

**BLM OREGON POST-FIRE RECOVERY PLAN  
EMERGENCY STABILIZATION AND BURNED AREA  
REHABILITATION**

**PLAN TEMPLATE 2010  
WATERMELON HILL FIRE (H8U0)  
BLM SPOKANE DISTRICT OFFICE  
OREGON STATE OFFICE**

**FIRE BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Fire Name	Watermelon Hill
Fire Number	LFESH8U00000 / LFBRH8U00000
District/Field Office	SPOKANE DISTRICT OFFICE
Admin Number	LLORW00000
State	OREGON
County(s)	SPOKANE, LINCOLN
Ignition Date/Cause	07/19/2014 Human Caused
Date Contained	07/24/2014
Jurisdiction	<i>Acres</i>
State	63
Private	8709
BLM	2644
Total Acres	11416
Total Costs	\$236,000
Costs to LF2200000 (2822)	\$236,000
Costs to LF3200000 (2881)	\$0

**Status of Plan Submission** (check one box below)

	Initial Submission of Complete Plan
X	Updating or Revising the Initial Submission
	Amendment

## **PART 1 - PLAN SUMMARY**

### **BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON FIRE.**

The Watermelon Hill fire ignition was on July 19, 2014; containment was established on July 24, 2014; determined to be controlled on August 12, 2014.

The Watermelon Hill fire burned 10,552 acres of The Channeled Scablands located approximately 40 minutes southwest of Spokane, Washington. The BLM manages 2,762 acres impacted by the fire and contains a diversity of habitats including shrub-steppe, Eastern WA dry forest, woodlands, grasslands and wetlands. Soils include a variety of Loamy, Stony, Very Shallow types and are susceptible to wind erosion. The annual precipitation of the affected area ranges from 12 to 15 inches.

The area supports a significant population of *Silene spaldingii* (Spaldings catchfly) a federally listed as threatened plant. Additionally, the BLM lands are used extensively for recreational use and livestock grazing. Two grazing allotments are located wholly or partially within the Watermelon Hill fire boundary.

The ignition of the fire was determined as human caused and occurred during a high wind event. Burn intensity and severity were low to moderate on the majority of BLM managed lands due to fire characteristics and a history of BLM fuel treatments.

The proposed emergency stabilization treatments are necessary to facilitate the stabilization and natural recovery of the BLM lands. The treatments will incorporate fencing and hazard tree removal associated with the stabilization of natural resources and safety of public users. In addition, treatments would ensure that continued BLM managed activities do not impact adjacent private lands.

### **LAND USE PLAN CONSISTENCY**

#### **S7 - Fence/Gate/Cattleguard ES Issue 2**

The proposed treatment are consistent with the Spokane District RMP (ROD 1987, pg 27),

#### **Soil, Water, and Air Management**

The inventory and evaluation of soil, water, and air resources on public lands will continue. Soils will be managed to maintain productivity and to minimize erosion. Corrective actions will take place, where practicable, to resolve erosive conditions.

#### **S10 - Tree Hazard Removal ES Issue 1**

The proposed hazard tree removal treatment is consistent with the Spokane District RMP (ROD 1987, pg 8) which states the following:

2. Assure for all Americans a safe, **healthful**, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;
3. Attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, **risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences** ;

### **S12 - Closures (area, OHV, livestock) ES Issue 2**

The proposed closures are consistent with the Spokane District RMP (ROD 1987, pg 12, 27).

### **General Management Objectives**

1. Protect or enhance water quality with particular attention to those watersheds with major downstream water uses including anadromous and other sport fisheries and agriculture.
2. Maintain and/or improve range productivity by providing available forage to maintain existing or target wildlife populations as estimated by the Washington State Department of Game. The remaining forage would be provided for livestock. Allow for the maintenance of all existing improvements. Implement management systems and all range improvements in allotments where projects and/or management systems are cost effective. Improve riparian habitat through management of livestock use.

#### **• Soil, Water, and Air Management**

The inventory and evaluation of soil, water, and air resources on public lands will continue. Soils will be managed to maintain productivity and to minimize erosion. Corrective actions will take place, where practicable, to resolve erosive conditions. Water sources necessary to meet BLM program objectives will be developed and filed on according to applicable state and federal laws and regulations. Water quality of perennial streams will continue to be monitored, and climatological data will continue to be gathered.

