

**DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
TWIN FALLS DISTRICT
SHOSHONE FIELD OFFICE
400 WEST F St.
SHOSHONE, IDAHO 83352**

**Full Force and Effect
Decision Record
For the
Dietrich Butte Emergency Stabilization (ES) and Burned Area Rehabilitation
(BAR) Project
#DOI-BLM-ID-T030-2015-0024-DNA**

I. PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action is to implement the Dietrich Butte Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation (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 Dietrich Butte ES and BAR plan. The proposed action entails 2,436 acres of vegetation treatment including 770 acres of drill seeding, ground detection and control of noxious weeds on 2,436 acres utilizing herbicides and bio-control, 1,218 acres of aerial sagebrush and forb seeding, 5 miles of existing fence repair, 4 miles of temporary protection fence, a livestock grazing closure, and monitoring (see attached Dietrich Butte ES and BAR plan).

II. PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW

The proposed actions are in conformance with the 1985 Monument Resource Management Plan.

III. EXISTING NEPA REVIEW

A Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) was completed for the Dietrich Butte ES and BAR project. As discussed in the DNA (NEPA# BLM-DOI-ID-T030-2015-0024-DNA), the activities included in this proposed action were adequately analyzed in the 2013 PESRP and EA for the Twin Falls District (DOI-BLM-ID-T000-2011-0001-EA) and the 1992 Shoshone District EA for Noxious Weed Control (EA# ID-050-EA-92031).

These EAs were reviewed against the following criteria to determine if they adequately address the proposed action:

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?

Standards for Obtaining a Stay

Except as otherwise provided by law or other pertinent regulation, a petition for a stay of a decision pending appeal shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

- (1) The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied;
- (2) The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits;
- (3) The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted; and
- (4) Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

In the event a request for stay or an appeal is filed, the person/party requesting the stay or filing the appeal must serve a copy of the appeal on any person named [43 CFR 4.421 (h)] in the decision and the Office of the Field Solicitor, 960 Broadway Ave., Suite 400, Boise ID, 83706.



Codie Martin
Shoshone Field Office Manager

8/5/15

Date