Prineville District

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

Review and Approval

Name of Proposed Action: Woodside, Van (#7573) grazing allotment lease renewal.

DNA Number: OR-056-08-057

Project or Serial Number: not applicable

Location of Proposed Action: Approximately five miles southwest of Tygh Valley, Oregon; T. 4 S., R. 13 E. (see map).

Purpose of and Need for Action: The current lease is due to expire on February 28, 2008.

Description of the Proposed Action: The proposed action is to renew the current grazing lease for the Woodside, Van grazing allotment for a term of ten years. The management actions and present Terms and Conditions for the allotment would remain unchanged.

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, Record of Decision, Rangeland Program Summary, signed June 1986 and the associated Rangeland Program Summary Updates June 1998, August 1997, June 1995, and March 1993. The Two Rivers Resource Management Plan, Record of Decision, Rangeland Program Summary was evaluated in 1998 and found to still provide valid guidance for land use and resource allocations and directions.*
> *White River National Wild and Scenic River Management Plan, Decision Notice, and Finding of No Significant Impact, Forest Plan Amendment #7, Two Rivers Resource Management Plan Amendment, signed November, 1994.*

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

> *Two Rivers Resource Management Plan, Record of Decision, Rangeland Program Summary, page 49, Allotment Number '7573', Selective Management Category 'Custodial', Acres of Public Land '80', Livestock Kind 'Cattle', Grazing Period Begin - End '4/01 - 7/31', Active Use '8'. The White River National Wild and Scenic River Management Plan excluded livestock grazing below the canyon rim, reducing the acreage to 26 and the active use to 3.*

Applicable NEPA document and related documents:

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

> *Two Rivers Resource Management Plan, Record of Decision, Rangeland Program Summary. Consultation for mid-Columbia steelhead has been completed for grazing actions within this allotment. Analysis rated actions within the Woodside, Van allotment as 'No Effect'.*

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 in general was addressed on pages 58 - 72 and 105 - 107 of the Two Rivers Resource Management Plan, Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), 1985, pages 17 - 20 of the Proposed Two Rivers Resource Management Plan, Final EIS, 1985, and on the Woodside, Van allotment specifically on pages 45 and 49 of the Two Rivers Resource Management Plan, Record of Decision, Rangeland Program Summary. Grazing use was to be continued in the allotment. No portion of the allotment was proposed for livestock exclusion. The Woodside, Van grazing allotment contained 80 acres of public land and supported 8 AUMs. However, the White River National Wild and Scenic River Management Plan, page 37, excluded livestock grazing on this allotment below the rim of the canyon.

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 document (pages 11 - 25 in the Two Rivers Draft EIS) ranged from an emphasis in commodity production to an emphasis of natural values. On the Woodside, Van allotment alternative E proposed decreasing authorized use to 0 AUMs. The range of alternatives is appropriate given the current issues. No new alternatives or concerns have been raised by the public since completion of the EIS.

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. The Two Rivers Resource Management Plan, Record of Decision, Rangeland Program Summary was formally evaluated in 1998 and found to provide valid guidance for land use and resource allocations and directions. The BLM has prepared a Biological Assessment (BA) and indicated livestock grazing in this allotment has 'no effect' on populations of the Mid Columbia steelhead, now listed as threatened. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has issued a Biological Opinion and they have concurred with the findings of the BA. Further consultation between NMFS and the BLM is ongoing.

New information may become available through the BLM's requirement to assess all public land grazing allotments for compliance with the Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management by means of an evaluation. The existing grazing authorization contains stipulations that provide for modifications of the grazing management, as needed, to protect public land.

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 Resource Management Plan, Record of Decision, Rangeland Program Summary addressed impacts of continued grazing and provided objectives and recommendations to facilitate maintenance of existing ecological condition trends (page 14-17). This approach is still valid. The Two Rivers Resource Management Plan, Record of Decision, Rangeland Program

Summary was evaluated in 1998 and found to still provide valid guidance for land use and resource allocations and directions.

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 analyzed in the Two Rivers Draft EIS. The Draft EIS (pages 57-72) stated grazing would produce no change, or slight to moderate, generally positive, impacts on soils, water quality, vegetation, cultural resources and wildlife habitat, and no impact on air quality, water, forest land, wild horses, recreation, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, visual resources, energy and minerals, 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 Draft EIS does not specifically address the cumulative impacts of grazing but does address long term impacts of the action with the assumption that the grazing activity would continue. 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 those 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 and organizations on the current "interested publics" list are the same as those on the mailing list for the NEPA documents referenced in this plan conformance document.

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

Name	Resource Represented	Initials/Date
Ron Halvorson	Special Status Plants	RWH 1/10/08
James Eisner	Fisheries/Special Status Fishes	JE 1/11/08
Tom Mottl	Wilderness/Recreation	TM 1/11/08
Craig Obermiller	Rangelands	CWO 10 JAN '08
Bill Dean	Wildlife/Special Status Animals	WD 1/11/08
John Zancanella	Cultural/Paleontological	RZZ 1/14/08

Mitigation Measures:
The following mitigation measures will be implemented as part of the proposed action:
No mitigation measures have been identified.

Recommendation:
Issue a ten year grazing lease showing authorized grazing period of April 1 to July 31.

Prepared By: _____ Date: 15 Jan '08
Craig W. Obermiller
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: _____ Date: 1/29/08
John Hanf, Assistant Field Manager
Deschutes Field Office

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: _____ Date: 1/31/08
Molly Brown, Field Manager
Deschutes Field Office

Attachments: allotment maps

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


Public Land
Creek
WHITE RIVER
Valley
DEVIL 1639
DEVIL AZIMUTH
Tuskan
FISH HATCHERY
Oak Springs
SPRINGS
Oak Springs Cr.
MAUPIN 1629
Spring Cr.
Maupin
East Maup
BM 876
BM 1661
GRANGE-HALL
AIRSTRIP
BM 1870
TRUNK
OREGON
Canyon
Chicken Spring
Natural
Pasture
FLAT
Wapinitia