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

OFFICE: Kingman Field Office (KFO)

NEPA DOCUMENT NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2010-0060-DNA

CASE FILE NUMBER:

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Melody Exclosure Study Area Re-initiation

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Section 19., Township 28N., Range 15W

BACKGROUND: In 1980, a 100 acre exclosure was built and designated as a study plot for the treatment of sagebrush and establishment of grasses. A variety of sagebrush treatments including herbicide and burning were done. A variety of grass species were planted to attempt to determine what treatments and seed mixes would work to control sagebrush and establish grasses. The plot was cleared for cultural and wildlife resources and was analyzed under an environmental assessment. Some parts of the plot are well established with grasses but sagebrush is beginning to increase; other parts of the plot have little or no grass.

APPLICANT (if any): BLM

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures: In the Melody Exclosure the BLM proposes to continue testing treatments and seeding options, focusing on the areas of the exclosure that are not well established with grasses.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: *Kingman Resource Management Plan/EIS*

Date Approved: March 1995

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):

GM-13/I Improve wildlife habitat by providing more forage, cover, and water (RMP page 461 and objective from the Cerbat/Black Mountains (1978) grazing EIS. Program Document page 1).

GM-14/I Reduce soil erosion and increase water infiltration by increasing vegetative ground cover and litter (RMP page 461 and objective from the Cerbat/Black Mountains (1978) grazing EIS Program Document page 1).

Melody Exclosure Study Area Rehabilitation

DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2010-0060-DNA

GM-16/I Sustain livestock production by providing more and better quality forage (RMP page 461 and objective from the Cerbat/Black Mountains (1978) grazing EIS Program Document page 1).

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Melody Study Fence EA #AZ-020-0-184 1980.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: The Proposed action is within the established Melody Study Area. This area was fenced and had T&E and Cultural Clearances done in 1980. That Proposed action included fencing the area and experimenting with various sagebrush removal techniques and experimental seeding to re-vegetate treated areas.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: There was only the proposed action alternative and the no action alternative. The range of alternatives now is to either continue using this enclosure as an experimental study area or to stop using as such.

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 new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, no new threatened or endangered species have been listed within the project area since the completion of the original EA in 1980.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The acreage for the enclosure is the same and some sage brush will be removed and other species will be tested to determine how to get them to establish. Impacts of the new proposed action will be essentially the same as described in the old EA.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. This project is a small level experimental plot and the only involved member of the public is the permittee who is providing both the labor and the seeds for the first experimental seeding.

