

Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

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

A. Describe the Proposed Action

The proposed action is the reissuance of a Section 15 grazing lease for the Dixie allotment, #00107 in accordance with 43 CFR §4100.0-8, §4110.1, §4110.3, §4130.2, and §4130.3. The allotment is located north of the Klamath River in southern Klamath County (see attached map). The current lessee, Jerry Barry, owns the base property for the lease.

The current lease authorizes use by 91 cattle from 5/01 to 9/15 for a total of 413 AUMs. The new lease would authorize use by 91 cattle from 5/01 to 8/15 for a total of 320 AUMs. In addition, the lessee would be required to begin moving cattle out of the Long Prairie Creek area in early July and to have them completely out of this area by July 15. The fenced riparian areas at Dixie Spring and Wild Gal Spring would continue to be closed to livestock grazing. The proposed action was discussed with the lessee at a meeting on 2/28/2000. The proposed AUMs, season of use, and herding requirements were agreed to. The term of the renewed lease would be 3/01/2003 to 2/28/2013, as required by 43 CFR §4130.2(d)(3) of the current grazing regulations. The lease would be issued to Jerry Barry.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: **Klamath Falls Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (KFRA RMP/EIS dated September 1994)**

Date Approved: **June 1995 via the Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary (KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS)**

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

- The ROD/RMP/RPS states on page 62, Grazing Management, Objectives, “Provide for livestock grazing in an environmentally sensitive manner, consistent with other objectives and land use allocations. Resolve resource conflicts and concerns and insure that livestock grazing use is consistent with the objectives and direction found in Appendix H (Grazing Management)”.

- The ROD/RMP/RPS states on page 62, Grazing Management, Land Use Allocations, “Provide for initial levels of livestock grazing within the parameters outlined, by allotment, in Appendix H”.
- The ROD/RMP/RPS states on page 62, Grazing Management, Management Action/Directions, General, “Adjust grazing use (including, but not limited to, changes in season-of-use, kinds and classes of livestock, numbers of animals, grazing capacity, management facilities needed) based on and supported by the ongoing range land studies performed in accordance with the above guidance. Review the results of these studies by an interdisciplinary team of resource specialists through the allotment evaluation process. Recommend future management actions (in consultation, coordination, and cooperation with the affected interests) to the Area Manager for review, modification, and/or approval. When necessary, implement changes in permitted use through written agreement or decision.”
- The ROD/RMP/RPS lists the grazing parameters for the Dixie allotment on pages H-9 and H-10 of Appendix H. The parameters shown here are 415 AUMs of use from 5/15 – 9/15. The proposed action would be a reduction in this level of use following the analysis process outlined on pages H-70 to H-74.

C. Identify applicable 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.

Klamath Falls Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (KFRA RMP/EIS dated September 1994) approved via the June 1995 Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary (KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS)

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard’s assessment and determinations, and monitoring reports).

Topsy/Pokegama Landscape Analysis, July 1996

Dixie Allotment (#107), Rangeland Health Standards Assessment, September 28, 2001.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

The proposed action is consistent with and the same as the grazing management identified in the RMP/EIS Preferred Alternative except that the season of use and total

allowable AUMs is different as outlined under A and B above. The new grazing lease parameters, however, fall within the parameters defined by the RMP/EIS. Environmental impacts of grazing, for all allotments, is found in Chapter 4 - "Environmental Consequences" (4-1 through 4-143) of the RMP/EIS.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

The proposed action lies within the range of various alternatives analyzed in the KFRA RMP/EIS (summarized in table S-1 "Comparisons of Allocations and Management by Alternative", pages 18-50 and in table S-2 "Summary of Environmental Consequences by Alternative", pages 52-53). This array and range of alternatives included the No Action alternative (status quo); five other alternatives (A through E) that covered a span of management from a strong emphasis on commodities production to a strong emphasis on resource protection/preservation; and the PRMP that emphasizes a balanced approach of producing an array of socially valuable products within the concept of ecosystem management. Since this plan is relatively recent, it more than adequately reflects "current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values".

