

DNA WORKSHEET
ID-110-2007-DNA-3569

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

Note: This Worksheet is to be completed consistent with the policies stated in the Instruction Memorandum entitled, "Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy" transmitting this Worksheet and the "Guidelines for using the DNA Worksheet," located at the end of the Worksheet. (Note: The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.)

- A. BLM Office:** Four Rivers Field Office
Lease/Serial/Case File No.: DUY5
Proposed Action Title/Type: Cold Fire ES & BAR Plans
Location of Proposed Action: Boise Meridian, Idaho: T3S, R9E, Secs. 25, 26, 35, & 36; T3S, R10E, Secs. 29-32; T4S, R10E, Secs. 5-8.
Description of the Proposed Action:

ES Plan:

Ground Seeding: Using rangeland drills, 524 acres would be seeded with two non-native perennial grasses.

Noxious Weeds: The 2,778 acre burned area would be surveyed for the presence of noxious weed species and appropriate control measures would be initiated.

Fence Repair: The 3.1 miles of pasture and allotment boundary fence damaged by the fire would be repaired and/or replaced, and 2.0 miles of protective fence would be constructed.

Livestock Closure: Livestock would be excluded from 2,778 acres area during the seeding/seedling establishment period.

Monitoring: Monitoring to determine the effectiveness of treatments would be conducted from initiation of their implementation through 2010.

BAR Plan:

Aerial Seeding: Perennial seed mixtures comprised of a native forb, shrub, and grass would be aerial broadcast seeded over 2,787 acres.

Shrub Seedling Planting: The hand planting of 25,500 bitterbrush seedlings would be conducted over 149 acres.

Noxious Weeds: The 2,778 acre burned area would be monitored for the presence of noxious weed species, and appropriate control measures would be conducted.

Fence Repair: Damaged by the fire were 1.0 miles of allotment boundary fence that would be repaired and/or replaced.

Livestock Closure: Livestock would be excluded from the 2,778 acre treatment area until monitoring indicates rehabilitation objectives have been met or there is no longer any need to maintain the livestock closure.

Monitoring: Monitoring to determine the effectiveness of treatments would be conducted from initiation of their implementation through 2010.

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

LUP Name: Jarbidge Resource Management Plan (RMP), Approved 1987.

Ground Seeding: Although not directly addressed in the Jarbidge RMP, the drill seeding of non-native perennial grasses is consistent with, Resource Management Guidelines, Fire Management, Rehabilitation and Reduction Actions/Procedures, (1.) “Rehabilitation of areas, particularly large ones, that have a high potential for fires or have a high frequency of fires, will utilize irregular buffer strips with seed mixtures that are fire resistant and/or meet watershed, protection, wildlife, and riparian objectives.”

Aerial Seeding: The aerial broadcast of a perennial seed mixture comprised of a native forb, grass, and shrub is with, Jarbidge RMP, Resource Management Guidelines, Range Improvements and Treatments, “Interseeding and reseeded projects in MUAs with objectives to improve ecological condition to benefit wildlife or livestock will use shrub, forb and grass seed mixture that are normally found in that type of ecological zone/type.” In addition, the RMP, Resource Management Guidelines, Fire Management, Rehabilitation and Reduction Actions/Procedures, (7.), states “Seedings will include appropriate seed mixtures to replace wildlife habitat that burned.”

Shrub Seedling Planting: The hand planting of bitterbrush seedlings as a treatment to restore the shrub structure lost by the fire is consistent with Jarbidge RMP, Resource Management Guidelines Terrestrial Wildlife, Mule Deer, “Improve forage condition by establishing seedings or plantings of bitterbrush four-wing saltbrush or other palatable shrub species on crucial mule deer winter range that presently has less than 30% palatable shrub composition by weight of the shrub component.”

Noxious Weeds: Monitoring for the presence of noxious species, and conducting appropriate control measures is consistent with Jarbidge RMP, Resource Management Guidelines, Control of Noxious Weeds, “BLM districts will work with their respective county governments to monitor the location and spread of noxious weeds and to maintain up-to-date inventory records. BLM will control the spread of noxious weeds on public lands where possible, where economically feasible and to the extent that funds are prioritized for this purpose.”

Fence Repair: Repair and/or replacement of allotment management fence damaged by the fire and the construction of protective fence to exclude livestock from the seeding treatment area during the establishment period is not addressed in the Jarbidge RMP, but is consistent with Resource Management Guidelines, Fire Management, Rehabilitation and Reduction Actions/Procedures, (4.), “All grazing licenses issued that include areas recently burned and/or

seeded areas will include a statement concerning the amount of rest needed in the seeding or burn area. Normally two years of rest will be necessary to protect these areas. This rested area may include remnant stands of desirable species that survived the fire.”

