



Bureau of Land Management

Boise District Office
Bruneau 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-B010-2014-0043-DNA

Lease/Serial Case File No.: IDI-5363

Proposed Action Title/Type: Idaho Power Line 470 Access Road

Location/Legal of Proposed Action: The proposed access road would be located 8 miles north of Council, Idaho (Map 1). Boise Meridian, Idaho T. 18 N. R. 1 W. Section 34 SE¹/₄NE¹/₄

Applicant (if any): Idaho Power Company

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

Idaho Power has requested authorization under the terms of their current grant (IDI-5363) to construct/extend an access road (approximately 135 ft. x 30 ft.) from US Forest Service-managed land to a structure on BLM-managed land to facilitate maintenance of one of their structures and to conduct overland travel to perform maintenance of structures within the right of way.

The Cambridge-Council-McCall 138kV Transmission Line Environmental Assessment (HLY 032-033 (02/08/05) 106497/1k) details several mitigation measures regarding road construction; these mitigation measures are more fully detailed in Section F of this DNA. The current grant also specifies the terms and conditions of the right-of-way.

Upon completion of the line maintenance, Idaho Power must ensure that other roads and overland travel routes on BLM-managed land used to access the structures referenced in this request are rehabilitated. These roads are identified on attachment 2 as “overland travel,” and attachment 3 as “alternative service road.” The objective would be to establish perennial cover equivalent to 40-60% of the pre-disturbance cover. Seeding would be repeated if a satisfactory stand of vegetation is not obtained as determined by the authorized officer upon evaluation after the second growing season.

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

LUP/Document¹	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Cascade RMP	Lands and Realty, part II, page 2-5	9/21/1987

¹List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans, Management Framework Plans, or applicable amendments) and activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

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 (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Rights-of-Ways: Over 480,000 acres of the resource areas is available for various types of rights-of-ways.

Lands and Realty Objectives: Optimize public use and management of the public lands under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

Lands and Realty Actions: Provide opportunities for utility rights-of-way. Encourage future rights-of-way to be located within or adjacent to existing rights-of-way. Restrict rights-of-way in areas with high resource values.

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).

NEPA/Other Related Documents	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Cambridge-Council-McCall 138kV Transmission Line Environmental Assessment (HLY 032-033 (02/08/05) 106497/1k)	The area affected by the proposed action of this DNA was analyzed as part of the proposed action of the referenced EA (see, page 15 and figure 2.3)	2/8/2005

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?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The proposed action would be for approximately 135 linear feet of a newly constructed access road. The proposed action analyzed in the EA included approximately 10 miles of new and or improved roads crossing BLM-managed lands within and adjacent to the right-of-way. Cultural, botanical, and wildlife surveys were conducted in a 200-foot corridor along the length of the line. This corridor captured all of the area affected by the proposed action except for 30 feet. This 30-foot area is essentially the same as the adjacent area within the 200-foot corridor.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. The proposed action analysis was covered in the EA on pages 24-25 and Appendix B. Road construction would occur as described in the EA (pages 24-31). The EA addressed improvement of existing roads and the construction of new roads across BLM-managed land and included a survey of a 200-foot wide corridor the length of the existing right-of-way. An interdisciplinary resource team reviewed the EA and determined that the resource values and concerns in the proposed action area are identical to those discussed in the EA, and meet the wildlife, soil, and watershed objectives of the Cascade RMP.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. Based upon a review of the EA and of the proposed action by an interdisciplinary team, the resources of concern in the area have not significantly changed since the EA was completed. The Class III cultural resource survey of the proposed access road conducted in 2014 did not identify any eligible properties.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects analyzed in the EA include and far exceed any possible effects from the new proposed action and are, therefore, qualitatively and quantitatively similar to the possible effects of implementing the new 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 for the EA exceed what would be required for the proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name of Person Consulted	Title/Specialty Area
U.S.Forest Service	
<i>Dan Anderson</i>	<i>NEPA Coordinator</i>
<i>Vincent Archer</i>	<i>Soil Scientist</i>
<i>Jeff Canfield</i>	<i>Supervisory Forester</i>
<i>Sylvia Clark</i>	<i>Land Management Planning Specialist</i>
<i>Ted Demetriades</i>	<i>Forester-Inventories</i>
<i>Michael Dixon</i>	<i>Civil Engineer: Landslides, Road construction, Geo/oqy</i>
<i>Mary Farnsworth</i>	<i>District Ranger</i>
<i>Joe Foust</i>	<i>Wildlife Biologist</i>
<i>Alma Hanson</i>	<i>Botanist</i>
<i>Vanessa Hawk</i>	<i>Forestry Technician</i>
<i>Dave Hogen</i>	<i>Wildlife Biologist/Fisheries</i>
<i>Jill Kemp</i>	<i>Realty Specialist</i>
<i>Larry Kingsbury</i>	<i>Archaeologist Supervisor</i>
<i>Faye Krueger</i>	<i>Deputy Forest Supervisor</i>
<i>Maura Laverty</i>	<i>Rangeland Management Specialist</i>
<i>Dean Martens</i>	<i>Soil Scientist</i>
<i>Brian McLaughlin</i>	<i>Civil Engineer</i>
<i>Mickey Pillers</i>	<i>Data Base Manager</i>
<i>Erin Rohlman</i>	<i>Lands Forester</i>
<i>Lonnie Schultz</i>	<i>Wildlife Biologist</i>
<i>Valerie Shaw</i>	<i>Legal Assistant</i>
<i>Pattie Soucek</i>	<i>Forest Planner</i>
<i>Curtis Spalding</i>	<i>Acting Forest Planner</i>
<i>Forrest Starkey</i>	<i>Planning and Resource Information Management</i>
<i>Mike Stayton</i>	<i>Trails Coordinator</i>
<i>Randy Zuniga</i>	<i>Hydrologist</i>
Bureau of Land Management	
<i>Daryl Albiston</i>	<i>Four Rivers Field Manager (former)</i>
<i>Tim Carrigan</i>	<i>Wildlife Biologist (former)</i>
<i>Ann DeBolt</i>	<i>Botanist (former)</i>
<i>Jim Johansen</i>	<i>Associate Field Manager (former)</i>
<i>Pat Kane</i>	<i>Weed Management Specialist (former)</i>

