

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
GRAND JUNCTION Field Office
2815 H ROAD
GRAND JUNCTION, CO 81506**

DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY

NUMBER: DOI-BLM-CO-130-2012-0009-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: Grazing Permit #0504532

PROJECT NAME: Grazing Permit Transfer. Hitchborn Estate (#0507057) to Three Springs Ranch (#0504532) on the Garr-Mesa Allotment (#16503).

PLANNING UNIT: Grand Junction Field Office.

APPLICANT: Three Springs Ranch.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS: No issues or concerns have been brought forth. The current grazing program associated with this permit was analyzed under an environmental assessment in 2010 (CO-130-2010-69-EA) and a new grazing permit issued to Don Hitchborn from 08/11/2010 to 02/28/2020.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action is to transfer the grazing preference from the Hitchborn Estate to Three Springs Ranch based on the base property lease. Upon transfer of the grazing preference, a new grazing permit would be issued to Three Springs Ranch under the same terms and conditions as the current permit. The new grazing permit would be a continuation of the current permit and would expire on the expiration date of the lease. The duration of the lease would be at least three years but not past 02/28/2020.

The grazing scheduled for the new permit would continue as the current permit:

Allotment/#	Livestock Number	Livestock Kind	Grazing Period		%PL	Type Use	AUMs
			From	To			
16503	110	Cattle	11/23	02/28	61	Active	216
	110	Cattle	03/01	04/30	61	Active	135

%PL is the percentage of forage contributed by BLM land within the allotment.

AUM-The amount of forage necessary for the sustenance of one cow or its equivalent for a period of one month.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS:

Terms and Conditions of the Grazing Permit would be:

1. No grazing use can be authorized under this grazing permit/lease during any period of delinquency in the payment of amounts due in settlement for unauthorized grazing use.
2. Grazing use authorized under this grazing permit/lessee may be suspended, in whole or in part, for violation by the permittee/lessee of any of the provisions of the rules or regulations now or hereafter approved by the Secretary of the Interior.
3. This grazing permit/lease is subject to cancellation, in whole or in part, at any time because of:
 - a. Noncompliance by the permittee/lessee with rules and regulations now or hereafter approved by the Secretary of the Interior.
 - b. Loss of control by the permittee/lessee of all or a part of the property upon which it is based.
 - c. A transfer of grazing preference by the permittee/lessee to another party.
 - d. A decrease in the lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management within the allotment(s) described herein.
 - e. Repeated willful unauthorized grazing use
4. This grazing permit/lease is subject to the provisions of executive Order NO. 11246 of September 24, 1965, as amended, which sets forth nondiscrimination clauses. A copy of this order may be obtained from the authorized officer.
5. The permittee/lessee must own or control and be responsible for the management of the livestock authorized to graze under this grazing permit/lease.
6. The permittee's/lessee's grazing case file is available for public inspection as required by the Freedom of Information Act.
7. In accordance with 43 CFR 4130.8-1(F): Failure to pay grazing bills within 15 days of the due date specified in the bill shall result in a late fee assessment. Payment made later than 15 days after the due date, shall include the appropriate late fee assessment. Failure to make payment within 30 days may be a violation of 43 CFR Sec. 4140.1(b) (1) and shall result in action by the authorized officer under 43 CFR Secs. 4150.1 and 4160.1-2 (Trespass).
8. Maintenance of all structural rangeland improvements (RI) and other projects are the responsibility of the permittee to which they have been assigned. Maintenance would be in accordance with cooperative agreements and/or range improvement permits (43 CFR 4120.3-1). Failure to maintain assigned projects in a satisfactory/functional condition may result in withholding authorization to graze livestock until

maintenance is completed. Construction of new RI on BLM administered lands is prohibited without approval from the authorized officer.

