

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

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

OFFICE: I040 Salmon Field Office

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-ID-I040-2014-0006-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: #1104478

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Issuance of 3 year livestock crossing permit

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Approximately 20 miles south of Salmon, Idaho at T. 20 N., R. 24 E., Sections 20, 21, 28, 29 and 30.

APPLICANT (if any): Lynn A. Herbst

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The description of the proposed action is the issuance of a 3 year livestock crossing permit to Lynn A. Herbst #1104478 on the Sandy Creek Allotment #06226 and the Rattlesnake Allotment (06228). The TERM of the new permit will begin January, 2014 and end on December 1, 2016. The Herbst crossing permit is as follows:

Mandatory Terms and Conditions:

<u>Allotment/#</u>	<u>#/Kind</u>	<u>Grazing Period</u>	<u>% P.L./Type Use</u>	<u>Total AUMs</u>
Sandy Creek/06226	50 cattle	05/20-05/27	100%/Crossing	2 AUMs
	50 cattle	08/06 –08/14	100%/Crossing	2 AUMs
Rattlesnake/06228	50 cattle	05/20-05/27	100%/Crossing	2 AUMs
	50 cattle	08/06-08/14	100%/Crossing	2 AUMs

Other Terms and Conditions:

- Crossing will occur along the route outlined on the attached map.
- This crossing permit authorizes active trailing using horses and stock dogs along the road prism and roadside ditch, or within a 150-foot wide corridor when trailing off-road, along the route indicated on the attached map.
- Cattle will be actively trailed and will not be left on the allotment overnight.
- A maximum of two crossing events will occur: one in May and one in August.
- Crossing will be restricted to 50 cattle during each crossing event (across the two allotments), for a maximum of 50 head for each permitted timeframe.

Standard Terms and Conditions

- Billing notices are issued which specify fees due. Billing notices, when paid, become part of the crossing permit. Fee payments are due on the date specified on the billing notice and MUST be paid in full prior to livestock crossing activities.
- This permit is issued solely for the purposes of moving livestock across public lands for proper and lawful purposes, as needed for the orderly administration of rangelands. This permit confers no priority for renewal, and cannot be transferred or assigned.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name* Date Approved: Lemhi Resource Management Plan 1987, as amended.

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

- Ⓢ “Manage 459,481 acres for grazing (page 11). The Public Lands will be managed under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield as required by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA). Any valid use, occupancy, or development of the public lands that conforms with the RMP will be considered (page 27). Livestock management will provide 43,602 animal unit months (AUMs) of livestock forage (page 3, Record of Decisions).”
- Ⓢ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because of the necessity for the proper and orderly administration of grazing activities on the public lands.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (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.

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).

- Ⓢ Environmental Impact Statement for the Lemhi Resource Management Plan, April 1987 as amended.
- Ⓢ The Kenney Creek Environmental Assessment Final Decision, from #EA-ID-040-9068, dated June 1999.
- Ⓢ Biological Evaluation/Assessment for the Trailing EA (BA #L-02-2013).
- Ⓢ Lemhi Watershed Assessment – Prepared for the Principal Working Group of the Lemhi County Riparian Conservation Agreement – Feb. 1998.
- Ⓢ Determination of Achieving Standards for Rangeland Health and Conforming with Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management – 1998.
- Ⓢ Trailing Environmental Assessment EA #DOI-BLM-ID-I040-2012-0028-EA for the Baldy Basin, Sandy Creek, Rattlesnake, NEF 3, Mill Creek, Walters, and Little Sawmill/S. Hayden Allotments and Notice of Field Manager’s Decision and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for temporary crossing permits of September 16, 2013(EA #DOI-BLM-ID-I040-2012-0028-EA).

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(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: The proposed action is identical to that of the current existing situation analyzed in EA# DOI-BLM-ID-I040-2012-0028-EA.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: The range of alternatives is appropriate given the scope and extent of the 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: Considering the intent of the proposed action and the current rangeland health assessment of 1998, of which both allotments met or were making significant progress toward meeting all applicable standards for rangeland health, the analysis is valid and appropriate.

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: The effects analysis of the proposed action would be identical to that considered in EA# DOI-BLM-ID-I040-2012-0028-EA.

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 existing documentation, analysis, and decision for the proposed action were released to the interested public with no comment concerning the proposal.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Name Title Resource/Agency Represented

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 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 the NEPA.

Preparer /s/ Mark Bonner

Date 3/28/2014

NEPA Reviewer /s/ Kyra L. Povirk

Date 4/21/2014

Field Manager /s/ Linda R. Price

Date 4/24/2014

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.