Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Winnemucca District Office

TRACKING NUMBER: **DOI-BLM-W010-2013-0044-DNA**

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: 7000

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: 4th of July and Bull Springs Meadows Restoration

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION
T. 47 N., R. 34, E., sec. 26 ,
T. 47 N., R. 34, E., sec. 35 ,
T. 46 N., R. 34, E., sec. 2 .

APPLICANT (if any): BLM

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

The Proposed Action would be to implement the **Bull Spring Meadow Restoration Plan** and the **4th of July Meadows Restoration Plan** as described and analyzed in the Environmental Assessment for the **Montana Mountains Cooperative Fuels Management and Habitat Restoration Plan**, #DOI-BLM-NV-WO10-2011-0005-EA, with minor adjustments which are described and evaluated in this document. The adjustments were determined to be necessary following staff archaeologist recommendations given after the Montana Mountains EA was completed. This project is in response to off-site mitigation needs associated with the Ruby Pipeline project for pygmy rabbit and greater sage-grouse habitat.

Bull Spring Meadow[1] Restoration Plan

Features evaluated in the Montana Mountains Cooperative Fuels Management and Habitat Restoration Plan

- Exclude cattle from the wet meadow complex through the construction of an exclosure fence. This 4 wire fence would be fitted with reflective fence markers following recommended protocol for greater sage-grouse (Stevens et al. 2012).

[1] In the Montana Mountains EA, the area referred to as Bull Spring Meadow is the riparian system associated with a spring known as East Bull Spring. The previously existing water development at the site is an approved BLM project and referred to as the East Bull Spring pipeline and trough Project # 005599 .

- Relocate existing East Bull Spring pipeline and trough outside of the new exclosure fence utilizing approximately ½ mile of pipe extension.
- Re-route an existing two-track road to outside of the new exclosure fence. The existing two-track road that falls within the exclosure would be abandoned, re-contoured and re-vegetated as needed with native vegetation, taking care to avoid any cultural sites that may be identified through cultural inventories.
- Repair approximately twelve head-cuts by re-grading stream channels and adjacent banks to follow natural topography. Any head-cuts immediately adjacent to archeologically significant eligible sites would not be mechanically altered and natural rehabilitation would be relied upon. Reinforce stream channels and adjacent banks around head-cuts by constructing a rip-rap layer from a material source on-site (See map detail). Re-vegetate disturbed areas with native vegetation through seeding, plugging or seedling planting. Monitoring would be conducted on the Bull Spring Meadow prior to construction and for a minimum of five years post-construction. The Multiple Indicator Monitoring (MIM) of Stream Channels and Streamside Vegetation protocol would be applied pre- and post-construction for monitoring of stream conditions and vegetation (Burton, Smith, and Cowley, 2011). Monitoring points (benchmark points) would be installed at each head-cutting area to document movement. The project area would be assessed for PFC rating as needed to compare to previous ratings.

<u>Adjustments not evaluated in the Montana Mountains Cooperative Fuels Management and Habitat Restoration Plan</u>

- Locations and alignments of the proposed fence, west road, and water trough have been modified to eliminate possible impacts to identified cultural resources (See Bull Springs Detail Map for new alignments).
- The proposed location for the new trough was adjusted to minimize the likelihood that concentrating cattle will damage the proposed exclosure fence (See Bull Springs Detail Map for new location).
- Rehabilitation of one head cut has been removed from the proposal to eliminate possible impacts to identified cultural resources.
- The new road surface to the east of the exclosure would be constructed to withstand haul truck traffic to and from an existing clay mine. The new road surface to the west of the exclosure would be constructed to withstand recreational use.
- Disposal of mineral materials (cobbles, boulders and sand & gravel) from up to three locations would be permitted: approximately 1,650 cubic yards (cumulative between Bull Spring Meadow and 4th of July Meadows) of sand & gravel would be mined from the Kings River community pit and/or Sentinel Rock Pit, and approximately 800 cubic yards (cumulative between Bull Spring Meadow and 4th of July Meadows) of cobbles and boulders would be mined from an area immediately adjacent to the Fourth of July Meadows Complex. These disposals would be authorized through Free Use Permits issued to BLM. The disposal of mineral materials from the Kings River Community pit was analyzed in the Humboldt County Road Department Free Use Permit Renewals, Community Pit Designations, and Expansions environmental assessment.

