

Murphy Complex Fire
 Documentation of NEPA Adequacy
 ID-210-2007-DNA-3554

**BLM/ TWIN FALLS DISTRICT/JARBIDGE FIELD OFFICE
 IDAHO STATE OFFICE**

FIRE BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Fire Name	Murphy Complex
Fire Number	DR62
District/Field Office	Twin Falls District/ Jarbidge Field Office
Admin Number	ID210
State	Idaho, Nevada
County(s)	Twin Falls, Elko, Owyhee
Ignition Date/Cause	7/16/07 Lightning
Date Contained	8/02/07
Jurisdiction	<i>Acres</i>
BLM	425,815 Jarbidge Field Office
<i>State</i>	25,984
<i>Private</i>	41,947
<i>USFS</i>	88,866
<i>Military</i>	1
Total Acres	593,549
Total Costs	\$22,947,000.00

Other document** Normal Fire Emergency S. & R. Plan Date Approved: May 12, 2005
Other document** Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health Date Approved: August, 1997
Other document** So. Central ID FMP Twin Falls District Date Approved: Sept., 2005

* List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).

** List applicable activity, project, management, water quality or other program plans.

- The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

The Jarbidge RMP states that lands administered by the BLM in this area (MUA 10 Bruneau Sheep Creek, MUA 11 Inside Desert, MUA 12 West Devil, MUA 13 East Devil, MUA 15 Jarbidge Foothills, and MUA 16 Diamond A) will be managed in order to:

- 1) Improve lands in poor ecological condition (p. II-40, 44, 47, 50, 56, 59) and maintain existing lands in MUA 10 that are in good and excellent ecological condition (p. II-40).
- 2) Maintain existing vegetative improvements in MUAs 10, 11, 12, 13, and 15 (p. II-40, 44, 47, 50, 56).
- 3) Manage big game habitat to support increased numbers of mule deer, pronghorn, and bighorn sheep (p. II-40, 44, 48, 50, 56, 59).
- 4) Maintain current upland game nesting and cover habitat in MUA 10 (p. II-40).
- 5) Improve sage grouse nesting through seeding and rehabilitation in MUA 10 (p. II-40); improve sage grouse habitat on 3,000 acres in MUA 12 by the year 2005 (p. II-48); maintain present areas of sage grouse nesting habitat in MUA 13 (p. II-51).
- 6) Maintain the current condition of riparian habitat in MUAs 12, 13, and 16 (p. II-48, 51, 60) and improve riparian habitat in MUAs 10, 11, and 15 by 2005 (p. II-40, 44, 56).
- 7) Maintain the current condition of fisheries habitat in MUA 13 (p. II-51) and improve fisheries habitat in MUAs 10, 11, 12, and 15 by 2005 (p. II-40, 44, 48, 56).

The lands within this area also include portions of the Bruneau-Jarbidge River Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), which will be managed to:

- 1) Protect, maintain, or improve bighorn sheep habitat to a good ecological condition class (p. II-67).
- 2) Protect and maintain the cultural, geologic, scenic, and natural values present in the area (p. II-68).

The proposed treatments in this ES and ER plans conform to the Jarbidge RMP. The interdisciplinary team developed objectives and treatments which respond to the identified issues and concerns. The BLM would evaluate this plan based on the success or failure in meeting these objectives.

The RMP also contains actions and procedures for fire rehabilitation in all multiple use areas (MUAs), as well as fire rehabilitation considerations specific to each MUA. These actions, procedures, and considerations include:

