

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-110-2004-038-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional): Temporary Use Permit COC67467

PROJECT NAME: Upgrade to Sand Springs Meter Station

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Sixth Principal Meridian, Colorado
T. 2 S., R. 101 W.,
Sec. 33, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$.

APPLICANT: Colorado Interstate Gas Company (CIG)

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (optional): N/A

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: The proposed action is for an upgrade to the Sand Springs Meter Station, utilizing a temporary use permit for extra work space. The temporary use permit (COC67467) is for an area that was previously disturbed under an expired temporary use permit for this facility (COC57225-01). This extra work area is to be used to provide space for vehicles, equipment, and supplies to be used during the construction phase of the additional aboveground piping that is need to accommodate increased oil and gas production in the area. The term of the temporary use permit is four months.

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): Pages 2-49 thru 2-52

Decision Language: “To make public lands available for the siting of public and private facilities through the issuance of applicable land use authorizations, in a manner that provides for reasonable protection of other resource values.”

_____ 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: EA CO-017-95-04

Date Approved: October 10, 1994

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, the proposed action is consistent with the existing site usage authorized by right-of-way COC57225 and analyzed by EA CO-017-95-04.

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, the range of alternatives in EA CO-017-95-04 remains adequate for the proposed action.

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 existing analysis remains valid since there are no new circumstances or 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 in EA CO-017-95-04 are appropriate for the current 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 adequately addressed in EA CO-017-95-04.

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 adequately addressed in the White River RMP/EIS.

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, the public, and other agencies were fully involved in the development of the RMP/EIS.

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 01/20/04.

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): Compliance checks will be conducted by the realty staff at the expiration of the temporary use permit.

NAME OF PREPARER: Penny Brown

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: 

DATE: 1/20/03

CONCLUSION

CO-110-2004-038-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:


Field Manager

DATE SIGNED:

1/20/04

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.