

**U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
White River Field Office  
220 E Market St  
Meeker, CO 81641**

## **DETERMINATION OF NEPA ADEQUACY (DNA)**

NUMBER: DOI-BLM-CO-110-2011-0116-DNA

PROJECT NAME: Town of Rangely Bike Path PUP

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Township	Range	Sections, Lots, or portions thereof
2 North	101 West	27, 33, 34

APPLICANT: Town of Rangely

ISSUES AND CONCERNS:

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: The town of Rangely has submitted a pesticide use proposal (PUP) to conduct bareground treatments along the bike path that is used to commute from Rangely to Kenney Reservoir. The path is approximately 5 miles long and about 6 feet wide. The bike trail is located primarily within the highway 64 right-of-way except for in two areas where it goes onto private lands for a short section. The proposed herbicides to be used are Sahara DG (Imazapyr + Diuron) and Roundup Pro (Glyphosate). Sahara DG will be applied at a rate of 8 lbs./acre and Roundup Pro will be applied at 6 qts./acre. Herbicide applications will be broadcast treatments along problem areas on the bike trail where annual mustards, cheatgrass, and Russian thistle are present. It is estimated that 3 acres will be treated

All herbicidal application will be under the control of a Certified herbicide applicator and a current PUP which specifies the area targeted, the chemical to be used, and sensitive areas. Control activities would be in compliance with the Record of Decision: Vegetation Treatment on BLM Lands in Seventeen Western States (BLM 2007) and the White River Field Office Integrated Weed Management Plan (BLM 2010).

LAND USE PLAN (LUP) CONFORMANCE REVIEW:

Name of Plan: White River Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP).

Date Approved: July 1, 1997

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

Decision Number/Page: Page 2-13

Decision Language: "Manage noxious weeds so that they cause no further negative environmental aesthetic or economic impact."

#### REVIEW OF EXISTING NEPA DOCUMENTS:

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

Name of Document: White River Resource Area Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/FEIS).

Date Approved: July 1, 1997

Name of Document: Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

Date Approved: September 30, 2007

Name of Document: White River Field Office Integrated Weed Management Plan  
DOI-BLM-CO-110-2010-0005-EA

Date Approved: March 19, 2010

#### 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 proposed chemical and mechanical treatments in the Proposed Action were a feature of the analysis in the White River Field Office Integrated Weed Management Plan (DOI-BLM-CO-110-2010-0005-EA). This environmental assessment (EA) covers the alternatives for doing noxious weed treatments around oil and gas facilities within the field office boundary. The integrated weed control strategy is improving vegetation conditions.

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:* Four alternatives, the Proposed Action, the No Action Alternative, No Aerial Application of Herbicides Alternative, and the No Herbicide Use Alternative were analyzed in DOI-BLM-CO-110-2010-0005-EA. No reasons were identified to analyze additional alternatives and these alternatives are considered to be adequate and valid for the Proposed Action.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, 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 in the EA listed above is still valid. It is not expected that new information or circumstances would substantially change the analysis of the new Proposed Action.

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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new Proposed Action is similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document, DOI-BLM-CO-110-2010-0005-EA.

5. 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, consultation occurred between the BLM and the US Fish and Wildlife Service for environmental assessment, DOI-BLM-CO-110-2010-0005-EA. In addition, lists of the current NEPA documents (projects) are available for review on the White River Field Office webpage.

**INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:** The Proposed Action was presented to, and reviewed by the White River Field Office interdisciplinary team on April 26, 2011. A list of resource specialists who participated in this review is available upon request from the White River Field Office.

## REMARKS:

*Cultural Resources:* The proposed treatments are for the Rangely “Way to the Water” bike path, which has been covered by previous cultural surveys. There are no recorded cultural resources within the bike path corridor that would be negatively affected by the application of liquid herbicides. An indirect impact of herbicide application is the unlawful collection and vandalism of cultural resources. (KB 5/11/2011)

*Native American Religious Concerns:* No known concerns. (KB 5/11/2011)

*Paleontological Resources:* It is not anticipated that there will be any new impacts to fossil resources from application of liquid herbicides. An indirect impact of herbicide application is the unlawful collection and vandalism of vertebrate fossils. (KB 5/11/2011)

*Threatened and Endangered Wildlife Species:* The White River, which supports higher order aquatic vertebrate species, is located within 350 and 850 meters of the proposed treatment sites. The White River between Rio Blanco Lake and the Utah state line is designated critical habitat for the endangered Colorado pikeminnow, although present occupation is confined to the reach below Taylor Draw dam. In addition, several BLM sensitive fish species inhabit the White River including roundtail chub, bluehead sucker, and flannelmouth sucker. Northern leopard frog, another BLM sensitive species, is likely found along the White River. The Proposed Action is not expected to have any influence on aquatic species or associated habitats as both treatment areas are well removed from the channel and surrounding riparian habitats. (LRB 05/16/11)

*Threatened and Endangered Plant Species:* There are no special status plant species concerns (MLD 5/25/2011)

## MITIGATION:

### Cultural Resources

1. The applicant is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing archaeological sites or for collecting artifacts. If archaeological materials are discovered as a result of operations under this authorization, the applicant must immediately contact the appropriate BLM representative.
2. The applicant is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for disturbing or collecting vertebrate fossils, collecting large amounts of petrified wood (over 25lbs./day, up to 250lbs./year), or collecting fossils for commercial purposes on public lands. If any paleontological resources are discovered as a result of operations under this authorization, the applicant must immediately contact the appropriate BLM representative.

Terrestrial and Aquatic Wildlife:

3. The applicator should be aware of all SOPs (Appendix C), mitigation measures (Appendix D) and conservation measures (Appendix E) regarding aquatic and terrestrial wildlife/migratory birds required in DOI-BLM-CO-110-2010-0005-EA.

COMPLIANCE PLAN (optional): On-going compliance inspections and monitoring will be conducted by the BLM White River Field Office staff during and after construction. Specific mitigation developed in this document will be followed. The operator will be notified of compliance related issues in writing, and depending on the nature of the issue(s), will be provided 30 days to resolve such issues.

NAME OF PREPARER: Matthew Dupire

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Heather Sauls

DATE: 06/01/2011

ATTACHMENTS: Map 1: Map of Bike Path and Treatment Area

## CONCLUSION

DOI-BLM-CO-110-2011-0116-DNA

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal in consort with the applied mitigation 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: 6/2/2011

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.

Map 1: Map of Bike Path and Treatment Area