- Public lands affected by wildfires will be rehabilitated to accomplish multiple use objectives and designed to reduce fire size (p. II-89).
- Rehabilitation of areas, particularly large areas, 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. These buffer strips will receive first priority for seeding prior to reseeding the rest of burned area (p. II-89).
- In areas where the RMP goal/objective is to return the area to an improved ecological condition, 10 to 25% of the wildfire burn area will use seed mixtures to allow this objective to be met (p. II-89).
- Seedings will include appropriate seed mixtures to replace wildlife habitat that is burned (p. II-89).
- Burned areas in MUA 10 should be allowed to revegetate to native grasses; if seeding is necessary, the mix should be native species if possible, and should improve wildlife habitat (p. F-7).
- Rehabilitation efforts in MUAs 11 and 12 will meet wildlife management objectives, in addition to providing forage for livestock and providing ground cover (p. F-8).
- Rehabilitation of burned areas in MUA 13 will meet wildlife, as well as other resource management objectives in MUA 13 (p. F-9)
- In crucial wildlife winter ranges in MUAs 15 and 16, use seed mixtures which benefit wildlife as well as livestock (p. F-10).

Finally, the RMP contains additional guidelines that relate to fire rehabilitation activities.

- Within the Bruneau-Jarbridge River ACEC, the management priority for the canyons is for bighorns and other wildlife (p. II-70).
- Within the Bruneau-Jarbridge River ACEC, the protection of threatened, endangered, and sensitive plant species will be given priority over livestock and recreation use (p. II-71).
- Fences will be modified to allow for pronghorn and mule deer passage in areas where wildlife needs are not being met (p. II-43, 46, 49, 52, 58, 62).
- Projects proposed in areas with known threatened, endangered, or sensitive plants will give full consideration to protecting these species, including fencing, if necessary (p. II-82).
- Protect and enhance endangered, threatened, and sensitive species habitats in order to maintain or enhance existing and potential populations (p. II-83).
- In sage grouse habitat, seed mixtures for range improvement projects and fire rehabilitation projects will include a mixture of grasses, forbs, and shrubs that benefit sage grouse (p. II-84).
- In mule deer habitat, in range rehabilitation or manipulation projects, maintain a 60/40 ratio of forage area to cover area (p. II-84).
- In pronghorn habitat, vegetation manipulation projects will include mixtures of grasses, forbs, and shrubs (p. II-86).
- Permit no adverse habitat alteration of potential bighorn sheep habitats (p. II-86).

- Priority for habitat management will be given to habitat for listed and candidate Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive species (p. II-87).
- Control the spread of noxious weeds on public lands where possible and economically feasible (p. II-94).

Idaho Standards and Guidelines for Rangeland Health Objectives (as applicable to this fire):

Standard #1: Watersheds provide for the proper infiltration, retention, and release of water appropriate to soil type, vegetation, climate and landform to provide for proper nutrient cycling, hydrologic cycling, and energy flow. Indicator: The amount and distribution of ground cover, including litter, for identified soil-plant associations are appropriate for site stability. [p. 4]

Standard #4: Healthy, productive, and diverse native animal habitat and populations of native plants are maintained or promoted as appropriate to soil type, climate, and landform to provide for proper nutrient cycling, hydrologic cycling, and energy flow. Indicators: Native plant communities (flora and microbiotic crusts) are maintained or improved to ensure the proper functioning of ecological processes and continued productivity and diversity of native plant species. The diversity of native species is maintained. Noxious weeds are not increasing. Adequate litter and standing dead plant material are present for site protection and for decomposition to replenish soil nutrients relative to site potential. [p. 6]

Standard #5: Seedlings are functioning to maintain life form diversity, production, native animal habitat, nutrient cycling, energy flow, and the hydrologic cycle. The indicators are that in established seedlings, the diversity of perennial species is not diminishing over time. Plant production, seed production, and cover are adequate to enable recruitment under favorable climate conditions. Noxious weeds are not increasing. Adequate litter and standing dead plant material are present for site protection and for decomposition to replenish soil nutrients relative to site potential. [p. 6]

Standard #6: Exotic plant communities will meet minimum requirements of soil stability and maintenance of existing native and seeded plants. The indicators are: the number of perennial species is not diminishing over time. Plant vigor of native and seeded plants is maintained to enable reproduction and recruitment when favorable climatic or other environmental events (wildfires) occur. [p. 7]

Standard #8: Habitats are suitable to maintain viable populations of threatened and endangered, sensitive, and other special status species. Indicators included: Riparian/wetland vegetation with deep, strong, binding roots is sufficient to stabilize stream banks and shorelines. Invader and shallow rooted species are a minor component of the floodplain. Age class and structural diversity of riparian/wetland vegetation are appropriate for the site. The diversity of native species is maintained. Native plant communities (flora and microbiotic crusts) are maintained or improved to ensure the

proper functioning of ecological processes and continued productivity and diversity of native plant species.