<i>Effie Schultsmeier</i>	<i>Realty Specialist (former)</i>
<i>Dean Shaw</i>	<i>Cultural Resources</i>
<i>Tate Fischer</i>	<i>Four Rivers Field Manager</i>
<i>Matt McCoy</i>	<i>Four Rivers Assistant Field Manager</i>
<i>Mark Steiger</i>	<i>Botanist</i>
<i>Tom McGinnis</i>	<i>Ecologist</i>
<i>John Sullivan</i>	<i>Supervisor, Realty Specialist</i>
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	
<i>Alison Beck-Haas</i>	<i>Snake River Fish and Wildlife Office</i>
National Marine Fisheries Service, Idaho Habitat Branch	
<i>Charley Rains</i>	<i>National Fire Plan Biologist</i>
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Walla Walla District Headquarters	
<i>Brad Daly</i>	<i>I Chief</i>
<i>Duane Mitchell</i>	<i>I Regulatory Specialist</i>
Idaho Department of Fish and Game	
<i>Jeff Rohlman</i>	<i>I Regional Wildlife Manager</i>
<i>Don Wright</i>	<i>I Regional Supervisor, Southwest Region</i>
Idaho Department of Fish and Game Conservation Data Center	
<i>Angie Schmidt</i>	<i>I Zoology Information Manager</i>
<i>George Stephens</i>	<i>I Zoology Information Manager</i>
Idaho Department of Water Resources	
<i>Gene Gibson</i>	<i>I Water Resource Agent</i>

Idaho Department of Environmental Quality	
<i>Charles Ariss, P.E.</i>	<i>Engineering Regional Manager</i>
Idaho Department of State Lands	
<i>Perry Whittaker</i>	<i>Lands Real Estate Bureau Chief</i>
<i>Sheldon Keafer</i>	<i>Lands Area Supervisor</i>
<i>Jay Sila</i>	<i>Lands Resource Supervisor</i>
Idaho State Historical Society, Historic Preservation Office	
<i>Susan Pengilly-Neitzel</i>	<i>Compliance Coordinator and Deputy SHPO</i>
Idaho Department of Transportation (District 3)	
<i>Robert Amoureux</i>	<i>Principal Design</i>
<i>Aaron Bauges</i>	<i>Project Coordinator</i>
<i>Jason Brinkman</i>	<i>Design Group Manager</i>
<i>Daris Bruce</i>	<i>Project Manager</i>
<i>Wade Christiansen</i>	<i>Project Manager</i>
<i>Joseph Haynes</i>	<i>Project Engineer</i>
<i>Katherine Porter</i>	<i>Staff Engineer</i>
<i>Felicia Statkus</i>	<i>Project Engineer</i>
<i>Cindy Herrick</i>	<i>County Planner</i>
Valley County Board of County Commissioners	
<i>Leland Heinrich</i>	<i>County Commissioner</i>
Adams County Planning and Zoning Department	
<i>Don Horton</i>	<i>County Planning and Zoning Administrator</i>
<i>Denny Minshall</i>	<i>County Planning and Zoning (GIS)</i>
Washington County Planning & Zoning Department	
<i>Wayne Laird</i>	<i>County Planning and Zoning Administrator</i>

