

Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management

A. Background

BLM Office: Prineville District

NEPA Log #: OR-054-08-201

Project/Lease/Serial/Case File #: 3605310

Applicant: Doug Breese

Location: south side of Big Summit Prairie

Proposed Action Title/Type: Grazing Permit Renewal

Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

Renew a ten year grazing permit for Doug Breese on the Grey Prairie/Antler Allotment.
Terms and Conditions will remain the same.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan:

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable plan because it is specifically provided for in the following land use plan decisions:

Two Rivers RMP/ROD, June 1986- Allocate 6 AUM's of forage to livestock (p. 43).
Livestock grazing specific to this allotment is addressed on pages 42 through 49 of this RMP.

Two Rivers RMP, ROD, Rangeland Program Summary, June 1986, page 10, "*Maintain current livestock grazing levels...*" pages 14-16, and pages 42-49.

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

The following NEPA documents (EA, DEIS, FEIS) cover the proposed action:

- Two Rivers Resource Management Plan (RMP) Draft EIS dated 1985 and Final EIS dated 1985
- Rangeland Program Summary Updates, June 1998, August 1997, June 1995, March 1993
- Two Rivers Resource Management Plan, ROD Rangeland Program Summary Evaluation, 1998
- Lower Deschutes River Management Plan Draft EIS, dated May 1991, Final EIS dated January 1993

The following other documentation is relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report):

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 proposed action is essentially the same as those addressed for continued grazing on public land, in four of the five alternatives in the Two Rivers DEIS, pages 58-72, 99-102, 105-107, 117-120 and the Two Rivers FEIS pages 17-20. In addition, it was addressed in three of the four alternatives analyzed in the Lower Deschutes RMP DEIS pages 37-38, 167-194, and 443; and the Lower Deschutes FEIS pages 20-21 and 31-35. The project is located within the same area analyzed in the above mentioned documents.

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. The alternatives in the Two Rivers DEIS ranged from emphasis of commodity production to emphasis of natural values, which included the elimination of livestock grazing. Refer to page ix and 58-72 of the Two Rivers DEIS and pages 5, 17-20 of the Two Rivers FEIS. The Final Lower Deschutes River Management Plan also described a range of alternatives on pages 20-21 and specifically for livestock on pages 31-35. The range of alternatives appears to be appropriate given the current issues.

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

Yes, both the Two Rivers RMP and Lower Deschutes River Management Plan remain valid. Standards and Guides were completed in 2003 and the allotment was found to be meeting all the standards. Nothing will substantially change the analysis of the 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(s)?

Yes. Impacts resulting from grazing are essentially unchanged from those analyzed in the

Two Rivers DEIS, pages 58-72, where it stated grazing would produce a slight short-term negative impact to soils, water quality, vegetation; a beneficial impact on wildlife; and no impact on air quality, water, forestland, recreation; areas of critical concern are visual resources, energy and minerals, or socio-economics. The Two Rivers RMP does not specifically address cumulative impacts of grazing but does address long-term impacts of the action with the assumption that the grazing would continue (impact analysis is on pages 58-72 of Two Rivers DEIS). Recommendations and objectives in the document reflect the impacts and expected improvements that would continue with ongoing grazing. The proposed action is substantially unchanged from the analyzed impacts.

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

Yes. The list of "interested publics" is updated on a regular basis and many of the individuals and organizations on the current "interested publics" list are the same as those on the mailing list for the planning and NEPA documents listed on page 1. A final copy of this DNA and the subsequent Proposed Decision will be posted on the Prineville District's internet page for public review. A printed copy of these documents will be available on request.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency represented</u>
Steve Castillo	Forester	Forestry
Rick Demmer	Natural Resource Specialist	Wildlife
Jeff Moss	Natural Resource Specialist	Fisheries
Cari Johnson	Rangeland Mgmt Specialist	Range
Berry Phelps	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation
John Zancanella	Archeologist	Cultural Resources
JoAnne Armson	Natural Resource Specialist	Botany, Special Status Plants
Michelle McSwain	Hydrologist	Hydrology
Teal Purrington	Planning & Enviro. Coord.	NEPA Compliance

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.

Conclusion

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

Signature

Responsible official: Christina M. Welch
Christina Welch, Central Oregon Resource Area Manager

12.19.2008
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.

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this review, contact: Cari Johnson, Rangeland Management Specialist, Prineville Field Office, 3050 NE 3rd Street, Prineville, OR 97754, telephone (541) 416.6790; cari_johnson@or.blm.gov.

GRAY PRAIRIE

NA

T. 14 S.

Private Land



BLM Land



1 inch = 1 mile

NORTH PASTURE

EAST PASTURE

GRAY PRAIRIE

T. 15 S.


CHOCO


NATIONAL

FOREST

R. 20 E.

R. 21 E.





GRAY PRAIRIE ALLOTMENT

BLM

Gray Prairie
Public Land
Private Land



#2582 **NA**

1 inch = 1 mile