Guideline #1: Use grazing management practices (rest) to maintain or promote significant progress toward adequate amounts of ground cover to support infiltration, maintain soil moisture storage and stabilize soils. [p.9]

Guideline #3: Use grazing management practices (rest) to maintain or promote soil conditions that support water infiltration, plant vigor, and permeability rates and minimize soil compaction appropriate to site potential. [p. 9]

Guideline #13: On areas seeded predominately with non-native plants, use grazing management practices (rest) to maintain or promote the physical and biological conditions to achieve healthy rangelands. [p. 10]

Guideline #15: Use non-native plant species for rehabilitation in those situations where non-native plants provide for management and protection of native rangelands. [p. 10]

Guideline #16: On burned areas, allow natural regeneration when it is determined that populations of native perennial plants are sufficient to regenerate the site. Rest burned or rehabilitated areas to allow recovery or establishment of perennial plant species. [p. 11]

Guideline #17: Carefully consider the effects of new management facilities (e.g., water developments, fences) on healthy and properly functioning rangelands prior to implementation. [p.11]

Guideline #20: Design management fences to minimize adverse impacts, such as habitat fragmentation, to maintain habitat integrity and connectivity for native plants and animals (p. 11).

So. Central Idaho Fire Mgmt Plan Twin Falls District Rehab Priorities (as applicable to this fire)

Fire Management Units (FMU's) within the fire perimeter include; Inside Desert FMU, Jarbidge Canyonlands FMU, Juniper Butte FMU, and the Jarbidge Foothills FMU.

Inside Desert FMU

Ranked as a high priority for ESR treatments to maintain remaining intact native vegetation communities.

1. Restore sage-grouse habitat.
2. Prevent post-wildfire spread of invasive non-native species.

Juniper Butte FMU

Ranked as high priority for ESR, due to the presence of *Lepidium papilliferum*.

1. Prevent post-wildfire spread of invasive non-native species.

Jarbidge Canyonlands FMU

Ranked as low priority for ESR since it is a remote FMU which is in generally good condition with intact native plant communities and low fire occurrence.

1. Prevent post-wildfire spread of invasive non-native species.

Jarbidge Foothills FMU

Ranked as low priority for ESR due to the intact native vegetative communities and moderate fire occurrence.

1. Prevent post-wildfire spread of invasive non-native species.

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

1. Boise District Normal Fire Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan EA #ID-090-2004-050, approved and signed May 12, 2005.

General vegetation (pg. 29) and fire management objectives of this plan are:

- The majority of desired herbaceous perennial plants are producing seed.
 - The plants must have developed root systems that are extensive enough to provide soil stabilization and prevent uprooting when grazed, especially when soils are moist.
 - The Individual ESR Plan objectives have been met
2. Environmental Assessment for Noxious Weeds Control, EA #ID-01-98-036.
 3. Vegetation treatment on BLM Lands in Thirteen Western States, approved July 23, 1991.
 4. Interim Management Policy and Guidelines for Lands Under Wilderness Review (BLM Manual Handbook H-8550-1)
 5. **Special Note of Concern:** The following table of allotments are subject to the September 2005 Stipulated Settlement Agreement in the case of Western Watersheds Project v. Idaho State Director K Lynn Bennett. The Settlement Agreement specifies interim grazing management plans, terms and conditions for these allotments pending completion of a revised Jarbidge RMP.

