



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Colorado River Valley Field Office
2300 River Frontage Road
Silt, Colorado 81652
www.co.blm.gov

DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY

NUMBER: DOI-BLM-CO-N040-2012-0005-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional): 0507713

PROJECT NAME: Livestock Grazing Permit Renewal on the Upper Garfield Common (08222) and the Alkali Creek (08214) Allotments

PLANNING UNIT: Garfield County

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T6S R90W Sec 15, 21, 22, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34; T6S R91W Sec 25 & 36; T7S R90W Sec 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 16 & 17; T7S R91W Sec 12 & 13. – Upper Garfield (08222) and Alkali Creek (08214) allotments; Refer to attached allotment map.

APPLICANT: Grazing Permittee

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (optional):

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: The Proposed Action is to renew a term grazing permit for the above applicant. The number/kind of livestock, period of use, percent public land and Animal Unit Months (AUMs) will remain the same as the previous permit. The permit will be issued for a 10-year period, unless the base property is leased for less, but for purposes of the DNA, we are assuming 10 years of grazing by this or another applicant (in case of transfer). The proposed actions are in accordance with 43 CFR 4130.2. The tables below summarize the scheduled grazing use and grazing preference for the permit.

Mandatory Terms and Conditions **Scheduled Grazing Use:**

Operator No.	Allotment Name & No.	Livestock No. & Kind	Period of use	Percent Public Land	AUMs
0507713	Upper Garfield (08222)	181 Cattle	06/01 – 10/10	100	785
0507713	Alkali Creek(08214)	74 Cattle	06/01 – 08/15	100	185

Grazing Preference AUMS:

Operator No.	Allotment Name & No.	Active	Suspended	Total
0507713	Upper Garfield (08222)	785	0	785
0507713	Alkali Creek (08214)	75	0	185

The following other terms and conditions will be carried forward on the renewed permit:

- Average utilization levels by livestock should not exceed 50% by weight on key grass species and 40% of the key browse species current year's growth at the end of the growing season. Application of this term may be flexible to recognize livestock management that includes sufficient opportunity for regrowth, spring growth prior to grazing, or growing season deferment. Grazing in riparian areas by livestock should leave an average minimum 4-inch stubble height of herbaceous vegetation and will not exceed an average utilization of 40% of the current year growth for browse species. Livestock will be moved to another portion of the allotment, moved to the next scheduled pasture, or removed immediately from the allotment when the above utilization levels occur.
- There are five pastures on the Upper Garfield Allotment, North, South, Baldy, Belodi and Belodi Riparian. The operator agrees to a specific grazing system in which cattle are rotated amongst five different pastures of the allotment during the use period. Periods of use in each grazing area is not to exceed a period of 45 days on the North, South, Baldy and Belodi pastures and not more than 10 days on the Belodi Riparian Pasture.
- Maintenance of range improvements is required and shall be in accordance with all approved cooperative agreements and range improvement permits. Maintenance shall be completed prior to turnout. Maintenance activities shall be restricted to the footprint (previously disturbed area) of the project as it existed when it was initially constructed. The Bureau of Land Management shall be given 48 hours advance notice of any maintenance work that will involve heavy equipment. Disturbed areas will be reseeded with a certified weed-free seed mixture of native species adapted to the site.¹
- The permittee and all persons associated with grazing operations must be informed that any person who injures, destroys, excavates, appropriates or removes any historic or prehistoric ruin, artifact, object of antiquity, Native American remains, Native American cultural item, or archaeological resources on public lands is subject to arrest and penalty of law. If in connection with allotment operations under this authorization any of the above resources are encountered, the proponent shall immediately suspend all activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery that might further disturb such materials and notify the BLM authorized officer of the findings. The discovery must be protected until further notified in writing to proceed by the authorized officer.

¹ This term and condition has been modified from the previous version to help ensure resource protection when heavy equipment is utilized.

