

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
Grazing Lease Transfer and Renewal for Cross Creek Allotment**

PREPARING OFFICE

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management



**Determination of NEPA Adequacy
(DNA)
Grazing Lease Transfer and Renewal for Cross
Creek Allotment**

DOI-BLM-CO-F02-2014-0064 DNA

**Prepared by
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Canon City, CO**

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) 1

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Grazing Lease Transfer and Renewal for Cross Creek Allotment

This page intentionally
left blank

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: RGFO LLCOF02000

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-CO-F02-2014-064 DN

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: Grazing Record # 0505312 (James and Lisa Paine) and Grazing Record# 0504989 (B. Adam and Sharon Terrell)

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Range – Grazing Lease Transfer and Renewal for Cross Creek Allotment #05115

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T13S, R73W, Sec 30 — Public Acres: 80

APPLICANT: B. Adam and Sharon Terrell

A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The proposed action is to transfer the authorization to graze livestock on public lands included in the Cross Creek Allotment. The new lease/permit will expire after ten years. Grazing use on the allotment will remain as previously scheduled. There will be no changes in livestock numbers; authorized grazing dates and times; authorized levels of use; or terms and conditions.

The allotment has undergone internal interdisciplinary team review through Public Land Health Assessments conducted in 2006. The allotment is currently meeting public land health standards. In addition, the allotment was analyzed for permit renewal under BLM-CO-200-2007-0058 EA, conducted in September, 2007.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

LUP Name: Royal Gorge Resource Management Plan	Date Approved: 05/13/1996
Other Document: Final Livestock Grazing EIS	Date Approved: 1995
Other Document	Date Approved

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):4-2, 4-4, C-30, & C-44

Decision Language:

4-2: Season of use and stocking rates will continue based on the Grazing EIS and vegetation monitoring.

4-4: Grazing is authorized on 49 allotments.

C-30: Base livestock grazing management on the 1981 Royal Gorge Area Grazing Environmental Impact Statement. Continue to use allotment management plans (AMPs) on an interim basis until replaced with IAPs.

C-44: On single pasture allotments with season long spring/summer grazing, utilization will be held to the 40 to 60 percent range on forage species in lieu of a rest standard. This requirement will be on high elevation allotments where deferment or dormant season use is impractical because of deep snow and fencing the allotment into smaller units is uneconomical.

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.

BLM-CO-200-2007-0058 EA Term Grazing Lease Renewal

Date Approved: September 18, 2007.

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).

Public Land Health Assessment 2006

Date Approved: September, 2006

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?

The Proposed Action is substantially the same action and at the site specifically analyzed in the existing NEPA documents. Grazing use on the allotments will remain as previously scheduled. There will be no changes in livestock numbers; authorized grazing dates and times; authorized levels of use; or terms and conditions.

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 value?

Yes. The RMP/EIS and EA considered a range of alternatives. The existing EA for permit renewal was conducted in 2007 and continues to be appropriate for current conditions. The EA included a proposed action alternative, a no action alternative, and a no grazing alternative that were analyzed in the document. The proposed action is described in this document. The no action alternative was analyzed as the “current management” of the allotments in the previous EA with no changes in terms and conditions. The no grazing alternative was analyzed as removal of livestock grazing from the allotment. No new environmental conditions or change in resource values have arisen that would invalidate those alternatives analyzed.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard 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?

Yes. The previous information and circumstances and analysis are still valid in light of the 2006 Health Assessment, and no new issues concerning grazing have arisen on this allotment. Also, the EA was recently completed.

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?

Yes. The impacts remain unchanged. Those impacts, including cumulative impacts, normally associated with livestock grazing are mitigated through monitoring of land health standards.

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

Yes. Extensive scoping and public involvement occurred in the RMP/EIS. Also, scoping occurred during the recent permit renewal.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Note

Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

REMARKS:

Cultural Resources:

Although cultural resources were found near the area of potential effect [see report CR-RG-14-130 (P)], no sites determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) were found. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on any historic properties (those eligible for the NRHP).

Native American Religious Concerns:

No possible traditional cultural properties were located during the cultural resources inventory (see above). There is no other known evidence that suggests the project area holds special significance for Native Americans.

Threatened and Endangered Species: There are no records of any federally listed or BLM sensitive species within or near the project area. The Proposed Action will not result in impacts to TES species.

MITIGATION:

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 requirement of NEPA.

Christine Cloninger

Signature of Project Lead

Melissa K.S. Garcia

Signature of Supervisor

/s/ Martin Weimer

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Signature of the Responsible Official

Date

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 process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.