

DNA WORKSHEET

Date: August 22, 2007

DNA WORKSHEET

ID-110-2007-DNA-3523

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:** Boise District, Four Rivers Field Office, Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area
Lease/Serial/Case File No.: DH9E
Proposed Action Title/Type: Rimstep ES
Location of Proposed Action: Sunnyside Winter Allotment T. 2 S., R. 1 E., Sections 29, 31 and 32, and T. 2 S., R. 2 E., Section 5.
Description of the Proposed Action: ES -- sediment traps to reduce off-site soil movement.

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

LUP Name: Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area (NCA) Management Plan - Approved 1995

LUP Name: Kuna Management Framework Plan (MFP) - Approved 1983

Other document: NFRP EA - Approved 2004

The proposed action is in conformance with the above LUPs, and is specifically provided for in the Snake River Birds of Prey NCA Management Plan and although not directly addressed in the Kuna MFP, it is clearly consistent with LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions).

The NCA Management Plan lists the following Special Status Wildlife Management Action:
24) Support the improvement of water quality in the Snake River.

The following objectives are stated in the Kuna MFP:

- WS-1.1 Manage all watersheds to achieve stable or moderate soil surface factor conditions and, where feasible/economical, strive for maintaining or establishing good perennial vegetation cover.

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, EA # ID-090-2004-050, approved May 12, 2005.

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 Emergency Stabilization Plan for the Rimstep Fire is a typical proposal to mitigate effects of wildfires in the Boise District. The subject plan is a routine example of an individual proposal to reduce erosion into the Snake River, which was analyzed by the environmental assessment cited above.

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 alternatives analyzed in the EA are applicable and appropriate to the current proposed fire rehabilitation 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?

The existing analysis is adequate and was prepared relatively recently. Although the bald eagle and the Idaho springsnail (re-named the Jackson Lake springsnail) were recently

de-listed, they are still considered BLM sensitive species. As such, we are obligated to manage them in such a way that they will not be re-listed. The proposed action will further this objective by ensuring that water quality in the Snake River is not impacted by off-site soil movement until natural plant regeneration occurs.

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 analysis is consistent with current requirements and guidelines.

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 (soil erosion and reduced water quality) related to the proposed rehabilitation plan were sufficiently analyzed.

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 Rimstep Fire rehabilitation, have been adequately analyzed in the NFRP EA.

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. Conducting additional public involvement for this specific fire rehabilitation plan would identify no new issues, and could potentially jeopardize the achievement of objectives by delaying the process.

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 Mgt Spec	Rangeland Management
Mark Steiger	Botanist	Vegetation
Dean Shaw	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources
John Doremus	Biologist	Wildlife

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 Snake River Birds of Prey NCA Management Plan, Kuna MFP, or in the NFRP EA that would apply to the Rimstep (DH9E) fire rehabilitation 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.

/s/ John Sullivan

9/26/2007

Signature of the Responsible Official

Date