Deferred Grazing: Discontinuance of livestock grazing on an area for a specified period of time during the growing season to promote plant reproduction, establishment of new plants, or restoration of the vigor by old plants.

### **S13 - Monitoring ES Issue 3**

The proposed monitoring is consistent with the Spokane District RMP (ROD 1987, pg 21); treatment project sites will be surveyed for listed plants and animals, listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered, or their critical habitats and crucial/essential habitats for Bureau sensitive species will be considered prior to treatment implementation.

Activities will not be permitted or implemented in habitat important for listed threatened or endangered species, or for proposed, candidate, or State-listed sensitive species, if such activities are likely to jeopardize the existence of the species in the area in question.

### **S13 - Monitoring ES Issue 5**

The proposed monitoring is consistent with the Spokane District RMP (ROD 1987, pg 21); treatment project sites will be surveyed for listed plants and animals, listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered, or their critical habitats and crucial/essential habitats for Bureau sensitive species will be considered prior to treatment implementation.

Activities will not be permitted or implemented in habitat important for listed threatened or endangered species, or for proposed, candidate, or State-listed sensitive species, if such activities are likely to jeopardize the existence of the species in the area in question.

**COST SUMMARY TABLES**

**Emergency Stabilization (LF2200000)**

Action/ Spec #	ES Issue #	Planned Action	Unit (Acres, WMs, Number)	# Units	Unit Cost (If Appl.)	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	Totals by Spec.
S1		Planning (Project Management)	WMS	5	\$4,700.00	\$0.00	\$18,000.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$24,000.00
S2										
S3										
S4										
S5										
S6										
S7	2	Fence/Gate/Cattleguard	Miles	11	\$16,323.82	\$0.00	\$178,000.00	\$0.00	\$2,000.00	\$180,000.00
S8										
S9										
S10	1	Tree Hazard Removal	Acres	48	\$281.25	\$0.00	\$14,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$14,000.00
S11										
S12										
S13	3	Monitoring	Acres	25	\$388.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$9,000.00
S13	5	Monitoring	Acres	25	\$372.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$9,000.00
S14										
<b>TOTAL COSTS (LF2200000)</b>						<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$216,000</b>	<b>\$12,000</b>	<b>\$8,000</b>	<b>\$236,000</b>
OTHER FUND CODE TOTALS:										
TOTAL COSTS (???)										
TOTAL COSTS (???)										
TOTAL COSTS (???)										

**Burned Area Rehabilitation (LF3200000)**

Action/ Spec #	BAR Issue #	Planned Action	Unit (Acres, WMs, Number)	# Units	Unit Cost (If Appl.)	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	Totals by Spec.
R1										
R2										
R3										
R4										
R5										
R6										
R7										
R8										
R9										
R10										
R11										
R12										
R13										
R14										
<b>TOTAL COSTS (LF3200000)</b>						<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>OTHER FUND CODE TOTALS:</b>										
TOTAL COSTS (???)										
TOTAL COSTS (???)										
TOTAL COSTS (???)										

## **PART 2 - POST-FIRE RECOVERY ISSUES**

### **EMERGENCY STABILIZATION ISSUES**

#### **1 - Human Life and Safety**

#### **2 - Soil/Water Stabilization**

Soils in the area affected by the fire are subject to wind and water erosion. The proposed treatments would ensure that remaining residual cover, including biotic crusts, will not be compromised by unauthorized activities.

#### **3 - Habitat for Federal/State Listed, Proposed, or Candidate Species**

*Silene Spaldingii* (Spalding's catchfly) a federally listed plant species is known to be present throughout much of the BLM lands affected by the fire. Six permanent monitoring sites with prior monitoring data exist within the fire perimeter on BLM lands. Three new monitoring sites are proposed to monitor the impacts from the fire and subsequent suppression activities. Habitats for the listed plant species and other native communities continues to be a management focus for the area.

#### **4 - Critical Heritage Resources**

There are both historic and prehistoric sites recorded in the project area. A review of existing cultural resource site maps show that there are fragile site types such as historic rock walls in the fire area that could be impacted by post-fire hazards, including burned trees weakened by the fire that could fall upon these sites and cause damage.

#### **5 - Invasive Plants and Weeds**

Invasive plants and noxious weeds are present throughout the area affected by the fire and the spread of invasives and noxious weeds in the burned area is a concern. Monitoring would help indicate if the proposed treatments were effective and will also help target future management actions throughout the burned area.

