

**Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
For Swanson Lakes Fire Emergency Stabilization Plan
#OR135-08-DNA-032**

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. Spokane BLM District, Border Resource Area

Proposed Action Title/Type: Swanson Lakes Fire Emergency Stabilization Plan

Location of Proposed Action: The Swanson Lakes fire is located in Lincoln County just west of Davenport, WA (See attached maps).

Description of the Proposed Action:

The proposed action is the implementation of the 2008 Swanson Lakes Fire Emergency Stabilization Plan. The following treatments are proposed in the emergency stabilization plan.

Facilities/Improvements Repair or Replacement: Fences along Highway 2 on public land within the burned area would be replaced. Damaged Barbwire and burned wood stays and posts would be removed and replaced. Existing pass gate and vehicle gate would be repaired. Fence repair is anticipated to be completed this winter. Damaged signs will be removed and replaced.

Seeding: Approximately, 1100 acres of public land within the burned area would be seeded with native and non-native grass species. Approximately 1000 acres would be seeded this fall with an aerial application. Approximately 70 acres of proposed seeding would be accomplished by broadcast seeding from the ground using ATV mounted seeders and/or hand carried broadcast seeders. The remainder 30 acres would be accomplished by the use of a rangeland drill. Most of the seeded area will be harrowed unless there are cultural concerns. Harrowing will be accomplished by dragging a section of chain link fence or other suitable harrowing device by the ATV. Seeding would be done in the fall of 2008.

Protective Fence Repair: Approximately 25 miles of fence on public lands which is the boundary between private and public would be replaced. Burned wooden posts would be replaced with steel posts and damaged barb wire would be replaced as necessary.

Closure (Livestock): The Telford grazing allotment (00048) that burned in the Swanson Lakes fire will be closed to grazing until the vegetation objectives are met

Cultural Protection: A homestead was damaged during the fire,

Noxious Weeds Treatment: Noxious weed infestation will be treated in accordance with the Spokane District Noxious Weed Control Environmental Assessment as amended and the Programmatic Management Direction and Environmental Assessment for Vegetation Restoration for Spokane District (April 2006).

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

- Spokane Resource Management Plan (RMP)/ Record of Decision (ROD)/Rangeland Program Summary (May 1987)
- Proposed Spokane RMP Plan Amendment ROD (December 1992)

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Seeding: The RMP states, “Soils will be managed to maintain productivity and to minimize erosion. Corrective actions will take place, where practical, to resolve erosive conditions.” Ground seeding as a land treatment is addressed in the RMP to achieve vegetation related objectives including increased vegetation cover to control soil erosion. Therefore, seeding is in conformance with the RMP.

Protective Fence: Protective fencing is in accordance with the RMP objectives to: maintain range productivity, manage habitat for wildlife and protect soil productivity and minimize erosion. Protective fencing will allow for recovery of vegetation to meet these objectives.

Noxious Weeds: The general management objectives of the Spokane RMP include the following: Protect or enhance water quality, Maintain and/or improve range productivity and Manage upland habitat for wildlife species. In addition, the RMP directs that methods of controlling noxious weeds will be proposed. Therefore controlling the spread of noxious weeds is in conformance with the Spokane RMP.

Cultural Protection: The BLM is directed by regulation, policy, and legislation to protect significant cultural sites. The stated goal of the RMP was to “...emphasize management, production on a sustained yield basis, and use of renewable resources on the majority of public lands in the Spokane District planning area while providing protection, maintenance, or enhancement of cultural, soil, water, botanical, and recreational resource values and big, small, and nongame habitats.”

Closures (OHV, Livestock area): Closure of portions of the burned area to OHV and livestock use is in accordance with the RMP objectives to: maintain range productivity, manage habitat for wildlife and protect soil productivity and minimize erosion. Closures will allow for recovery of the vegetation and soil resources to meet these objectives.

C. Identify the applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

- Programmatic Management Direction and Environmental Assessment for Vegetation Restoration (Vegetation Restoration EA), BLM Spokane District, 2006.

- Noxious Weed Management Programmatic EA #OR-130-EA-02-01 (Noxious Weed EA), BLM Spokane District, 2002.

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 current proposed action is substantially the same action contained in the proposed action in the Vegetation Restoration and Noxious Weed EAs.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the Vegetation Restoration and Noxious Weed EAs is appropriate with respect to the current proposed action and circumstances.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

There is no new information specific to the burned area or surrounding area available (other than the changed conditions due to the recent wildfire).

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA documents continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Yes, the methodology and analytical approach used in the Vegetation Restoration and Noxious Weed EAs continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA documents? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Yes, the impacts are unchanged from those identified in the Vegetation Restoration and Noxious Weed EAs which sufficiently analyzed the site-specific impacts related to the proposed action.

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 documents?

Yes, the cumulative impacts are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the Vegetation Restoration and Noxious Weed EAs.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes, the public involvement and interagency review associated with the Vegetation Restoration and Noxious Weed EAs is adequate for the proposed action.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet are identified on the cover sheet of this DNA.

CONCLUSION

 X Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing 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 and this box cannot be checked

_____/S/ June E. Hues_____
Field Manager

_____/9/16/08_____
Date