



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: Boise District/Morley Nelson NCA and Owyhee Field Office

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-ID-B011-2015-0006-DNA

Lease/Serial Case File No.:

Proposed Action Title/Type: CELEBRATION FIRE (JR0Z) ESR Plan

Location/Legal of Proposed Action: T01S R01W Sec. 31-33, T01S R02W Sec. 35-36,
T02S R01W Sec. 4-9, 15-18, 21-22 T02S R02W Sec.1-2, 11-12

Applicant (if any): NA

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

Noxious Weeds – The primary noxious weeds of concern within the burned area and adjacent lands that have a high potential to increase are; perennial pepperweed (*Lepidium latifolium*), rush skeleton weed (*Chondrilla juncea*) Russian knapweed (*Acroptilon repens*), Scotch thistle (*Onopordum acanthium*), and whitetop (*Cardaria draba*). Noxious and invasive weed species have the potential to spread following fire disturbance and post-fire conditions increase the potential for noxious weed expansion which would further degrading the landscape if left untreated. ESR weed treatment are necessary to inventory, document, and treat noxious weed populations to prevent an increase, additional infestations and expansion of noxious weeds and further degradation across the landscape.

Repair/Replace Fence- Approximately 2.0 miles of existing allotment division fencing was fire damaged and requires repair. This fencing is integral for livestock management in the affected allotments.

Protective Fencing- Approximately 0.5 miles of Physa snail enclosure fence and 0.8 miles of Mulford's milkvetch plant enclosure fence will be repaired to BLM specifications.

Approximately 4.0 miles of temporary electric fence and 1.0 miles of temporary 3-wire fence will be constructed to BLM specifications.

Original snail enclosure fence construction occurred in 2002 as a result of 2002 Guff fire and was constructed to address same issue of protecting snail habitat through mitigating potential soil erosion and sedimentation movement into snail habitat from soil disturbing activities of grazing and recreational use. Repair of original fence will provide long-term protection to area.

Fire damage repair is needed on the Mulford's Milkvetch fence for continued protection of this special status species.

The segments of new protective exterior fence are necessary to aid in livestock management of grazing closure area and allow for grazing of unburned area. Approximately 28% of Rabbit Creek/Peters Gulch Allotment Con Shea Pasture 1 burned and 19% of Con Shea Allotment Cons Shea Pasture 1 burned.

Cultural Protection- Close road access to all motorized vehicles for approximately 1.0 mile of road segment and restrict pedestrian foot traffic to existing main trails in designated areas. Signage will be placed at strategic locations to inform the public of closure and restrictions. The closures and restrictions will be enforced through patrols by BLM law enforcement and County Sheriff.

Closures- A livestock closure of the burned area is planned until grazing resumption objectives identified in the grazing closure decision or grazing agreement are met.

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

LUP/Document¹	Date Approved
Snake River Birds of Prey NCA RMP/ROD	September 30, 2008
Owyhee Field Office RMP	December 30, 1999

¹List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans, Management Framework Plans, or applicable amendments) and activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Management Objectives pertinent to this treatment in the NCA RMP relate directly to PL103-64 which established the NCA to "...provide for the conservation, protection, and enhancement of raptor populations and habitats and the natural and environmental resources and values associated therewith.." Upland Vegetation Standard Operating Procedure include objectives that

emergency stabilization and rehabilitation (ESR) will include the establishment of shrub and perennial herbaceous species to minimize soil erosion and invasion by annual plant species, and to maintain and improve raptor prey habitat.

NCA RMP relate directly to Cultural and Tribal Resource Objectives: “Manage cultural resources by emphasizing mitigation and public interpretation”, and Management Actions “Protect cultural resources in place without actions such as site excavation or removal of objects when possible” (2.2 of the Morley Nelson Snake River Birds of Prey NCA RMP).

Owyhee RMP-Vegetation (Vege-1) “...apply approved noxious weed control methods...”.

Owyhee RMP for Soil (SOIL-1), Vegetation (VEGE-1), Wildlife (WDLF-1), and Fire (FIRE-2) Objectives state that areas burned would be rested from livestock grazing and other watershed disturbing activities for a minimum of two growing seasons following fire.

Owyhee RMP for Cultural Resources (CULT 1) identifies: “Protect known cultural resource values from loss until their significance can be determined.” The treatment is consistent with the management action related to Objective CULT 1, “Mitigate the negative impacts to significant cultural resource sites known to be suffering the effects of agents of deterioration”, and “Develop management strategies to ensure preservation of cultural resource values within specific areas known to contain concentration of unique or significant cultural resource sites”.

