

**U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Kremmling Field Office  
P.O. Box 68  
Kremmling, CO 80459**

## **DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY**

NUMBER: CO-120-2008-35-DNA

PROJECT NAME: James Ellison lease # 051732 renewal with Conrad Sterkel on Allotment # 07583 (Cottonwood)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: The BLM-administered public land includes all or part of the following:

T2S, R82W, 6<sup>th</sup> PM, Sections 1 and 12

APPLICANT: James and Nicole Ellison

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: BLM livestock grazing lease # 051732 (attachment #1) would be renewed for a period of 3 years beginning January 1, 2008 and ending on December 31, 2011. The renewed lease would make no changes to the number or kind of livestock, the grazing season, or the amount of grazing preference (AUMs\*).

\* AUM = animal unit month = the amount of forage required to sustain one cow and calf for one month.

LAND USE PLAN (LUP) CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The Proposed Action is subject to the following plan:

Name of Plan: Kremmling Resource Management Plan (RMP), Record of Decision (ROD)

Date Approved: December 19, 1984; Updated February 1999

X 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):

Decision Language: The Proposed Action would occur in an area identified in Resource Management Plan with wildlife and water quality land use priorities. The Proposed Action is in compliance with these designations.

REVIEW OF EXISTING NEPA DOCUMENTS:

List by name and date all existing NEPA documents that cover the Proposed Action.

Name of Document: CO-KRFO-00-36-EA

Date Approved: 09/12/2000

| <b>NEPA Adequacy Criteria</b>  | <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> |
|--|------------|-----------|
| <p>1. Is the Proposed Action substantially the same action and at the site specifically analyzed in an existing document?</p> <p>Explanation: No changes to the number or kind of livestock, season of use, or livestock grazing preference would be made with implementation of the Proposed Action.</p>  | X          |           |
| <p>2. Was a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Action analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s), and does that range and analysis appropriately consider current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?</p> <p>Explanation: Yes, a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Action were analyzed.</p>   | X          |           |
| <p>3. Does the information or circumstances upon which the existing NEPA document(s) are based remain valid and germane to the Proposed Action? Is the analysis still valid in light of new studies or resource assessment information?</p> <p>Explanation: Yes. No changes have been made to the livestock grazing on allotment # 07583 (Cottonwood) since the existing NEPA document was approved.</p> | X          |           |
| <p>4. Does the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the Proposed Action?</p> <p>Explanation: Yes. The methodology and analytical approach continue to be appropriate.</p>  | X          |           |
| <p>5. Are the direct and indirect impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?</p> <p>Explanation: Yes. No changes have occurred to the livestock grazing, so the direct and indirect impacts would remain the same.</p>  | X          |           |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?</p> <p>Explanation: Yes. No changes have been made to the livestock grazing since the existing NEPA document was approved. Therefore, the cumulative impacts would remain unchanged.</p> | X |  |
| <p>7. Is the public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the Proposed Action?</p> <p>Explanation: Yes, the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document is adequate.</p>  | X |  |

**INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:**

| <b>Name</b>   | <b>Title</b>       | <b>Area of Responsibility</b>            | <b>Date Review Completed</b> |
|---------------|--------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Paula Belcher | Hydrologist        | Soil, Water, Air & Riparian              | 3/05/08                      |
| Megan McGuire | Wildlife Biologist | Wildlife, T&E species, Migratory birds   | 3/25/08                      |
| Bill B. Wyatt | Fire Archaeologist | Cultural Resources & Tribal Consultation | 5/5/08                       |
| Joe Stout     | P&EC               | NEPA Compliance                          | 7/3/08                       |

**REMARKS:**

Cultural Resources: The proposed action is not an undertaking under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and it's implementing regulations. Thus, no historic properties would be affected.

Native American Religious Concerns: Because this action is not an undertaking and the action is a renewal, Native American consultation is not necessary.

Threatened and Endangered Species: The proposed action would not impact Threatened or Endangered Species.

**COMPLIANCE PLAN:** Compliance with grazing lease # 051732 and its terms and conditions would be accomplished through the Kremmling Field Office Range Management Program.

Livestock grazing would be monitored by the Range Staff and other BLM personnel, as appropriate, to ensure compliance. The Kremmling Field Office Range Management Program will be followed to schedule periodic utilization checks, collect trend data, and evaluate allotment condition. Adjustments will be made to the grazing permit, when monitoring indicates changes are necessary to protect and/or improve public land health.

NAME OF PREPARER: Richard Johnson

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Joe Stout

DATE: 7/3/08

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1). Livestock Grazing Lease # 051732
- 2). Standard Terms and Conditions

## CONCLUSION

CO-120-2008-35-DNA

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the land use plan and that the NEPA documentation previously prepared fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

SIGNATURE OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: /s/ Peter McFadden (acting)

DATE SIGNED: 7/3/08

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.