Prineville District

Land Use Plan Conformance and Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Review and Approval

Name of Proposed Action: Renewal of a Grazing Permit that includes the Fuston Allotment, # 7528.

DNA Number: OR-056-08-040

Location of Proposed Action: East of Gateway, Oregon.

Allotment Summary: 150 acres of public land; 20 AUMs total (20 active, 0 suspended); season of use: April 1 to October 31.

Purpose of and Need for Action: This action is part of the required NEPA process to renew an expired grazing lease. The current lessee's lease, for grazing preference in the Fuston Allotment, expired on February 28, 2008. A timely application for renewal of the lease was completed.

Description of the Proposed Action: The proposed action is to renew the expired grazing lease to Gerald and Elizabeth Otter for a term of ten years. Except for the new term of the permit, all other terms and conditions will remain the same; including allocated AUM's and season of use.

Plan Conformance:

The above project has been reviewed and found to be in conformance with one or more of the following BLM plans:

Two Rivers Resource Management Plan (RMP)/Record of Decision (ROD)/Rangeland Program Summary (RPS)

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

Two Rivers ROD, June 1986

Applicable NEPA document and related documents:
The following NEPA documents and related documents address the proposed action:

Two Rivers Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), September 1985;
Two Rivers Resource Management Plan (RMP)/Record of Decision (ROD)/Rangeland Program Summary (RPS), June 1986

NEPA Adequacy Criteria:

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Yes. Livestock grazing is discussed on pages 14-17 in the Two Rivers RMP/ROD. Livestock grazing in the above allotment was addressed on pages 42 to 48 of the Two Rivers RMP/ROD referenced above. There are no proposed changes from what is shown in the Two Rivers RMP/ROD in the current proposed action.

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, resource values, and circumstances? Yes. Alternatives in the planning documents (page 6 of the Two Rivers RMP/ROD/RPS; page 12 of the Two Rivers RMP/EIS ranged from emphasis of commodity production to emphasis of natural values, which included the elimination of all livestock grazing as an alternative. The range appears to be appropriate given the current issues.

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. New information, which would enter into the analysis, includes the Standards for Rangeland Health & Guidelines for grazing management (43 CFR 4180, available for review at the Prineville District BLM). The BLM is required to assess all public land grazing allotments for compliance with the Standards and Guidelines; this allotment will be scheduled for evaluation sometime in the near future. Until completion of the evaluation, the new term lease will contain stipulations that will provide for modifications of grazing of the public lands, if needed, on completion of the evaluation. Mid Columbia River summer steelheads were listed as threatened in March 1999. Through the streamline consultation process it was determined that grazing was a likely to adversely affect action due to the potential for livestock to trample steelhead redds. NOAA Fisheries has issued a Biological Opinion with Terms and Conditions to minimize potential of livestock to impact summer steelhead habitat and spawning areas.

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 Two Rivers RMP/ROD addressed impacts of continued grazing and provided objectives and recommendations to facilitate maintenance of existing ecological condition trends (page 49 of Two Rivers RMP/ROD).

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 sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action? Yes. Impacts resulting from grazing are essentially unchanged from those from those analyzed in the Draft Two Rivers RMP/EIS. The RMP/EIS (pages 58-72) stated grazing would produce a slight short-term negative impact to soils, water quality, vegetation; a beneficial impact on wildlife; and no impact on air quality, water, forestland, recreation; areas of critical concern are visual resources, energy and mineral, or socio-economics.

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. The Two Rivers RMP/EIS does not specifically address cumulative impacts of grazing but does address long-term impacts of the action with the assumption that the grazing activity would continue (impact analysis is on pages 58-72 of Draft Two Rivers RMP/EIS). Recommendations and objectives in the document reflect the impacts and expected improvements that would continue with the ongoing grazing. The proposed action is substantially unchanged from the analyzed impacts.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequately for the current proposed action? Yes. Many of the individuals/organizations on our current "interested publics" list are the same as those on the mailing list for the RMP/EIS referenced above. A copy of this worksheet will be mailed to individuals and organizations that have expressed an interest in this or similar actions.

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

Name	Resource Represented	Initials/Date
Steve Castillo	Forestry	SC 4/23/08
Bill Dean	Wildlife	WD 4/23/08
Ron Gregory	Cultural Resources	RG 4/28/08
Ron Halvorson	Botany, Special Status Plants	RHalvorson 4/29/08
Michelle McSwain	Hydrology, Riparian, Watershed	MM 5/5/08
Tom Mottl	Recreation	TM 6/2/08
Jim Eisner	Fisheries	JDM. 6/4/08
Ed Horn	Soils	EH 6/2/08

Prepared By : Brooke Anderson Date 4/17/08
Title: Rangeland Management Specialist

Plan Conformance/DNA Determination:

The proposed action and any specified mitigation measure(s) has been determined to meet the criteria for a Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA). No additional environmental analysis required. All cultural, T&E plant, and T&E wildlife specialists have provided clearances for the proposed project.

Reviewed By : Karl Kuhlen Date 6/24/08
Environmental Coordinator

Approval:

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA

Approved By: John C. Hap, Acting Date 6/26/08
Field Manager, Molly Brown

Note: The signature on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM=s internal decision process and cannot be appealed.


FUSTON ALLOTMENT
07528
R 14 E
PUBLIC LAND
R.14 E.
T 9 S
Gateway
Water Tank
Quarry
Mud Springs
Old Maids
Creek
CLEMENS DRIVE
TRUNK DRIVE
(SPOKANE PORTLAND AND SEATTLE)
BM 1450
BM 1549
BM 1722
BM 1650
BM 1886
BM 1853
BM 1871
5
4
3
8
9
10
17
16
15
20
22
222 acres seeded to Agcr
64 acres seeded to Agcr