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

A review was conducted to determine if any new information, studies, and analyses were available that would provide data that would materially differ from the data in the earlier analyses performed in the RMP, ROD, FEIS, and DEIS documents noted above. The following was found:

- A Rangeland Health Standards Assessment was completed for this allotment on 9/28/01. This assessment of monitoring data and other information lead to management recommendations and the proposed action described above. The lessee agreed to implement the proposed action during a documented meeting on 2/28/02. The proposed action of a reduction in use on the allotment would not materially differ from the data analyzed in the NEPA documents cited above in **B.** and **C.**

The existing analysis and subsequent conclusions in the LUP are still considered valid at this time, including the described and analyzed livestock grazing impacts. It is thus reasonable to conclude that the new information is insignificant with regard to the analysis of the proposed action (lease re-issuance), which falls within the parameters previously analyzed in the LUP.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

The KFRA RMP/EIS, and subsequent ROD/RMP/RPS, designated domestic livestock grazing as a principle or major use for this allotment under the principle of multiple use on a sustained yield basis in accordance with FLPMA. The development of the Proposed Resource Management Plan in the RMP/EIS, as adjusted or affirmed by the ROD/RMP/RPS, meets NEPA standards for impact analysis. The methodology and analyses employed in the RMP/EIS are still considered valid as this planning effort is relatively recent (ROD – June 1995) and considered up to date procedurally. The plan is also “maintained” regularly to keep it current by incorporating new information, updating for new policy and procedures, and correcting errors as they are found. In addition, all rangeland monitoring, studies, and survey methods utilized in the resource area prior to and during the planning process continue to be accepted (or required) BLM methods and procedures.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

The proposed action is consistent with the impact analysis in the KFRA RMP/EIS, as affirmed or adjusted by the ROD/RMP/RPS. The impacts of livestock grazing were analyzed in most of the major sections of Chapter 4 - Environmental Consequences (pages 4-1 through 4-143) in the RMP/EIS. No new information has come to light since completion of the plan that would indicate that the previously analyzed direct and indirect impacts of maximum grazing use would be substantially different than that analyzed. The point of the proposed action is to adjust the grazing use so that LUP objectives are met.

The details of the proposed action were adequately covered in Appendix H – *Grazing Management and Rangeland Program Summary* (page H-9) of the KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS via allotment specific objectives. During the pre-RMP process in 1990-91, a series of IDT meetings were held to specifically address the formulation of objectives for every grazing allotment in the KFRA. These objectives were based on the monitoring (or related) data collected, past allotment categorization efforts (1982, as subsequently revised), as well as professional judgment based on field observations up to that time. Five “Identified Resource Conflicts/Concerns” was listed for Dixie, with the accompanying “Management Objectives”; the three livestock pertinent ones follow:

Identified Resources Conflicts/Concerns

Management Objectives

Under current management the range condition, level or pattern of utilization, and/or season of use may be unacceptable; or carrying capacity may be exceeded.

Maintain or improve rangeland condition and productivity through a change in grazing management practices, timing, and/or level of active use.

Critical deer winter range occurs in allotment.

Management systems should reflect the importance of deer winter range.

Riparian or aquatic habitat is in less than good habitat condition.

Improve and maintain riparian or aquatic habitat in good or better habitat condition.

The specific rationales supporting these objectives are recorded in IDT notes for the Dixie allotment dated December 15, 1990. The grazing management changes proposed and covered by this DNA for the Dixie grazing lease are not only consistent with the above objectives, but also required to meet these LUP objectives. Based on current information and knowledge, this NEPA “adequacy” question must be answered in the affirmative because the direct and indirect impacts of revising and re-issuing this grazing lease are unchanged from that identified in the LUP, are adequately analyzed, and are adequately site-specific.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

The proposed action as analyzed in the PRMP of the KFRA RMP/EIS, as affirmed or adjusted by the ROD/RMP/RPS, would not change analysis of cumulative impacts. Any adverse cumulative impacts are the same as and within the parameters of those identified and accepted in that earlier planning effort for this allotment’s grazing use, since all portions of the proposed action were specifically analyzed in the RMP/EIS. In addition, the analyses in the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Plan (ICBEMP) have not indicated any cumulative impacts beyond those anticipated in the earlier analyses. (In addition, the ICBEMP, due to its regional approach, does not have the specificity of the RMP.)

