

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

A. Background

BLM Office: Prineville District

NEPA Log #: OR-054-08 -175

Project/Lease/Serial/Case File #: 3605006

Applicant: Dow Ranches c/o Reese Camara

Location: 2 miles north east of Post, Oregon

Proposed Action Title/Type: Grazing Permit Renewal

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

Renew a ten year grazing permit for Dow Ranches, on the Bonnieview Allotment. Terms and conditions will remain the same.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: *Brothers/La Pine Resource Management Plan (RMP) (ROD): July 1989.*

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

Brothers/La Pine RMP/ ROD, 1989- Allocate 28 AUMs of forage to livestock (p. 76).
Livestock grazing specific to this allotment is addressed on pages 74 through 86 of this RMP.

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

The following NEPA documents (EA, DEIS, FEIS) cover the proposed action:

Brothers/La Pine Resource Management Plan, July 1989

Brothers/La Pine Final Environmental Impact Statement, 1988

Brothers/La Pine Draft EIS, October 1987

Brothers Grazing Management Program Draft Environmental Impact Statement, 1982

The following other documentation is relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report):

Results of Assessment from Standards and Guidelines, 9.30.04

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, this action has already been analyzed under the existing NEPA documents and is within the same location as before. There are no changes or differences with this action compared to the action previously analyzed. Grazing is analyzed throughout the Brothers Grazing Management EIS; specific alternatives are discussed on pages 10-14.

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. Alternatives are displayed on pages 10 through 14 of the EIS, and ranged from optimizing livestock to the elimination of livestock grazing. This range 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, 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?

New information includes the Standards for Rangeland Health & Guidelines for grazing management (43 CFR 4180, available for review at the Prineville District BLM). The BLM is required to assess all public land grazing allotments for compliance with the Standards and Guidelines. This allotment was evaluated in September of 2004 and failed. The BLM lands within the allotment are scattered, isolated tracts amongst a large amount of private land. It would not be practical to fence around all of these isolated 40 and 80 acre pieces to enforce a change. The allotment does have monitoring established on it which can be done jointly with the permittee to identify needed measures to adjust management to make changes on the landscape for the health of the land. The BLM will continue to look into mitigation measures as time and priority allows.

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)?

The direct, indirect and site specific effects of renewing this grazing permit were adequately addressed in this DEIS. It considered continuing vs. discontinuing grazing in many allotments and described the effects of allotment closures on forage availability, the local economy, BLM management costs, permittee costs, and other factors (pages 52 through 75). The effects of livestock grazing on soil, vegetation, and ecological processes were likewise included. These effects have not substantially changed.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequately 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 District's 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/Agency represented</u>
Steve Castillo	Forester	Forestry
Rick Demmer	Natural Resource Specialist	Wildlife
Jeff Moss	Natural Resource Specialist	Fisheries
Cari Johnson	Rangeland Mgmt Specialist	Range
Berry Phelps	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation
John Zancanella	Archeologist	Cultural Resources
JoAnne Armson	Natural Resource Technician	Botany, Special Status Plants
Michelle McSwain	Hydrologist	Hydrology
Teal Purrington	Planning and Enviro. Coord.	NEPA Compliance

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 documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

Signature

Responsible official: Christina M. Welch 12.19.2008
Christina Welch, Central Oregon Resource Area Manager 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: Cari Johnson, Rangeland Management Specialist, Prineville Field Office, 3050 NE 3rd Street, Prineville, OR 97754, telephone (541)416.6790, cari_johnson@or.blm.gov.

Amendment:

On January 5, 2009 Cari met with Reese Camara, the ranch manager, and explained the failed Health Assessment and need to fix those conditions within the permitted season of use and allotted AUMs, or the proper NEPA will need to be completed. Based on the following information that was provided, it has been decided that a two year grazing permit will be issued. Monitoring and utilization will be completed on these tracts and at the end of the two years, it will be re-evaluated to see if further mitigation measures need to be taken or if the permit can be renewed.

Past Management on the Bonnieview Ranch:

The previous owner/manager grazed cattle in the various pastures at different times of the year with high intensity. The main focus of the ranch was hunting, so many times cows were left out in pastures until a hunting season was over so as to not adversely affect the hunting. This resulted in over grazing to the point where vegetation was eaten to the.

Current Management on the Bonnieview Ranch:

Neal Dow is the new owner of Bonnieview, and for the last year and a half Reese Camara has been managing the ranch. Hunting is not a focus, and to some extent not even allowed on the ranch. Reese has implemented a new grazing system that allows almost every pasture to be rested every other year. Following is the approximate grazing schedule:

- Section 13 grazed every other year; to be rested in 09
- Section 24 along the river is a tough spot to fix- then it goes up into rim rock where the cattle don't have access; rested during spring/summer- used in fall
- Section 18 rested since early spring of 08; will use in fall of 09; will try to continue resting even more in the future
- Section 21 early spring use when grass is growing- end of Feb-March
- Section 10 used in 08; will be rested in 09; spring grazing- approx. April
- Section 12 (south 40) rested in 08, and rest will continue for two more years due to RX burn on private land adjacent to BLM; (north) winter use- Nov & Dec. every year

The 40 acre pieces in sections 21 and 12 (north) are the only two pieces that don't get rested every other year.