4th of July Meadows Restoration Plan

Features evaluated in the Montana Mountains Cooperative Fuels Management and Habitat Restoration Plan

- On Pole Creek Road, three existing corrugated steel culverts would be removed and replaced with low water crossings. To construct the low water crossing, the road base would be excavated and replaced with boulder fill, creating a permeable rock base to facilitate flow through of water. Gravel fill would be added on top of the rock base, creating a durable drivable surface and bringing the road surface up to the historic meadow elevation as determined by current floodplain terraces, which are currently inaccessible to stream flow in some areas. Boulder and gravel fills would be keyed in to the adjacent uplands to ensure that high flows will not erode around the ends of the structure.
- A large, grade-control rock riffle would be constructed at the furthest downstream point in the project area. All rock used for the structure would be taken from a material source on site. The grade-control rock riffle would prevent upward migration of downstream head-cuts, preventing further incision of stream channels. The grade-control rock riffle would also provide an elevated base level for the downstream meadow area, creating a depositional regime.
- Stream channels between the rock riffle and Pole Creek Road would be modified substantially, requiring the use of heavy equipment. Vertical stream banks will be terraced to create floodplains which can be accessed by surface water during high flow events. Terraces would be designed to encourage growth of wetland (soil stabilizing) vegetation and ensure access of wetland vegetation to groundwater. After terraces are contoured, they would be planted with appropriate wetland vegetation (Juncus sp., Carex sp., Salix sp., etc.). Stream bank terracing and revegetation would lead to retention of sediments within and adjacent to stream channels, promoting restoration of historic meadow function and surface levels.
- Monitoring would be conducted on Fourth of July Meadow complexes prior to construction and for a minimum of five years post-construction. The Multiple Indicator Monitoring (MIM) of Stream Channels and Streamside Vegetation protocol would be applied pre- and post-construction for monitoring of stream conditions and vegetation (Burton, Smith, and Cowley, 2011). Erosion/sedimentation monitoring points would be installed pre-construction on the west side of Pole Creek Road and post-construction on the east side to assess the effectiveness of low water crossings and the grade-control rock riffle at retaining sediments and preventing further incision. Additionally, piezometers have been installed to monitor ground water levels. The project area would be assessed for PFC rating as needed to compare to previous ratings.

Adjustments not evaluated in the Montana Mountains Cooperative Fuels Management and Habitat Restoration Plan

- It would be the responsibility of the BLM to ensure compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through consultation with the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) prior to implementation. If consultation with USACE leads to a need for project design changes, additional evaluation under NEPA would be conducted.
- Disposal of mineral materials (cobbles, boulders and sand & gravel) from two locations would be permitted: approximately 1,650 cubic yards (cumulative between Bull Spring Meadow and 4th of July Meadows) of sand & gravel would be mined from the Kings River community pit, and approximately 800 cubic yards (cumulative between Bull Spring Meadow and 4th of July Meadows) of cobbles and boulders would be mined from an area immediately adjacent to the Fourth of July Meadows Complex. These disposals would be authorized through Free Use Permits issued to BLM. The disposal of mineral materials from the Kings River Community pit was analyzed in the Humboldt County Road Department Free Use Permit Renewals, Community Pit Designations, and Expansions environmental assessment.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Paradise-Denio Management Framework Plan (MFP)
Date Approved: 1982

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

> Wildlife MFPIII Decisions WL-1.21 P.D.-WL 1.27 SG: Maintain and improve habitat for sensitive, protected, threatened and endangered species listed on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Endangered and Threatened List, BLM-Nevada Department of Wildlife Sensitive Species List and those existing Federal and state laws and regulations.

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

DOI-BLM-NV-WO10-2011-0005-EA
Montana Mountains Cooperative Fuels Management
and Habitat Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment
FONSI: Aug. 2, 2012

DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2009-0005-EA
Humboldt County Road Department Free Use Permit Renewals, Community Pit Designations, and Expansions [Environmental Assessment]
FONSI and Decision Record: July 16, 2009

Montana Mountains Cooperative Fuels Management and Habitat Restoration Plan Biological Assessment (BA) BLM, 2012.

The Winnemucca District initiated informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on March 26, 2012 for the EA. The USFWS reviewed the project and concurred that the project may effect, but will not adversely affect Lahontan cutthroat trout. The USFWS provided a letter of concurrence on April 12, 2012. This satisfies section 7 consultation requirements for this project. No further consultation is required.

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?

Yes. All the proposed actions and locations described in this DNA were described and analyzed in the *Montana Mountains Cooperative Fuels Management and Habitat Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment* and *Humboldt County Road Department Free Use Permit Renewals, Community Pit Designations, and Expansions* Environmental Assessment (HCRD EA). Although general site locations are the same, incremental changes were made in the specific design features of Bull Springs Complex Project (See description of Proposed Action above) in response to new information gleaned from cultural assessment(s) completed after the Montana Mountains Cooperative Fuels Management and Habitat Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment (EA). Impacts related to the disposal (mining and hauling) of mineral materials were analyzed in the HCRD EA. The impacts from the Proposed Action are similar to those analyzed in the above referenced EAs.

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?

Yes. See explanation to D NEPA Adequacy Criteria, question (1) above. Also, these actions as described in the EA and this DNA are in full compliance with BLM Instruction Memorandum (IM) No. 2012-043, titled: Greater Sage-Grouse Interim Management Policies and Procedures, specifically Policy/Action Principles- 1) Protection of unfragmented habitats; 2) Minimization of habitat loss and fragmentation; and 3) Management of habitats to maintain, enhance, or restore conditions that meet Greater sage-Grouse life history needs.

