

**Worksheet Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance
and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)**

NEPA#: DOI-BLM-ID-I010-2015-0011-DNA

BLM Office: Upper Snake Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.

Proposed Action Title/Type: Menan Boat Access Stabilization

Location of Proposed Action: Menan Boat Access along the south bank of the Main Snake River adjacent to the Menan Bridge approximately two miles north of Menan, T 5N 38 E Sec. 22 SWNW

Description of the Proposed Action:

The proposed action is to stabilize the eroding bank upstream of the concrete boat ramp. The bank would be armored for approximately 50-60 feet with riprap keyed into the bed and bank of the river. Geoweb and pit run would be placed above the normal high water line. Concrete ramp sections would also be replaced at the end of the boat ramp. The size of the project is approximately .02 acres.

Applicant (if any):

N/A

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

LUP Name: *Medicine Lodge Resource Management Plan*

Date Approved: April 1985

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) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions:

Management Area 9 Snake River, Objective 7 (page 38), "To manage for the recreation values and uses of the area."

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) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions:

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

This proposed action is addressed in the following existing BLM EA/EIS:

Name/Number of NEPA Document:

Lorenzo Boat Access (2011) EA number DOI-BLM-ID-I010-0062-EA

NEPA Adequacy Criteria

Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

Yes, the proposed action (bank stabilization and boat ramp repairs) is substantially the same action that was previously analyzed. The bank stabilization complies with the alternative selected or analyzed in the *Lorenzo Boat Access (2011) EA number DOI-BLM-ID-I010-0062-EA*.

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, resource values, and circumstances?

Yes, Chapter 2 of the Lorenzo Boat Access Environmental Assessment (2011) describes the alternatives considered for a boat access and associated facilities on BLM-administered lands within the USFO. The action alternative is described in detail and the alternatives considered but not carried through for full analysis are presented. A description of the No Action Alternative (no change from current management) is also included as required by CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1502.14d).

Two alternatives were developed by the Interdisciplinary (ID) team on issues identified during internal scoping. A full analysis of the two alternatives is described in the EA including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts (Chapters 3 and 4).

Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service 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 are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

Yes, there has been no significant change in circumstances or significant new information germane to the proposed action. No new information is presented under the proposed action to warrant any further analysis. The proposed action is adequately analyzed under the existing NEPA document *Lorenzo Boat Access (2011) EA number DOI-BLM-ID-I010-0062-EA*.

Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Yes, the Environmental Assessment provides sufficient detailed assessments of all alternatives including the proposed action alternative to stabilize the bank and replace the end of the concrete ramp.

Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Yes, the direct and indirect impacts of bank stabilization and boat ramp repairs are unchanged from those identified in the existing *Lorenzo Boat Access (2011) EA number DOI-BLM-ID-I010-0062-EA*. The current NEPA document specifically analyzes impacts related to bank stabilization and boat ramp work on the river systems managed by BLM.

Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Yes, cumulative impacts of the proposed action are essentially the same as those identified in the existing document. The direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts section of the *Lorenzo Boat Access (2011) EA number DOI-BLM-ID-I010-0062-EA* accurately describes impacts associated with bank stabilizations and boat ramp work may be found within Chapters 3 and 4 of the NEPA document.

Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequately for the current proposed action?

Yes, Chapter 5, page 32 of the *Lorenzo Boat Access (2011) EA number DOI-BLM-ID-I010-0062-EA* lists the individual resource specialists who participated in the preparation of the EA. Also, public involvement during the broader EA process was in accordance with NEPA timelines. The final EA was available to the public for a thirty day comment period and no comments were received either positive or negative from any constituents or members of the public. The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes were consulted during the process and did not provide comments related to the EA.

Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Devon Englestead	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Amy Forsgren	Recreation Technician	Recreation
Dawn Loomis	Biological Science Technician	Botany
Marissa Guenther	USFO NEPA Specialist /Archeologist	NEPA/Cultural
Monica Zimmerman	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation

CONCLUSION

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

/s/ Monica Zimmerman
Monica Zimmerman
Outdoor Recreation Planner
Date: March 3, 2015

/s/ Marissa Guenther
Marissa Guenther
NEPA Reviewer
Date: March 3, 2015

/s/ Jeremy Casterson
Jeremy Casterson
Upper Snake Field Manager
Date: March 3, 2015