

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

A. Background

BLM Office: Prineville District

NEPA Log #s: DOI-BLM-OR-PO40-2009-0052

Project/Lease/Serial/Case File #s: 3602065, 3602174, and 3602119

Applicants: Art and Susan Kilander, Darlene Moss, and Jim Rixen

Location: Approximately one air mile south of Dayville, Oregon T13S R27E

Proposed Action Title: Smokey Creek Grazing Allotment #4124 Lease Renewal

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures: Renew current grazing lease Section 15 for ten year term. Lessees (applicants), permit terms and conditions, and management actions will remain unchanged from the current situation. Currently there are three lessees grazing livestock on this allotment. This DNA addresses the BLM managed land included in the Smokey Creek allotment. The following discussion of land use plan conformance, and NEPA adequacy applies to this land not to each applicant separately. A separate Decision Notice based on this DNA will be issued for each applicant.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: John Day Resource Management Plan Record of Decision (JDRMP)

Date approved (ROD): February 1995

Land Use Plan Name: John Day River Management Plan Record of Decision

Date approved (ROD): February 2001

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable plan because it is specifically provided for in the following land use plan decisions: Page 30 and page 264. Forage use to remain at 256 AUMs on 2,213 acres of public land. Improve allotment, #4124

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:

- Proposed John Day Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement (November 1984)
- John Day River Proposed Management Plan, Two Rivers and John Day Plan Amendments and Final Environmental Impact Statement (June 2000)

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 the same as those addressed, for continued livestock grazing on public land, in three of the four alternatives in the Draft John Day RMP EIS on pages 30, 62-66 and the Final John Day RMP EIS on pages 8-9, 161-170. The project is located within the area analyzed in these documents.

Grazing use was to be continued in the allotment. No portion of the allotment was proposed for livestock exclusion. The Smokey Creek grazing allotment contains 2,213 acres of public land and supports 307 AUMs (JDRMP EIS page 19). Currently there are three lessees on this allotment authorized 256 AUMs.

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. The alternatives in the Final John Day RMP EIS and the John Day River Management Plan EIS (2000) ranged from emphasis of commodity production to emphasis of natural values, which included the elimination of livestock grazing. Refer to pages 154-22 in the Final John Day RMP EIS.

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?

Yes. The John Day RMP EIS (1984) remains valid. The BLM has determined that livestock grazing in this allotment 'may effect not likely to adversely affect' populations of the Mid Columbia steelhead, which are listed as threatened.

A rangeland health assessment was completed in 2002. The assessment found that rangeland health standards were being met on the majority of the allotment (6 of 8 sites). 87% of the public lands monitored were meeting standards. Current monitoring and grazing management is aimed at improving the acreage in non-compliance with rangeland health standards. Additionally, seeding, spring development, and fencing of river area as recommended in the John Day RMP EIS have been completed.

Most of the public lands in this allotment are within the Aldrich Mountain Wilderness Study

Area. The public lands that are not within the WSA (3 small parcels totaling approximately 160 acres) have been evaluated for wilderness character. The evaluation found that the public land parcels do not have wilderness character because they lack sufficient size and do not meet any of the exceptions to the size criteria.

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, Final John Day RMP EIS pages 63 – 66. Smokey Creek is a improve allotment with specific direction in the John Day RMP EIS for improvement actions. Trend monitoring is conducted every five years to document current rangeland conditions. The latest reading was in 2006 and shows static to improving conditions on all monitoring plots in the allotment.

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 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>
JoAnne Armson	Natural Resource Technician	Botany and Special Status Plants
John Zancanella	Archeologist	Cultural Resources
Rick Demmer	Natural Resource Specialist	Wildlife
Jimmy Eisner	Fisheries Biologist	Fisheries
Heidi Mottl	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation and Wilderness
Vicki Van Sickle	Rangeland Mgt. Specialist	Range
Teal Purrington	Planning & Environ. Coordinator	NEPA Compliance
Michelle McSwain	Assistant Field Manager, CORA	Management

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: /S/ H.F. "Chip" Faver 04/06/10
H.F. "Chip" Faver Date
Field Manager, Central Oregon Resource Area

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: Prineville District Office 3050 NE 3rd Street, Prineville, OR 97754, telephone (541) 416-6700 or Colleen Wyllie, John Day Field Office, telephone (541) 575-3146.