

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

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

OFFICE: Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument LLMTL07000

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM MT-MTL070-2014-0012-DNA

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Schwenke Pipeline Reroute/Range Improvement

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Antelope Creek Grazing Allotment #05610, T23N R22E Section 11 NE¼SE¼, MPM, Phillips County, Montana.

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The applicant has proposed a minor re-route on the approved Schwenke Pipeline project. The re-route would change the location of a spur water line to a livestock tank. The alternative proposed by the applicant reduces the amount of pipeline trenching by approximately 470 feet and avoids trenching the pipeline up a steep slope with undisturbed native vegetation and Wyoming big sagebrush that would be visible from other open roads in the area.

Pipeline will be trenched in and installed in the same manner as the rest of the approved pipeline.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name*: UMRBNM RMP

Date Approved 2008

- ✓ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

UMRBNM RMP - Record of Decision, December 2008: page 50, Livestock Grazing: Implementation. *New range improvements (primarily reservoirs, other water facilities, fences and land treatments) could be built to support activity plans, enhance Monument resources, or meet overall management goals.*

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Antelope Creek Grazing Allotment #05610 Grazing Permit Modification Environmental Assessment #DOI-BLM-MT-L070-2010-0008-EA.

The EA analyzed four alternatives including Alternative C (Manage Livestock Grazing with Allowable Use Levels) which included the extension of the Schwenke Pipeline. *To influence livestock distribution and reach a more uniform use of forage, Schwenke Pipeline would be extended 7.2 miles and six stock tanks installed on public land. The pipeline route follows and is*

within the width of existing roads and vehicle trails. Pipeline construction would consist of ripping 1 ½ to 2 inch, flexible, polyethylene pipe to a depth of five or six feet (EA, page39).

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?

YES, the action is the same action as analyzed in the Antelope Creek Grazing Allotment #05610 Grazing Permit Modification Environmental Assessment #DOI-BLM-MT-L070-2010-0008-EA. The FONSI for this EA was signed on 4/23/2012, and the Proposed Decision selecting Alternative C was issued on 4/25/2012. No protests were received in response to the proposed decision which became final on 5/10/2012. No appeals were received on the final decision which was implemented on 6/9/2012.

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?

YES, all reasonable alternatives, including a No Action and a No Grazing alternative were analyzed.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, 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, there are no new circumstances that would require a substantial change in the analysis needed to conduct the proposed action. Mitigations and design features included in the Antelope Creek Grazing Allotment #05610 Grazing Permit Modification Environmental Assessment #DOI-BLM-MT-L070-2010-0008-EA were designed to eliminate and reduce effects on the natural and human environment.

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, BLM's NEPA responsibilities are being met, and the methodology and analytical approach are fully adequate. Direct, indirect, and cumulative effects are essentially the same as analyzed by the Antelope Creek Grazing Allotment #05610 Grazing Permit Modification Environmental Assessment #DOI-BLM-MT-L070-2010-0008-EA.

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

Yes, public and interagency review solicited during the preparation Antelope Creek Grazing Allotment #05610 Grazing Permit Modification Environmental Assessment #DOI-BLM-MT-L070-2010-0008-EA.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Ben Hileman	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range Resources
Mark Schaefer	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation/Special Management Designations/VRM
Jody Peters	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife/T&E/Migratory birds/Fisheries
Zane Fulbright	Archaeologist	Archaeology and Paleontology
Josh Sorlie	Soil Scientist	Soils
Chad Krause	Hydrologist	Floodplains, Water Quality, Wetland and Riparian Areas
Dan Brunkhorst	NEPA Coordinator	NEPA/Environmental Review
Kenneth Keever	Natural Resource Specialist	Noxious & Invasive Species/Project Lead

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.

F. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures and design features would be the same as those listed in the Antelope Creek Grazing Allotment #05610 Grazing Permit Modification Environmental Assessment #DOI-BLM-MT-L070-2010-0008-EA, page 8, section 2.1 - Features Common to All Alternatives.

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 the NEPA.

 11/20/15

Signature of Project Lead

 11.24.15

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

 11/24/15

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. 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. A Decision Document may be required (if the Decision Document for the previously-completed action does not apply), consistent with program requirements.