

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
White River Field Office
73544 Hwy 64
Meeker, CO 81641

DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY

NUMBER: CO-110-2004-027-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional):

PROJECT NAME: Pesticide Use Proposal, Karmex

PLANNING UNIT:

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T2N R103W

APPLICANT: Chevron

ISSUES AND CONCERNS : Pesticide Use Proposals are approved for a three year period. This is a renewal of a Chevron PUP which was originally approved in 2001.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: Chevron will use Karmex DF to control broadleaf weeds and other vegetation around production facilities. Karmex DF will be used at the rate of 6 pounds. This will effectively control vegetation and produce a bare ground environment. The goal is to minimize fire and work hazards.

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

Name of Plan: White River Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP).

Date Approved: July 1, 1997

X The Proposed Action is in conformance with the LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s): Page 2-55

Decision Language: Manage fire to protect public health, safety, and property...

_____ 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):

REVIEW OF EXISTING NEPA DOCUMENTS:

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

Name of Document: CO-WRFO-01-017-EA

Date Approved: 12-12-00

List by name and date any other documentation relevant to the Proposed Action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

Name of Document:

Date Approved:

NEPA ADEQUACY CRITERIA:

1. Is the Proposed Action substantially the same action and at the site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. This is the exact same action as analyzed in 2000.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, there is a reasonable range of alternatives in the existing NEPA document(s), and the range and analysis is appropriate, considering current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The information or circumstances upon which the existing NEPA document(s) are based remains valid and germane to the Proposed Action. The analysis is still valid in light of no new studies or resource assessment information.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continues to be appropriate for the Proposed Action.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the Proposed Action unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The direct and indirect impacts of the Proposed Action are unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes the cumulative impacts of the Proposed Action are unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s).

7. Is the public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the Proposed Action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. No new public involvement or interagency review is warranted.

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this work sheet (by name and title).

The proposed action was presented to, and reviewed by the White River Field Office interdisciplinary team on 12-16-03.

Date

A list of resource specialists who participated in this review is available upon request from the White River Field Office.

REMARKS:

Cultural Resources: N/A

Native American Religious Concerns: N/A

Threatened and Endangered Species: N/A

MITIGATION: None.

COMPLIANCE PLAN (optional):

NAME OF PREPARER: Max Mc Coy

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Scott Perry

DATE: 12/16/03

CONCLUSION

CO-110-2004-027-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:

Hunt E. Walter

Field Manager

DATE SIGNED:

12/16/03

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.