

Posted: _____

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Kremmling Field Office
P.O. Box 68
Kremmling, CO 80459**

DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY

NUMBER: DOI-BLM-CO-120-2010-0004-DNA

PROJECT NAME: Livestock Grazing Permit # 0501801 Renewal and Base Property Lease Renewal for Randy Baumgardner.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Kremmling Field Office (KFO) administered lands include all or part of the following:

Allotment 07511 (Forster B) 3084 acres
T. 2N, R. 77W., 6th PM, Sections 5-8, 17-21, 28, 29
T. 2N, R. 78W., 6th PM, Sections 12, 13

Allotment 07589 (Forster A) 160 acres
T. 2N., R. 77W., 6th PM, Sections 28, 29

APPLICANT: Randy Baumgardner

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: The Proposed Action would renew livestock grazing permit # 0501801 and also renew Randy Baumgardner's base property lease with Deane (Skip) Jacques. Deane Jacques has leased his base property and livestock grazing permit # 0501801 to Randy Baumgardner for a 3 year period from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2011. Also, the 10 year permit expires on February 28, 2010. This DNA would renew both the permit and the lease. A copy of livestock grazing permit # 0501801 is enclosed as Attachment 1. There would be no changes to the number or kind of livestock, season of use, or amount of authorized livestock grazing preference expressed in AUMs (animal unit months*).

* AUM = animal unit month = the amount of forage needed to support one cow and calf for one month.

Livestock grazing permit # 0501801 would authorize livestock grazing to the following extent:

Allotment	Livestock		Season of Use	Percent Public Land	AUMs
	Number	Kind			
07511 Forster B	38	Cattle	6/1 – 9/30	100	152
07589 Forster A	5	Cattle	6/1 – 9/30	100	20

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

Name of Plan: Kremmling Resource Management Plan (RMP), Record of Decision (ROD)

Date Approved: December 19, 1984; Updated February 1999

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):

Decision Language: Objectives of the RMP/ROD include allocation of a base level of livestock forage and maintaining or improving forage production and condition in areas where livestock grazing is a priority or is compatible with the land use priority. Allotment 07589 (Forster A) was designated with a livestock priority. Allotment 07511 (Forster B) was designated with a forest products and livestock priority. Livestock grazing is compatible with these priorities.

REVIEW OF EXISTING NEPA DOCUMENTS:

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

Name of Document:

CO-KRFO-00-10-EA Livestock grazing permit # 0501801 renewal on Allotment 07511 (Forster B) and 07589 (Forster A).

Date Approved: September 27, 2000

Name of Document:

CO-120-2006-45-CE

Transfer of base property and livestock grazing permit # 0501801 from Deane Jacques to Randy Baumgardner.

Date Approved: August 31, 2006

NEPA Adequacy Criteria	Yes	No
<p>1. Is the Proposed Action substantially the same action and at the site specifically analyzed in an existing document?</p> <p>Explanation: The Proposed Action is the same as analyzed in the existing NEPA documents. There would no change to the number or kind of livestock, season of use, or the amount of authorized livestock grazing preference.</p>	X	
<p>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?</p> <p>Explanation: A reasonable range of alternatives was analyzed in the existing NEPA documents.</p>	X	
<p>3. Does the information or circumstances upon which the existing NEPA document(s) are based remain valid and germane to the Proposed Action? Is the analysis still valid in light of new studies or resource assessment information?</p> <p>Explanation: The allotments were determined to be in compliance with the Standards for Public Land Health in Colorado during the 2000 permit renewal process. There have been no changes to the livestock grazing since that time.</p>	X	
<p>4. Does the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the Proposed Action?</p> <p>Explanation: No changes to the methodology and analytical approach have been implemented since the original NEPA documents were approved.</p>	X	
<p>5. Are the direct and indirect impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?</p> <p>Explanation: The direct and indirect impacts would be the same since no changes have been made to the number or kind of livestock, season of use, or amount of authorized livestock grazing preference.</p>	X	
<p>6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation</p>		

of the Proposed Action unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Explanation: Since no changes have been made to the livestock grazing, the cumulative impacts would be the same as those analyzed in the original NEPA documents.	X	
7. Is the public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the Proposed Action? Explanation: The public involvement and interagency review in the existing NEPA documents is adequate for the Proposed Action.	X	

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

Name	Title	Area of Responsibility	Date Review Completed
Bill B. Wyatt	Staff Archaeologist	Archaeology/Tribal Consultation	11/24/09
Megan McGuire	Wildlife Biologist	T&E Species	12/9/2009
Paula Belcher	Hydrologist	Soil, Water, Air, and Riparian	12/16/2009
Frank Rupp	Archaeologist	Paleontology	11/13/2009

REMARKS:

Cultural Resources: All undertakings will require a cultural resource inventory in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Section 106 prior to implementation to determine if historic properties would be affected.

Native American Religious Concerns: Native American consultation will be conducted for each undertaking prior to implementation to identify traditional spiritual places.

Threatened and Endangered Species: The proposed renewal would not impact Endangered, Threatened, or Sensitive Species

MITIGATION: None

COMPLIANCE PLAN: Compliance with the renewed livestock grazing permit and its associated terms and conditions would be accomplished through the Kremmling Field Office Range Management Program. Livestock grazing would be monitored by the range staff and other area personnel, as appropriate, to ensure compliance. The Kremmling Field Office Range Monitoring Plan would be used to schedule periodic utilization checks, collect trend data, and evaluate allotment condition. When activity plans have been developed covering an allotment,

monitoring methods and schedules included in them would be applied to the allotment. Changes would be made to the permit, based on monitoring, when changes are determined necessary to protect land health.

NAME OF PREPARER: Richard Johnson

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Peter A.McFadden

DATE: December 18, 2009

ATTACHMENTS:

Livestock grazing permit # 0501801 with Standard Terms and Conditions

CONCLUSION

DOI-BLM-CO-120-2010-0004-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:

DATE SIGNED:

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.