Livestock Closure: Livestock are to be excluded from the burned area until monitoring results, documented in writing; show rehabilitation objectives have been met. In case of treatment failure, other factors may need to be considered, such as natural recovery of untreated areas, and need or reason to continue closure. This treatment is consistent with Jarbidge RMP, Resource Management Guidelines, Fire Management, Rehabilitation and Reduction Actions/Procedures, (4.), “All grazing licenses issued that include areas recently burned and/or seeded areas will include a statement concerning the amount of rest needed in the seeding or burn area. Normally two years of rest will be necessary to protect these areas. This rested area may include remnant stands of desirable species that survived the fire.”

Monitoring: Monitoring data would be collected from initiation of the proposed treatments through 2010. The collection of monitoring data to determine the effectiveness of fire rehabilitation treatments is not addressed in the Jarbidge RMP, but is consistent with the evaluation and assessment of the Resource Management Guidelines, Fire Management, Rehabilitation and Reduction Actions/Procedures statement “Public lands affected by the fire will be rehabilitated to accomplish multiple use objectives and designed to reduce fire size.”

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

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

- Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan Environmental Assessment (NFRP EA), EA # ID-090-2004-050, approved May 12, 2005.
- Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment for the Boise District and Jarbidge Field Offices Environmental Assessment (NIWT EA), ID-100-2005-EA-265.
- United States Department of Interior (USDI) Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Final Environmental Impact Statement, Vegetation Treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States, 1991.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard’s assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

- Biological Assessment of Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan for Boise District Office and Jarbidge Field Office, Twin Falls District, Bureau of Land Management, Idaho, approved February 9, 2005.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

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

Yes, the proposed ES & BAR Plans for the Cold Fire are typical proposals to mitigate effects of wildfires in the Boise District. Rehabilitation treatments proposed in the ES & BAR Plans are standard methods and procedures that have been regularly implemented within the District's fire rehabilitation program and which were accordingly considered and analyzed by the NFRP EA, pp 9-30 (Protective Fences, Seeding and Planting, Livestock and Wild Horse Management, Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatments, and Monitoring).

2. **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, and resource values, and circumstances?**

Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the NFRP EA, are appropriate with respect to the current proposed ES & BAR Plans, given existing environmental situation or circumstances. The range of alternatives analyzed in the NFRP EA considered all treatments proposed in the current ES & BAR Plans.

3. **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, the NFRP EA analysis is adequate and having been recently prepared (2005) it considers present circumstances. There are no new circumstances that would be considered significant and the existing NEPA analysis is adequate.

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

Yes, The methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document is appropriate because it provides for the implementation of treatment actions that have a high probability of resulting in the successful cost effective stabilization and restoration of a major portion of the rangelands burned in the fire and are consistent with CEQ (43 CFR 1500) and BLM (Departmental Manual 516, Handbook 1790-1, Handbook 1742-1)

requirements and guidelines, which are the current requirements and guidelines for the development of a programmatic EA.

- 5. 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 analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?**

Yes, the impacts are substantially unchanged, and the types of impacts relating to the proposed ES & BAR Plans were sufficiently analyzed. There are no unique site specific impacts resulting from the implementation of the ES & BAR Plans or the individual rehabilitation treatments. The direct and indirect impacts of the ES & BAR Plans are identified and addressed in the NFRP EA, IV Environmental Consequences, B. Proposed Action by resources affected, pp 60-75 (Soils, Water, Floodplains/Wetland/Riparian Zones, Air, Vegetation, Terrestrial Wildlife, Aquatic Wildlife, Recreation, Special Management Areas, Visual Resources, Cultural Resources, and Grazing Management).

- 6. 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, reasonably foreseeable cumulative impacts of past, present, and future actions, including the currently proposed ES & BAR Plans, are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the NFRP EA, IV Environmental Consequences, C. Cumulative Impacts.

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

Yes, public involvement and interagency review were appropriately conducted in conjunction with the NFRP EA. The DNA, ES & BAR Plans will be posted on the BLM NEPA web page and will be available to the public along with other pertinent documents. In addition, contacts were made with all allotment permittees.

- E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:** Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet.

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Mike Barnum	Team Leader	Rangeland Management
Mark Steiger	Botanist	Vegetation
Jack LaRocco	Natural Resource Specialist	Environmental Coordination
Mary Jones	Natural Resource Specialist	Environmental Coordination
Cindy Fritz	ESR Coordinator	Project Costs and Review

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 must be incorporated and implemented.

No specific mitigating measures were identified in the Jarbidge RMP or in the NFRP EA that would apply to the Cold (DUY5) ES & BAR Plans.

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.

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

/s/ John Sullivan

9/24/2007

Signature of the Responsible Official

Date