



Bureau of Land Management

Boise District Office
Four Rivers Field Office
3948 Development Ave
Boise, ID 83705
<http://www.id.blm.gov>

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

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

A. BLM Office: Four Rivers Field Office

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-ID-B010-2010-0062-DNA

Lease/Serial Case File No.: 1103969

Proposed Action Title/Type: Through a Proposed/Final Grazing Decision, issue a Grazing Permit

Location/Legal of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures: The Glasscock Draw Allotment (#00047) is located approximately four miles NE of Cambridge, Idaho. Public land is found in T. 15 N, R. 2 W., Sections 21, 28, 29 and 32. (See Attachment 1-Map of Glasscock Draw Allotment).

Description of the Proposed Action:

Through a Proposed/Final Grazing Decision issue a Grazing Permit on the Glasscock Draw Allotment (#00047), for the following applicant: Bill Copher. Terms and conditions of the new permit would be consistent with the existing permit and are described under the proposed action in the following Categorical Exclusion (CE): DOI-BLM-ID-B010-2010-0061-CX.

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP/Document ¹	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Cascade Resource Management Plan (CRMP)	Record of Decision p. 2 Rangeland Program Summary pp. 6, 7. Plan Objectives & Actions pp. 24-30 Resource Management Guidelines pp. 38-61	July 1, 1988

¹List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans, Management Framework Plans, or applicable amendments) and activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

The proposed action is in conformance with the Cascade RMP, Record of Decision, which states "...Livestock forage will be provided for 68,000 animal unit months (AUMs), a 2% increase over current levels, with a 20 year objective of 70,108 AUMs..."

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action.

NEPA/Other Related Documents¹	Sections/Pages	Date Approved
Environmental Assessment (EA) # ID-110-2005-EA-011 Goodrich Blocked Unit	Appendix A4 Glascock Draw Allotment (#00047)	August 2008
Glascock Draw Signed Evaluation and Determination Rangeland Health Assessment		August 25, 2008
Area Manager's Final Decision		October 10, 2008
DOI-BLM-ID-B010-2010-0061-CX	Grazing Preference Transfer Glascock Draw (#00047)	July 2010

¹List applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action or documentation relevant to the proposed action (i.e., source drinking water assessment, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, rangeland health standard assessment and determination, or monitoring report).

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The permitted use under this permit conforms to that analyzed under the Proposed Action for Glasscock Draw Allotment (#00047) in EA#ID-110-2005-EA-011, Appendix A4 pp. 2-4. The terms and conditions of the new permit (Authorization#: 1103969) would be consistent with the previous permit (Authorization#: 1100038), with the correction of term and condition (#2), addressed in the Categorical Exclusion Review listed above, along with the Grazing Preference and Preference Transfer application. Authorized AUMs would not be exceeded, and Season of Use would not be changed; however, to accommodate a change in percent public land from 67 percent to 55 percent that was analyzed in EA#ID-110-2005-EA-011, Appendix 4, pp. 2-4, livestock numbers would be 137 cattle. The Proposed Action 3.2.2.2, Alternative B, analyzed a delayed livestock turnout date by one week in the spring, which would be expected to continue to meet the standard by promoting proper infiltration, retention, and release of water appropriate to soil type, vegetation, climate and landform to provide proper nutrient cycling, hydrologic cycling and energy flow.

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, resource values, and circumstances?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The range of alternatives analyzed in EA# ID-110-2005-EA-011 Goodrich Blocked Unit is appropriate with respect to the current issuance of one grazing permit, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances. Grazing management and terms and conditions of the new permit would remain consistent with the existing permit.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (i.e., riparian proper functioning condition reports; rangeland health standards assessments; inventory and monitoring data; most recent USFWS lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The current permit to be reissued was fully processed (August 2008) through EA#ID-110-2005-EA-011. The NEPA analysis is adequate and considers present circumstances. Greater sage-grouse were listed as a candidate species in 2010. When the BLM analyzed the permit renewal in 2008, greater sage-grouse were considered a BLM sensitive species. It is BLM policy to manage special status animals as if they were listed to preclude listing. Therefore, the candidate status would not affect how the species is managed.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. All of the same issues related to livestock grazing are still relevant, and were adequately analyzed in the existing NEPA documents. The same monitoring and analysis methods are still relevant, are supported by current BLM technical references, and are still used today. A Rangeland Health Assessment, Evaluation and Determination of conformance with Idaho's Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management, and NEPA assessment for grazing permit renewal were completed by August 25, 2008.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The impacts are substantially unchanged and the types of impacts relating to the issuance of a grazing permit for livestock grazing were sufficiently analyzed. There are no unique site specific impacts resulting from the issuance of

grazing permits. The direct and indirect impacts of livestock grazing are identified and addressed in the EA#ID-110-2005-EA-011, 3.0 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, B. Proposed Action by resources affected, pp. 18-38 (Upland Vegetation, Noxious and Invasive Weeds, Soils, Special Status Plants, Wildlife, Riparian Areas, Fisheries, Water Quality, Cultural Resources, Fire, Social and Economic, Recreation). Specific allotment analyses were reported in the following Appendix: Glascock Draw Allotment (#00047) A4 pp.4-5.

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)?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. Reasonably foreseeable cumulative impacts of past, present, and future actions, including the proposed action, are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the EA#110-2005-EA-011, 4.0 Cumulative Impacts (pages 38-42).

7. 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. Public involvement and interagency review were appropriately conducted in conjunction with the EA #110-2005-EA-011. The CE and DNA will be posted on the web page and will be available to the public.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Christina Handy	Rangeland Management Specialist	Rangeland
Jill Holderman	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
J. Allen Tarter	Natural Resource Specialist	Riparian
Dean Shaw	Archaeologist	Cultural
Mark Steiger	Botanist	Plants

F. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures have been incorporated and implemented.

Mitigation measures are not specifically listed in EA#110-2005-EA-011, but are incorporated into the permit terms and conditions. The FONSI found that the EA adequately addressed the impacts of the proposed action, and that none of them would have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

G. 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 one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked.

/s/ Christina Handy
Preparer

July 23, 2010
Date

/s/ Michael M. O'Donnell
NEPA Specialist

August 4, 2010
Date

/s/ Terry A. Humphrey
Four Rivers Field Manager

August 4, 2010
Date