Allotment Name	
Antelope Springs	East Juniper Draw
Blackrock Pocket	Echo 4
Camas Slough	Grassy Hills
Cedar Butte/Devil Creek	Juniper Butte
Cedar Creek	Noh Field
Coonskin	Pigtail Butte
Crawfish	

The Inside Desert and Poison Butte allotments are subject to the April 2003 terms and conditions outlined in the memorandum decision and order in the case of Committee for the High Desert v. Edward Guerrero, Jarbidge Field Manager, Bureau of Land Management. The order specifies interim grazing management plans as well as terms and conditions for these allotments

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 for the Boise NFRP concurrence, OALS #1-4-05-I-218.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: A range of proposed actions were analyzed under the NFESRP. These included seeding, herbicide use, noxious weed treatments, and livestock management alternatives. An interdisciplinary team review of this fire has determined that the resource values, concerns, and rehabilitation needs are substantially similar to those discussed and approved in the Boise District NFESRP of May 2005 and best meet the vegetative, watershed and soil objectives of the Plan, the Jarbidge RMP, and the South Central Idaho Fire Management Plan. The proposed emergency stabilization actions include; 63,000 acres of drill seeding, 13,200 acres of aerial seeding, shrub planting for channel stabilization, 37 miles of temporary fence, 4.3 miles of soil stabilization structures, cultural resource stabilization treatments, 425,800 acres of noxious weed treatment and two closures, one for livestock grazing and a cross country motorized vehicular closure. Emergency rehabilitation actions include aerial seeding of sagebrush on 260,000 acres, drill and hand seeding of bitterbrush on a total of 30,000 acres, repair 390 miles of existing allotment fences, sign replacement, 425,800 acres of noxious weed treatment and monitoring. All of the above treatment types were previously analyzed under the NFESRP.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: The range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document is appropriate. Two alternatives to the proposed action were analyzed in the EA. They included an alternative action that would not implement ESR treatments, but was eliminated from detailed analysis because it was not consistent with BLM policy, and the No Action Alternative which would continue to use existing 1987/1988 NFESRP's. However, the overall objective of the Proposed Action of this plan is to stabilize and return the 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.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

FISHERIES: The proposed treatments to reduce erosion, such as riparian plantings and use of straw bales, complies with the emergency stabilization objectives and design criteria in the EA and will promote the stabilization of soils and recovery of riparian vegetation within the burn area. The affects from using these treatments were analyzed in the EA and the potential affects and benefits are identified. The use of riparian plantings and straw bales as emergency stabilization treatments will not result in any additional direct or indirect affects to fish bearing or non-fish bearing habitats beyond the affects identified in the EA.

The use of temporary fences to protect riparian plantings complies with the emergency stabilization and rehabilitation objectives and design criteria in the EA and will promote the recovery of streamside vegetation in the identified treatment areas. The affects from using protective fences were analyzed in the EA and the potential affects and benefits are identified. The use of protective fences as an emergency stabilization treatment will not result in any additional direct or indirect affects to fish bearing or non-fish bearing habitats beyond the affects identified in the EA.

The proposed noxious weed treatments comply with the emergency stabilization objectives and design criteria in the EA and will reduce competition between noxious and

invasive weeds and the recovering native and seeded vegetation. The affects of treating noxious and invasive weeds were analyzed in the EA and the potential affects and benefits are identified. The proposed noxious weed treatments will not result in any additional direct or indirect affects to fish bearing or non-fish bearing habitats beyond the affects identified in the EA.

The proposed upland stabilization and rehabilitation treatments would use a variety of mechanical, broadcast and hand treatments to restore vegetation within the burned area. These treatments comply with the objectives and design criteria in the EA and are expected to promote the stabilization of soils and recovery of upland and riparian vegetation within the burned area. The affects from using these treatments were analyzed in the EA and the potential affects and benefits are identified. The use of the proposed revegetation treatments will not result in any additional direct or indirect affects to fish bearing or non-fish bearing habitats beyond the affects identified in the EA.