These lands within the burn perimeter are newly acquired with known weeds within and adjacent to the fire perimeter. However; the extent of these populations have not been completely captured. The monitoring plan would serve to identify expansion and encroachment into *Silene Spaldingii* populations, while also providing inventory data.

Known noxious weed species and invasive annual grasses within and adjacent to fire perimeter are as follows: Diffuse Knapweed, Russian Knapweed, Spotted Knapweed, St. Johnswort, Houndstongue, Rush Skeletonweed, Dalmatian Toadflax, Canada Thistle, Common Mullen, Cheat grass and Medusahead rye.

### **BURNED AREA RECOVERY ISSUES**

**1 - Lands Unlikely to Recover Naturally**

N/A

**2 - Weed Treatments**

N/A

**3 - Tree Planting**

N/A

**4 - Repair/Replace Fire Damage to Minor Facilities**

N/A

## **PART 3 - DESCRIPTION OF TREATMENTS**

### **Issue 1 - Human Life and Safety**

#### ***S10 Tree Hazard Removal***

##### **A. Treatment/Activity Description**

S10 - Survey and hazard tree removal of 2 miles or 48 acres of existing recreational trails. Hazard trees within 100 feet of the trail will be removed.

##### **B. How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?**

Many of the trees along the trails may have been compromised by the fire effects and pose a threat to the public.

##### **C. Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?**

This treatment is directly related to a health and safety issue. There is the potential for trees that have been compromised by the fire to fall or lose limbs that could strike an individual. All trees within 100 feet of a designated public trail would be placed on the ground to abate any falling hazard to public users.

### **Issue 2 - Soil/Water Stabilization**

#### ***S7 Fence/Gate/Cattleguard***

##### **A. Treatment/Activity Description**

There would be approximately 10.25 miles of fence re-constructed as a result of the fire. Another 0.5 to 0.75 miles of new temporary fence would be constructed to protect natural resources from OHV use.

The repair, reconstruction and temporary construction of fencelines to limit/guide livestock and recreational use is essential for the protection and recovery of natural resource values.

##### **B. How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?**

Soils in the area are susceptible to wind erosion after the loss of herbaceous/shrub vegetation removed during the fire. Fencing is required to limit recreational and livestock access to BLM managed lands to allow for recovery. The BLM lands involved in the fire were acquired through land exchanges initiated in 1992 and have no known permanent boundary markers. Maintenance and reconstruction of many of the fences would limit the amount and extent of use on BLM lands while recovery occurs.

Much of the existing fences that were in use to manage BLM activities at the time of the fire are no longer functional.

##### **C. Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?**

- Location, replacement and repair of BLM fence management boundaries will better facilitate the management of BLM activities and hasten the recovery of the area. The

temporary protective fences will limit unauthorized recreational activities and prevent livestock entry, ensuring adequate rest of the burned area. This will provide long-term benefits for the recovery of federally listed Spaldings catchfly and other native vegetation. Faster recovery of plant species preserves site productivity, and wildlife habitat.

- Treatments would ensure that land management activities are consistent with the Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (specifically standards 1,3 and 5)
- 2,644 acres of federal land burned in the Watermelon Fire; All (100%) of the East Fishtrap Allotment burned (765 acres) consisting of 133 AUMs and 1,879 acres (25%) of the 7,400 acre Fishtrap Allotment, consisting of 834 AUMs.
- Fencing will enable the permitted grazing to occur on areas of the allotment not affected by the fire.
- The repair and replacement of BLM fencelines would allow the recovery of the area and is more cost effective than extensive soil stabilization activities that may be necessary if barriers to livestock and recreation use are not implemented in a timely manner.
- Permanent soil loss and site degradation may occur without implementation of the proposed projects.

Policy -

- The proposed activities are consistent with the guidance provided by:
- WO IM 2011-122 - Plan to Ensure Adequate Cadastral Survey.....
- OSO IM OR-2012-038 - Cadastral Survey Review and Boundary Risk Assessment....
- BLM Handbook H-1742-1 (pg 26-27)
- BLM Handbook H-1740-1
- BLM Manual 6840 - Special Status Species Management

## *S12 Closures (area, OHV, livestock)*

### A. Treatment/Activity Description

The burned area would be rested until plant production and ground cover are adequate to ensure site stability. Monitoring data and professional judgment will indicate that health and vigor of desired vegetation has recovered to levels adequate to support and protect upland function. Typically this would occur by the completion of one full vegetative growing season, but may require additional time in some areas.

