

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-W010-2013-0075-DNA**

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: Raspberry – HNF3

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Raspberry (HNF3) Fire Emergency Stabilization
and Rehabilitation Plan

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Broadcast Seeding

T. 33 N., R. 36 E., sec. 06

T. 34 N., R. 36 E., sec. 32

Invasives Mgmt.

T. 33 N., R. 36 E., sec. 06

T. 34 N., R. 36 E., sec. 32

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

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON FIRE

The Raspberry Fire was ignited by lightning on 7/01/2013 and contained on 7/04/2013.

The Raspberry Fire occurred on the northwest flank of the East Range, immediately south of Raspberry Creek. The fire burned a total of 685 acres, with 334 acres occurring on BLM managed lands and 351 acres occurring on private landholdings. All of the burned area occurred within the East Range Greater Sage Grouse Population Management Unit (PMU), and 100% of the burned area is classified by the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) as sage grouse nesting and winter range. Approximately 60% of the burned area on BLM lands is classified as bighorn sheep potential habitat.

The Raspberry Fire burned in 3 different ecological sites. Approximately 60% of the fire occurred in ecological site R024XY005NV, which is typified by loamy soils receiving an average of 8-10" of precipitation annually. This ecological site, in reference condition, is dominated principally by Wyoming big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata* ssp. *wyomingensis*) and Thurber's needlegrass (*Achnatherum thurberianum*). Approximately 20% of the fire burned across ecological site R024XY020NV, which typically has

droughty loam soils and receiving an average of 8-10" of precipitation annually. This ecological site, in reference condition, is characterized by Wyoming big sagebrush, Thurber's needlegrass, and Indian ricegrass (*Achnatherum hymenoides*). Approximately 20% of the fire burned across ecological site R024XY021NV, which is a loamy slope receiving an average of 12-14" of precipitation annually. This ecological site is characterized by mountain big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata* spp. *vaseyana*), Idaho fescue (*Festuca idahoensis*), and bluebunch wheatgrass (*Pseudoroegneria spicata*). The entirety of the Raspberry Fire burned area occurred within the Whitehorse Allotment.

The entirety of the Raspberry Fire had been burned over in 1995 by the Cosgrave Fire and Dun Glen Fire complex of 1999. Aerial seeding of drainages was conducted as part of the Cosgrave Fire and Dun Glen Fire complex ESR projects.

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

Broadcast Seeding

The BLM proposes to broadcast seed a total of 334 acres of public land managed by BLM that burned due to lightning ignited wildfire in July 2013. Seeding would occur in the fall or winter with a preference for application in fall or early winter. Ecological sites R024XY020NV and R024XY005 would be seeded with Wyoming big sagebrush and Sandberg's bluegrass. Ecological site R024XY021NV would be seeded with mountain big sagebrush. Other site-adapted native plant species would be utilized depending on seed and funding availability.

Objectives for broadcast seeding are as follows:

1. Obtain an average of 0.25 sagebrush plants per meter² by the end of the third year from fire containment, which occurred on 07/04/2013.
2. 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.
3. The broadcast 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.
4. 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 25 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

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: Sonoma-Gerlach 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 Sonoma-Gerlach MFP, .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 in is 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):

Sonoma-Gerlach 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 maintenance 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 Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in Seventeen Western States Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Statement, 07/2007**, Record of Decision 9/29/07.
- **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.
- **Integrated Weed Management Environmental Assessment NV-020-02-19, 8/07/02**, Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact 8/27/02.
- **Vegetation Treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States Environmental Impact Statement, 05/91**, Record of Decision 07/91.

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).

- **Biological Opinion for the Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan** (August 2004)
- **IM 2012-043 Greater Sage Grouse Interim Management Policies & Procedures/A Report on National Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures.** Produced by: Sage-grouse National Technical Team, 12/21/2011 (pp 27)
- **IM 2012-044 BLM National Greater Sage-Grouse Land Use Plan Strategy.**

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 drill seeding, broadcast seeding, aerial seeding and installation of temporary fencing. 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 NDOW in the form of a meeting at the Winnemucca District Office on 10/30/2013 regarding the Raspberry Fire ESR. Coordination with the affected permittee regarding the Raspberry Fire ESR projects occurred on 11/15/2013 in the form of a phone conversation with the Winnemucca District Rangeland Management Specialist.

DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2013-0075-DNA

D. 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 10/22/2013	
Rob Burton	Veg/Soils	/s Rob Burton 10/24/2013	
Pat Haynal	Cultural	/s Pat Haynal 10/22/2013	
John McCann	Hydrology/Riparian	/s John McCann 10/24/2013	
Nancy Spencer-Morris	Wildlife	/s Nancy Spencer-Morris 11/6/2013	
Greg Lynch	Fisheries	/s Greg Lynch 10/24/2013	
Allie Brandt	GIS	/s Allie Brandt 10/22/2013	
Eric Baxter	ESR Lead	/s Eric Baxter 11/12/2013	
Lynn Ricci	NEPA	/s Lynn Ricci 11/12/2013	
Samantha Gooch	Wild Horse/Burro	/s Samantha Gooch 10/24/2013	
Sandra Gracia	Lands w/ Wilderness Characteristics	/s Sandra Gracia 11/13/2013	
Mark Williams	Fire/Fuels	/s Mark Williams 10/23/2013	
Mark Turney	Public Affairs	/s Mark Turney 11/14/2013	

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 11/25/2013
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.