."

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 (objective, terms, and conditions):

Paradise-Denio MFP (1982)

Although not specifically addressed, stabilization and rehabilitation treatments conform to wildlife and watershed objectives WL-1, which state in part; "Provide for improvement or maintenances of wildlife habitat in the planning area in order to assure that sufficient quantity, quality and diversity of habitat exists to accommodate the needs of all species of wildlife..."

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

- **Vegetation Treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States Environmental Impact Statement, 05/91**, Record of Decision 07/91.
- **Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment EA# NV-020-04-21, 06/2004**, Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact 8/19/04.
- **Vegetation Treatment Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in Seventeen Western States Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Statement, 07/2007**, Record of Decision 9/29/07.
- **Integrated Weed Management Environmental Assessment NV-020-02-19, 8/07/02**, Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact 8/27/02.

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).

- **IM NV 2012-043 Greater Sage-Grouse Interim Management Policies and Procedures** (December 2011)
- **A Report on National Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures.**
Produced by: Sage-grouse National Technical Team, 12/21/2011 (pp 27)
- **Biological Opinion for the Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan** (August 2004)

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan EA-NV-020-04-21 (DR/FONSI 8/19/04), addresses the proposed treatments including broadcast seeding and harrowing. Control of noxious weeds is analyzed in the Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan EA-NV-020-04-21 (DR/FONSI 8/19/04), Integrated Weed Management EA-NV-020-02-19 (DR/FONSI 8/27/02) and the Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States EIS (ROD 9/29/07).

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents are appropriate with respect to the current proposed action and current environmental concerns, interests, resource values and circumstances.

3. Is the existing analysis valid 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 proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the existing analysis is adequate and there is no new information or circumstances regarding the current proposal known at this time.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the analytical approach used in the existing NEPA documents continues to be appropriate for the current proposed action.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents are adequate. In addition, there has been coordination with Nevada Department of Wildlife (10/30/2013) and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (11/12/2013) during development of the Coyote Fire ESR plan in the form of meetings to discuss fire-affected resources and restoration priorities.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name /Title	Resource/Agency Represented	Signature/Date	Comments (Attach if more room is needed)
Wes Barry	Range	/s Wes Barry 10/18/2013	
Rob Burton	Veg/Soils	/s Rob Burton 9/30/2013	
Pat Haynal	Cultural	/s Pat Haynal 9/30/2013	
John McCann	Hydrology/Riparian	/s John McCann 10/21/2013	
Nancy Spencer-Morris	Wildlife	/s Nancy Spencer-Morris 10/18/2013	
Greg Lynch	Fisheries	/s Greg Lynch 9/30/2013	
Allie Brandt	GIS	/s Allie Brandt 10/18/2013	
Eric Baxter	ESR Lead/Invasive Species	/s Eric Baxter 10/01/2013	
Lynn Ricci	NEPA	/s Lynn Ricci 10/30/2013	
Samantha Gooch	Wild Horse/Burro	/s Samantha Gooch 9/30/2013	
Sandra Gracia	Lands w/ Wilderness Characteristics	/s Sandra Gracia 10/21/2013	
Mark Williams	Fire/Fuels	/s Mark Williams 9/30/2013	
Mark Turney	Public Affairs	/s 10/22/2013	

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.

Conclusion *(If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.)*

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' compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

/s Eric Baxter _____
Signature of Project Lead

/s Lynn Ricci _____
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s Derek Messmer _____ 11/04/2013 _____
Signature of the Responsible Official 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.