### B. How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?

The temporary closure will prevent livestock grazing and recreation use from impacting the burned area. This will facilitate vegetative growth and soil stabilization leading to the improvement of upland function. This will provide long-term benefits for the recovery of native and previously seeded vegetation.

### C. Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?

The temporary closure will limit unauthorized recreational activities and livestock grazing. Closures will facilitate rest and the recovery native vegetation, federally listed as threatened plant species, site productivity, and wildlife habitat.

Policy -

The proposed activities are consistent with the guidance provided by:  
BLM Handbook H-1742-1 (pg 26-27)  
BLM Manual 6840 - Special Status Species Management

### **Issue 3 - Habitat for Federal/State Listed, Proposed, or Candidate Species**

#### ***S13 Monitoring***

##### A. Treatment/Activity Description

- Monitor the post fire effects on the federally listed as threatened *Silene spaldingii* (Spalding's catchfly). Federally listed Threatened species *Silene spaldingii* is known to be present throughout much of the BLM land affected by the Watermelon Hill Fire. Within the fire boundary there are six monitoring sites that have been previously established and have associated data collected. In addition to these sites three more new monitoring sites should be established for short term monitoring of fire effects. One of the new sites and one of the current monitoring sites are in close proximity of the dozer line created to control the fire (the site was not impacted by suppression activities).
- The three new sites to be established would have a 10 by 10 meter plot with the largest portion on the population centered towards the middle of the plot and as the topography allows.
- All sites should have the following data collected:
  - -Plot photo(s) with UTM of location photo taken at.
  - -Number of plants
  - -Number of stems per plant
  - -height in cm of the tallest stem of each plant
  - -Phenology of each individual plant (flower, bud, vegetative, seed head).
  - -if buds/flowers/seed heads are present the number present per plant.
  - -If plant has damage and they type of damage (breakage, herbivory, .....)
  - -General comments on the plant health and habitat condition.
  - -Associated plant species
- Monitor the amount and persistence of noxious weeds throughout the burn area. Currently qualitative and ocular assessments with estimates of weed population have been completed. Sampling techniques to monitor the existence and expansion of weeds and invasive species within the 100 meter radius of known *Silene Spaldingii* plant clusters would be completed.

## B. How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?

Three known *Silene spaldingii* longterm monitoring sites were burned during the fire. Burn severity was variable at different sites. Recent inventory indicated that no suppression line directly impacted known sites. (see *Silene spaldingii* map)

Monitoring would determine changes in the density and extent of invasive plants and the need for additional treatments to prevent the spread and establishment of invasive plants. Invasive plants, noxious weed and loss of habitat are commonly noted as a threat to the persistence of the species.

Monitoring would ensure that the existing weed populations do not increase or encroach into known Spaldings Catchfly populations. The 2007 *Silene Spaldingii* (Spalding Catchfly) recovery plan states, "Invasive nonnative plants with the potential to displace *Silene spaldingii*..."

## C. Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?

Monitoring data is instrumental in the development and treatment of BLM activities associated with the management of *Silene spaldingii*. Pre-burn baseline data exists on 6 plots. This data would be combined with new monitoring data to determine the plants response to the level of impact that may have occurred from the fire. It's cost effective because the monitoring methods are already developed. In addition, we are adding to the trend data after a disturbance.

Policy -

- The proposed activities are consistent with the guidance provided by: BLM Manual 6840 - Special Status Species Management

## **Issue 5 - Invasive Plants and Weeds**

### ***S13 Monitoring***

#### A. Treatment/Activity Description

- Monitor the post fire effects on the federally listed as threatened *Silene spaldingii* (Spalding's catchfly) habitats.
- Monitor the amount and persistence of noxious weeds throughout the burn area. Currently qualitative and ocular assessments with estimates of weed population have been completed. Sampling techniques to monitor the existence and expansion of weeds and invasive species within the 100 meter radius of known *Silene Spaldingii* plant clusters would be completed.

