Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management

A. Background

BLM Office: Prineville District NEPA Log #: DOI-BLM-OR-P040-2009-0021-DNA

Project/Lease/Serial/Case File #: *3605055*
Applicant: Mark Mallot
Location: 10.5 miles west of Paulina, Oregon
Proposed Action Title/Type: Butler and Camp Creek Allot 3 Year Base Lease
Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

The previous permittees' lease with the land owner, Glenn Butler has expired. Glenn has decided to lease his deeded land to Mark Mallot, starting at the beginning of 2009, for three years. Attached to the deeded land are the Butler and Camp Creek Community Allotments- East pasture of Camp Creek. This is not a transfer, considering the lease with the previous permittees has expired and therefore is null and void. Mark Malott is now making application, as the lessee of Glenn Butler's deeded land. All terms and conditions will remain the same. The AUMs for each allotment will also remain the same: Butler Allotment- 13 AUMs and Camp Creek Community Allotment- 51 AUMs.

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 13 AUMs of forage to the Butler Allotment and 51 AUMS to the Camp Creek Community Allotment (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 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):

Cooperative Rangeland Management Agreement, Camp Creek Comm. Allot. 10.12.89
Camp Creek Community Allotment Evaluation, 10.17.89
Results of Assessment for Standards and Guides, Butler Allotment 9.26.03

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 was 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 Draft 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?

The existing analysis of the Brothers/La Pine FEIS is still valid. New information, which would enter into the analysis, 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. The Camp Creek 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. The Butler Allotment has been evaluated and was found to be failing standards 1 and 5. Mitigation measures taken were complete rest and a fence. A grazing system will be implemented with the new operator to ensure continued improvement of the allotment.

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 the Brothers Grazing Management Program, EIS 1982. 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

Name	Title	Resource/Agency represented
Steve Castillo	Forester	Forestry
Rick Demmer	Natural Resource Specialist	Wildlife
Jeff Moss	Natural Resource Specialist	Fisheries
Cari Johnson	Rangeland Mgment 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 3/23/2009
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.



SHOUN leasing BUTLER

N