

**DNA WORKSHEET**  
**Worksheet**  
**Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**  
**ID-110-2007-DNA-3524**  
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/Boise District Office

**Lease/Serial/Case File No.** DNZ5

**Proposed Action Title/Type:** Warm Springs Fire Emergency Stabilization (ES) and Burned Area Rehabilitation (BAR) Plans

**Location of Proposed Action:** Northwest of Weiser, Idaho; Between Hog Creek, Rock Creek, and Jenkins Creek; Townships 11, 12 and 13 North; Ranges 5 and 6 West Covering 5,294 acres of public land

**Description of the Proposed Action:**

**ES Plan:**

Noxious Weeds: The 5,294 acres of public land that burned would be surveyed for the presence of noxious species in 2008. Site inventory and noxious weed control would be conducted and appropriate treatment(s) would be applied.

Fence Repair: Approximately 9.0 miles of protective fence would be constructed to exclude livestock and provide for the establishment of ground and aerial seeding treatments. The protective fences would adjoin other (existing) fences. The protective fence would remain in place to exclude livestock from the treatment area until monitoring results indicate rehabilitation objectives have been met. Fences may be used for long term management of the Henley Basin Wildlife Habitat area to reduce livestock use and maintain the investment within the wildlife management area.

Livestock Closure: The eight (8) grazing allotments and Henley Basin WHA will have varying degrees of closure to livestock grazing until monitoring results, documented in writing; show plan objectives have been met.

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

**BAR Plan:**

Ground Seeding: To restore diversity and shrub structure lost by the fire, the 40 acre parcel which supports southern Idaho ground squirrel would be drill seeded using a perennial seed

mix which includes non-native forbs, and native grasses and shrub.

Aerial Seeding: A total of 1,342 acres would be aerially seeded. The aerial seeding would re-establish pre-fire shrub structure and some plant diversity and would restore big game crucial winter range habitat components lost by the fire.

Fence Repair: The 23 miles of allotment management fence damaged by the fire would be repaired and/or replaced to exclude livestock from the treatment area during the seeding establishment closure period.

Noxious Weeds: The 5,294 acres of public land that burned would be surveyed for the presence of noxious species and appropriate control measures would be conducted.

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

LUP Name: Cascade Resource Management Plan (RMP), Approved 1988.

The proposed actions (both ES and BAR) are in conformance with the LUP, and are consistent with LUP decisions and objectives.

Protective Fence: The construction of protective fencing, although not addressed in the Cascade RMP, is consistent with RMP Objectives and Actions. A protective fence would be constructed to exclude livestock from the treatment area during the seeding/seedling establishment period. Protective fence construction 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 seedlings or burned area. Normally two years of rest will be necessary to enable recovery of these areas.”

Aerial Seeding: A perennial seed mixture comprised of forbs and a native 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 occurrence sites would be replanted with seedlings. 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.

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 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**

- Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment for Boise District and Jarbidge Field Office (EA # ID-100-2005-265) approved February 2007.
- Snake River Breaks Watershed, Henley Basin Management Unit Environmental Assessment #ID-095-02019; January 7, 2002
- Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) 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).

- Allotment Assessments for Henley Basin Management Unit May 31, 2001
- Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ) 303(d) list of water quality limited streams (HUC # 17050201, 1998).
- Brownlee Reservoir (Weiser Flat) Sub-basin Assessment and Total Maximum Daily Loads (IDEQ 2003)
- Final Biological Assessment, Four Rivers Land Use Plan: Cascade and Kuna Planning Areas; January 2006.
- 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, proposed actions found in the Warm Springs Fire Emergency Stabilization Plan and Burned Area Rehabilitation Plan are substantially the same actions as analyzed for the NFRP EA, the Cascade RMP, the **Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment for the Boise District and Jarbidge Field Office**, and the Snake River Breaks, Henley Basin Management Unit Environmental Assessment.

Habitat seedings for rehabilitation efforts are identified throughout the RMP. Also, in Snake River Breaks Watershed, Henley Basin Management Unit Environmental Assessment (EA), Tar Gulch Allotment is identified as an area that may be prescribed burned, chemically treated with annual grass-targeted herbicide, and seeded with big sagebrush, forbs, and native perennial grasses. (ID-095-02019, pages 7 and 8).

New fence construction is identified in the EA (ID-095-02019, Appendix 1, page 25) for Henley Basin Wildlife Habitat Area. Fences being rebuilt have been in existence for several years.

Rest from livestock use is discussed in the proposed action for Wildfire Rehabilitation on page 7 of the EA (ID-095-02019).

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 is appropriate with respect to the current proposed ES and BAR plans, given the existing environmental situation or circumstances. The Range of alternatives analyzed in the FRRP EA considered all treatments proposed in the current ES and BAR plans. In addition, proposed actions are within the range of alternatives discussed in the RMP, and Henley Basin EA (ID-095-02019) related to management of, and protection from unwanted livestock use within, the wildlife habitat area, big game winter range and candidate species habitat.

