

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) Worksheet

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

OFFICE:: , LLNVC010000

TRACKING NUMBER:

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2015-0025

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Change in livestock kind from sheep to cattle.

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Gray Hills Allotment

APPLICANT (if any): National Fish and Wildlife Foundation

A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The permittee on the Gray Hills Allotment would like to temporarily change the kind of livestock on the allotment from sheep to cattle for the following reasons:

1. The new permittee prefer to graze cattle instead of sheep.
2. This allotment contains bighorn sheep habitat. Removing domestic sheep from the allotment would reduce the risk of spreading potentially fatal disease to the bighorn sheep.

The portion of the allotment that lays east of the East Walker River was overgrazed by excess wild horses. The horses were gathered in 2012 and the range has started to recover. By returning cattle to the Gray Hills Allotment, the Allotment Management Plan (AMP) would be utilized to rotate cattle among the existing pastures.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

LUP Name*	<u>Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan</u>	Date Approved:	<u>2001</u>
Other Document	<u>Carson City District Drought Management EA</u>	Date Approved:	<u>June, 2013</u>

**List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto)*

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

LSG-1

- Maintain or improve the condition of the public rangelands to enhance productivity for all rangeland and watershed values
- Provide adequate, high quality forage for livestock by improving rangeland condition
- Maintain a sufficient quality and diversity of habitat and forage for livestock, wildlife, and wild horses through natural regeneration and/or vegetation manipulation methods

- Improve the vegetation resource and range condition by providing for the physiological needs of the key plant species
- Reduce soil erosion and enhance watershed values by increasing ground cover and litter

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 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.

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?

Yes. The Proposed Action is to implement Drought Response Actions (DRA's) described in the CCD Drought Management Plan (Appendix 3 of the Drought EA) "1. Livestock: Temporary Change in Kind or Class of Livestock The Carson City Drought Management Environmental Assessment (EA), provides for a temporary change of livestock species. The current permit authorizes sheep grazing, however, the new permittee wants to change the authorized livestock to cattle. Bighorn sheep habitat has been identified within the allotment and changing the authorized livestock to cattle would reduce the spread of potentially fatal diseases between domestic sheep and wild bighorn sheep.

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 value?

Pg. 30 of the EA: If changing kind or class of livestock, BLM would not authorized temporary changes from cattle to sheep in areas of known bighorn sheep habitat or areas within nine miles of known bighorn sheep habitat.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, 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?

Yes. The existing analysis covers the current drought conditions that have been documented. A temporary change of livestock kind is one of the DRA's described in the Drought Management Plan (Appendix 3 of the Drought EA) and analyzed in the Drought EA (page 30). According to the U.S. Drought Monitor the drought is forecasted to persist across Northern Nevada for an unknown number of years. Given the continuation of the drought, the BLM can reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the potential impacts of the Proposed Action.

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?

Yes. The direct, indirect and cumulative effects for the Proposed Action are identical to those identified in the Drought EA. The Drought EA sufficiently analyzed all affected resources related to implementing one or more DRA's.

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

Public outreach efforts and the interagency review conducted for the Drought EA qualifies as adequate public involvement for the Proposed Action. The EA was made available for a 30 day public review and comment period on March 12, 2013 through April 12, 2013. The EA was also made available by hard copy at the Carson City District Office and on the project website on March 12, 2013. All comments received were reviewed, considered and responded to by the BLM Carson City District Office.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Table 1. List of Preparers

Name	Role	Discipline
Chelsy Simerson	Team Lead	Rangeland Management Specialist/ Wild Horse Specialist
Jill Devours		Land Law Examiner
Chris Kula		Wildlife Biologist <i>CK 7/6/15</i>
Dan Westermeyer		Outdoor Recreation Planner <i>DW 7-6-15</i>
Jason Wright/Kristin Bowen		Archaeologist <i>KB 7/13/15</i>
Angelica Rose		Planning & Environmental Coordinator <i>AR 7/6/15</i>
Ken Depaoli/ Joel Hartmann		Geologist <i>KD 7/6/15</i>
Dave Schroeder		Natural Resource Specialist <i>DS 7-6-15</i>
Matt Simons		Land and Realty Specialist <i>MS 7/13/15</i>
Michelle Stropky		Hydrologist/Soil Specialist <i>MSS 07/13/15</i>
Ken Vicencio		Noxious Weeds <i>KV 9/2/15</i>

Note

Refer to the EA for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

Table 2. Cooperating Agencies

Agency Type	
Contact Name	
Contact Date	
MOU Number	
MOU Signed Date	
Address	
Parts Jointly Developed	

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 requirement of NEPA.



Signature of Project Lead



Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Carla Jann Acting Stillwater Field Manager 9-9-15

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 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.