

Prineville District  
**Land Use Plan Conformance and  
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**  
Review and Approval

---

**A. Background**

**Name of Proposed Action:** Grazing Lease Renewal for the Grant Allotment (7529)

**DNA Number:** OR-056-07-083

**Location of Proposed Action:** Three miles northwest of Madras, Oregon (see attached map)

**Allotment Summary:** 1,104 acres of public land; 115 AUMs (115 active, 0 suspended); season of use from March 1 to February 28 for upland pastures and November 1 to May 1 for riparian pastures.

**Purpose of and Need for Action:** This action is part of the required NEPA process to renew an expired grazing lease. The current lessee's lease, for grazing preference in the Grant Allotment, expired on February 28, 2008.

**Description of the Proposed Action:** The proposed action is to renew the grazing lease for the Grant Allotment for a term of ten years. The management actions and Terms and Conditions for the allotment would remain unchanged.

**B. Land Use Plan Conformance**

Land Use Plans:

*Two Rivers Resource Management Plan (RMP), Record of Decision, Rangeland Program Summary, June 1986, page 10 "Maintain current livestock grazing levels..." , pages 14 – 16, and pages 42 – 49.*

*Lower Deschutes River Management Plan, Record of Decision, February 1993, pages 31 – 35; page 32, "The period of livestock use within the planning area will generally be between November 1 and May 1, unless there is a site specific rationale for an exception, such as use in a non-riparian pasture."*

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable plans because it is specifically provided for in the following land use plan decisions:

*Two Rivers RMP Record of Decision, Rangeland Program Summary, pages 45 and 48; Allotment Number 7529, Selective Management Category 'Maintain'. The Lower Deschutes River Management Plan Record of Decision, page 32, restricted livestock use along the river and tributaries, with riparian areas, between November 1 and May 1.*

**C. Applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document and related documents to the Proposed Action**

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

*EISs: Two Rivers Resource Management Plan (RMP) Draft EIS dated 1985 and Final EIS dated 1985.*

*Lower Deschutes River Management Plan Draft EIS dated May 1991 and Final EIS dated January 1993.*

## **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 essentially the same as those addressed, for continued livestock grazing on public land, in four of the five alternatives in the Draft Two Rivers RMP EIS on pages 58 – 72, 99 – 102, 105 – 107 and 117 - 120 and the Final Two Rivers RMP EIS on pages 17 – 20. In addition, it was addressed in three of the four alternatives analyzed in the Draft Lower Deschutes River Management Plan EIS on pages 37 – 38, 167 – 194, and 443 and the Final Lower Deschutes EIS pages 20 – 21 and 31 – 35. The project is located within the same area analyzed in the before listed documents.

**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, and resource values?**

Yes. The alternatives in the Draft Two Rivers EIS ranged from emphasis of commodity production to emphasis of natural values, which included the elimination of livestock grazing. Refer to page ix and 58 to 72 of the Draft Two Rivers EIS and pages 5 and 17 to 20 of the Final Two Rivers EIS. The Final Lower Deschutes River Management Plan also described a range of alternatives on pages 20 – 21 and for livestock specifically on pages 31 – 35. The range of alternatives appears to be appropriate given the current issues.

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

Yes. Both the Two Rivers RMP and Lower Deschutes River Management Plan remain valid. In addition, the Two Rivers RMP was formally evaluated in 1998 and found to provide guidance for land use and resource allocations and directions. The BLM has determined that livestock grazing in this allotment has ‘no effect’ on populations of the Mid Columbia steelhead, which are listed as threatened. The BLM will reevaluate this determination when fish passage is completed at Round Butte Dam.

This allotment has not been evaluated for compliance with the Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management, but the grazing authorization contains stipulations that provide for modifications of the grazing management, as needed, to protect public land.

**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)?**

Yes. The effects resulting from the proposed action are unchanged from those analyzed in the Two Rivers Draft EIS, pages 58 – 72 and the Draft Lower Deschutes River Management Plan EIS, pages 167 – 194, 236, and 268.

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

Yes. The list of "interested publics" is updated on a regular basis and many of the individuals and organizations on the current "interested publics" list are the same as those on the mailing list for the planning and NEPA documents listed on page 1. A final copy of this DNA and the subsequent Proposed Decision will be posted on the Prineville Districts' internet page for public review. A printed copy of these documents will be available on request.

**E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted**

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource Represented</u>
Lyle Andrews	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range
Steve Castillo	Forester	Forestry
Bill Dean	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Jim Eisner	Fisheries Biologist	Fisheries
Ron Gregory	Archeologist	Cultural Resources
Ron Halvorson	Natural Resource Specialist	Botany, Special Status Plants
Ed Horn	Soil Scientist	Soil
Michelle McSwain	Hydrologist	Hydrology, Riparian, Watershed
Tom Mottl	Recreation Planner	Recreation
Teal Purrington	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	NEPA Compliance

Note: Refer to the listed EIS/EA 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 documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

**Signature**

Responsible Official: \_\_\_\_\_

Molly Brown, Deschutes Resource Area Field Manager



9/15/08

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: Lyle Andrews, Prineville Field Office, 3050 NE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, Prineville, OR 97754, 541-416-6715, [Lyle\\_W\\_Andrews@or.blm.gov](mailto:Lyle_W_Andrews@or.blm.gov).

