

**DNA WORKSHEET
ID-110-2007-DNA-3605**

**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.: DY0D

Proposed Action Title/Type: Grays Creek Fire BAR Plan

Location of Proposed Action: T14N, R1E, Sec. 4-5-6-8-10 & T15N, R1E, Sec. 18, 20, 29, 30, 32 Boise Meridian, Idaho

Description of the Proposed Action:

Aerial Seeding: A perennial seed mixture comprised of a nonnative grass, and a native forb and shrub would be aerial broadcast seeded over 1,014 acres.

Shrub Seedling Planting: Antelope bitterbrush seedlings (9,000) will be hand planted over a 30 acre area.

Fence Repair: Damaged by the fire were 6.2 miles of pasture and allotment boundary that would be repaired and/or replaced.

Livestock Closure: Livestock would be excluded from 1,385 acres area during the seeding establishment and natural recovery period.

Noxious Weeds: The 1,385 acre burned area would be surveyed for the presence of noxious species, and appropriate control measures would be initiated.

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: Cascade Resource Management Plan (RMP), Approved 1987.

Ground Seeding: A seed mixture comprised of non-native grasses and a forb would be manually applied and covered, using hand broadcast seeders and rakes or other hand implements. The goal is to plant competitive species to inhibit the post-fire spread of invasive species and noxious weeds in riparian habitat bordering a perennial stream. The Cascade RMP addresses ground seeding as an acceptable vegetation manipulation method in

Preferred Alternative E, Livestock Resources and Wildlife Resources, Actions, Vegetative Manipulation.

Aerial Seeding: A perennial seed mixture comprised of a native forb and shrub would be aerial broadcast seeded. The Cascade RMP, Resource Management Guidelines, Wildlife Resources, states “Habitat to support viable populations of all native and exotic wildlife species present in the resource area will be maintained” and further stipulates under Sage Grouse that where applicable, seed mixtures for fire rehabilitation projects will include a mixture of grasses, forbs, and shrubs that benefit sage grouse.

Shrub Seedling Planting: To restore the shrub structure lost by the fire, bitterbrush seedlings would be hand planted. The Cascade RMP, Preferred Alternative E, Wildlife Resources, Objectives, cites “shrub plantings” as a way of improving wildlife habitat, and the RMP Resource Management Guidelines, Wildlife Resources, Mule Deer Habitat, acknowledges the use of bitterbrush plantings as a method for improving forage condition for mule deer.

Fence Repair: The repair and/or replacement of allotment fence damaged by the fire, although not addressed in the Cascade RMP, is consistent with RMP Objectives and Actions. Fence repair would provide for natural recovery, the exclusion livestock from the treatment area during seeding establishment period, and would allow for the authorized grazing use of unburned areas of pastures and allotments. Fence repair is consistent with RMP, Fire Management, Rehabilitation, Greenstripping and Reduction Actions/Procedures, (3.) states “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 burned area. Normally two years of rest will be necessary to enable recovery of these areas.”

Livestock Closure: Livestock are to be excluded from the treatment 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. The Cascade RMP, Fire Management, Rehabilitation, Greenstripping and Reduction Actions/Procedures, (3.) states “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 burned area. Normally two years of rest will be necessary to enable recovery of these areas.”

Noxious Weeds: The burned area would be surveyed for the presence of noxious species, and appropriate control measures would be initiated. The control of noxious weeds is consistent with Cascade RMP, Resource Management Guidelines, Weeds (Control of Noxious), “BLM districts will work with 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 that purpose.” The control of noxious weeds is in compliance with State and county laws.

Monitoring: Monitoring data would be collected from initiation of the proposed treatments through 2010. Monitoring of fire rehabilitation treatments is consistent and supportive of the Cascade RMP, Resource Management Guidelines, Fire Management, Rehabilitation, Greenstripping and Reduction Actions/Procedures, “The multiple use objectives identified in this land use plan will be evaluated for the potential accomplishment through fire rehabilitation and greenstripping.”

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.
- Environmental Assessment #ID-095-02-075, Indian Valley Watershed Management Unit dated January 2003.

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 Burned Area Rehabilitation (BAR) Plan for the Grays Creek Fire is a typical proposal to mitigate effects of wildfires in the Boise District. Rehabilitation treatments proposed in the BAR Plan 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 BAR Plan, given the existing environmental situation or circumstances. The range of alternatives analyzed in the NFRP EA considered all treatments proposed in the current BAR Plan.

- 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. In addition, the Indian Valley Watershed Management Unit EA is a more site specific document having developed its analysis based on grazing allotments. 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 BAR Plan were sufficiently analyzed. There are no unique site specific impacts resulting from the implementation of the BAR Plan or the individual rehabilitation treatments. The direct and indirect impacts of the BAR Plan 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 BAR Plan, 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 and BAR Plan 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 the allotment permittee and the Adams County Cooperative Weed Management Area Chairperson.

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

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Allen Tarter	Team Leader	Riparian
Mike Barnum	Rangeland Management Specialist	Rangeland
Tim Carrigan	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Cindy Fritz	ESR Coordinator	Project Costs and Review
Mary Jones	Natural Resource Specialist	Environmental Coordination
Jack LaRocco	Natural Resource Specialist	Environmental Coordination

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 Cascade RMP or in the NFRP EA that would apply to the Grays Creek (DY0D) BAR Plan.

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.

Signature of the Responsible Official

Date