



# United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
Colorado River Valley Field Office  
2300 River Frontage Road  
Silt, Colorado 81652  
[www.co.blm.gov](http://www.co.blm.gov)



## DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY

NUMBER: DOI-BLM-CO-N040-2012-0067-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional):

PROJECT NAME: South Canyon Boat Ramp Maintenance

PLANNING UNIT: Garfield County

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T6S R90W Sec 2 and T5S R89W Sec 31 6<sup>th</sup> PM

APPLICANT:

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (optional):

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: The Proposed Action is to extend the concrete ramp another 45 feet up the slope of the boat ramp. Given the steepness of the ramp (>20%) some provision will need to be made for increasing the roughness of the ramp surface. It may also be prudent to use some technique such as cutting grooves in the existing concrete ramp to increase surface roughness.

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

Name of Plan: Glenwood Springs Resource Management Plan

Date Approved: Jan. 1984, revised 1988, amended in November 1991 - Oil and Gas Leasing and Development - Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement; amended Nov. 1996 - Colorado Standards and Guidelines; amended in August 1997 - Castle Peak Travel Management Plan; amended in March 1999 - Oil and Gas Leasing & Development Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement; amended in November 1999 - Red Hill Plan Amendment; and amended in September 2002 – Fire Management Plan for Wildland Fire Management and Prescriptive Vegetation Treatment Guidance; amended in September 2009.

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

Decision Language: The action is in conformance with Administrative Actions (pg. 5) and Livestock Grazing Management (pg. 20). Administrative actions states, "Various types of actions will require special attention beyond the scope of this plan. Administrative actions are the day-to-day transactions required to serve the public and to provide optimal use of the resources. These actions are in conformance with the plan". The livestock grazing management objective as amended states, "To provide 56,885 animal unit months of livestock forage commensurate with meeting public land health standards."

- \_\_\_\_\_ 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(s): CO-078-5-75, South Canyon Recreation Site Project Plan Environmental Assessment

Date Approved: April 11, 1995.

Name of Document(s): CO-140-2001-0024 DNA, South Canyon Recreation Site Project Plan

Date Approved: January 16, 2002.

#### 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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The current Proposed Action was analyzed in the above mentioned Environmental Assessment. The proposed action is the same action analyzed in the existing document.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The existing NEPA document analyzed the proposed action. No unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources were identified through public scoping; therefore, other alternatives were not analyzed. The same applies to the current proposed action given current concerns, interests, and resource values.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and 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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the analysis is still valid and there has been no “new” identified impacts resulting from the proposed action. In addition, the proposed action does not involve any new developments or trails nor does it introduce any new uses as it has been occurring throughout these areas for years.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The current Proposed Action is the same as what was analyzed in the existing NEPA document. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts would be the same as those identified in the existing NEPA document. The environmental assessment thoroughly reviewed the many specific environmental impacts including vegetation, water resources, air quality, wildlife, cultural, threatened and endangered species, wilderness, and riparian resources.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. For the existing NEPA document, no comments specific to the new proposed action were received.

**INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:**

<i>Name</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Responsibility</i>
Monte Senor	Rangeland Management Specialist	NEPA Lead, Range Management Invasive, Non-native Species
Pauline Adams	Hydrologist	Air Quality, Water Quality, Soils, Riparian and Wetlands
Carla DeYoung	Ecologist	ACEC, Vegetation, T/E/S Plants, Land Heath Stds

Greg Wolfgang	Outdoor Recreation Planner	VRM, Recreation, Travel Management
Kimberly Miller	Outdoor Recreation Planner	WSR, Wilderness, Recreation
Erin Leifeld	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources and Native American Concerns
Sylvia Ringer	Wildlife Biologist	Migratory Birds, Terrestrial & Aquatic Wildlife, T/E/S Terrestrial & Aquatic Wildlife

REMARKS: None

MITIGATION: : Work schedule may impact recreational use of the site. Mitigation for this should include scheduling the project work to occur between Tuesday through Thursday, if possible. In addition, the BLM should provide public notices and signs identifying the project schedule before the project work commences.

COMPLIANCE PLAN (optional):

NAME OF PREPARER: Monte Senior

DATE: 5/05/2012

# CONCLUSION

DOI-BLM-CO-N040-2012-0067-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:

  
Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist

DATE SIGNED: 5-23-2012

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.

