

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

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

---

**Note:** The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.

**A. BLM Office:** Klamath Falls R.A. OR-014      **Lease/Serial/Case File No.**

**Proposed Action Title/Type:** East Branch Lost River Riparian Fencing

**Location of Proposed Action:** East Branch Lost River downstream of Willow Valley Reservoir. T41S, R14E, Sec. 13, 23, 24 and T41S, R14½, Sec. 19. See the attached maps for more specific locations. All of the project would be in the Willow Valley grazing allotment, #00890.

**Description of the Proposed Action:** Fencing designed to exclude livestock would be constructed at the location listed above. Recent management activities in the riparian area of the stream have included juniper removal. Fencing would be constructed to determine if riparian vegetation recovery after the juniper removal is enhanced by the removal of livestock grazing. The fencing would be built to exclude livestock from the stream and adjacent riparian areas. Most of the fence would be small sections to close off gaps in the rim rock along the creek. The fence design would consist of 3 upper strands of barbed wire and 1 bottom strand of smooth wire (at 18" height to allow wildlife passage) with steel line posts at varied spacing. Rock cribs and tree scabs would be used for end, corner, and stress panels. Creek crossings would consist of removable panel sections. For 2004, approximately 0.6 miles of creek downstream from Willow Valley reservoir would be protected. The fencing would mainly be short stretches to close gaps in the rim rock. The remainder of the creek, approximately 2.0 miles would remain unfenced in 2004. Additional fencing may be built in future years.

### **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 KFRA RMP/EIS provides for 4 miles of new fence in the Willow Valley allotment. This is shown on page H-68 of Appendix H of the KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS under **Potential Range Improvements by Allotment**. To date, approximately 1.5 miles of fence have been planned for construction in the allotment. This proposed project would be for approximately 2.5 miles of fence.
- The ROD/RMP/RPS states on page 62, **Grazing Management, Objectives**, “Provide for rangeland improvement projects and management practices, consistent with other objectives and land use allocations”.
- The ROD/RMP/RPS states on page 63, **Grazing Management, Management Actions/Direction**, “Construct rangeland improvements as needed to support achievement of management objectives. Rangeland improvements may include, but are not limited to fence and reservoir construction, spring developments, vegetation manipulation, and prescribed burns. See Appendix H for a listing of proposed rangeland improvements, for each grazing allotment, predicted to be necessary at this time”.
- The ROD/RMP/RPS states in **Appendix H – Grazing Management and Rangeland Program Summary** on page H-76, **Grazing in Riparian-Wetland Areas, Management Actions/Direction**, “In general, the most successful strategies for protecting or restoring these areas incorporate one or more of the following features:
  - ◆ fencing or herding of livestock out of riparian areas for as long as necessary to allow vegetation to recover;
  - ◆ permanently excluding livestock from those riparian-wetland areas that are at high risk and have poor recovery potential, and where there is no practical way to protect them while grazing adjacent uplands.”

**C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

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)**

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 standards assessment and determinations, and monitoring reports).

No information found

#### **D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?**

The proposed action is consistent with and the same as the grazing management identified in Appendix H of the KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS under **Potential Range Improvements by Allotment**. The KFRA RMP/EIS provides for 4 miles of new fence in the Willow Valley allotment. This is shown on page H-68 of Appendix H of the KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS.

**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 alternatives analyzed in the RMP/EIS. These are summarized in table S-1 Comparisons of Allocations and Management by Alternatives, pages 18-50 and in table S-2 Summary of Environmental Consequences by Alternatives, pages 52-53. 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?**

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 documents noted above. The following was found:

The existing analysis performed in the LUP sited in B. above is still considered valid at this time.

A cultural resource survey and a botanical resource survey of the areas would be completed prior to any construction activities. Modifications to the proposed action may be done based upon the findings of these surveys.

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

The RMP was approved in 1995 and prepared under the guidance provided by BLM planning regulations issued under the authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) and in conformance with regulations established by the Council on Environmental Quality regarding the preparation of Environmental Impact Statements as required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970 (NEPA). This guidance is currently considered appropriate.

**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 essentially the same action as was analyzed by the existing NEPA documents cited throughout this document. No new information has been discovered that would indicate that the previous analysis of impacts would change substantially.

**6. Are 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 cumulative impacts of the proposed action are essentially the same as those analyzed in the NEPA documents cited throughout this document. No new impacts would result from the proposed action that has not already been analyzed.

**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.

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

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Dana Eckard	Rangeland Management Specialist
Lou Whiteaker	Botanist
Tim Canaday	Archaeologist
Mike Turaski	Hydrologist
Steve Hayner	Wildlife Biologist
Scott Snedaker	Fisheries Biologist
Todd Forbes	Acting Branch Chief

**Conclusion**

X 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.

*/s/ Jon Raby*

Manager

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.