## B. How does the treatment relate to damage or changes caused by the fire?

Monitoring will determine changes in the density and extent of invasive plants and the need for additional treatments to prevent the spread and establishment of invasive plants. Invasive plants, noxious weed and loss of habitat are commonly noted as a threat to the persistence of the species. Three known Spaldings Catchfly longterm monitoring sites were burned during the fire. Burn severity was variable at different sites. Recent inventory indicated that no suppression line directly impacted known sites.  
(see *Silene spaldingii* map)

Monitoring would ensure that the existing weed populations do not increase or encroach into known Spaldings Catchfly populations. The

2007 *Silene Spaldingii* (Spalding Catchfly) recovery plan states, "Invasive nonnative plants with the potential to displace *Silene spaldingii*..."

### C. Why is the treatment/activity reasonable, within policy, and cost effective?

Invasive plants compete with native plants, degrade habitat and reduce range condition. Invasive plant infestations typically respond to the release of nutrients, reduced competition and increased number of sites for germination and establishment caused by fire. Preventing the introduction or spread of invasive plants is cost-effective compared to controlling established infestations. Monitoring and treatment of invasive plants is consistent with BLM (9015, 9011, H9011-1 and H1752) DOI manuals and federal laws and executive order 13112.

## **PART 4 - DETAILED TREATMENT COST TABLE**

<b>Action / Spec #</b>	<b>Action Description</b>	<b>Unit Type</b>	<b># Units</b>	<b>Unit Cost</b>	<b>FY14</b>	<b>FY15</b>	<b>FY16</b>	<b>FY17</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
<b>S1</b>	<b>Planning (Project Management)</b>								
1	Planning (Plan Prep)	WM'S	3	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$8,000.00	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$12,000.00
2	Implementation Layout & Design	WM'S	1	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00
3	Travel/Vehicles	Miles	6,500	\$1.00	\$0.00	\$4,875.00	\$1,625.00	\$0.00	\$6,500.00
	<b>Total</b>			<b>\$9,001.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$18,000.00</b>	<b>\$6,000.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$24,000.00</b>
<b>S7</b>	<b>Fence/Gate/Cattleguard ES Issue 2</b>								
1	Fence/Gates/Cattle Guards	WM'S	4	\$8,000.00	\$0.00	\$32,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$32,000.00
2	Travel Vehicles	Miles	1,200	\$1.00	\$0.00	\$1,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,200.00
3	Supplies/Materials	Other	1	\$500.00	\$0.00	\$500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$500.00
4	Cultural Clearance contract	Acres	200	\$25.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,000.00
5	Cultural Clearance Contract Admin	WM'S	2	\$8,000.00	\$0.00	\$16,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$16,000.00
6	Fence Construction Contract	Miles	11	\$5,372.00	\$0.00	\$59,092.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$59,092.00
7	New Fence Materials	Miles	11	\$3,070.00	\$0.00	\$33,770.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$33,770.00
8	Temporary Fence Removal	Miles	1	\$2,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
9	Fence Removal	Miles	10	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$30,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$30,000.00
	<b>Total</b>			<b>\$29,968.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$178,000.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$2,000.00</b>	<b>\$180,000.00</b>
<b>S10</b>	<b>Tree Hazard Removal ES Issue 1</b>								
1	Tree Hazard Removal	WM'S	2	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$12,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$12,000.00
2	Travel Vehicles	Miles	500	\$1.00	\$0.00	\$500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$500.00
3	Supplies/Materials	Total	1,000	\$1.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,000.00
	<b>Total</b>			<b>\$6,002.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$14,000.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$14,000.00</b>
<b>S13</b>	<b>Monitoring ES Issue 3</b>								
1	BLM Labor	WM'S	3	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$9,000.00
2	Travel/Vehicles	Miles	700	\$1.00	\$0.00	\$300.00	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$700.00
	<b>Total</b>			<b>\$3,001.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$3,000.00</b>	<b>\$3,000.00</b>	<b>\$3,000.00</b>	<b>\$9,000.00</b>
<b>S13</b>	<b>Monitoring ES Issue 5</b>								
1	Travel/Vehicles	Miles	300	\$1.00	\$0.00	\$300.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$300.00
2	BLM Labor	WM'S	3	\$3,000.00	\$0.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00	\$9,000.00
	<b>Total</b>			<b>\$3,001.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$3,000.00</b>	<b>\$3,000.00</b>	<b>\$3,000.00</b>	<b>\$9,000.00</b>
<b>ES</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>\$50,973.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$216,000.00</b>	<b>\$12,000.00</b>	<b>\$8,000.00</b>	<b>\$236,000.00</b>
<b>Project</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>\$50,973.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$216,000.00</b>	<b>\$12,000.00</b>	<b>\$8,000.00</b>	<b>\$236,000.00</b>

