



Bureau of Land Management
Boise District Office
Four Rivers 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-B010-2015-0006-DNA

Lease/Serial Case File No.: IDI-37739

Proposed Action Title/Type: Canyon Creek Station Acquisition

Location/Legal of Proposed Action: 0.5 acre, more or less within Township 2 S., Range 6 E., Section 11, Boise Meridian, Elmore County, Idaho

Applicant (if any): Bureau of Land Management

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures: BLM is proposing to acquire, through donation, approximately 0.5 acres of private land housing the historic Canyon Creek Station. The site is identified by the National Park Service as a high potential site for historic values associated with the Oregon National Historic Trail.

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

LUP/Document	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Kuna Management Framework Plan	CRM-2 / 122-124	1983

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):

Cultural Resources Management (CRM-2)

Objective 2: Protect and preserve historic ruins, structures and sites for future scientific use and public enjoyment.

Rationale: Substantial historic occupation sites including structures are very rarely controlled by BLM. These are usually in private ownership and are not always owned by those sympathetic to their preservation.

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
Management and Use Plan update Final Environmental Impact Statement Oregon National Historic Trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of Canyon Creek Station as a High-Potential Site / page 19. • Administrative Objective: Resource Protection – preservation of trail resources / page 26. • Resource Protection Plan – Protection Tools (donations) / page 67 • Appendix H Oregon National Historic Trail: High Potential Sites, No. 92, (detailed description) / page 303 	1999

The Bureau of Land management was a cooperating agency to the development of the above referenced plan and the associated EIS.

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?

The Proposed Action is to acquire, through donation, approximately 0.5 acres of private land housing the historic Canyon Creek Station. The Management and Use Plan for the Oregon National Historic Trail Final Environmental Impact Statement identifies sites that are either listed on or determined eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places as High-potential Sites. The plan specifically identifies Canyon Creek Station as a high-potential site (map on page 19).

The administrative objectives of the Oregon Trail management plan set the goals for maintaining the significant qualities of the Oregon Trail with preservation of trail resources

as a resource protection goal (page 26). Tools identified to meet resource protection goals include easements, donation/bargain sale, fee-simple ownership, agreements, and local land protection (page 67). The plan states that donations of sites into federal ownership not only help to preserve trail resources but also could result in beneficial publicity for a site, as well as tax benefits for the donor. Because donations cost the recipients little or nothing, this technique would be an economical means to acquire appropriate interests in Oregon Trail resources (page 336).

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?

The Management and Use Plan for the Oregon National Historic Trail Final Environmental Impact Statement considered four alternatives (pages 47 and 77). Two alternatives were rejected because they did not address certain management issues or did not fulfill requirements of the National Trails System Act. The remaining alternatives provided an appropriate range of management options given the constraints for management of nationally significant cultural resources. Given current situations, the alternatives analyzed are the same that would be analyzed if new analysis were conducted and are therefore appropriate for the proposed action.

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?

The Management and Use Plan for the Oregon National Historic Trail Final Environmental Impact Statement documented relevant issues and concerns at that time which included management concerns for protection of significant national historic sites that are at risk due to neglect, or natural processes (page 26). These issues and concerns are the same that would be analyzed in a new NEPA document. No new information would substantially change the conclusions of this document and are therefore adequate for the proposed action.

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?

The Management and Use Plan for the Oregon National Historic Trail Final Environmental Impact Statement documented potential direct and indirect impacts on trail resources (air quality, soils, water quality, vegetation, wildlife, cultural landscapes, archeological resources, historic resources and ethnographic resources) interpretation, visitor experiences, visitor use, and socioeconomic conditions (pages 113-121). Cumulative impacts from potential energy

developments, transportation developments, and population increases including associated developments are analyzed (page 122). The environmental consequences from direct, indirect and cumulative effects from the proposed action would be similar to those analyzed and described in the Oregon Trail management plan.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current Proposed Action?

Public involvement for the proposed action would include public meetings in nearby communities, interagency review with affected federal, state, and local agencies, and coordination with Tribal representatives. The public involvement associated with both the Kuna Management Framework Plan and the Management and Use Plan for the Oregon National Historic Trail Final Environmental Impact Statement adequately coordinated with affected parties, provided opportunities to comment on proposed actions, received comments, and addressed identified concerns. These are adequate public involvement and interagency review for the proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Larry Ridenhour	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation/Visual Resources – BLM
Dean Shaw	Archeologist	Cultural Resources - BLM
Jeremy Bluma	Realty Specialist	Lands - BLM
Seth Flanigan	NEPA Specialist	Planning/NEPA - BLM
Terry Heslin	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Historic & Scenic Trails - BLM
Kirk Halford	Archeologist	Cultural Resources - BLM
Jeff Cartwright	Realty Specialist	Lands - BLM
Tate Fischer	Field Manager	Management - BLM

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: 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.

Throughout the environmental consequences section of the Management and Use Plan for the Oregon National Historic Trail Final Environmental Impact Statement (pages 113-

120) inventorying and monitoring of trail resources are identified as important components for protecting both trail resources and visitor experiences. Mitigation measures identified are primarily associated with potential negative impacts from increased visitor use or inappropriate visitor behavior. Mitigation measures to address resources impact concerns are focused on:

- increased visitor education and interpretation,
- dispersing visitors, and
- setting limitations on number of visitors, timing of visitation, or areas allowed to visit in order to limit or minimize potential negative effects.

Site specific criteria that would trigger additional limitation on use are not identified. These criteria would be documented in subsequent activity level planning documents specific to Canyon Creek Station.

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/ Larry Ridenhour
Larry Ridenhour
Preparer

1/13/15
Date

/s/ Seth Flanigan
Seth Flanigan
NEPA Specialist

1/13/15
Date

/s/ Tate Fischer
Tate Fischer
Four Rivers Field Manager

1/13/15
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.