

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: *Hassayampa Field Office (HFO)*

NEPA/TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AZ-P010-35-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: N/A

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Green Gulch Transfer

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T 13N R 1E Section 8

APPLICANT (if any): New Lessee

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

Issuance of a grazing lease to a new lessee.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: Bradshaw Harquahala Resource Management Plan

Date Approved/Amended: **4/22/2010**

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

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 decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

GM-4, "Administer 93 grazing authorizations within the grazing allotment boundaries shown on Map 13"

GM-5, "Grazing lands without a permit or lease authorization will remain unauthorized for livestock grazing."

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

Bradshaw Harquahala Resource Management Plan 2010

Phoenix Resource Management Plan 1988

Eastern AZ Grazing EIS 1986

Eastern AZ Grazing EIS RPS 1995

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing ENPA document(s)? 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 exiting NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Yes. The action serves to issue a grazing authorization on public lands as analyzed in the current and prior EIS documents.

- 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 authorization to graze on an existing allotment does not introduce new or unanalyzed resource concerns.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

Yes. New information could serve to modify the terms of the lease, but would not affect the issuance of a grazing authorization.

- 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?**

Yes. Effects from the issuance of the grazing authorization are fundamentally the same as analyzed in the EIS.

- 5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents(s) adequate for the current proposed action?**

Yes. Public involvement and interagency review for the EIS are sufficient for the proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
James Holden	RMS	Range

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

CONCLUSION:

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.

_/s/ 10/05/2010 _____
James Holden

_/s/ 10/05/2010 _____
Leah Baker

_/s/ 10/05/2010 _____
Stephen Cohn

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.