

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy
(DNA)
#DOI-BLM-ID-T030-0028-DNA
Cottonwood Emergency Stabilization and Burned
Area Rehabilitation Plan**

**Prepared by
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Shoshone Field Office, Twin Falls District
Shoshone, ID**

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

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

1. Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM lands in the 17 Western States Programmatic EIS. September 29, 2007.
2. Shoshone District EA for Noxious Weed Control (EA# ID-050-EA-92031), 1992.
3. Twin Falls District Programmatic Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (DOI-BLM-ID-T000-2011-0001-EA). 2013

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).

1. Biological Assessment for the Twin Falls District Noxious Weed and Invasive Plant Treatment EA and Concurrence, OALS #0000.

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, the proposed action is a feature of the proposed actions outlined in the 2013 PESRP.

An interdisciplinary resource team review of this fire has revealed that the resource values, concerns, stabilization and rehabilitation needs are essentially the same as those analyzed in the 2013 PESRP and best meet the wildlife, watershed, and soil objectives in the Monument RMP. The primary purpose of the BAR plan is to stabilize soils from erosion impacts by assuring that the pre-existing native plants and proposed seeded plants are protected from grazing use, and allowed to recover, maximize growth, and provide a source of live and litter ground cover for the protection of the soil resource.

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, and resource value?

Yes, the range of alternatives in the existing NEPA documents is appropriate considering the current proposed action.

The range of alternatives analyzed in the PESRP is appropriate with respect to the Burned Area Rehabilitation activities. Two alternatives to the proposed action were analyzed in the PESRP EA. They included an alternative action that would not implement ES and BAR treatments, but was eliminated from detailed analysis because it was not consistent with BLM policy, and the No

Action Alternative which would have continued to use the existing NFRPs. The current proposals follow the PESRP proposed action with the overall objective of stabilizing and rehabilitating the burned area 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.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, 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, the existing analysis is still valid.

The PESRP was approved on October 31, 2013. No new information that would change the proposed action or invalidate the analysis contained in the PESRP has been identified. During the interdisciplinary review, team members consulted the most recent list of Threatened and Endangered species (July 16, 2013) and BLM sensitive species for the Shoshone Field Office.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from the BAR project are similar to those analyzed in the 2013 PESRP EA.

The proposed action would result primarily in impacts to soils and vegetation. These impacts were considered in the PESRP on pages 78-82 and 87-96. With native vegetation recovery the area susceptible to wind erosion would be reduced.

The PESRP adequately analyzed the actions proposed in the BAR plan and it is anticipated that the cumulative impacts of the actions are not substantially different as analyzed in the PESRP. Therefore, there will not be any additional cumulative effects to consider under the plan.

5. Are there public involvement and interagency reviews associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes, the public involvement and interagency review of the PESRP is adequate for the current proposed actions.

Scoping letters informing the public of the purpose and need for action were sent to interested publics including organizations, and federal and state agencies beginning in March of 2007. The public and other agencies included interest from ranchers, academia, conservation groups, the Tribes, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, and ESA consultation with the USFWS.

The BAR plan along with the Decision Record would be posted on the Idaho BLM's NEPA website and is available upon request.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Table 1.1. List of Preparers

Name	Role/Discipline
Danelle Nance	Team Lead/Natural Resource Specialist
Dan Patten	Rangeland Management Specialist
Tara Anderson	Wildlife Biologist
Cassandra Mavencamp	Geographic Information Specialist
Scott Uhrig	Operations
Lisa Cresswell	Cultural Resources/Archeologist

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

The burned areas will be managed to keep livestock from grazing until natural recovery objectives are met. Non-treated burn areas will be monitored for recovery prior to allowing resumption of livestock grazing.

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 requirement of NEPA.

/s/ Danelle Nance 7/16/2014
Signature of Project Lead

/s/ Lisa Cresswell 7/16/2014
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ Elizabeth Maclean 7/16/2014
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 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.