**PART 5 - SEED LISTS**

**DRILL SEED**

**AERIAL SEED**

**SEEDLINGS**

<b>Seedling Species</b>	<b>Scientific Name</b>	<b>Acres of Seedlings planted.</b>	<b># of Seedlings per Acre</b>	<b>Total # of Seedlings</b>	<b>Cost / Seedling</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
TOTALS:		0.0	0	0		\$ 0.00

## **PART 6 - NATIVE/NON-NATIVE PLANT WORKSHEET**

### **A. Proposed Native Plants in Seed Mixtures (Both ES & BAR Treatments)**

**1. Are the native plants proposed for seeding adapted to the ecological sites in the burned area?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

No seeding is proposed and this does not apply

**2. Is seed or seedlings of native plants available in sufficient quantity for the proposed project?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

No seeding is proposed and this does not apply

**3. Is the cost and/or quality of the native seed reasonable given the project size and approved field unit management and Plan objectives?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

No seeding is proposed and this does not apply

**4. Will the native plants establish and survive given the environmental conditions and the current or future competition from other species in the seed mix or from exotic plants?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

No seeding is proposed and this does not apply

**5. Will the existing or proposed land management practices (e.g. wildlife populations, recreation use, livestock, etc.) maintain the seeded native plants in the seed mixture when the burned area is re-opened?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

No seeding is proposed and this does not apply

### **B. Proposed Non-native Plants in Seed Mixtures (Both ES & BAR Treatments)**

**1. Is the use of non-native plants necessary to meet objectives, e.g., consistent with applicable approved field unit management plans?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

No seeding is proposed and this does not apply

**2. Will non-native plants meet the objective(s) for which they are planted without unacceptably diminishing diversity and disrupting ecological processes (nutrient cycling, water infiltration, energy flow, etc.) in the plant community?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

No seeding is proposed and this does not apply

**3. Will non-native plants stay on the site they are seeded and not significantly displace or interbreed with native plants?**

Yes  No  Rationale:

No seeding is proposed and this does not apply

**C. Proposed Seed Species - Native & Non-Natives (Both ES & BAR Treatments)**

**PART 7 - COST-RISK ANALYSIS**

**A. Probability of Treatments Successfully Meeting Objectives**

<b>Action/ Spec #</b>	<b>ES Issue #</b>	<b>Planned ES Action (LF2200000)</b>	<b>Unit (acres, WMs, Number)</b>	<b># Units</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>% Probability of Success</b>
S7	2	Fence/Gate/Cattleguard	Miles	11	\$180,000.00	100%
S10	1	Tree Hazard Removal	Acres	48	\$14,000.00	100%
S13	3	Monitoring	Acres	25	\$9,000.00	90%
S13	5	Monitoring	Acres	25	\$9,000.00	90%
					<b>\$212,000.00</b>	
<b>Action/ Spec #</b>	<b>BAR Issue #</b>	<b>Planned BAR Action (LF3200000)</b>	<b>Unit (acres, WMs, Number)</b>	<b># Units</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>% Probability of Success</b>
					<b>\$ 0.00</b>	

## B. Cost Risk Summary

1. Are the risks to natural resources and private property acceptable as a result of the fire if the following actions are taken?

Proposed Action Yes  No  Rationale for Answer:

Only measures necessary to re-establish management infrastructure and stabilize and protect natural resources and public safety would be implemented.

No Action Yes  No  Rationale for Answer:

If the no action alternative were to be implemented and no post-fire stabilization completed, it would have a substantial impact on both public resources and private lands, as well as, public safety. The loss of project infrastructure (fences) for the management of livestock and recreational use on public lands has greatly reduced the ability to manage burned and unburned portions of the fire and impact private land owners. The safety to the public users within the burn area is at a greater risk of injury without hazard tree survey and removal. The ability to manage for federally threatened *Silene spaldingii* would be greatly hindered and potentially detrimental to species.

Alternative(s) Yes  No  Rationale for Answer:

There are no other alternatives identified.

