

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

BLM proposes to treat the invasive juniper stands in the Lorella area T.39s. R.12e Sections 22,23,26,27. The treatment will include cutting juniper with a large shear. This machine will mechanically sever the tree from its base and move the tree to a pile or lay the tree down so it can be utilized.

The cut juniper will be made available for utilization (Posts , poles, firewood, etc.). The remaining slash will be burned. Treatment areas may be planted with shrubs or grass to restore native plant communities.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name*: *Klamath Falls R.A. 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 applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans and activity, project, management, or program plans, or applicable amendments thereto)

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

The KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS discusses the treatment of encroaching juniper under the wildlife section specifically to improve forage for big game (page 34). Vegetation management is also discussed under the range section (page 63 and Appendix H pages 68-69). The impacts of these treatments were discussed in the RMP/EIS.

The Lorella Project, which is within the Horton Allotment is projected to receive approximately 100 acres of juniper treatment. Recent surveys show the juniper encroachment is more extensive than previously thought. There are 880 public acres within the Horton Allotment. The proposed project will increase the total amount of vegetation management completed to 130 acres within this allotment. The original estimates in the RPS were based on treating 25% of the vegetation in each allotment. The proposed treatment represents less than 15 percent of the total public acres in the allotment. The proposed project will not exceed the impacts as discussed in the RMP.

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

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 R.A. Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (KFRA RMP/EIS dated September 1994)

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

None Additional

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 current action was discussed in the RMP under the Wildlife section and the Range Summary section.

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?

Yes.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?

Yes

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

Yes

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?

Yes

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)?

Yes

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

Yes. We also continue to receive very positive comments from the public on our juniper work in the area.

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

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Joe Foran	Fuels
Bill Johnson	Silviculture
Bill Lindsey/ Dana Eckard	Range
Matt Kritzer/ Michelle Durant	Archeology
Gayle Sitter	Wildlife

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.

Field Manager, Klamath Falls Resource Area

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.

16

15

14

21

22

23

28

27

26

33

34

35

*Treatment
areas.*

