Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management
Hollister Field Office
DOI-BLM-C090-2016-0001

Proposed Action Title/Type: Mercy Grazing Allotment Renewal Humboldt West, Inc.
Location of Proposed Action: San Joaquin Valley

A. Describe the Proposed Action:

BLM proposes to renew the grazing lease for the Mercy Allotment. All terms and conditions from the existing lease would remain the same.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

Hollister Resource Management Plan for the Southern Diablo Mountain Range and Central Coast of California Record of Decision (2007)

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Livestock Grazing Authorization: DOI-BLM-CA-0900-2010-005-EA

USFWS Consultation #1-1-92-F-5, February 1992
Rangeland Health Standards Assessment September 2008

Central California Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing (1998)

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?

Yes. Approval of grazing lease renewal and authorization of grazing for Humboldt West, Inc. for the Mercy allotment is substantially the same as authorization analyzed in DOI-BLM-CA-0900-2010-005-EA. Authorization including livestock numbers and seasons of use and all terms and conditions would remain the same. Requirements from USFWS Consultation would remain in effect.

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. DOI-BLM-CA-0900-2010-005-EA is appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, because the range of alternatives analyzed the grazing authorization and no-grazing alternative for the Mercy allotment.

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

Yes. The existing analysis is valid and there is no new information or circumstances that were not previously considered in the decision for DOI-BLM-CA-0900-2010-005-EA.

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

Yes. The methodology and analytical approach applied to existing studies, inventory, monitoring and rangeland health assessments used in DOI-BLM-CA-0900-2010-005-EA continue to be appropriate for the current 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?

Yes. DOI-BLM-CA-0900-2010-005-EA analyzed potential impacts to the critical and required elements of the environment including air quality, ACEC, cultural, environmental justice, farm lands, flood plains, invasive species, native American concerns, recreation, social and economic, soil, waste hazardous and solid, water quality, wetlands riparian, wild and scenic rivers, wilderness wildlife, threatened or endangered species, horses and burros and vegetation.

Therefore, the direct and indirect impacts of the approval of the grazing lease application for the Mercy Allotment is substantially unchanged from those identified in DOI-BLM-CA-0900-2010-005-EA.

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. The cumulative impacts that would result from approval of the grazing lease authorization are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the prior NEPA document.

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

Yes. The prior decision to authorize the livestock grazing on the Mercy allotment was available for public review.

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

Name	Title
Sky Murphy	Planning & Environmental Coordinator
Stacey Schmidt	Natural Resource Specialist (Range)
Ryan O'Dell	Natural Resource Specialist (Botany/Soils)
Greg Middleton	Geologist
Erik Zaborsky	Archeologist
Michael Westphal	Ecologist

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.

_____
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.