2. Is the probability of success of the proposed action, alternatives or no action acceptable given their costs?

Proposed Action Yes  No  Rationale for Answer:

The treatments that have been prescribed have a high probability of success due to the nature of treatments. There are no treatments that are dependent upon weather, soil moisture or precipitation content.

No Action Yes  No  Rationale for Answer:

The no action alternative does not meet the objective of resource stabilization and public safety and therefore un-acceptable.

Alternative(s) Yes  No  Rationale for Answer:

There are no other alternatives identified.

3. Which approach will most cost-effectively and successfully attain the objectives and therefore is recommended for implementation from a Cost/Risk Analysis standpoint?

Proposed Action

Alternative(s)

No Action

Comments:

Only measures necessary to re-establish management infrastructure and stabilize and protect natural resources and public safety would be implemented.

The proposed action is the only alternative that meets the objectives.

## C. Risk of Resource Value Loss or Damage

### No Action - Treatments not Implemented

Resource Value	N/A	None	Low	Med	High
Unacceptable Loss of Topsoil					X
Weed Invasion				X	
Unacceptable Loss of Vegetation Diversity			X		
Unacceptable Loss of Vegetation Structure				X	
Unacceptable Disruption of Ecological Processes				X	
Off-site Sediment Damage to Private Property	X				
Off-site Threats to Human Life			X		
Other-loss of Access Road Due to Plugged Culverts	X				

### Proposed Action - Treatments Successfully Implemented

Resource Value	N/A	None	Low	Med	High
Unacceptable Loss of Topsoil			X		
Weed Invasion			X		
Unacceptable Loss of Vegetation Diversity			X		
Unacceptable Loss of Vegetation Structure			X		
Unacceptable Disruption of Ecological Processes			X		
Off-site Sediment Damage to Private Property	X				
Off-site Threats to Human Life			X		
Other-loss of Access Road Due to Plugged Culverts	X				

## **PART 8 - MONITORING PLAN**

### **S7 - Fence/Gate/Cattleguard - ES Issue 2**

#### **Identify the objective of the treatment:**

The re-establishment of livestock management infrastructure (fences) to provide for short and long-term stabilization and protection of natural resources. The fence/barrier treatments also serve to limit public recreational vehicle access. The objective is to negate any new off road use.

#### **Describe how implementation will be monitored:**

Local field office staff will monitor and complete inspection and compliance associated with the construction and maintenance of fences as required. Long term monitoring will occur annually for 3 years to ensure BLM managed activities are consistent with the recovery and stabilization of the burned area.

#### **Describe how effectiveness will be monitored, how it will be measured, and within what time period:**

The monitoring will consist of meeting or not meeting specifications of project construction, use supervision of presence or absence of un-wanted activities and inspections completed as necessary during season where on-going BLM managed activities occur.

### **S10 - Tree Hazard Removal - ES Issue 1**

#### **Identify the objective of the treatment:**

Remove any tree that may pose a hazard to public (life or property) within 100 feet of existing identified trail routes.

#### **Describe how implementation will be monitored:**

The area will be surveyed by field staff to determine hazard and potential risk. Local field staff will complete inspections/compliance to ensure objectives and specifications are met.

#### **Describe how effectiveness will be monitored, how it will be measured, and within what time period:**

The presence or absence of identified hazard and risk. Monitoring would be done prior, during and after work completed.

### **S12 - Closures (area, OHV, livestock) - ES Issue 2**

#### **Identify the objective of the treatment:**

The re-establishment of livestock management infrastructure to provide for short and long-term stabilization and protection of natural resources. The fence/barrier treatments also serve to limit public recreational vehicle access. The objective is to negate any new off road use.

**Describe how implementation will be monitored:**

Local field office staff will monitor and complete compliance checks for length of project to ensure specifications are met and activities are managed to ensure stabilization.

**Describe how effectiveness will be monitored, how it will be measured, and within what time period:**

use supervision of the presence or absence of un-wanted activities and inspections completed as necessary during season where on-going activities are taking place.

**S13 - Monitoring - ES Issue 3**

**Identify the objective of the treatment:**

Six long term Spalding's catchfly sites occur on the BLM lands within the fire perimeter. In addition to these sites three more new monitoring sites would be established for short term monitoring from fire effects.