City of Council	
<i>Ron Hasselstrom</i>	<i>Public Works Supervisor</i>
Albertson College	
<i>Dr. Eric Yensen</i>	<i>Wildlife Biologist - Northern and Southern Idaho Ground Squirrel Specialist</i>
Idaho Power Company	
<i>Tom Barber</i>	<i>Project Leader</i>
<i>Jerry Ellsworth</i>	<i>Project Leader</i>
<i>Mike Jacobs</i>	<i>Right-of-Way Agent</i>
<i>Jeff Lincoln</i>	<i>Project Engineer</i>
Friends of the Weiser River Trail	
<i>Shirley Atteberry</i>	<i>Treasurer</i>
Native American Tribes	
<i>Shoshone Paiute</i>	
<i>Shoshone Bannock</i>	<i>Business Council</i>
<i>Nez Perce</i>	<i>Tribal Council</i>
<i>Umatilla</i>	<i>Indian Tribal Council</i>
<i>Burns Paiute</i>	<i>Tribal Council</i>
<i>Fort McDermitt</i>	<i>Tribal Council</i>

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 have been incorporated and implemented.

In addition to the terms and conditions of right-of-way grant IDI-5363, to which Idaho Power is bound, the following mitigation measures specific to road construction were included in the Cambridge-Council-McCall 138kV Transmission Line Environmental Assessment (HLY 032-033 (02/08/05) 106497/1k) and are incorporated into the proposed action. Refer to the EA (pages 26-31) for a complete list of mitigation measures.

0.3 To minimize ground disturbance and/or reduce scarring (visual contrast) of the landscape, the alignment of any new access roads or cross-country route will follow the landform contours in designated areas where practicable, providing that such alignment does not impact other resources.

0.6 In construction areas where recontouring is not required, disturbance will be limited to overland driving and no grading will occur to minimize changes in the original contours. Large rocks and vegetation may be moved within these areas to allow vehicle access. Restoration could include reseeding (if required). Methods will be detailed in the Revegetation Plan that will be approved by the USFS and BLM and submitted as part of the POD/COM plan.

3.4 The specific areas of ground disturbing activities (e.g., access road construction, structure sites, staging areas, etc.) will be identified prior to construction. If any of these areas have not been sufficiently inventoried for cultural resources, they will be surveyed prior to construction in that specific area.

4.5 Ground disturbance will be limited to that necessary to safely and efficiently install the proposed facilities and described in detail in the POD/COM.

4.6 With the exception of emergency repair situations, construction, restoration, maintenance, and termination activities in designated areas will be modified or curtailed during sensitive periods (e.g., nesting and breeding periods) for candidate, proposed, threatened, and endangered, or other sensitive animal species. The Authorized Officer, in advance of such activities, will approve sensitive areas and timeframes.

5.2 All roads will be engineered on a case-by-case basis in cooperation with pertinent regulatory agencies.

5.3 Roads will be obliterated where they are no longer needed (as specified by the PNF) after construction and improvements will be made to existing, poorly engineered roads to help reduce sediment delivery to waterways over the long-term.

6.1 In areas where soils are particularly sensitive to disturbance (e.g., high erosion potential) existing access roads will be improved only to where they are passable.

6.2 Roads will be constructed in accordance with the POD/COM and generally be placed on ridge tops or low-relief topography wherever feasible.

6.3 In construction areas, work will be halted when wet conditions cause rutting of roads and/or work areas. Work will not resume until conditions improve.

6.4 In accordance with the guideline a pre-construction field verification of landslide prone areas will be made. Design changes to roads may need to be made based on the field verification.

7.1 Road construction will include dust-control measures, as required and identified in the PNF and BLM-approved Dust Control Plan submitted as part of the POD/COM plan.

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/ *Matthew McCoy*

7/9/2014

Preparer

Date

/s/ *Lara Hannon*

7/9/2014

NEPA Specialist

Date

/s/ *Jate Fischer*

7/9/2014

Four Rivers Field Manager

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.