

**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 -176

Project/Lease/Serial/Case File #: 3605010

Applicant: Lower Pocket Community, Birdsong Butte, Upper Pocket Community, Ferrian, Paulina, Congleton; c/o Gary Young.

Location: 5-10 miles north east of Paulina, 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 Gary Young, on the Lower Pocket Community, Birdsong Butte, Upper Pocket Community, Ferrian, Paulina, and Congleton Allotments. 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 a total of 674 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):

*Lower Pocket Community Allotment Mgmt Plan, 4.4.75*

*Lower Pocket Comm. Allot. Results of Assessment from Standards & Guidelines, 9.12.06*  
*Birdsong Butte Allotment, Results of Assessment from Standards & Guidelines, 9.12.06*  
*Upper Pocket Community Allotment Evaluation 6.8.88*  
*Upper Pocket Comm. Allot. Results of Assessment from Standards & Guidelines, 9.12.06*  
*Paulina Allotment Results of Assessment from Standards & Guidelines, 9.12.06*  
*Ferian Allotment Cooperative Rangeland Management Agreement, 10.2.07*  
*Ferian Allotment Results of Assessment from Standards & Guidelines, 9.12.06*  
*Congleton Allotment Management Plan, 4.4.75*  
*Congleton Allotment Results of Assessment from Standards & Guidelines, 9.12.06*  
*Paulina, Congleton & Lower Pocket Community Allotments Cooperative Rangeland Management Agreement, 10.2.07*

#### **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. Pages 1-140 of the Brothers Grazing Management EIS analyzes grazing; 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 (S&Gs). Birdsong Butte and Congleton Allotments passed S&Gs. Ferian failed the assessment and a Cooperative Agreement was written for the allotment specifying deferred grazing system. The allotment is now in a two year rest rotation system with spring grazing. Lower Pocket Community Allotment and Paulina Allotments failed the assessment as well and a

Cooperative Rangeland Agreement was written addressing the failures. A rest rotation grazing system was created and the Paulina Allotment was incorporated into that rotation. Upper Pocket Community Allotment failed standard five but it was not due to current livestock use. There are no further recommendations for this allotment because proper livestock management practices are occurring. Proper stocking levels have been instituted along with a deferred-rotation grazing system.

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 Armonson	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 Welch,

Christina M. Welch  
Central Oregon Resource Area Manager

12.19.2008  
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.




UPPER POCKET COMMUNITY ALLOTMENT



- Fence maintenance**  
 — Congleton Ranch
- Water sources**  
 ~ Stream  
 ▽ Reservoir  
 ▽ Proposed reservoir  
 .G Trend study plot

**LEGEND**

- ▨ National Resource Land  
 ■ Congleton Ranch  
 ✕ Allotment boundary fence  
 ✕ Allotment pasture fence



R. 23 E


R. 24 E

Lower Pocket Community Allotment  
No. 0034

North

T. 16 S.

1" = 1 mile



SOUTH

T. 16 S.

R. 23 E.

North FERIAN ALLOTMENT


PUBLIC LAND   
 PRIVATE LAND 

ALLOTMENT BOUNDARY

1" = 1 mile




Map labels include: Trapper Butte, Lewelyn Springs, Isadore Butte, Ruby Butte, Moccasin Ridge, Big Rattlesnake Butte, Paulina, Minife Ridge, Dry Ridge, Minitie, Paulina Creek, Ferian Ranch, Congleton Ranch, Isadore Ranch, Flat Top Butte, Red Canyon, Beaver Creek, Drift Canyon, Beaver River, Alkali Rim, and Paulina Valley.



Paulina Allotment 00039

North

1" = 1 mile



Birdsong Butte Allotment, 00073

North

Public Land   
Private Land  1" = 1 mile

Table