

**Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and
NEPA Adequacy (DNA) #OR134-07-DNA-012
For Renewing Grazing Allotment # 3600832**

Note: The signed Conclusion at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLMs internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.

**A. Spokane BLM District, Wenatchee Resource Area
Lease/Serial/Case File No. 3600832**

Proposed Action Title/Type: Grazing Lease Renewal/Custodial Allotment

Location of Proposed Action: This allotment is located approximately 2 miles northwest of the town of Riverside, in Okanogan County Washington. The allotment is part of the Okanogan County Scattered Tracts Management Area (See attached map). Legal Description of the lands is as follows:

T35N R26E Sec 22: E½SW¼
 Sec 27: N½NE¼

Description of the Proposed Action: The proposed action is to address a grazing lease renewal for grazing allotment # 3600832 for a period of 10 years (3/2007-3/2017). This allotment is a “Custodial” allotment with 160 acres of public land intermingled with private land owned or leased by the lessee. The proposed action will continue the authorized use of 20 AUMs on 160 acres. The allotment was renewed in 2007 under provisions of Section 116 of Public Law 106-291, which provided for renewal based on allowed use being the same as the previous lease period, and also contingent on completion of environmental analysis.

The number of cattle and AUMS may be adjusted to an equivalent use, contingent on review and approval of the Interdisciplinary Team and the Field Manager.

Applicant (if any): Robert Laughery

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

- Spokane District Resource Management Plan (RMP)/Final EIS (August 1985) and its Record of Decision (ROD)/Rangeland Program Summary (May 1987)
- Proposed Spokane RMP Plan Amendment/Final EIS (June 1992) and its ROD (December 1992)

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions:

C. Identify the applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Other documentation relevant to the Proposed Action:

- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitats and Species - 1997 Databases
- Washington Natural Heritage - 1998 Database
- Washington Office of Archaeological and Historical Preservation - 2003 Database
- Spokane District 2003 Archaeological Survey Database and files.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

Yes, The Spokane RMP/FEIS (page 57) and its ROD/RPS (page 24) designated domestic livestock grazing as an appropriate use for BLM-administered lands completely surrounded by private lands being grazed. This complies with the principle of multiple use on a sustained yield basis in accordance with the Federal Land and Policy Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA). The Spokane RMP/FEIS, as adjusted or affirmed by the Spokane ROD/RPS, meets NEPA requirements for impact analysis.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

The proposed action is within the range of alternatives identified and analyzed in the Spokane RMP/EIS (1985), in the Summary (pages v-viii, and including Table S-2, which summarizes long-term environmental consequences and compares alternative allocations). The range of alternatives is thought to appropriately reflect current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

An interdisciplinary team conducted a review for any new information, studies, and analyses that would materially differ from earlier analysis in the RMP/FEIS. Included in these categories since the date of the ROD/RPS (1987), are the following:

Along with the provision in the LUP for monitoring of allotments and implementing changes to grazing use as mitigations to minimize impacts to other resource values, the existing analysis is still considered adequate. The new information is not significant regarding the proposed action.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA documents

continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

The Spokane RMP/FEIS (page 57) and its ROD/RPS (page 24) designated domestic livestock grazing as an appropriate use for BLM-administered lands completely surrounded by private lands being grazed. This complies with the principle of multiple use on a sustained yield basis in accordance with the Federal Land and Policy Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA). The Spokane RMP/FEIS, as adjusted or affirmed by the Spokane ROD/RPS, meets NEPA requirements for impact analysis. The methodology and analyses used in the Spokane RMP/FEIS are still considered appropriate. In addition, all rangeland monitoring, studies, and survey methods used in the general area prior to and during the planning process continue to be accepted (or required) BLM methods and procedures.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA documents? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

The proposed action is consistent with the Spokane RMP/FEIS, as affirmed or adjusted by its ROD/RPS. The impacts of livestock grazing were analyzed in Chapter 4 - Environmental Consequences (pages 79-92) in the Spokane RMP/FEIS, and details of grazing were addressed in Appendix J (Grazing Systems). The number of AUMS and grazing use times are the same as were addressed in the Spokane RMP.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents?

Cumulative impacts are identical to, and within the parameters of, those identified and accepted for Allotment 3600832 grazing use, since the proposed action was specifically analyzed in the Spokane RMP/FEIS.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA documents adequate for the current proposed action?

The Spokane RMP/FEIS and its ROD (including the Rangeland Program Summary) were distributed to all interested publics and other government agencies for review. Since the subject grazing leases are identified in the land use plan, which went through all of the appropriate and legally required public/agency review, at the time public involvement was considered adequate. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) was consulted, but individual tribes were not.

The BLM issued consultation letters regarding the grazing lease #0832 renewal on July 3, 2007. Letters regarding this allotment and a list of other leases expiring in 2007 were sent to the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), the Yakama Indian Nation, and the Colville Confederated Tribes. On July 9, 2007 the DAHP responded, concurring with the definition of the area of potential effect (APE). BLM did not receive a response from either the Yakama Indian Nation or from the Colville Confederated Tribes.

As of August of 2008, Cultural Resource Surveys were completed. Letters regarding these

surveys were sent to the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), the Yakama Indian Nation, and the Colville Confederated Tribes on September 15, 2008. On September 18, 2007 the DAHP responded, concurring with the determination of effect. BLM did not receive a response from either the Yakama Indian Nation or from the Colville Confederated Tribes.

No other specific public involvement, or interested public status (under the grazing regulations at 43 CFR 4100.0-5), has been requested for these allotments, except from the grazing lessee who has been involved in all planning processes pertaining to this allotment.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet are identified on the cover sheet of this DNA.

F. Mitigation Measures:

CONCLUSION

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

_____/S/ Karen Kelleher_____
Karen Kelleher, Field Manager

____10/30/08_____
Date