- If an assessment of rangeland health results in a determination that changes are necessary in order to comply with the standards for public land health and guidelines for livestock grazing management in Colorado, this lease will be reissued subject to revised terms and conditions.

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

Name of Plan: Glenwood Springs Resource Management Plan

Date Approved: Jan. 1984, revised 1988, amended in November 1991 - Oil and Gas Leasing and Development - Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement; amended Nov. 1996 - Colorado Standards and Guidelines; amended in August 1997 - Castle Peak Travel Management Plan; amended in March 1999 - Oil and Gas Leasing & Development Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement; amended in November 1999 - Red Hill Plan Amendment; and amended in September 2002 – Fire Management Plan for Wildland Fire Management and Prescriptive Vegetation Treatment Guidance; amended in September 2009.

- The Proposed Action is in conformance with the LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

Decision Language: The action is in conformance with Administrative Actions (pg. 5) and Livestock Grazing Management (pg. 20). Administrative actions states, “Various types of actions will require special attention beyond the scope of this plan. Administrative actions are the day-to-day transactions required to serve the public and to provide optimal use of the resources. These actions are in conformance with the plan”. The livestock grazing management objective as amended states, “To provide 56,885 animal unit months of livestock forage commensurate with meeting public land health standards.”

- 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):

REVIEW OF EXISTING NEPA DOCUMENTS:

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

Name of Document(s): DOI-BLM-CO-N040-2009-0068, Grazing Permit Renewal on the Upper Garfield Common and Alkali Creek allotments, Case-file numbers: 0507713

Date Approved: April 4, 2009.

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

Name of Document: Determination Document for Assessment of Divide Creek Landscape.

Date Approved: June 1, 2010.

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: Yes. The current Proposed Action was analyzed in the above mentioned Environmental Assessment. The proposed action is the same action analyzed in the existing document.

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 existing NEPA document analyzed the proposed action. No unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources were identified through public scoping; therefore, other alternatives were not analyzed. The same applies to the current proposed action given current concerns, interests, and resource values.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. In 2009, a formal land health assessment determined that the allotment was meeting all applicable land health standards. Trend photos and utilization studies were conducted in 2009 and 2010. New information does not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action.

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 current Proposed Action is the same as what was analyzed in the existing NEPA document. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts would be the same as those identified in the existing NEPA document. The environmental assessment thoroughly reviewed the many specific

environmental impacts including vegetation, water resources, air quality, wildlife, cultural, threatened and endangered species, wilderness, and riparian resources.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. For the existing NEPA document, notices of public scoping were issued through Colorado BLM's internet web page seeking public comments on grazing permit/lease renewals. No comments specific to the new proposed action were received.

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
Monte Senor	Rangeland Management Specialist	NEPA Lead, Range Management Invasive, Non-native Species
Pauline Adams	Hydrologist	Air Quality, Water Quality, Soils, Riparian and Wetlands
Carla DeYoung	Ecologist	ACEC, Vegetation, T/E/S Plants, Land Heath Stds
Greg Wolfgang	Outdoor Recreation Planner	VRM, Recreation, Travel Management
Kimberly Miller	Outdoor Recreation Planner	WSR, Wilderness, Recreation
Erin Leifeld	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns
Brian Hopkins	Wildlife Biologist	Migratory Birds, Terrestrial & Aquatic Wildlife, T/E/S Terrestrial & Aquatic Wildlife

REMARKS: None

MITIGATION: : The “Other Terms and Conditions” identified in the new proposed action are substantially the same mitigation measures that were approved in the existing NEPA document.

COMPLIANCE PLAN (optional):

NAME OF PREPARER: Monte Senor


DATE: 12/05/2011

CONCLUSION

DOI-BLM-CO-N040-2012-0005-DNA

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.


SIGNATURE OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:


Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist

DATE SIGNED: 12-14-2011

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.

Upper Garfield Common (08222)



Alkali Creek (08214)

