

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

OFFICE: Klamath Falls Resource Area, Lakeview District

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-OR-L040-2013-029-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: OR67646

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Bly Free Use Permit Renewal

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Klamath Falls Resource Area BLM, Klamath County, OR.
T37S R14E S9 SE1/4 W.M.

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

The proposed action is to renew a Free Use Permit for Klamath County to crush and stockpile aggregate within the Oregon Dept. of Transportation's (ODOT) permitted area. The BLY FUP is entirely within the ODOT material site right-of-way (OR52560), and ODOT completed the crushing and stockpiling under their operations plan and stipulations.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) and Related Program Planning and Decision Conformance

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

- Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary (KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS), approved June 1995, page 61: "*Continue to use rock from existing quarries for construction and maintenance of timber sale access roads and other purposes.*"

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

FHWA Project: Bly Quarry OR-18-033-4 (FHWA Categorical Exclusion)

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)? 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)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Yes. The proposed action is a feature of (aggregate stockpile), and completely within the area analyzed under (FHWA Project: Bly Quarry OR-18-033-4) as part of ODOT Mineral Material ROW renewal (OR52560).

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 proposed action is a permit renewal for activities analyzed by ODOT / FHWA in 2010 in

the course of renewing ODOT's permit and Mineral Material ROW (OR52560). There are no known new environmental concerns, interests, or resource values that require additional alternatives to be analyzed.

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)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Yes, the interdisciplinary team has not identified any new studies, information, or circumstances that require analysis or that would substantially change the analysis of the proposed action.

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?

The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the action proposed in this DNA are the same as those analyzed in the existing NEPA document. Resource conditions and locations are unchanged.

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

This is an older, pre-existing pit with continuous use for at least the last decade. No further public involvement is required.

E. Persons/Agencies Consulted

Oregon Department of Transportation
Klamath County Road Department

F. Interdisciplinary Team*

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Johanna Fickenscher	Natural Resource Specialist	Noxious Weeds & Rare Plants
Steve Hayner	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Andy Hamilton	Hydrologist	Hydrology
Brooke Brown	Archeologist	Archeology
Don Hoffheins	Supervisory Planner	Planning and Environmental Coordination

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I determine 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 the NEPA.

/s/ Donald J. Holmstrom
Donald J. Holmstrom, Manager

6/3/2013
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.