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
Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan Boise District Office and Jarbidge Field Office Environmental Assessment (EA)	All	May 12, 2005
Biological Assessment for the Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan as amended and USFWS letter of concurrence	All	July 13, 2006 Sept. 13, 2006
Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment EA – Boise District	All	Feb 6, 2007
Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic	All	June, 2007

NEPA/Other Related Documents	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) and the Vegetation Treatments on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Report.		
Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment Program Biological Assessment and Addendum for Boise District and Jarbidge Field Office of the Twin Falls District – Ada, Adams, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, Owyhee, Payette, Twin Falls, Valley, and Washington Counties, Idaho	All	August 27, 2009

The treatments outlined in the plan are also consistent with the treatments analyzed in the Boise District Office Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) and Environmental Assessment (EA, #ID-090-2004-050) and the Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment EA (#ID100-2005-EA-265) for the Boise District.

Programmatic conference reports were prepared in 2006 by the Boise District Office for Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment (144-2006-IC-0918) and Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (14420-2006-IC-0975) programmatic actions. These programmatic actions were developed to include all field offices in the Boise District. These Conference Reports were confirmed December 15, 2009 (14420-2010-TA-0103). BLM also consulted with the Service regarding programmatic shrub planting activities and received a letter of concurrence on January 27, 2012.

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, a range of proposed actions were analyzed under the 2005 Boise District and Jarbidge Field Office Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment (NFESRP EA). These included; ground and aerial seeding, herbicide uses for noxious weed treatments, cultural protection and livestock management actions. An interdisciplinary team review of this fire determined that the resource values, concerns, and rehabilitation needs are substantially similar to those discussed and approved in the NFESRP EA and best meet the vegetative, watershed, and soil objectives of this Plan, the 2008 Snake River Birds of Prey NCA RMP/ROD and the 1999 Owyhee RMP.

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?

Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the NFESRP EA is appropriate for this action. A No Action alternative was considered but eliminated from analysis because it was not consistent with BLM policy or the Purpose and Need Statement of the EA. The overall objective of the Purposed and Need of the NFESRP EA is to stabilize and return a burned site to its previous native and/or seeded condition to enhance and protect the watershed, soil, wildlife habitat, and livestock forage values of the area. The proposed actions of the Celebration Fire ES&R plan are designed to accomplish that objective.

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?

Yes, the proposed treatments are covered under the Biological Assessment for the 2005 NFESRP EA, which addresses the proposed treatments. Based on information gathered during the survey and inventory of the burn area, the existing analysis from the NFEDRP EA is adequate. The proposed actions within the treatment area and their effects to the above resources were analyzed in the plan and found to be insignificant.

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 analyses of the direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action remain unchanged from those outlined in the existing NEPA document. The NFESRP EA analyzes site-specific impacts to resources such as vegetation, wildlife, soils, and sensitive species as a result of the proposed treatments outlined in the ES and BAR plans. All specific design features outlined in the NFESRP EA will be followed during implementation of the emergency stabilization and rehabilitation treatments.

The cumulative impacts analyzed in the existing NEPA document are adequate with the addition of the proposed action. Special status and non-status plants and animals would be protected by the general and species-specific design features and would benefit from a return to more natural fire cycles and improved ecosystem function including better habitat/population connectivity, migratory corridors, habitat structure, forage, and suitability.

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 existing NEPA document is adequate for the current proposed action. The EA states on page 77 that “scoping letters informing the public of the purpose and need for action were sent to 1,077 interested publics including organizations, and federal and state agencies in October, 2003.” The general publics and other agencies included interest from ranchers, academia, conservation groups, Tribal governments, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, and ESA consultation with the USFWS.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Shoshone-Piute Tribes	Wings and Roots	Native American Nation

Boise District Staff

Name	Title	Agency/Duty Station
Raul Trevino	READ	Owyhee FO
Cindy Fritz	Operations	OPS
Beth Corbin	Botanist	Owyhee FO
Anne Halford	Botanist	NCA
Kelli Barnes	Archaeologist	Owyhee FO
Dean Shaw	Archaeologist	NCA
Pete Torma	Rangeland Mgt. Specialist	Owyhee FO
Jared Fluckiger	Recreation Mgt. Specialist	NCA
Brad Jost	Wildlife Biologist	Owyhee FO
Joe Weldon	Wildlife Biologist	NCA
Alex Webb	GIS Specialist	OPS

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.

No mitigation measures have been identified

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/ Amanda Scott
Preparer

9/10/2015
Date

/s/ Seth Flanigan
NEPA Specialist

9/15/2015
Date

/s/ Tate Fischer
Four Rivers Field Office Manager

9/16/2015
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.