

Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

LITTLE SNAKE FIELD OFFICE

NUMBER: CO-100-06-090 DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: COC 07518 and COC 07519

PROJECT NAME: Trapper Mining Inc. Coal Readjustment

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

COC 07518: T. 6 N., R. 91 W., Secs. 33; T. 5 N., R. 91 W., Secs. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, and 10.

COC 07519: T. 6 N., R. 90 W., Sec. 31; T. 5 N., R. 90 W., Sec. 6.

APPLICANT: Trapper Mining Inc.

A. Describe the Proposed Action

This is a re-adjustment of conditions on Trapper Mining Inc.'s two coal leases for their ten-year anniversary of the lease assignment. The date of the original assignment is June 1, 1958. The last readjustment date was effective, June 1, 1998. No change in operation, disturbance or conditions.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name* Little Snake Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision (ROD)

Date Approved April 26, 1989

Other document _____ Date Approved

Other document _____ Date Approved

* List applicable LUP's (e.g., Resource Management Plans and activity, project, management, or program plans, or applicable amendments thereto)

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP's because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Little Snake Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision (ROD)

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):

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Green River - Hams Fork EIS, 1984.

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

Staff Review Reports:

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The Proposed Action has not changed, and no permitting requirements are being revised or updated. Yes, the location is exactly the same, no change.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The initial concerns that instigated the existing imposed stipulations have not changed.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The initial concerns that prompted the existing stipulations have not changed. No change in operations or location.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The proposed action has not changed.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. Direct or indirect impacts from operating conditions have not changed as analyzed in the existing EA. Yes, the EA analyzed impacts from the proposed action, which has not changed in this renewed permitting circumstance.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. No change to the originally proposed action as analyzed in the existing EA document.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. Since there is no change to the originally proposed action as analyzed in the existing EA document, the existing public and interagency reviews hold true and are adequate.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis* and preparation of this worksheet.

<u>Name</u>		<u>Title</u>	
Ole Olsen	Natural Resource Specialist	Air Quality & Climate, Floodplains, Prime/Unique Farmlands, Surface Water Quality Invasive Non-native Species	OO 8/24/06
Gary Collins	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources, Native American Concerns	GDC8/24/06
Louise McMinn	Realty Specialist	Environmental Justice	LM 8/23/06
Duane Johnson	Environmental Coord. NEPA	Hazardous Materials	DJ 6/7/06
Hunter Seim	Rangeland Management Spec.	Sensitive Plants, T&E Plant	JHS 8/22/06

Desa Ausmus	Wildlife Biologist	T&E Animal, Wetlands/Riparian Zones	DA 8/25/06
Rob Ernst	Geologist	Ground Water Quality	
Jim McBrayer	Outdoor Recreation Specialist	WSA, W&S Rivers	JDM 8/22/06

STANDARDS:

Desa Ausmus	Wildlife Biologist	Animal, Riparian Systems	DA 8/25/06
Hunter Seim	Rangeland Management Spec	Plant	JHS 8/22/06
Hunter Seim	Rangeland Management Spec	T&E Plant	JHS 8/22/06
Desa Ausmus	Wildlife Biologist	T&E Animal	DA 8/30/06
Ole Olsen	Natural Resource Specialist	Water Quality, Upland Soils	OO 8/24/06

* See the EA for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original NEPA document.

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA

Note: If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.

Land Health Assessment

This action has been reviewed for conformance with the BLM's public land health standards adopted Feb. 12, 1997. This readjustment will not adversely affect achievement of the public land health standards.

Signature of Lead Specialist _____ Date

Signature of NEPA Coordinator _____ Date

Signature of the Responsible Official _____ Date

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.