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

OFFICE: *NV065*

TRACKING NUMBER: *NV065-DNA08-156*

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER:

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: *Temporary Non-Renewable (TNR) grazing use on the East Portion of the South Pasture and the West Pasture of the Ralston Allotment.*

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: *Refer to attached map*

APPLICANT (if any): Mr. Gary Snow, P.O. Box 5520, Fallon, NV 89407

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

The Proposed Action would issue Temporary Non-Renewable (TNR) grazing use on the East Portion of the South Pasture of the Ralston Allotment for 500 head of livestock from October 15, 2008 to May 10, 2009 and the West Pasture of the Ralston Allotment for 100 head of livestock from November 1, 2008 to May 15, 2009.

Violations of the Terms and Condition set forth in the proposed decision would negate the Proposed Action and the applicant's proposed authorization would be cancelled in accordance with the provision of 43 Code of Federal Regulations §4140.1 Acts -Prohibited on Public Lands.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name* *Tonopah Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Record of Decision (ROD* Date Approved *October 2, 1997*

Other document_____ Date Approved_____

Other document_____ Date Approved_____

**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:

Livestock Grazing Management "To create healthy, productive rangelands through implementation of the recommendations of the ongoing rangeland monitoring and evaluation program" pg. 12

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.

Montezuma Complex Rangeland Health Evaluation Environmental Assessment NV065-2005-042, August 8, 2007
Temporary non-renewable grazing authorization on Montezuma Allotment, NV065-EA07-030, January 2007
Temporary non-renewable grazing authorization on Sheep Mountain Allotment, NV065-EA06-19, 13 January, 2006
Temporary non-renewable grazing authorization to Gary Snow for the Ralston Allotment for November 1, 2002 through May 31, 2003, DNA# NV065-2002-052
South Ralston temporary non-renewable grazing permit, NV065-EA00-014, May 20, 2000
Thunder Mountain Environmental Assessment, NV065-EA00-013, February 1, 2000

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).

Ralston Monitoring Report of August 2008

Weather Data 2008

Montezuma Allotment Rangeland Health Evaluation, June 2007

Soil Survey, Nye County, Nevada, Southwest Part I & Part II, USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2004

Standards and Guidelines for the Mojave-Southern Great Basin Resource Advisory Council, approved February 12, 1997.

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 would be substantially the same as the Environmental Assessments (EAs) listed above in section C. These EAs all analyze the impacts of authorizing temporary non-renewable grazing within different allotments and pastures in the general vicinity of the Proposed Action. The Ralston is adjacent to the northern portion of the Montezuma Allotment.

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?**

Yes, the current proposed action considered other treatments and a reasonable range of alternatives as did those EAs listed in section C. East Section of the South Pasture of the Ralston Allotment has not been grazed since 2006 and certain portion of the proposed area has not been grazed for over a decade. The West Pasture of the Ralston Allotment has not been grazed since 2006.

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?**

Yes, the existing analysis and the conclusions would be adequate with regard to analysis of the proposed action. The relevant documents conclude in support of the proposed action. There is no new information or circumstances that would be considered significant with regard to the Proposed Action. The August 2008 monitoring report demonstrates that the forage in the proposed grazing area is adequate to sustain grazing during the proposed grazing season.

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 and indirect impacts of the current proposed action would be substantially unchanged in accordance with the EAs listed above in section C as those documents analyzed the impacts of temporary non-renewable grazing. Site-specific impacts to resources as analyzed in the previous EAs are expected to be the same for the current proposed action.

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

Yes, the interested parties for the Ralston Allotment were sent a letter on June 12, 2008 for a fifteen-day comment period in accordance with 43 Code of Federal Regulations 4130.2(b). The Tonopah Interdisciplinary NEPA Team reviewed the proposed action. This public involvement is considered adequate for the current Proposed Action. The following interested parties responded to the comment letter:

- Katie Fite, Biodiversity Director, Western Watersheds Project, P.O. Box 2863, Boise, ID 83701; Mr. Joe Dahl, P.O. Box 2392, Fallon, NV 89407
- Mr. Al Steninger, Western Range Service and for Colvin & Son, LLC, Range Management Consultants, P.O. Box 1330, Elko, NV 89803
- Tracy Kipke, Habitat Biologist, Nevada Department of Wildlife, Southern Region Office, Las Vegas, NV
- Krista Coulter, Dept. of Conservation and Natural Resources, Division of Water Resources, 901 South Stewart St., Suite 2002, Carson City, NV 89701
- Catherine Barcomb, Commission for the Preservation of Wild Horses, 885 Eastlake Blvd. Carson City, NV 89049 (telephone conversation).

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name and Title	Resource/Agency Represented	Signature
Marc Pointel, Range Management Spc. (RMS),	Range/TFO, BLM	
Marc Pointel, RMS	Soils/TFO, BLM	
Scott Stadler, Archeologist,	Cultural Resources/TFO, BLM	
Marc Pointel, RMS	Wildlife/TFO, BLM	
Marc Pointel, RMS	Wildlife T&E/TFO, BLM	
Valerie Metscher, RMS for	Vegetation/TFO, BLM	
Valerie Metscher, RMS for	TFS Plants T&E/TFO, BLM	

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's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

Signature of Project Lead

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Signature of Responsible Official: Date 9-9-2008

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.