



**Bureau of Land Management**  
 Boise District Office  
 Four Rivers Field Office  
 3948 Development Ave  
 Boise, ID 83705  
<http://www.id.blm.gov>

**Determination of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**  
 U.S. Department of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management

**A. BLM Office:** Four Rivers Field Office

**NEPA Log Number:** ID-110-2009-DNA-3907

**Lease/Serial Case File No.:** 1103449

**Proposed Action Title/Type:** Issue a Proposed Grazing Decision and Grazing Permit

**Location/Legal of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:**  
 Dry Ridge Allotment (#00103) T15N, R3W, Section 15

**Description of the Proposed Action:**

Issue a Proposed Grazing Decision and Grazing Permit on the Dry Ridge Allotment (#00103), previously known as Farrens Individual Allotment, for the following applicant: Philip and Heidi Farrens. Terms and conditions of the new permit would be the same as the current permit and are described under the proposed action in the following Categorical Exclusion (CE): CE #ID-110-2009-CE-3906.

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

LUP/Document <sup>1</sup>	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Cascade Resource Management Plan (CRMP)	Record of Decision p. 2 Rangeland Program Summary Table pp. 10-11. Resource Management Guidelines pp. 38-61 Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Plan Objectives & Actions pp. 2-43-2-50	July 1, 1988

<sup>1</sup>List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans, Management Framework Plans, or applicable amendments) and activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

The proposed action is in conformance with the Cascade RMP, Record of Decision, which states "...Livestock forage will be provided for 68,000 animal unit months (AUMs), a 2% increase over current levels, with a 20 year objective of 70,108 AUMs..."

**C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action.**

NEPA/Other Related Documents <sup>1</sup>	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Environmental Assessment (EA) # ID-110-2005-EA-010 Goodrich Watershed Isolated Parcels	Pages 1-35; Appendix A-7	August 2006
Area Manager's Final Decision		September 14, 2006
CE # ID-110-2009-CE-3906	Grazing Preference Transfer Dry Ridge#00103	October 2009

<sup>1</sup>List applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action or documentation relevant to the proposed action (i.e., source drinking water assessment, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, rangeland health standard assessment and determination, or monitoring report).

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the current Proposed Action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current Proposed Action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?**

*Documentation of answer and explanation:* Yes. The permitted use under this permit conforms to that analyzed under the Proposed Action for Dry Ridge Allotment (#00103) in EA#ID-110-2005-EA-010, Appendix A7 pp. 2-3. Terms and conditions of new permit would be the same as the existing permit. Grazing preference and preference transfer applications are addressed in the Categorical Exclusion Review listed above.

**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?**

*Documentation of answer and explanation:* Yes. The range of alternatives analyzed in EA# ID-110-2005-EA-010, is appropriate with respect to the current issuance of a grazing permit, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances. Grazing management and terms and conditions of the new permit would remain the same as the existing permit.

**3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (i.e., riparian proper functioning condition reports;**

**rangeland health standards assessments; inventory and monitoring data; most recent USFWS 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?**

*Documentation of answer and explanation:* Yes. The current permit to be reissued was fully processed (August 2006) through EA#ID-110-2005-EA-010. The NEPA analysis is adequate and considers present circumstances. There are no new circumstances that would be considered significant.

**4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current Proposed Action?**

*Documentation of answer and explanation:* Yes. All of the same issues related to livestock grazing are still relevant, and were adequately analyzed in the existing NEPA documents. The monitoring and analysis methods are still relevant, are supported by current BLM technical references, and are still used today. A Rangeland Health Assessment, Evaluation and Determination of conformance with Idaho's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management, and NEPA Assessment (EA# ID-110-2005-EA-010) for grazing permit renewal were completed in August 2006.

**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 analyze site-specific impacts related to the current Proposed Action?**

*Documentation of answer and explanation:* Yes. The impacts are substantially unchanged and the types of impacts relating to the issuance of a grazing permit for livestock grazing were sufficiently analyzed. There are no unique site specific impacts resulting from the issuance of a grazing permit. The direct and indirect impacts of livestock grazing were identified and addressed in the EA#ID-110-2005-EA-010, 3.0 Affected Environment and 4.0 Environmental Consequences, B. Proposed Action by resources affected, pp. 11-29 (Vegetation and Soils, Special Status Plants, Wildlife, Riparian Areas and Fisheries, Fire, Recreation, Noxious and Invasive Weeds, Cultural Resources, Forest Management, and Geologic Resources). Specific allotment analyses were reported in the following appendix: Dry Ridge Allotment (#00103) A7 pp. 3-4.

**6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?**

*Documentation of answer and explanation:* Yes. Reasonably foreseeable cumulative impacts of past, present, and future actions, including the proposed action, are substantially

unchanged from those analyzed in the EA#110-2005-EA-010, 4.0 Environmental Consequences pp. 27-30, Appendix A7, 4.0 Environmental Consequences pp. 3-4.

**7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current Proposed Action?**

*Documentation of answer and explanation:* Yes. Public involvement and interagency review were appropriately conducted in conjunction with the EA #110-2005-EA-010. The CE and DNA will be posted on the web page and will be available to the public.

**E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:**

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Christina Handy	Rangeland Management Specialist	Rangeland
Helen Ulmschneider	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Allen Tarter	Natural Resource Specialist	Riparian
Dean Shaw	Archaeologist	Cultural
Mark Steiger	Botanist	Plants

**F. Mitigation Measures:** *List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures have been incorporated and implemented.*

Mitigation measures are not specifically listed in EA#110-2005-EA-010, but are incorporated into the permit terms and conditions. The FONSI found that the EA adequately addressed the impacts of the proposed action, and that none of them would have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

**G. 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.

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/ Christina Handy  
Preparer

September 25, 2009  
Date

/s/ Matthew McCoy  
NEPA Specialist

October 1, 2009  
Date

/s/ Michael O'Donnell  
Acting Four Rivers Field Manager

October 21, 2009  
Date