

**Worksheet**  
**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**  
U.S Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management

---

**A. Background**

BLM Office: Prineville

NEPA Log #: DOI-BLM-OR-P060-2012-0052-DNA

Project/Lease/Serial/Case File #:

Applicant: None

Location: Jaynes Well: T22S, R17E, Sec. 31. Nershall Road: T22S, R17E, Sec. 13,24 and T22S, R18E, Sec. 17-20

Proposed Action Title: Jaynes Well and Nershall Road Juniper Treatments

Description of the Proposed Action: Reduce western juniper on 2145 acres where trees are expanding into shrub-steppe and infilling into juniper woodlands. Treatments would include chainsaw thinning, firewood harvesting, and prescribe burning. Juniper will be cut October – December 2012. No trees with two or more old-growth characteristics will be cut. Public firewood harvesting will occur on both units following completion of juniper cuts when soils are stable and the chance of wildfire is reduced (September 1 – December 1). Jackpot burns will occur within four years post-thinning during the winter months when soils are frozen or covered with snow, or in the early spring when soils are wet. Pastures will not be rested following juniper cuts. However, pastures may be grazed following prescribed burns or rested for up to two years depending on an interdisciplinary team review. No treatments will occur in either unit during the sage-grouse breeding/nesting season March 1 – July 31. Treatments activities from December 1 – April 30 will be completed within a two week window to protect mule deer, elk, and pronghorn winter range. Project boundaries that are adjacent to private lands will be flagged approximately 250 feet from private land. Project boundaries will meander, so no sharp vegetation cut lines are introduced to the landscape. Jeep trail will not be blocked by cut trees. Minor compaction will occur during firewood harvesting. Minor soil disturbance will occur during jackpot burns. Archaeology, botany, and wildlife clearances have been completed. Archaeology resources have been identified in both units and will be flagged for protection prior to all treatments. No botany or wildlife concerns were identified during clearances. If any new resources were observed during project implementation, then the project would stop and the BLM Resource Specialist would be notified.

**B. Land Use Plan Conformance**

Land Use Plan Name: Brothers/LaPine Resource Management Plan

Date approved (ROD): July 5, 1989

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

- Page 12, objective, "Provide optimum habitat diversity for game and non-game wildlife species."
- Page 12, objective, "Use prescribed fire to meet management objectives throughout the planning area".

- Pages 88-89, Guidelines for juniper and shrub control projects on, including "Mosaic patterns will be incorporated into all control projects...Juniper control projects will be restricted to no more than 60 percent removal of juniper trees with leave areas...."
- Page 90, standard operating procedures, e.g., "All actions will be consistent with the BLM's Visual Resource Management criteria," "In crucial wildlife habitat...work will be scheduled during the appropriate season to avoid or minimize disturbances," "Surface disturbance at all project sites will be held to a minimum."

### C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and related documents that cover the proposed action

The following NEPA document covers the proposed action:

High Desert Shrub Steppe Restoration Environmental Assessment (HDSSREA), April 2011

### D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Yes. The proposed action is to cut juniper with chainsaws, remove tree boles, and jackpot burn which is analyzed under alternative 2, Pages 13-20.  
Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Yes. The vegetation community is shrub-steppe and juniper woodlands located in sage-grouse habitat, pages 5, 13-16. If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?
  - Page 8 of the HDSSREA, Alternative 2: Cut, mow, or crush young juniper and/or shrubs on 10,200 acres annually. Pile or scatter the downed vegetation, including juniper limbs. Allow removal of tree boles via personal use permits (generally firewood), commercial sales, or other methods".
  - Page 9 of the HDSSREA, Alternative 2: Prescribe burn 3,400 acres of standing live vegetation, and about half of the areas that have already been treated by cutting, mowing or crushing. Jackpot burning: low intensity burning of concentrations of fuels".

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values? Yes

The alternatives looked at a no action alternative (Alt. 1), an alternative that emphasized mechanical treatments (Alt. 2), and an alternative that emphasized burning (Alt 3.). These ranges of alternatives are consistent with the current concerns and actions for this project.

Acres treated annually	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Cut, mow or crush vegetation	0	10,200	3,400
Prescribe burn live vegetation	0	3,400	10,200
Prescribe burn areas already cut, mowed or crushed	0	5,100	1,700
Seed or transplant forbs, grass and shrubs	0	500	500

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM sensitive species)? Yes, the existing analysis is valid because no new information is available.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? The direct and indirect effects of the proposed action are similar to those analyzed in the EA.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action? Yes. The existing EA and subsequent decision were posted on the BLM's public web site on April 15, 2011 and mailed to agencies, local governments, organizations and interested public. The current permittee has been notified about the proposed action.

## E. Preparers

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource</u>
Christopher R. Anthony	Natural Resource Specialist	Wildlife, Botany, Weeds
Jennifer Moffitt	Soil Scientist	Soils
Emily Lent	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range
Steve Castillo	Forester	Forestry
Ryan Griffin	Archeology Technician	Archeology
Berry Phelps	Recreation	Recreation, Visual, Wilderness Char.
Guy Chamness	Fuels Specialist	Fuels
Teal Purrington	NEPA Coordinator	NEPA
Bill Dean	Assistant Field Manager	Manager

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis.

### Conclusion

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

Signature

Responsible official:

Molly Brown

9/9/12  
Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program specific regulations.

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this review, contact: Christopher R. Anthony Prineville Field Office, 3050 NE 3rd Street, Prineville, OR 97754, telephone (541) 416-6756/ cranthon@blm.gov.