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

OFFICE: Kingman Field Office (KFO)

NEPA DOCUMENT NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2011-0021-DNA
CASE FILE NUMBER:

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Ephemeral Grazing Application

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: On the La Cienega Allotment at the following location
Township 14 North, Range 17 West, The lower elevations of the allotment.

APPLICANT (if any): Clay Tyree

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures: The grazing permittee has submitted a grazing application for 1000 head of yearling in a portion of the of the La Cienega allotment which is designated for ephemeral grazing and is part of the Allotment Management Plan (AMP) for this allotment.

- 1) The rancher/permittee will notify the authorized officer before turning out additional livestock (Kingman Field Office at 928-718-3700).
- 2) Fence and water facilities will be maintained to a minimal necessary to a share proper control and distribution of livestock.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: *Kingman Resource Management Plan/EIS*

Date Approved: March 1995

LUP Name*	Hualapai-Aquarius. Grazing EIS	Date Approved	1978
LUP Name*	Program Document;RPS	Date Approved	1979
Other doc*	Ephemeral Range Prog. EA (AZ-020-7-41)	Date Approved	1978
Other doc*	AMP EA (AZ-030-99-29)	Date Approved	1999

**List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto. Delete this statement before finalizing the document.*

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions: *This proposal is in conformance with the direction found in the Program Document, RPS Hualapai-Aquarius Mountain Planning Unit and the Ephemeral Range Programmatic EZ (AZ-020-7-41) which states "In response to an application from the grazing operator, BLM would issue ephemeral license when it is determined that adequate ephemeral*

forage would be available and that grazing would not conflict with other resources”. These documents were incorporated into the Kingman Resource Management Plan approved 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):

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document (s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

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

LUP Name*	Hualapai-Aquarius. Grazing EIS	Date Approved	1978
LUP Name*	Program Document;RPS	Date Approved	1979
LUP Name*	KRMP Document	Date Approved	1995
Other doc*	Ephemeral Range Prog. EA (IM AZ-94-018)	Date Approved	1978
Other doc*	Ephemeral Grazing Authorization (AZ-020-7-41)	Date App.	1994
Other doc*	Allot. Manag. Plan EA (AZ 030-99-29)	Date Approved	1999

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: *Documentation of answer and explanation: This proposal is in conformance with the direction found in the Program Document RPS Hualapai-Aquarius Mountain Planning Unit and the Ephemeral Range Programmatic EA (AZ-020-7-41) which states “In response to an application from the grazing operator, BLM followed (IM AZ-94-018) to issue an ephemeral license . BLM completed an allotment inspection and determined that adequate ephemeral forage would be available and that grazing would not conflict with other resources”.*

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: *Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the Program Document RPS Hualapai-Aquarius Mountain Planning Unit are appropriate with respect to the selected action, given the current environmental concerns, interests, resource values and circumstances.*

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as,; rangeland health standards assessments, 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: *Circumstances have not significantly changed and no new information has surfaced to show that documents being reviewed are not valid and germane to the selected action. No new T&E species have been listed for the allotment area, upland monitoring is continuing, and allotment evaluation has been conducted for the allotment area. No new land designations have been established for the allotment area.*

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 manner of regular procedure and systemic way of preparing and reviewing the environmental documents continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action.*

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: *Yes, the site specific NEPA document prepared for the allotment area sufficiently analyze impacts related to the current selected action*

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Mike Blanton	Range Management Specialist	Grazing/Range
Ammon Wilhelm	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife/T&E

Note: RPS Hualapai-Aquarius Mountain Planning Unit, the Ephemeral Range Programmatic EZ (AZ-020-7-41) and the Kingman Resource Management Plan approved 1995

Conclusion

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

 /s/ Michael M. Blanton
Signature of the Project Lead
Michael M. Blanton

 02/08/2011
Date