In 2005, the Bureau of Land Management Boise District and the Jarbidge Field Office of the Twin Falls District completed a programmatic Endangered Species Act Consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service on the Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plans (OALS #1-4-05-I-218). The direct and indirect affects from the emergency stabilization and rehabilitation treatments (i.e. riparian plantings, erosion control treatments, temporary protective fences, treatment of noxious and invasive weeds, and the use of various treatments to restore burned vegetation) were all considered in this consultation. The proposed ES and BAR treatments for the Murphy Complex Fire are in compliance with this consultation. The proposed treatments will not result in any affects to Federally listed species or their habitats that were not considered in the existing consultation.

The ES Plan for the Murphy Complex Fire includes a treatment to assess, and modify where needed, fire related hazard trees in the Jarbidge River between the confluence of the East and West Fork and Poison Creek. To address safety concerns, fallen trees that pose an immediate safety risk to water recreationists would be modified to reduce the safety risk. The potential affect from modifying hazard trees in the Jarbidge River canyon was not analyzed in detail in the EA but does not require a separate NEPA analysis. This treatment may require ESA consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Any supplemental ESA requirements will be completed prior to implementing this proposed treatment.

WILDLIFE: The proposed treatments, particularly the seeding of shrubs and forbs will speed the recovery of habitat used by sage-grouse and a number of other Idaho BLM sensitive species. The various temporary fences will be aligned and configured to minimize collision hazard for sage-grouse. Mitigation will include using let down fences, having strips of vinyl siding hung on the wires between posts to enhance visibility, and locating temporary fences as far from sage-grouse leks as possible, but at least 0.25 miles. These mitigation measures are the same as listed in the NFESRP (p. 21). Additionally, BLM will minimize temporary fence construction through remaining sagebrush habitats to reduce fragmentation of sagebrush habitats. Fences will normally be constructed at the perimeter of the burn.

Seeding shrubs and planting shrub seedlings in various areas will help restore crucial winter range for interstate herds of mule deer, pronghorn, and elk. Treatments are generally scheduled in the fall (drill seeding) and will avoid stressing wildlife during the winter. The sole exception is the aerial seeding of sagebrush. The NFESRP provides the exception for aerial seeding of sagebrush (p. 21). Impacts to wintering wildlife were analyzed in the Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan and are not expected to be different than analyzed NFESRP (p. 68 – 69). Sage-grouse using remaining islands of habitat within or near the edge of the burned area may be temporarily impacted. Impacts to wintering big game (p. 64) or sage-grouse (p. 68) may include temporary displacement from habitat adjacent to areas being aeri ally seeded because of disturbance.

Species such as loggerhead shrike, Brewer’s sparrow, sage sparrow, and other migratory song birds are no longer nesting and will have migrated from the area by the time drill seeding or aerial seeding is initiated. A few prairie falcons may be present in the fall into the winter, but the treatments are scheduled for periods outside the nesting/fledging periods. This is consistent with the analysis in the NFESRP (p. 67-69).

The livestock closures will minimize potential displacement impacts to wintering big game from remaining patches of suitable habitat within the burned area. Two temporary fences in the Diamond A were recommended but not approved for construction to eliminate impacts to wintering big game on crucial winter range. All temporary fences will be constructed consistent with the NFESRP (p. 24) in big game habitat. The analysis in the NFESRP (p. 65) is valid.

Based on the new information gained during recent inventory and survey of the burn area, existing analysis from the Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan 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.

VEGETATION: The proposed treatments, particularly the seeding of native species, will speed the recovery of native and non-native vegetation communities and sensitive plant habitat for slickspot and Davis peppergrasses, and Bruneau River phlox. Seed mixtures primarily contain native species that occurred in the burned area prior to the wildfire. The seed mixtures are primarily developed based on site potential as described in soil surveys and range site descriptions. Exceptions are mixes which include fourwing saltbush and bluebunch wheatgrass, native species which will be seeded on range sites that lack potential for those species, and alfalfa and sainfoin, which are introduced species. Seeding treatments are prescribed mainly in those areas severely burned and where recovery of pre-fire vegetation is not expected to recover as determined by the Jarbidge interdisciplinary team. Those areas that will recover without seeding treatment are identified by the interdisciplinary team. The existence of sensitive plant species is addressed in the ES and BAR Plans. Habitat for these species will be protected from livestock use to allow for recovery of these species in accordance with the objectives of the plans.

