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

Name of Proposed Action: Grazing Lease Renewal for the McQuinn Allotment 2589

DNA Number: OR-054-08-017

Location of Proposed Action: One mile east of Service Creek, Oregon

Purpose of and Need for Action: This action is part of the required NEPA process to renew an expiring grazing lease. The current lessee's grazing lease for the McQuinn Allotment will expire on February 28,2008 and a timely application has been made for renewal.

Description of the Proposed Action: Renewal of the grazing lease to the current authorized lessees, Richard Ross and Barbara Macomber, for a term often years.

Plan Conformance:
The above action has been reviewed and found to be in conformance with the following BLM plan:

The applicable land use plans (LUP) are:
Two Rivers Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Record of Decision (ROD) dated June 1986.
John Day River Management Plan, Two Rivers, John Day, and Baker RMP Amendments ROD dated February 2001.

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the decisions as described below under NEPA Adequacy Criteria.

Conformance with Other Applicable Documents:
The following NEPA documents and related documents address the proposed action:
EISs: Two Rivers Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Draft EIS, dated 1985.
John Day River Proposed Management Plan, Two Rivers and John Day RMP Amendments and Final EIS dated June 2000.

NEPA Adequacy Criteria:
1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part ofthat action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?
Yes, livestock grazing on the McQuinn Allotment is addressed in the Final Two Rivers EIS pages 5 and 17 to 20, Two Rivers *RMP/ROD* pages 42 to 48, and the John Day River Management Plan ROD pages 10, 11 and 240.

Interdisciplinary Analysis:
The following Prineville District BLM specialists reviewed this analysis for accuracy in their area of expertise:

Name	Specialty	Initials/Date
Ron Halvorson	Botany, Special Status Plants	11/27/2007
Jeff Moss	Fisheries, Riparian	JDM 12/04/07
Heidi Mottl	Recreation, Wilderness Study Areas	HM 11/28/07
Don Zalunardo	Wildlife	DZ 12/4/07
John Zancanella	Cultural Resources	11/28/07

Mitigation Measures:
None.

Recommendation:
Authorize the renewal of the grazing lease on the McQuinn Allotment for a term often years.

Prepared By: _____ Date 11/27/07
Lyle Andrews, Ran 'eland Management Specialists

Plan Conformance/DNA Determination:
The proposed action has been determined to meet the criteria for a Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA). No additional environmental analysis is required. The appropriate cultural, T&E plant and wildlife specialists have reviewed the proposed action and concur with the recommendation.

Reviewed By: _____ *Date* 12/4/07
Danny L. Tippy, Assistant ger, Ce al Oregon Resource Area
Environmental Coordinator

Approval:
Based on review of this documented, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plans and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLMs compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Approved By: Christina M. Welch Date 12/11/07
Christina M. Welch, Field Manager, Central Oregon Resource Area

Attachment: allotment map

Note: *The signature on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the ELM's internal decision process and cannot be appealed.*

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?
Yes, the alternatives ranged from emphasis of commodity production to emphasis of natural values, which included the elimination of livestock grazing. Refer to page ix and pages 58 to 72 of the Draft Two Rivers EIS, pages 5 and 17 to 20 of the Final Two Rivers EIS. Also, the John Day River Final EIS page 165.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?
Yes, the existing analysis is still valid. There is no new information and the circumstances are unchanged.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?
Yes, the Two Rivers Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Record of Decision (ROD) was evaluated in 1998 and found to still provide valid guidance for land use and resource allocations and directions. The Record of Decision for the John Day River Management Plan contains plan amendments, which update the Two Rivers, John Day, and Baker Resource Management Plans.

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?
Yes, the proposed action does not present new impacts which were not already analyzed in the existing NEPA documents. The proposed action is a continuation of the existing management.

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)?
Yes, they are substantially unchanged. Although the Two Rivers RMP does not specifically address cumulative impacts of grazing, it does address long-term impacts of the action with the assumption that the grazing activity would continue. Recommendations and objectives in the documents reflect the impacts and expected improvements that would continue with ongoing grazing. In addition, the cumulative impacts are unchanged which were addressed in the John Day River Proposed Management Plan, Two Rivers and John Day RMP Amendments and Final EIS on pages 336 to 338.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?
Yes. Many of the individuals and organizations on the current "interested publics" list are the same as those on the mailing list for the various NEPA documents listed. A copy of this conformance worksheet is available to the public upon request.


McQuinn Allotment 2589
MULESHOE CREEK
SERVICE CREEK
JENKINS CREEK
LAKE CREEK
ALDER CREEK
JOHN DAY RIVER
DONNELY CREEK
T. 8 S.
T. 9 S.
R. 23 E.
Legend
Allotment Boundary
Arterial
Bureau of Land Management
State
Private
N
a 0.25 0.5 1 Miles
No ffarrantv is made by the Bureau o f'Lau1 Management as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data for individual or aggregate use wnh other data. Original d.rta were compiled trom sources This informa tion may nnl meet National Map Accuracy Standards. This product was develop ed through digital means and may be updated wirhoutnotifi cano n
Created 11/27f2007