

**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: DOI-BLM-CO-120-2010-0032-DNA

PROJECT NAME: Noxious Weed Treatment within the Kremmling Field Office
Pesticide Use Proposals CO-120-2010-01,02,03,06,07,08,09,10,11,12,13

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Grand and Jackson Counties

APPLICANT: Grand County, Jackson County, BLM (Kremmling Field Office)

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: The BLM proposes to control noxious weeds throughout the Kremmling Field Office in partnership with the above counties during the 2010 field season. Treatments would occur using the herbicides listed below on the designated weed species in accordance with the Pesticide Use Proposals (PUP), labels, and Material Data Safety Sheets (MSDS's). Contact the Kremmling Field Office for more information on the Pesticide Use Proposals. See Attachment #1 for project map and EA # CO-120-2008-31 Appendix 4 for mitigations measures, standard operating procedures, and conservation measures.

Herbicides: Habitat, Escort XP, Roundup Pro, Krovar I DF, Telar XP, Plateau, Curtail, Cornbelt 6# Low Vol Ester (2,4-D)

Weeds: Tamarisk, Cheat grass, Canada Thistle, Musk Thistle, Bull Thistle, Yellow Toadflax, Dalmatian Toadflax, Common Mullein, Oxeye Daisy, and Houndstongue

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: Intensive management of habitats is necessary to assure continued support of the wildlife species dependent upon them for survival (page 9 ROD)

REVIEW OF EXISTING NEPA DOCUMENTS:

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

Name of Document: Weed Management for the Kremmling Field Office BLM
DOI-BLM-CO -120-2008-31-EA

Date Approved: 05/15/2009

Name of Document: Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement ,Vegetation
Treatment using herbicides on BLM lands in 17 Western States

Date Approved: 06/2007

| NEPA Adequacy Criteria | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| <p>1. Is the Proposed Action substantially the same action and at the site specifically analyzed in an existing document?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes, the Proposed Action is the same action that was analyzed in the 2008 EA. It is also located at the same sites that are specifically analyzed in the EA, which included the entire Kremmling Field Office boundary. | 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes, the 2007 EIS analyzed the alternatives of no use of prescribed burning, no aerial herbicide application, no use of herbicides, and the no action alternative. This is a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Action and appropriately considers current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values. | 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> | X | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes. There is no new information or circumstances that would invalidate the existing analyses. The attachments to the 2008 EA, which included mitigations measures, standard operating procedures, and conservation measures, are still appropriate. These can be found in EA# DOI-BLM -CO-120-2008-31 Appendix 4 | | |
| <p>4. Does the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the Proposed Action?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes. The 2008 EA analyzed a program for noxious weed control that was weighted towards chemical spraying in an effort to knock down widespread weeds quickly. The 2008 EA also analyzed methods such as biological controls. Methods such as biological controls have been tried but have met with little/no success. Annual countywide spraying programs coordinated with other local agencies remain as the most effective deterrent to the spread of these species. | 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes. The 2008 EA referenced the effects analysis presented in the 2007 EIS as applicable for the resource area. This analysis remains valid and impacts are substantially unchanged. | 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes, the cumulative impacts remain unchanged from those analyzed in the 2007 EIS. | X | |
| <p>7. Is the public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the Proposed Action?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of answer: Yes. There have been no additional issues, concerns, or controversies developed since the 2007 EIS and 2008 EA were written. The Proposed Action will be listed on the Kremmling Field Office NEPA Register notifying potential interested or affected publics. | X | |

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

| Name | Title | Area of Responsibility | Date Review Completed |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Richard Johnson | Rangeland Management Specialist | Vegetation, Livestock Grazing | 4/5/2010 |
| Megan McGuire | Wildlife Biologist | T&E Species | 4/1/2010 |
| Frank G. Rupp | Archaeologist | Paleontology | 3/29/2010 |
| Paula Belcher | Hydrologist | Soil, Water, Air, and Riparian | 4/5/2010 |

See the 2007 EIS and 2008EA for a complete list of the original IDT member's participating in the preparation of these documents.

REMARKS:

MITIGATION: See EA# DOI-BLM -CO-120-2008-31 Appendix 4

NAME OF PREPARER: Zach Hughes

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Susan Cassel

DATE: 4/21/2010

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1). Map of Proposed Project Area

CONCLUSION

DOI-BLM-CO-120-2010-0032-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/ David Stout

DATE SIGNED: 4/23/2010

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.



BLM Kremmling Field Office

