



**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-B010-2016-0016

**Lease/Serial Case File No.:**

**Proposed Action Title/Type:** Mann Fire (J169) ESR Plan

**Location/Legal of Proposed Action:** T11N. R4W., multiple sections

**Applicant (if any):** N/A

**Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:**

The J169 MANN Fire burned federal (663-acres) and private (667-acres) lands northeast of Weiser, Idaho. The Mann Fire ESR Plan includes the following activities on BLM managed lands:

- Inventory and control of noxious weed species including scotch thistle and leafy spurge would occur in years one through three post-fire.
- Repair of existing allotment boundary fence (~ 3 miles).
- Issue grazing closure agreements for two separate allotments including Sandy Ridge and Lund FFR Allotments until grazing resumption and ESR vegetation objectives are met.
- Planting of approximately 16,000 sagebrush and 18,000 bitterbrush seedlings over three years post-fire within the Rebecca Sand Hill Research Natural Area and Area of Critical Environmental Concern using shovels, hoe dads, or augers. No motorized equipment for transportation into the area would be utilized.

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

<b>LUP/Document</b>	<b>Sections/Pages</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>
Cascade Resource Management Plan (CRMP)	Fire Management and Resource Management Guidelines	July 1, 1988
Record of Decision and Approved Greater Sage-Grouse Resource Management Plan Amendment for	Section 2.2 Goals, Objectives, and Management Decisions (see specific decisions below for page numbers)	Sept. 21, 2015

LUP/Document	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Idaho and Southwestern Montana		

The proposed action is in conformance with the Cascade RMP even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

**All ES & BAR Treatments Planned**

Public lands and resources affected by wildfires would be rehabilitated. The multiple use objectives identified in this land use plan would be evaluated for potential accomplishment through fire rehabilitation and greens stripping efforts. Fire rehabilitation and greenstripping efforts would incorporate, to the extent practicable, provisions to help accomplish those objectives as conditions allow. The following would be applied:

- All grazing licenses issued that include areas recently burned and/or seeded will include a statement concerning the amount of rest needed in the seedings or burn area. Normally two years of rest will be necessary to enable recovery of these areas.

The area burned by the Mann Fire is classified as General Sage Grouse Habitat in the Greater Sage-Grouse Resource Management Plan Amendment for Idaho and Montana. The proposed action is in conformance with this LUP Amendment because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP Amendment decisions:

**Management Decision for Vegetation #1 (pg. 2-16):** Implement habitat rehabilitation or restoration projects in areas that have potential to improve Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG) habitat using a full array of treatment activities as appropriate, including chemical, mechanical and seeding treatments.

**Management Decision for Vegetation #11 (pg. 2-18):** Conduct integrated weed management actions for noxious and invasive weed populations that are impacting or threatening GRSG habitat quality using a variety of eradication and control techniques including chemical, mechanical and other appropriate means.

**Management Decision for Fire and Fuels Management #34 (pg. 2-23):** Provide adequate rest from livestock grazing to allow natural recovery of existing vegetation and successful establishment of seeded species within burned/ESR areas. All new seedings of grasses and forbs should not be grazed until at least the end of the second growing season, and longer as needed to allow plants to mature and develop robust root systems which will stabilize the site, compete effectively against cheatgrass and other invasive annuals, and remain sustainable under long-term grazing management. Adjust other management activities, as appropriate, to meet ESR objectives.

**Management Decision for Special Status Species #38 (pg. 2-15):** Monitor the effectiveness of projects until objectives have been met or until it is determined that objectives cannot be met, according to the monitoring schedule identified for project implementation.

**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).**

<b>NEPA/Other Related Documents</b>	<b>Sections/Pages</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>
Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan Boise District Office and Jarbidge Field Office Environmental Assessment (EA)	All	May 12, 2005
Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment EA – Boise District	All	Feb 6, 2007
Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) and the Vegetation Treatments on BLM Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Report.	All	June, 2007
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, 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 and the Cascade 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. An alternative action to not implement ESR treatments, was considered but eliminated from detailed analysis because it was not consistent with BLM policy or the Purpose and Need Statement of the EA. The No Action Alternative which would continue to use existing 1987/1988 NFESRP EAs was analyzed as an alternative to the Proposed Action. 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 in the shortest time frame to enhance and protect the watershed, soil, wildlife habitat, and livestock forage values of the area. The proposed actions of the Mann Fire ES&R plan are designed to accomplish that objective for the area burned by the Mann Fire.

**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, especially the seeding of shrubs, will stabilize soils and protect habitat for the Greater sage-grouse and other sagebrush obligate wildlife species by re-establishing the shrub-steppe plant community.

Based on the new information gained during recent inventory and survey of the burn area, existing analysis from the NFESRP EA is adequate. The proposed actions within the treatment area and their effects to the above species 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 impacts outlined in the document directly correlate to those impacts expected from the current proposed actions of noxious weed treatment, emergency livestock grazing closure, shrub seedling plantings, and infrastructure repair. The direct and indirect impact analysis does not analyze the impacts of the fire and the resulting loss of habitat, which is outside the scope of the 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**

**Boise District Normal Fire Rehabilitation Plan**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Resource/Agency Represented</b>
Shoshone-Piute Tribes	Wings and Roots	Native American Nation
Barbara Chaney	Biologist	US Fish and Wildlife Service
County Commissioners	Local Policymakers	Washington County

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis and planning documents.

**Mann Fire ESR Plan Team**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency Represented/Duty Station</b>
Sarah Garcia	Rangeland Mgmt Specialist	BLM – Four Rivers Field Office
Alex Webb	Operations	BLM – Boise District
Al Tarter	Natural Resource Specialist	BLM – Four Rivers Field Office
Mark Steiger	Botanist	BLM – Four Rivers Field Office
Joseph Weldon	Wildlife Biologist	BLM – Four Rivers Field Office
Seth Flanigan	NEPA Specialist	BLM – Boise District

**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** (*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 NEPA.

/s/ Sarah C. Garcia  
Sarah C. Garcia  
Preparer

01/15/2016  
Date

/s/ Seth Flanigan  
NEPA Specialist

01/12/2016  
Date

/s/ Tate Fischer  
Four Rivers Field Manager

01/22/2016  
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.