

**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-P040-2009-0057

**Project/Lease/Serial/Case File #:** 3612118

**Applicant:** Cora/Jim Stubblefield

**Location:** Five air miles north of Monument, Oregon T8S R28E

**Proposed Action Title:** Big Bend Grazing Allotment #4122 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:** 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. Forage use to remain at 25 AUMs on 280 acres of public land. Custodial allotment, #4122

**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.

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 (19 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, and 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 has 'may effect not likely to adversely affect' 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 have been 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.

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. Big Bend is a custodial allotment with direction for custodial management actions to prevent resource deterioration. Management actions will not change from current. Periodic compliance monitoring indicates management is maintaining satisfactory conditions on 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 constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

Signature

Responsible official: /S/ H.F. "Chip" Faver 03/26/10  
H.F. "Chip" Faver CORA 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: 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.