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, existing analysis, found in the January 2006 Final Biological Assessment Four Rivers Land Use Plan: Cascade and Kuna Planning Areas, the Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan EA, the Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment for Boise District and Jarbidge Field Office EA, the Cascade RMP, and Snake River Break Henley Basin Management Unit EA, is adequate as described above. These documents, having been recently prepared consider 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 documents are appropriate because they provide for the implementation of treatment actions that have a high probability of resulting in the successful cost effective rehabilitation of a major portion of the rangelands burned in the fire, and are consistent with CEQ (43 DFR 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.

All previously approved NEPA documents (NFRP EA, Snake River Breaks Henley Basin Management Unit EA, Noxious and Invasive Weed Treatment for Boise District and Jarbidge Field Office EA, and Final Biological Assessment Four Rivers Land Use Plan: Cascade and Kuna Planning Areas, continue to be appropriate for stabilization and rehabilitation projects on public land within the Warm Springs Fire burned area.

**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 and BAR Plans were sufficiently analyzed. There are no unique site specific impacts resulting from the implementation of the ES and/or BAR plans or the individual rehabilitation treatments. The direct and indirect impacts of the ES and BAR plans are identified in the NFRP EA, IV Environmental Consequences, B. Proposed Action by resources affected, pp 60-75 (Soils, Water, Floodplains/Wetlands/Riparian Zones, Air, Vegetation, Terrestrial Wildlife, Aquatic Wildlife, Recreation, Special Management Areas, Visual Resources, Cultural Resources and Grazing Management). The BA NFRP addresses the effects of ESR treatments on the Southern Idaho Ground Squirrel, ESA listed Candidate Species, pp 86-88: Direct Effects, Interrelated and Interdependent Effects, Indirect Effects, and Determination of Effects.

**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, it can safely be concluded that reasonably foreseeable cumulative impacts of past, present and future impacts from stabilizing and rehabilitating public lands burned within the Warm Spring Fire remain substantially unchanged from those analyzed in existing NEPA documents. Furthermore, stabilization and rehabilitation projects on public lands will compliment efforts being made by private land owners.

**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. In addition, public involvement and interagency review was conducted in conjunction with preparation of the Snake River Breaks Watershed, Henley Basin Management Unit Environmental Analysis (EA #ID-095-02019, page 14).

A public meeting was held July 20, 2007, in Weiser, Idaho to solicit input to rehabilitation efforts. This meeting was advertised in The Weiser Signal American (the Weiser newspaper) and flyers were posted throughout the town. Meeting participants included:

- Private land owners
- Livestock grazing permittees
- Weiser Signal American newspaper
- Representatives from (1) Payette National Forest; (2) Natural Resources Conservation Service; (3) Bureau of Land Management; (4) Washington County Commissioners; (5) Washington County Sherriff; (6) Washington County Weed Management Area; (7) Idaho Department of Fish and Game; (8) Idaho Department of Agriculture; (9) Senator Craig's office; and (10) Congressman Sali's office

The DNA, ES and BAR Plans, will be posted on the BLM NEPA web page and will be available to the public along with other pertinent documents.

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

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Mary Clark	Rangeland Management Specialist	Team Leader
Matt McCoy	NEPA Specialist	NEPA
Tim Carrigan Anna Owsiak (IDFG) Tim Shelton (IDFG) Marilynn Hemker (USFWS)	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Cindy Fritz	ESR Coordinator	Project Costs and Review
Mark Steiger	Botanist	Vegetation
Allen Tarter	Hydrologist	Riparian
Paul Seronko	Soil Scientist	Soils
Dean Shaw	Archeologist	Cultural Resources
Jeff Mork	GIS Specialist	Maps
Pat Kane	Noxious Weeds Specialist	Weeds
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 applicable mitigation measures are incorporated and implemented.

Table 2-5 for Southern Idaho Ground Squirrel: Conservation Measures and Implementation Action for the Four Rivers FO, found on page 13 of 19 of the Final Biological Assessment, Four Rivers Land Use Plan: Cascade and Kuna Planning Areas, January 2006 states: For Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation, the conservation measure is to “Implement Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation activities to promote southern Idaho ground squirrel habitat rehabilitation.” To do so, “BLM will implement ES&R activities: a) If needed and if natural recovery would not achieve habitat objectives, implement ES&R activities to promote rehabilitation of suitable habitat or restoration areas. Design seed mixes that emphasize native shrubs, grasses, and forbs and would promote establishment of species needed to achieve suitable southern Idaho ground squirrel habitat, if natural recovery of such vegetation is doubtful. b) As needed, protect disturbed areas using temporary closures or other measures until grasses and forbs are re-established and self sustaining.”

CONCLUSION

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action. Therefore, BLM is in compliance with NEPA requirements with the proposals documented in Warm Springs Fire Burned Area Rehabilitation plan.

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