Based on the new information on vegetation communities and sensitive plant species gained during recent, pre-burn inventory and survey of the burn area, existing analysis from the Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan is adequate. The proposed actions within the treatment area and their effects were analyzed in the plan for all sensitive plant species occurring in the project area and were found to be insignificant.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: The methodology and analytical approach used in the Normal Year Fire Rehab plan continue to be appropriate for the current proposed actions. The proposed actions analyzed in the document are the same as the proposed treatment for the Murphy Complex Fire. No new fire rehabilitation methods have been identified which would result in a need to revisit the approach taken in the Normal Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (NFESRP). These methods continue to be appropriate to help restore native plant communities after wildfire.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: 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 drill seeding, aerial seeding, noxious weed treatment, soil stabilization techniques 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 Normal Fire Year Rehab Plan 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 will be followed during implementation of the emergency stabilization and rehabilitation treatments.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: The cumulative impacts analyzed in the existing NEPA document are similar to the cumulative impacts expected as a result 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.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: 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 was 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, the Tribes, Idaho Department of Fish and Game, and ESA consultation with the USFWS.

Currently, public interest and demand is very much in favor of quickly stabilizing and rehabilitating burned areas and controlling noxious weeds on public lands.

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

Team Leader, Fire Ecologist	Jennifer Mata (BLM/Jarbidge FO)
Operations, Rehab Specialist	Scott Uhrig (BLM/Twin Falls DO)
NEPA Compliance & Planning	Jeff Ross (BLM/Jarbidge FO)
Botanist	Sheri Hagwood (BLM/Jarbidge FO)
Cultural Resources/Archeologist	Jeff Ross (BLM/Jarbidge FO)
Supervisory Rangeland Mgt. Specialist	Arnie Pike (BLM/Jarbidge FO)
Wildlife Biologist	Jim Klott (BLM/Jarbidge FO)
GIS Specialist	Bonnie Ross (BLM/Jarbidge FO)
Fisheries Biologist	Kate Forster (BLM/Twin Falls DO)
Cultural Resources/Archeologist	Mike Holt (BLM/Jarbidge FO)
Recreation Planner	Max Yingst (BLM/Jarbidge FO)

F. Mitigation Measures: The burned area on public lands will be fenced, monitored and managed to keep livestock from grazing the burned areas within the 37 allotments until monitoring criteria are met as reviewed by an interdisciplinary team, to allow for the re-growth, recovery, and establishment of the seeded plants and the recovery of any surviving native plants.

All temporary fences will be constructed to BLM specifications (three strand wire) for wildlife including the bottom wire being smooth and appropriate spacing 10 inches – bottom strand, 12 inches middle strand and 16 inches top strand above ground level. Proposed fences may be rerouted to minimize impacts to sage grouse leks or nesting/winter habitat. To reduce the chance of collision mortality to birds, 6 inch long

pieces of white vinyl siding will be placed on the top strand of wire mid-way between metal fence posts. Portions of fences near sage grouse leks will also be let down fence to minimize potential collision impacts during the breeding period.

Before livestock grazing is reintroduced to the rested allotments, all temporary fences will be analyzed by the Interdisciplinary team and scheduled for removal. Cultural resource review or wildlife / plant field inventories may be completed if and where necessary prior to any ground disturbing activities (e.g., temporary fence construction, drill seeding) to avoid any potential adverse effects to cultural sites.

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 constitute 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 and this box cannot be checked.

<u>/s/Jennifer Mata</u>	<u>9/5/07</u>
Preparer	Date
Jennifer Mata	

<u>/s/Jeff Ross</u>	<u>9/6/07</u>
NEPA reviewer	Date
Jeff Ross	

<u>/s/Bill Baker</u>	<u>9/11/07</u>
Signature of the Responsible Official	Date
Bill Baker	