

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 renewal of a Section 15 grazing lease for the Edge Creek allotment, #00102 in accordance with 43 CFR 4100.0-8, 4110.1, 4130.2, and 4130.3. The allotment is located north of the Klamath River in southern Klamath County (see attached map). PacifiCorp owns the base property for the lease.

The renewed grazing lease would have the same parameters as the expiring lease, use by 43 cattle from 5/1 to 7/15 for a total of 107 AUMs of active and total preference. The term of the renewed lease is 3/01/2001 to 1/09/2004, as required by 43 CFR 4130.2(d)(3) of the current grazing regulations, to coincide with the terms of the base property lease. The lease will be issued to Robert E. Miller, who has a base property lease with PacifiCorp.

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 lists the grazing parameters for the Edge Creek allotment on page L-5 of Appendix L. The listed parameters show an AUM figure for the allotment that is different than the proposed action. The reduced AUM figure for this proposed action reflects use in the Ward Pasture only. Two season of use figures are displayed, the No Action and the PRMP (Proposed Resource Management Plan). The proposed action season of use is the same as the No Action but different from the PRMP season of use. The PRMP season was proposed based upon preliminary interpretation of conditions on the allotment. In order to implement this season of use or a similar one, changes must be based upon an evaluation of monitoring data in an interdisciplinary allotment evaluation or through a Rangeland Health Standards Assessment in accordance with 43 CFR 4180. A Rangeland Health Standards Assessment was completed for this allotment on 9/29/00. The current livestock grazing was found to be meeting the five Standards for Rangeland Health and no changes were recommended.
- 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” .

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., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

Edge Creek Allotment Rangeland Health Standards Assessment, 9/29/00

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 the RMP/EIS Preferred Alternative except that the season of use is different as outlined under B above. 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 alternatives analyzed in the RMP/EIS. These are 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. 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 DEIS documents noted above. The following was found:

- In accordance with 43 CFR 4180, the Klamath Falls Resource Area is in the process of implementing the Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management. A Rangeland Health Standards Assessment was completed on 9/29/00. It was determined that current livestock grazing on the allotment is meeting the 5 Standards for Rangeland Health. No management changes were recommended. The current monitoring studies will continue to provide data for future analyses.

The existing analysis performed in the LUP sited in B. above is still considered valid at this time, including the described/analyzed livestock grazing impacts.

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. In addition, the rangeland inventory and monitoring methods used at the time of the RMP development are still currently approved as being appropriate for the analysis of the proposed action.

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 sited throughout this document. The direct and indirect impacts of livestock grazing on this allotment were analyzed in most of the major sections of Chapter 4 - "Environmental Consequences" in the RMP/EIS. No new information has been discovered that would indicate that the previous analysis of impacts would change substantially.

The details of the proposed action were also covered in Appendix L - Grazing Management, page L-25. On this page, under Identified Resources Conflicts/Concerns was the following: 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. The accompanying Management Objective was: Maintain or improve rangeland condition and productivity through a change in grazing management practices, timing, and/or level of active use. The basis for this objective was based upon professional judgment of conditions in the allotment since no formal monitoring studies have been done in the allotment. The proposed change in the season of use from 5/1 - 7/15 to 5/1 - 7/1 resulted from this objective. As noted above under B., in order to implement this season of use or a similar one, changes must be based upon an evaluation of monitoring data in an interdisciplinary allotment evaluation or through a Rangeland Health Standards Assessment in accordance with 43 CFR 4180. A Rangeland Health

Standards Assessment was completed on 9/29/00. It was determined that current livestock grazing on the allotment is meeting the 5 Standards for Rangeland Health. No management changes were recommended. The current monitoring studies will continue to provide data for future analyses. Thus, the current season of use of 5/1 to 7/15 will continue.

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 have 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. In addition, copies of the Rangeland Health Assessment were mailed to adjacent private landowners and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

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

Klamath Falls Resource Area, Oregon

 Name

 Title

Dana Eckard

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

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.

Tom Raley, District Manager
Manager, Klamath Falls Resource Area

May 30, 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-03-11 Klamath Falls Resource Area Project Proposal Routing Slip for Internal Review

Project Name: Edge Creek Allotment Lease Renewal DNA Date Initiated: 5/6/03

Resource or Staff Responsible	Review Priority	Preliminary Review Date/Initials	Comments Attached/Incorporated	Final Review Date/Initials
Manager:	Last		<i>Looks good!</i>	<i>JR 5/30</i>
Branch Chief: Barbara Ditman	Second to Last		<i>GOOD -</i>	<i>BAL 5/29</i>
Branch Chief: Larry Frazier				
Branch Chief:				
Planner/EC: Don Hoffheins Kathy Lindsey	Third from Last			<i>KL 5/21</i>
Range: Bill Lindsey Range: Dana Eckard				<i>EL 5/17</i>
Wild Horses: Tonya Pinckney				
Fire/Air Quality: Joe Foran				
Silviculture: Bill Johnson				
Timber: Mike Bechdolt				
Botany/ACEC/Sensitive Plants/Noxious Weeds: Lou Whiteaker		<i>5/14/03 JW</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>5/14/03 JW</i>
Soils: T. Cutler				
Cultural: Tim Canaday		<i>5/19/03 TC</i>	<i>If improvements are made by the leaseholder, cultural surveys will be required</i>	<i>TC 5/19/03</i>
Lands/Realty/Minerals/HazMat: Tom Cottingham				
Recreation/Visuals/Wilderness: Scott Senter				
Hydrology/Riparian: Mike Turaski		<i>MFT 5/14/03</i>	<i>NONE</i>	<i>MFT 5/14/03</i>
Wildlife/T&E: Gayle Sitter		<i>GS 5/20/03</i>	<i>NONE</i>	<i>GS 5/20/03</i>
Fisheries/T&E: Scott Snedaker				
W&S Rivers: Grant Weidenbach				
Engineering: Brian McCarty				

Clearances/Surveys	Needed	Done/Attached	<p>*This document will not sit on your desk for more than 8 hours</p> <p>**Some resource areas may not apply for all projects. If so, just mark "N/A" and date reviewed.</p>
Cultural	<i>No - unless improvements are made TC 5/19/03</i>		
Botanical	<i>No JW 5/19/03</i>		
T&E, BA & or Consultation	<i>No GS 5/20/03</i>		
404 Permit			
R-O-W Permits			