

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: MT-070

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-MT-M070-2016-0003- DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: DOI-BLM-MT-M070-2016-0003- DNA

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Additional Treatment Area – Clancy Area Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T9N, R3W, Section 18

APPLICANT (if any): None.

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The proposed action is to allow fuels treatments within T9N R3W Section 18. Section 18 was scoped and analyzed in the Clancy Area Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project Environmental Assessment (EA) and Decision Record/Finding of No Significant Impact (DR/FONSI) (06/2012); but no decision was issued for this area. In 2014 and 2015, landowners within Section 18 constructed new homes adjacent to BLM. During construction, the landowners contacted the BLM with concerns about fuel loading in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) on BLM adjacent to their private land. They proposed to remove dead and dying lodgepole pine to alleviate their concerns. Harvest operations would be conducted with ground based mechanized equipment. Mixed and lodgepole pine cover types occur within this area. The slopes are moderate and range between 5-50%. The majority of the treatments would occur within a pole sized stand of lodgepole pine and scattered Douglas-fir. Treatment would include removing the dead and dying timber and spacing out the residual stand. Treatments within T9N R3W Section 18 would not exceed treatment acres identified in the Clancy Area Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project EA and DR (06/2012). Also, the prescriptions and all mitigation procedures outlined in the EA would apply to any treatments conducted within Section 18.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name*: Butte Resource Management Plan

Date Approved April 2009

Other document:

Date Approved _____

Other document:

Date Approved _____

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

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):

FM1: Provide an appropriate management response to all wildland fire, emphasizing firefighter and public safety.

FM4: Promote seamless fire management planning across jurisdictions within the boundaries of the Butte Field Office.

FM5: Protect life and property by treating hazardous fuels on BLM lands.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

EA # LLMTB070-2011-054 EA. Clancy Area Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project DR and FONSI signed June 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. The prescriptions and type of treatments would all be the same as identified under the original Clancy Area Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project EA. T9N R3W Section 18 was included within the analysis area but was not identified for treatment. The proposed action would allow for fuels treatment within Section 18.

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, and resource values?

Yes, the new proposed action would occur within the original project analysis area and includes the same types of treatments proposed in the EA. Environmental concerns, interests, and resource values have not changed.

3. Is the existing analysis valid 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 proposed action?

Yes. No species have been added to USFWS, BLM or MT special status lists that would be likely to occur in the area. Range land health standard assessments for the area have not changed since the original NEPA analysis, and the BLM sensitive plant identified in the original NEPA has not been found in the additional area. The area will be surveyed for cultural resources; any finding from the survey will be mitigated as outlined by the existing NEPA analysis.

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 proposed action would have the same effects as the original actions. The location, acres, prescriptions, and types of treatments would be the same as identified under the 2012 EA.

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

Yes. The public was involved in the Clancy Area Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project (2012) with an open house meeting and public notification of the purposed action with 30 day appeal period. All required BLM resource specialists approved those actions.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented	Signature, date
Scot Franklin	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, fish, special status animal species	<i>Scot Franklin</i> 10/27/15
Michael O'Brien	Forester	Forestry	<i>Michael O'Brien</i> 10/17/15
Charles Tuss	Fuels specialist	Fire/fuels	<i>Charles Tuss</i> 10/17/15
Brad Colin	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Visual Resources and Recreation	<i>Brad Colin</i> 10/07/2015
Carrie Kiely	Archaeologist	Archaeology	<i>Carrie Kiely</i> 10/20/15
Lacy Decker	Natural Resource Specialist	Noxious Weeds/Sensitive Plants	<i>Lacy Decker</i> 10/6/15
Brad Colin	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Travel Management	<i>Brad Colin</i> 10/07/2015
Roger Olsen	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range, Riparian	<i>Roger Olsen</i> 10-14-15
Corey Meier	AFM	Soils, Water, and Air	<i>Corey Meier</i> 10/21/2015

Conclusion (If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.)

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 the NEPA.

Michael O'Brien 10/20/15

 Signature of Project Lead

Corey Meier 10/21/2015

 Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Scot Franklin 10/22/2015

 Signature of the Responsible Official: 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. A Decision Document may be required (if the Decision Document for the previously-completed action does not apply), consistent with program requirements.