

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-110-2004-031-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional): COC25122CG

PROJECT NAME: Columbine Springs Launcher & Interconnect Project

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Sixth Principal Meridian, Colorado
T. 4 S., R. 104 W.,
Sec.11, NE¹/₄SE¹/₄.

APPLICANT: Canyon Gas Resources, Inc.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (optional): N/A

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: The proposed action is the reroute of approximately 150' of 6" pipeline which will add a receiver within the existing gathering system for the area. This proposed facility will be located at the Columbine Springs 8-11-4-104 well location. The proposed action will be an amendment to an existing right-of-way, COC25122CG. The terms for the amendment will run concurrent with the original grant dated March 23, 1982.

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-017-82-64

Date Approved: 03/19/82

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: White River Resource Management Plan (RMP) EIS

Date Approved: July 1, 1997

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 useage authorized by right-of-way COC25122CG and analyzed by EA CO-017-82-64.

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-017-82-64 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-017-82-64 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-017-82-64.

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 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): Compliance checks will be conducted by the realty staff every five years.

NAME OF PREPARER: Penny Brown

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: S. P. [Signature]

DATE: 12/16/03

CONCLUSION

CO-110-2004-31-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: *Kent 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.