9. The permittee shall submit an Actual Use form within 15 days after completing their annual grazing use as outlined in 43 CFR 4130.3-2(d).
10. Permittees or leasees shall provide reasonable access across private and leased lands to the Bureau of Land Management for the orderly management and protection of the public lands related to grazing administration.
11. This permit is subject to change if results from a land health assessment conclude that the Standards for Rangeland Health are not being met and livestock grazing is determined to be the cause.
12. It is the responsibility of the Permittee to inform all persons associated with work on federal lands subject to the permit that they would be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts.
13. Surface disturbing range improvements associated with the allotment (e.g., fences, ponds) are subject to compliance requirements under Section 106 and will undergo standard cultural resources inventory and evaluation procedures.
14. If newly discovered cultural resources are identified during project implementation, work in that area should stop and the BLM Authorized Officer should be notified immediately (36 CFR 800.13).
15. Notify the AO by telephone and with written confirmation, immediately upon discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Activities would stop in the immediate area of the find, and the discovery would be protected for 30 days or until notified to proceed in writing by the AO.
16. Grazing management as detailed in this Environmental Assessment would become a condition of the Terms and Conditions.

Allotment Summary:

Allotment	Federal Acres	BLM AUMs		
		Active	Suspended	Total
Garr Mesa	6,225	351	0	351

LAND USE PLAN (LUP) CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The proposed action is subject to the following plan:

PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The Proposed Action is subject to and has been reviewed for conformance with (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM 1617.3) the following plan:

Name of Plan: GRAND JUNCTION Resource Management Plan

Date Approved: January 1987

Decision Number/Page: 2-17

Decision Language: Manage livestock grazing as described in the Grand Junction Grazing Management Environmental Statement using the new priorities and general management categories established through the allotment categorization process and this plan.

REVIEW OF EXISTING NEPA DOCUMENTS:

List by name and date all existing NEPA documents that cover the Proposed Action.

Name of Document

EA #DOI-BLM-CO-130-2010-69-EA-Garr Mesa Permit Renewal

Date Approved: July 26, 2010

NEPA ADEQUACY CRITERIA:

1. Is the Proposed Action substantially the same action and at the site specifically analyzed in an existing document? The Permit to be issued has exactly the same grazing schedules and permit requirements as analyzed in the existing document.
2. Was a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Action analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s), and does that range and analysis appropriately consider current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values? A reasonable range of alternatives were analyzed considering current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values.
3. Does the information or circumstances upon which the existing NEPA document(s) are based remain valid and germane to the Proposed Action? The information is valid and germane to the proposed action. This allotment was reviewed in 2010 prior to permit renewal.
4. Is the analysis still valid in light of new studies or resource assessment information? Most recent monitoring information combined with the assessment or resource conditions found that the previous analysis in 2010 was acceptable and no new information has come forward.

5. Does the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the Proposed Action? The methodology and analytical approach used in the 2010 document was completely appropriate for development of the proposed action.
6. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the Proposed Action unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document? The direct and indirect impacts are unchanged from the existing NEPA document in that maintaining the same grazing schedules and Permit terms and conditions maintain consistency.
7. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? The cumulative impacts remain unchanged. The parent document found the proposed action, when taken into account with other actions, past and present, would have no additive impact to the environment.
8. Is the public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the Proposed Action? Public involvement was conducted along with interagency review. This review was adequate for the Proposed Action.

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW: Team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet found no additional concerns or impacts from the previous analysis.

NAME OF PREPARER: Scott Clarke RMS

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Collin Ewing

DATE: 12/15/11

CONCLUSION

DOI-BLM-CO-130-2012-0009-DNA

The transfer of the grazing preference from the Hitchborn Estate to Three Springs Ranch is categorically excluded from documentation in a EA or EIS under 516 DM 11.9 D. 1. The proposed action to issue a grazing permit to Three Springs Ranch conforms to the land use plan and the NEPA documentation previously prepared fully analyzed the impacts of grazing under this preference and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the land use plan and that the NEPA documentation previously prepared fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that either the proposal does not conform with the land use plan, or that additional NEPA analysis is needed.

SIGNATURE OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:


GRAND JUNCTION, Field Manager

DATE SIGNED:

12/15/11

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.