

**2 ½ mile creek, north of Pocatello, in Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**
(DOI-BLM- ID-I020-2013-0042-DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

Note: This worksheet is to be completed consistent with the policies stated in the Instruction Memorandum entitled “Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy” transmitting this worksheet and the “Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet” located at the end of the worksheet. (Note: The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM’s internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.)

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

Proposed Action Title/Type: 2 ½ Mile Fire ESR

Location of Proposed Action: 2 ½ Mile creek north of Pocatello in Bannock County, Idaho (T5S R35E Sec. 28, 29, 30, 31, 32).

Description of the Proposed Action: The proposed action is to implement stabilization and rehabilitation treatments following the 2 ½ Mile Fire. Treatments include: treatment and inventory of noxious weeds, re-construction of an existing fence (approx. one mile) and closure of the burned area to grazing until natural re-vegetation objectives are met. A complete description of the treatments can be found in the 2 ½ MILE FIRE ES&BAR PLAN approved 7/27/2013.

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

LUP Name*	<u>Pocatello RMP</u>	Date Approved	<u>April 2012</u>
LUP Name*	_____	Date Approved	
Other document**	_____	Date Approved	
Other document**	_____	Date Approved	
Other document**	_____	Date Approved	

*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).

**List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

The proposed action is in conformance with the following Livestock Grazing (LG) and Vegetation (VE) management direction in the Pocatello Resource Management Plan (April 2012), approved July 10, 2012, by the Idaho BLM State Director.

Goal LG-1. Provide forage for livestock grazing consistent with other resources/uses as part of an ecologically healthy system consistent with multiple use and sustained yield.

Objective LG-1.2. Consistent with maintaining a thriving ecological balance and multiple use relationships provide annually a total preference (active + suspended) of approximately 87,500 animal unit months (AUM).

Action LG-1.2.4. Beginning the following year after a wildland fire, livestock will be excluded from burned areas until an evaluation is completed to determine if objectives specific to or potentially impacted by livestock grazing in site-specific ES&R plans have been met. Should it be determined that ES&R treatments failed (plan objectives not met), at the discretion of the authorized officer livestock grazing could resume provided that:

- a) Livestock grazing be adjusted (e.g., number, season of use, kind) to compensate for the change in rangeland health and forage conditions; and
- b) Livestock grazing will not prevent meeting or moving towards meeting Standards of Rangeland Health and or ES&R objectives.

Goal VE-2. Prevent the establishment of invasive species/noxious weed species.

Objective VE-2.1. Treat invasive species/noxious weeds to decrease or control the total number of acres occupied.

Action VE-2.1.4. As appropriate, chemical, biological, mechanical and manual methods will be used in treating invasive species/noxious weeds. The use of biological control agents will be promoted when reasonable as identified through current BLM policy.

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) (EA # ID-320-2005-003)

Pocatello Northeast Fuels Reduction and Restoration Project (ID-320-2009-EA-3698)

Upper Snake-Pocatello Integrated Weed Control Program Programmatic Environmental Assessment (ID-310-2008-EA-43)

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 standards assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

N/A

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. The NFRP discusses and identifies all of the proposed treatments on pages 8-18 under its proposed action. The treatment and control of noxious weed species is discussed within the

Upper Snake-Pocatello Integrated Weed Control Program Programmatic Environmental Assessment.

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, resource values, and circumstances?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. The NFRP was specifically written to address stabilization and rehabilitation needs following a wildfire. There are no new concerns, interests, resource values or circumstances dealing with the proposed treatments since the NFRP EA which was completed in 2005. The Upper Snake-Pocatello Integrated Weed Control Program Programmatic Environmental Assessment was written in 2009 to address the control and treatment of noxious weed species.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service 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 are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The existing analysis is adequate. The fire occurred within typical upland vegetation. An interdisciplinary (ID) team assessed the fires impacts and developed the treatments to stabilize the resources at risk. The ID team did not identify any special resource concerns or issues that were not addressed within the NFRP.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. The NFRP and Upper Snake-Pocatello Integrated Weed Control Program Programmatic Environmental Assessment are recent documents that analyzed existing restoration, stabilization, and control techniques. The proposed treatments will utilize the materials and equipment analyzed in these EAs.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. The treatments proposed are specifically identified in the existing EA's and analyzed. The EA's analysis of impacts is sufficient because it was based on performing treatments in sites similar to the burned area.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. The cumulative impacts would be the same as those analyzed in the EA's, because the treatments are the same and the area affected is typical for the lands analyzed in the EA's.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. The NFRP deals directly with post fire treatments and involved the known interested public. Local affected parties and Idaho Fish and Game were involved in the development of the treatments.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

Michael Kuyper, Natural Resource Specialist: Range/ESR

James Kumm, Wildlife Specialist: Wildlife

Amy Lapp, Archeologist: Cultural Resources

Chuck Patterson, Recreation Planner: Recreation

Neil Norman, Range Tech.: Weeds

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 must be incorporated and implemented.

N/A

CONCLUSION

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Karen Kraus, Preparer

Date: 12/9/2013

/s/ David A. Pacioretty

Pocatello Field Manager

Date: 12/12/2013