

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

OFFICE: Humboldt River Field Office, LLNVW01000

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2013-0022-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: 2703880

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Change in Season of Use in the Daveytown Allotment

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Davytown Allotment:

T 40 N, R 35 E; Sections: 1-36.

T 39 N, R 35 E; Sections 1-36.

T 40 N, R 36 E; Sections 1-36.

T 41 N, R 35 E; Sections 19, 20, 25-36

T 41 N, R 36 E; Sections 25-36

T 39 N, R 36 E; Sections 1-24, 29-31

T 38 N, R 35 E; Sections 1-10

APPLICANT (if any): Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

A. Description of the Proposed Action with attached map(s) and any applicable mitigation measures.

John Falen of Jordan Meadows, LLC has requested a change in season of use within the Daveytown Allotment. He has requested to graze his cattle from March 1, 2013 through April 30, 2013. Beginning March 1, livestock would gradually be reduced at the rate of approximately 8% per week. Prior to April 30, 2013, all livestock would be removed from the Daveytown Allotment. Mr. Falen's permitted use for the Daveytown Allotment is November 1 through February 28 for 5,148 animal unit months (AUM's).

Mr. Falen's request would result in grazing beginning November 1, 2012 and ending April 30, 2013. This results in grazing which includes two grazing fee years. The beginning of a new grazing fee year (March 1 through February 28) is also the reset date for tracking permitted AUMs. Therefore, the permitted AUMs for 2013 would be utilized during March and April of 2013. The use from November 1, 2013 through February 28, 2014 would also utilize the 2013 permitted AUMs.

Throughout the month of April, Mr. Falen would submit actual use on a weekly or more frequent basis to track the number of livestock removed from the allotment and to ensure livestock are being reduced at an appropriate rate.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name*: Paradise Denio Management Framework Plan (MFP)

Date Approved: 1982

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 (objective, terms, and conditions):

Paradise-Denio MFP (1982)

Although the issuance of TNR grazing permits is not specifically addressed, the proposal is consistent with the decisions that:

- Future adjustments in grazing will be based on monitoring data (RM 1.1) and,
- Accepted initial stocking levels will be based on current data, but will not preclude the future establishment of other management practices that may be necessary to obtain proper management of the rangeland resources (RM 1.11).

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

- **Environmental Assessment of the Proposed Issuance of a Temporary Nonrenewable Grazing Permit for the Daveytown Allotment.**
EA #: NV-020-06-EA-07, Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact
2/23/2006

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA documents(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?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes: the new proposed action is essentially similar to an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document (NV-020-06-EA-07). The project is within the same analysis area.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes: the proposed action, alternative # 2, and the no action alternative are a reasonable range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document appropriate to the new proposed action.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes: The existing analysis is valid and relevant to the proposed action in light of new information and circumstances. Since the NEPA document (NV-020-06-EA-07) was completed in 2006, new guidance has been implemented regarding sage grouse (United States Department of Interior determination of warranted but precluded status [2010]). Sage grouse and sage grouse habitat were analyzed in the NEPA document. New guidance resulting from this determination should not substantially change the analysis of the proposed action since Preliminary Primary Habitat (PPH) or Preliminary General Habitat (PGH) for the Greater Sage Grouse does not occur in this particular area.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes: the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action are similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the public involvement and interagency review associated with this existing NEPA document is adequate for the current proposed action. A letter describing the proposed action was sent to the interested publics for the Daveytown Allotment on January 20, 2006 to solicit their comments on the EA.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name /Title	Resource/Agency Represented	Signature/Date	Comments (Attach if more room is needed)
Peggy McGuckian	Cultural Resources	/s/ Peggy McGuckian 1/15/2013	
Mark Hall	Native American Religious Concerns	/s/ Mark E. Hall 1/16/2013	
Peggy McGuckian	Paleontological Resources		
Bret Allen	Range	/s/ Bret Allen 1/17/2013	
Eric Baxter	Invasive, Non-native species	/s/ Eric Baxter 1/14/2013	
Rob Burton	Vegetation	/s/ Rob Burton 1/16/2013	
Rob Burton	Soils	/s/ Rob Burton 1/16/2013	
John McCann	Wetlands and Riparian Zones	/s/J.W. McCann 1/16/2013	
John McCann	Hydrology	/s/ J.W. McCann 1/16/2013	
Rob Burton	Air Quality	/s/ Rob Burton 1/16/2013	
Kathy Cadigan	T&E Species (Plants & Animals)	/s/K. Cadigan 1/17/2013	
Kathy Cadigan	Special Status Species (Plants & Animals)	/s/ K. Cadigan 1/17/2013	See Attached Sheet
Kathy Cadigan	General Wildlife Habitat	/s/ K. Cadigan 1/17/2013	
Kristine Struck	LWC	/s/CoryRoegne 1/16/2013	
Zwaantje Rorex	NEPA Coordinator	/s/ Zwaantje Rorex 1/17/2013	

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

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' compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

/s/Bret Allen 1/17/2013
Signature of Project Lead

/s/ Zwaantje Rorex 1/17/2013
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/Mandy Deforest, Acting FM- HRFO 1/17/2013
Signature of the Responsible Official 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.

1-17-2013 Special Status Species review for Change in Season of Use in the Daveytown Allotment DNA

There is potential for suitable habitat for Pygmy rabbits within the Daveytown allotment. Pygmy rabbits are a designated BLM Special Status Species; BLM policy is to provide these species with the same level of protection as provided for candidate species in BLM Manual 6840.06C, that is to “ensure that actions authorized, funded, or carried out do not contribute to the need for the species to become listed”. Pygmy rabbits and their habitat were not addressed within the Environmental Assessment of the Proposed Issuance of a Temporary Nonrenewable Grazing Permit for the Daveytown Allotment. Pygmy rabbits may be injured or burrows may be damaged by livestock. Pygmy rabbits burrow under shrubs and livestock tend to walk around shrubs rather than walk over them. These impacts are not likely to affect Pygmy rabbit populations as a whole.