**Describe how implementation will be monitored:**

The three new sites to be established would have a 10 by 10 meter plot with the largest portion on the population centered towards the middle of the plot and as the topography allows. Monitoring would occur initially for 3 years and may continue to be monitored as part of the long term monitoring of this species.

All *Silene spaldingii* sites would have the following data collected:

- Plot photo(s) with UTM of location photo taken at.
- Number of *Silene spaldingii* plants
- Number of stems per plant
- height in cm of the tallest stem of each plant
- Phenology of each individual plant (flower, bud, vegetative, seed head).
- if buds/flowers/seed heads are present the number present per plant.
- If plant has damage and they type of damage (breakage, herbivory, .....
- General comments on the plant health and habitat condition.
- Associated plant species

In addition the three new sites would need the UTM's of each corner established on year

one and

corners established with surveyors markers or equivalent.

**Describe how effectiveness will be monitored, how it will be measured, and within what time period:**

Monitoring data will be used to ensure *Silene Spaldingii* sites persist and recovery is effective. The three year monitoring window will provide initial data on the effects of the fire. The existing monitoring sites and the three new sites will be evaluated at the end of the three year period to determine if additional monitoring is required. These data will be included in the annual reports on *Silene spaldingii*.

**S13 - Monitoring - ES Issue 5**

**Identify the objective of the treatment:**

Monitor the potential increase and spread of known weed populations within the perimeter of the fire. Monitor the potential spread of noxious weeds and invasive species within a 100 meter radius of known *Silene spaldingii* plant clusters.

**Describe how implementation will be monitored:**

Qualitative data by ocular evaluations would be completed within the fire perimeter. Quantitative data would be collected using the criteria outlined in issue 3 for *Silene spaldingii*.

**Describe how effectiveness will be monitored, how it will be measured, and within what time period:**

Monitoring data will be used to determine the extent and spread of noxious weeds and invasive annuals. The three year monitoring window will provide initial data on the effects of the fire. The existing *Silene spaldingii* monitoring sites and the three new sites will be evaluated at the end of the three year period to determine if additional monitoring is required. These data will be included in the annual reports on *Silene spaldingii*. The monitoring data would also be used to determine to what extent and what type of control agents for noxious weeds and invasive annuals would be recommended within the 100 meter radius of known *Silene spaldingii* plant clusters and the remaining fire impacted area.

## **PART 9 - MAPS**

1. - Treatment Area Map
2. - Silene Spaldingii Map
3. - Weed location Map

## **PART 10 - REVIEW, APPROVALS, and PREPARERS**

### **TEAM MEMBERS**

<b>Position</b>	<b>Team Member (Agency/Office)</b>	<b>Initial</b>	<b>Date</b>
Team Leader	Ray Pease (BLM Border Field Office)	Initialed	09/03/2014
Botanist	Kim Frymire (BLM Border Field Office)		09/03/2014
Cultural Resources/Archeologist	Anne Boyd (BLM Border Field Office)		09/03/2014
Rangeland Mgt. Specialist	Kerrin Doloughan (BLM Spokane District/BFO)	Initialed	09/03/2014
Rangeland Mgt. Specialist	Robert Hopper (BLM State Office)		
Wildlife Biologist	Jason Lowe (BLM Spokane District/BFO)		09/03/2014
Outdoor Recreation Planner	Chris Shafer (BLM Border Field Office)	Initialed	09/03/2014
Noxious & Invasive Species Specialist	Sean MacDougall (BLM Spokane District)		09/03/2014
Resource Advisor(s) on Fire	Ray Pease (BLM Border Field Office)	Initialed	09/03/2014

### **PLAN APPROVAL**

The Agency Administrator is responsible for developing, implementing, and evaluating emergency stabilizations and rehabilitation plans, treatments and activities. 620 DM 3.5C

---

FIELD OFFICE MANAGER

DATE

## **FUNDING APPROVAL**

The funding of ES treatments is approved through the appropriate administrative approval level in coordination with the National Office Budget Shop. As funding is available, ES funding requested within a plan that totals below \$100,000 may be approved by the State Director, while ES funding of \$100,000 and above must be approved by the WO. If the ES funding cap is reached, all ES funding will be approved through the National Office in coordination with State ES&R Coordinators to determine highest priority projects. Funding of all BAR treatments is accomplished through a scoring process and is dependent on accurate entries into NFPORS. All funding is approved and allocated on a year-by-year basis.