

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
Pagari Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation Plan
#DOI-BLM-ID-T030-2014-0031-DNA
Bureau of Land Management
Idaho State Office
Twin Falls District
Shoshone Field Office

FIRE BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Fire Name	Pagari
Fire Number	H7DB
District/Field Office	Twin Falls/Shoshone
Admin Number	LLIDT03000
State	Idaho
County(s)	Lincoln
Ignition Date/Cause	7-5-2014/Human
Date Contained	7-6-2014

Jurisdiction	Acres
BLM	4,372
State	639
Private	0
Other	0

Total Acres	5,011
Total Costs	\$101,000
Costs to LF2200000	\$0
Costs to LF3200000	\$101,000

A. BLM Office: Shoshone Field Office Lease/Serial/Case File No.

Proposed Action Title/Type: Pagari Emergency Stabilization (ES) and Burned Area Rehabilitation (BAR) Plan

Location of Proposed Action:

Meridian	Township	Range	Affected Sections
Boise	T4S	R20E	Various

Description of the Proposed Action: The proposed action is to implement the Pagari ES and BAR plan as prescribed by the 2013 Twin Falls District Programmatic Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (PESRP) and Environmental Assessment (EA) and outlined in the Pagari ES and BAR plan. The proposed action entails 4,327 acres of vegetation treatment by ground detection and control of noxious weeds utilizing herbicides and bio-control, riparian planting of river birch along 2.0 miles of the Little Wood River, hand planting of sagebrush seedlings, a livestock grazing closure, and monitoring.

Applicant (if any): N/A

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

The applicable land use plan for the ES and BAR project is the 1985 Monument Resource Management Plan (RMP).

The proposed action is in conformance with the Monument RMP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions.

Monument RMP

The Monument RMP states that lands administered by the BLM in this area will be managed in order to:

- 1) Maintain or improve wildlife habitat for crucial mule deer winter range;
- 2) Improve poor or fair condition rangeland;
- 3) Maintain, improve, protect, and restore watershed conditions; and
- 4) Control the spread of noxious weeds on public lands and eradicate them where possible and economically feasible.

The project is also in conformance with the analysis of Alternative E, the selected alternative, in the 2008 Final Fire, Fuels and Related Vegetation Management Direction Plan Amendment (FMDA) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Final FMDA/EIS amends all Land Use Plans for the Shoshone Field Office, except the Craters

of the Moon National Monument and Preserve Management Plan, to provide direction and guidance for fire/fuels and related vegetation management.

The treatments outlined in this plan are also consistent with the treatments analyzed in the 2013 Twin Falls District PESRP and EA (#DOI-BLM-ID-T000-2011-0001-EA).

Proposed ES and BAR actions conform with the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management.

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

The proposed action is addressed in the following NEPA documents.

1. Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM lands in the 17 Western States Programmatic EIS, September 29, 2007.
2. Shoshone Noxious Weed Control EA (ID-050-EA-92-031), March 25, 1992
3. Twin Falls District Programmatic Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (DOI-BLM-ID-T000-2011-0001-EA), October 31, 2013.

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 standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

1. Biological Assessment for the Twin Falls District PESRP and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Concurrence, #01EIFW00-2013-I-0204.

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.

Documentation of answer and explanation: An interdisciplinary resource team review of this fire has revealed that the resource values, issues, 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 ES and BAR plan is to stabilize soils from erosion impacts by assuring that natural recovery is adequate before grazing is reintroduced and provides 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 current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values, and circumstances?

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: The range of alternatives analyzed in the PESRP is appropriate with respect to the ES and BAR activities. One alternative to the proposed action was analyzed in the PESRP EA. The alternative action was a no action alternative which would not implement ES and BAR treatments. While not consistent with current BLM policy and did not fully meet the purpose and need it was analyzed to compare environmental effects, and to demonstrate the consequences of not meeting the need for action. 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 adequate and are the conclusions adequate 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 the proposed action?

Yes, the existing analysis is still valid.

Documentation of answer and explanation: 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 (August 11, 2014) of Threatened and Endangered species 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 ES and BAR project are similar to those analyzed in the 2013 PESRP and EA.

Documentation of answer and explanation: The proposed action would result primarily in impacts to soils and vegetation. These impacts were considered and fully analyzed in the PESRP. With native vegetation recovery and control of noxious weeds the area susceptible to wind erosion would be reduced.

The PESRP adequately analyzed the actions proposed in the ES/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 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 of the PESRP is adequate for the current proposed actions.

Documentation of answer and explanation: Scoping letters informing the public of the purpose and need for action were sent to approximately 700 interested publics including organizations, and federal and state agencies beginning in March 2007. On August 24, 2011 the PESRP EA was made available for further comment. Interest from the public and other agencies included ranchers, academia, conservation groups, the Tribes, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, and ESA consultation with the USFWS.

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

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet.

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Joe Russell	Fire Ecologist	Fuels
Danelle Nance	Natural Resource Specialist	Fuels
Scott Uhrig	Fire Rehabilitation Specialist	Operations
Dan Patten	Range Management Specialist	Range
Lisa Cresswell	Archaeologist/NEPA Coordinator	Cultural/NEPA
Gary Wright	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife

F. Mitigation Measures:

The natural recovery of the burned area will be monitored and managed to keep livestock from grazing until natural recovery objectives are met.

CONCLUSION

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the Monument RMP and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLMs compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

/s/ Joseph E. Russell
 Joseph E. Russell
 Project Lead

8/15/14
 Date

/s/ Lisa Cresswell
 Lisa Cresswell
 NEPA Coordinator

8/15/14
 Date

/s/ Beth Maclean
 Elizabeth Maclean
 Shoshone Field Office Manager

8/15/14
 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.