



**Bureau of Land Management**  
Boise District Office  
Four Rivers Field Office  
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:** Four Rivers Field Office

**NEPA Log Number:** DOI-BLM-ID-B010-2013-0047-DNA

**Lease/Serial Case File No.:**

**Proposed Action Title/Type:** Weiser Complex Fire #HX4J ESR Plan

**Location/Legal of Proposed Action:** Washington County, Idaho in drainages adjacent to the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River along the eastern edge of Brownlee Reservoir; T.13N,14N,15N,16N; R.6W; multiple sections

**Applicant (if any):**

**Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:**

***Aerial Seeding*** – Approximately 4,300 acres of northerly-facing slopes in the McChord Butte Allotment (Wolf Creek Pasture) would be aerially seeded with native, locally adapted big sagebrush species (xeric big sagebrush and/or similar big sagebrush species) to rehabilitate Greater sage-grouse habitat and other special status species habitat. The treatment would ideally occur in December or January of FY14.

***Noxious Weeds*** - Canada thistle, houndstongue, jointed goatgrass, perennial pepperweed, poison hemlock, rush skeletonweed, Scotch thistle, spotted knapweed, and whitetop are known to occur within and adjacent to the burned area boundary. Noxious weed inventory and spot herbicide treatment would occur for three years following the fire within the burned area. Noxious weeds would be treated with the BLM-approved chemicals in accordance with the Noxious Weed EA and the Record of Decision for Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States, approved September 29, 2007 (Vegetation Treatment EIS).

***Fence Repair*** - Approximately 15 miles of fence burned in the fire and would be repaired (portions may be removed and replaced depending on level of damage). The allotment boundary fences, internal fences, and spring exclosure fences necessary to protect the burned area from livestock grazing and movement during the closure period would be repaired.

***Livestock Allotment Closure*** - The Sturgill Creek Allotment and the Wolf Creek Pasture of the McChord Butte Allotment would be rested from livestock grazing for a minimum of two growing seasons. Further, necessary conditions regarding vegetation recovery must be achieved for grazing resumption to occur. Livestock grazing allotment/pasture temporary closures would be accomplished through grazing decisions.

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

<b>LUP/Document</b>	<b>Sections/Pages</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>
Cascade Resource Management Plan (RMP)	Fire Management, Rehabilitation, Greenstripping and Reduction Actions/Procedures; Wildlife Resource Objectives; Resource Management Guidelines (Weeds)	1988

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP and is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

The 1988 Cascade Resource Management Plan (RMP), Wildlife Resource Objectives section includes, “Manage 185,860 acres of sage-grouse habitat to improve brooding and nesting habitat” and “Manage 181,640 acres of elk habitat, 275,250 acres of deer habitat and 4,400 acres of antelope crucial winter habitat and provide forage to support proposed populations of these animals” and “Maintain existing habitats for other wildlife species”. The decision further stipulates under the Sage-Grouse sub-section that where applicable, seed mixtures for fire rehabilitation projects will include a mixture of grasses, forbs, and shrubs that benefit sage-grouse.

The 1988 Cascade RMP, Fire Management, Rehabilitation, Greenstripping and Reduction Actions/Procedures, (3.) states “All grazing licenses issued that include areas recently burned and/or seeded will include a statement concerning the amount of rest needed in the seedings or burned area. Normally two years of rest will be necessary to enable recovery of these areas.” The construction of protective fencing, although not addressed in the 1988 Cascade RMP, is consistent with RMP Objectives and Actions.

The control of noxious weeds is consistent with Cascade RMP, Resource Management Guidelines, Weeds (Control of Noxious), “BLM districts will work with respective County governments to monitor the location and spread of noxious weeds and to maintain up-to-date inventory records.” BLM will control the spread of noxious weeds on public lands where possible, where economically feasible, and to the extent that funds are prioritized for that purpose.” The control of noxious weeds is in compliance with State and county laws.

The 1988 Cascade RMP, Fire Management, Rehabilitation, Greenstripping and Reduction

Actions/Procedures, (3.) state “All grazing licenses issued that include areas recently burned and/or seeded will include a statement concerning the amount of rest needed in the seedings or burn area”.

**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).**

<b>NEPA/Other Related Documents</b>	<b>Sections/Pages</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>
Boise District Office Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment (EA) # ID-090-2004-050	All	May 12, 2005
Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) and the Vegetation Treatments on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Report.	All	June, 2007
Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment Program Biological Assessment and Addendum for Boise District and Jarbidge Field Office of the Twin Falls District – Ada, Adams, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, Owyhee, Payette, Twin Falls, Valley, and Washington Counties, Idaho	All	August 17, 2005
Boise District Noxious and invasive Weed Treatment EA	All	Feb 6, 2007

**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 was analyzed under the Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment (NFESRP EA) for the Boise District BLM. These included ground and aerial seeding, herbicide uses for noxious weed treatments, infrastructure repair, 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

of May 2005 and best meet the vegetation, watershed, and soil objectives of this Plan and the Cascade RMP.

**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 EA (p. 8-30). They included an alternative that would not implement ESR treatments; however, this was eliminated from detailed 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 EA's Proposed Action is to stabilize and return a burned site 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. The proposed activities in the Weiser Complex Fire ESR Plan are designed to accomplish that objective for the area burned by the Raft and Hells Canyon Fires (#HX4J).

**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 in the Weiser Complex Fire ESR Plan are within the scope of environmental analysis completed for the Boise District NFESRP and associated Biological Assessment and USFWS concurrence letter.

**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 aerial seeding of sagebrush, noxious weed treatment, fence repair, and livestock allotment closure. 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 plan. All specific design features outlined in the NFESRP 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**

**Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Resource/Agency Represented</b>
Barbara Chaney	Biologist	US Fish and Wildlife Service
County Commissioners	Local Policymakers	Owyhee County
Native American Nation		Shoshone Paiute Tribes

**Weiser Complex Fire ESR Plan**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency Represented/Duty Station</b>
Sarah Garcia	Rangeland Management Specialist	BLM – Four Rivers FO
Mark Steiger	Botanist	BLM-Four River FO
Dean Shaw	Archeologist	BLM-Four Rivers FO
Jill Holderman	Wildlife Biologist	BLM-Four Rivers FO
Alan Tartar	Riparian Specialist	BLM-Four Rivers FO
Lara Hannon	Operations	BLM-Boise District
Alex Webb	Operations	BLM-Boise District
Anna Owsiak		IDFG Rocking M Ranch Conservation Easement
Gary Holmstead		Idaho Power Company
Andy Bumgarner		Payette National Forest
Diane Green		Idaho Department of Lands

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:**

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/ Sarah C. Garcia  
Preparer

11/1/2013  
Date

/s/ Seth Flanigan  
NEPA Specialist

11/1/2013  
Date

/s/ Terry A. Humphrey  
Four Rivers Field Manager

11/4/2013  
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.