In addition, these actions fully meet the intent under Title I. of IM No. 2012-043: Interim Conservation Policies and procedures for "Preliminary Priority Habitat "(PPH).

- Pursue a long term objective to maintain resilient native plant communities.
- Pursue short-term objectives that include maintaining soil stability and hydrologic function of the disturbed site so that a resilient plant community can be established.

- Implement management actions, where appropriate, to improve degraded Greater Sage-Grouse habitat that have become encroached upon by shrubland or woodland species.

In the Sage-Grouse National Technical Team's "A Report on National Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures" dated December 21, 2011 which is attached to IM No. 2012-044 , meadow complex exclosures, springs, and other watering modifications are described as appropriate conservation measures to benefit sage-grouse. For example, the report recommends:

> Where riparian areas and wet meadows meet proper functioning condition, strive to attain reference state vegetation relative to the ecological site description. For example: Within priority sage-grouse habitat, reduce hot season grazing on riparian and meadow complexes to promote recovery or maintenance of appropriate vegetation and water quality. Utilize fencing/herding techniques or seasonal use or livestock distribution changes to reduce pressure on riparian or wet meadow vegetation used by sage-grouse in the hot season (summer) (Aldridge and Brigham 2002, Crawford et al. 2004, Hagen et al. 2007).
>
> Authorize new water development for diversion from spring or seep source only when priority sage-grouse habitat would benefit from the development. This includes developing new water sources for livestock as part of an AMP/conservation plan to improve sage-grouse habitat.
>
> Analyze springs, seeps and associated pipelines to determine if modifications are necessary to maintain the continuity of the predevelopment riparian area within priority sage-grouse habitats. Make modifications where necessary, considering impacts to other water uses when such considerations are neutral or beneficial to sage-grouse.

A Report on National Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Measures, pp.16.

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?

Yes. All the proposed actions and locations described in this DNA were described and analyzed in the Montana Mountains Cooperative Fuels Management and Habitat Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment and Humboldt County Road Department Free Use Permit Renewals, Community Pit Designations, and Expansions Eenvironmental Aassessment (HCRD EA). The impacts from the Proposed Action are similar to those analyzed in the above referenced EAs.

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 impacts from the Proposed Action are similar to those analyzed in the above referenced EAs. Subsequently, the direct, indirect and cumulative effects would remain essentially the same as analyzed in the existing EA.

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 associated with the existing EA document(s) are adequate for the current proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Resource	Signature/Date	Comments (Attach if more room is needed)
Pat Haynal	Cultural Resources	/s/ Patrick Haynal 1/27/14	None
Rob Burton	Native American Consultation	/s/ Rob Burton 01/27/2014	
Pat Haynal	Paleontological Resources	/s/ Patrick Haynal 01/27/14	
Debbie Dunham	Realty	/s/ Debbie Dunham 1/27/14	
Joey Carmosino	Recreation	/s/ VJ Carmosino	----------None----------
Joey Carmosino	Visual Resource Management	/s/ VJ Carmosino	----------None----------
Morgan Lawson	Rangeland Management	/s/ Morgan Lawson	----------None----------
Daniel Atkinson	Minerals	/s/ Daniel Atkinson 1/27/2014	
Mark Williams	Fire Management	/s/ Mark Williams 27 Jan 2014	None
Mark Williams	Fuels	/s/ Mark Williams 27 Jan 2014	None
Eric Baxter	Fire Rehab	/s/ Eric Baxter 1/27/2014	
Eric Baxter	Invasive, Non-native species (plants & animals)	/s/ Eric Baxter 01/27/2014	
Rob Burton	Vegetation	/s/ Rob Burton 01/27/2014	
Rob Burton	Soils	/s/ Rob Burton 01/27/2014	
John McCann	Wetlands and Riparian Zones	/s/ JW McCann 01/27/2014	
John McCann	Hydrology	/s/ JW McCann 01/27/2014	
Rob Burton	Air Quality	/s/ Rob Burton 01/27/2014	
Mandy DeForest	T&E Species (Plants & Animals)	/s/ Mandy DeForest 1/27/14	
Mandy DeForest	Special Status Species (Plants & Animals)	/s/ Mandy DeForest 1/27/14	
Mandy DeForest	General Wildlife Habitat	/s/ Mandy DeForest 1/27/14	
Greg Lynch	Fisheries	/s/ Greg Lynch 1-27-14	
Rob Bunkall	GIS	/s/ Rob Bunkall 1/27/14	
Zwaantje Rorex	Other: LWC	/s/ Zwaantje Rorex 1/27/14	
	Public Outreach		

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/ Rob Burton_____
Signature of Project Lead

___/s/ Lynn B Ricci_____
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

__/s/ Victor W Lozano_____ __2/2/14____
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.