

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-P040-2009-0055-DNA

Project/Lease/Serial/Case File #: 3605382

Applicant: Joe Kintz

Location: Approximately five air miles north of Spray, Oregon T 8S R 25E

Proposed Action Title: Larson Grazing Allotment #2632 Lease Renewal

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures: Renew current grazing lease Section 15 for ten year term. Lessee (applicant), permit terms and conditions, and management actions will remain unchanged from the current situation.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Two Rivers Resource Management Plan, Record of Decision, Rangeland Program Summary (TRRMPRPS).

Date approved (ROD): June 1986

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable plan because it is specifically provided for in the following land use plan decisions: Page 44, 57. Forage use to remain at 9 AUMs on 80 acres of public land.

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:** Two Rivers Resource Management Plan, Draft EIS, 1985
- Proposed Two Rivers Resource Management Plan FEIS, September 1985

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 essentially the same as those addressed, for continued livestock grazing on public land, in four of the five alternatives in the Draft Two Rivers RMP EIS on pages 58 – 72, 99 – 102, 105 – 107 and 117 - 120 and the Final Two Rivers RMP EIS on pages 17 – 20. 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 (TRRMPEIS pg. 64). The Larson grazing allotment contains 80 acres of public land and supports 9 AUMs. The allotment contained 400 acres and supported 27 AUMS at the time of the Two Rivers RMP, June 1986 (TRRMPEIS pg.118). Some of the lands within the allotment were identified as potential land disposal parcels, Zone 3, Appendix J (TRRMPEIS pg. 59). Since the time of the EIS completion those lands have been disposed of. This changed the acres and subsequent AUMs to the current numbers.

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 Two Rivers EIS ranged from emphasis of commodity production to emphasis of natural values, which included the elimination of livestock grazing. Refer to pages 5 and 17 to 20 of the Final Two Rivers 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 Two Rivers RMP remains valid. In addition, the Two Rivers RMP was formally evaluated in 1998 and found to provide guidance for land use and resource allocations and directions. The BLM has determined that livestock grazing in this allotment has ‘no effect’ on populations of the Mid Columbia steelhead, which are listed as threatened.

This 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 public lands contained within this allotment were evaluated for wilderness characteristics. 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. Wilderness Characteristics Inventory Update.

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 Two Rivers Draft EIS, pages 58 – 72.

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 03/26/10
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.

Checklist for Internal NEPA Review

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-OR-P040-2009-0055-DNA **Project Title:** Larson Grazing Allotment #2632 Lease Renewal

Team Leader: Vicki Van Sickle/ Colleen Wyllie **Proposed Action:** Renew grazing lease as is

Draft available: now **Draft comments due:** **Final available:** **Final comments due:**

Lead: File document & checklist at: S:\NEPA\Current Projects

Specialists: Type your comments at bottom of this document or file in same folder as this checklist.

Internal Review FM or AFM highlights those required and fills in specialist names	Specialist name	Draft review			Final Review	
		Review date	Comments? Yes/No	Field trip requested? Yes/No	Review date	Comments? Yes/No
ACECs						
Air Quality						
Cave / Karst						
Cultural / Historic	John Zancanella	1/27/10	Yes	No		
Energy						
Engineering						
Environmental Justice						
Soils, Farmlands (prime or unique)						
Fire / Fuels						
Forestry / Timber / Biomass						
Geology / Minerals						
Hazardous or Solid Wastes						
Hydrology, Flood Plains, Wetlands, Riparian Zones						
Invasive Non-native Species						
Native American Concerns						
Paleontology	John Zancanella	1/27/10	Yes	No		
Public Health & Safety						
Range / Livestock Grazing						
Realty / Access / Land Use						
Recreation						
Social & Economic						
Special Status Animals, Migratory Birds, Wildlife	Rick Demmer	1/8/10	No	No		
Special Status Fish, Fisheries	Jimmy Eisner	3/16/10	No	No		
Special Status Plants	JoAnne Armson	3/16/10	No	No	3/16/10	No
Transportation / Roads						
Vegetation						
Visual Resources / Scenic or Back Country Byways / VRM						
Water Quality						

(drinking/ground)						
Water Rights						
Wild & Scenic Rivers						
Wild Horses & Burros						
Wilderness, WSA, Wilderness Characteristics	Heidi Mottl	2/18/2010	No	No	2/18/2010	No
Assistant Field Manager	Michelle McSwain				3/10/2010	No
Environmental Coordinator	Teal Purrington	--	--	--	2/8/2010	Yes

Comments from specialists (list name):

Zanc (CR/Paleo) – One inventory has been performed on BLM lands within the allotment. The survey was associated with an agricultural trespass. No archaeological sites were discovered. The BLM lands within the allotment cover a west-facing slope and ridge at the head of a small valley. State Route 207, a paved road, passes N-S through the parcel. Then entire BLM parcel is covered with ponderosa pine and Douglas fir, with some juniper. No live water sources occur on the BLM lands. The BLM lands are considered low potential for the presence of significant archaeological sites.

The BLM lands within this allotment are considered low to moderate for the presence of paleontological resources.

Comments from Teal

- Part C asks for NEPA documents, which include analysis of effects, such as EIS and EA. A decision (ROD) is not a NEPA document. Your list of applicable NEPA docs should only include DEIS, FEIS, or EA. The statement about the RMP/ROD still being valid would be appropriate if you move it up to Part B.
- Question #1 and 2 ask about analysis and range of alternatives, so again all you should be citing is DEIS, FEIS, or EA (not plans or decisions). Delete the second paragraph in #1...or move that info into proposed action or part B?
- Q3 asks for new info, so the discussion of S&Gs and wilderness characteristics is appropriate. But Q3 also asks about existing analysis (again, analysis is in a DEIS, FEIS, or EA, not the plan or decision that follow the analysis). You need to mention the relevant analysis and cite that doc.

Vicki-Done

Michelle-need to cite the document that the Wilderness Characteristics were evaluated.