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

The public involvement associated with the NEPA documents referenced above is outlined on pages R-7 and R-8 of the KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS under Public Involvement. This effort was in conformance with NEPA and FLPMA and is still considered adequate for the proposed action.

All publics/agencies have also been kept informed of plan implementation through periodic planning update reports (i.e. May 1995, October 1997, February 1999, July 2000, and August 2002). These planning updates, or Annual Program Summaries as they are now called, include information on range program and project accomplishments, updates to the RPS, monitoring accomplishment reports, planned activities for the upcoming year, allotment evaluation and Standards and Guidelines assessments scheduling, and other information necessary to allow for adequate public involvement opportunities.

One group, Friends of the Greensprings, requested specific public involvement – or “interested public” status – for this allotment under the grazing regulations at 43 CFR 4100.0-5. They have been recognized as such since April 1994. They have been and will continue to be kept informed of all grazing related actions relative to the Dixie allotment as copies of the documentation covering these actions are mailed to them. The grazing

lessee (Jerry Barry) is granted automatic status.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet.

Klamath Falls Resource Area, Oregon

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Dana Eckard	Rangeland Management Specialist/author
Bill Lindsey	Rangeland Management Specialist/author

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 NEPA

Note: If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.

Jeresa A Lamb
Manager

Feb 21, 2003
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.

DNA # 03-03

Klamath Falls Resource Area Project Proposal Routing Slip for Internal Review

Project Name: DNA - Dixie Allotment Lease Re Issue Date Initiated: 12-30-02

Resource or Staff Responsible	Review Priority	Preliminary Review Date/Initials	Comments Attached/Incorporated	Final Review Date/Initials
Manager: Teri Raml	Last			TR
Branch Chief: Barbara Ditman	Second to Last		(SEE NOTE ATTACHED)	BD 1/17/03
Branch Chief: Larry Frazier				
Branch Chief: Mel Crockett				
Planner/EC: Don Hoffheins Kathy Lindsey	Third from Last			KL 1/13/03
Range: Bill Lindsey Range: Dana Eckard		BL 12/31/02 DE 12/31/02		BL 12/31/02 DE 1/21/03
Wild Horses: Tonya Pinckney				
Fire/Air Quality: Joe Foran				
Silviculture: Bill Johnson				
Timber: Mike Bechdolt				
Botany/ACEC/Sensitive Plants/Noxious Weeds: Lou Whiteaker		1/10/03 JW	No new information since Assessment	1/10/03 JW
Soils: T. Cutler				
Cultural: Tim Canaday		1/13/03 TC	No survey needed as long as there are no improvements/ground disturbance	1/13/03 TC
Lands/Realty/Minerals/HazMat: Tom Cottingham				
Recreation/Visuals/Wilderness: Scott Senter				
Hydrology/Riparian: Mike Turaski				
Wildlife/T&E: Gayle Sitter		GS 1/07/03	None	1/13/03
Fisheries/T&E: Scott Snedaker				
W&S Rivers: Grant Weidenbach				
Engineering: Brian McCarty				
Clearances/Surveys	Needed	Done/Attached	*This document will not sit on your desk for more than 8 hours **Some resource areas may not apply for all projects. If so, just mark "N/A" and date reviewed.	
Cultural	No TC 1/13/03			
Botanical	No JW 1/19/03			
T&E, BA & or Consultation				
404 Permit				
R-O-W Permits				