

Klamath Falls Resource Area Optional Plan Conformance Review/NEPA Compliance Record and/or Categorical Exclusion Review

Klamath Falls Resource Area Project File Number - KCER 99-22

Proposed Action Title/Type: Tree Pruning

Location of Proposed Action: Hamaker Mountain (40-7-11)

Description of Proposed Action: Lower branches of plantation trees would be cut flush with main stem, to a height of 9 feet.

Applicant (if any): None.

PART 1: PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW. This proposed action is subject to the following land use plan:
Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary, June 1995.

The proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with this plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM MS 1617.3).

Signature of Reviewers: Kathy Helm

Remarks: This is considered an intensive management treatment. Pruned trees will grow clear wood through the years, which is considerably more valuable than knotty, common-grade wood.

PART 2: NEPA REVIEW

A. Categorical exclusion review. This proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion under 516 DM 6, Appendix 5.4 C (4). It has been reviewed to determine if any of the exceptions described in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2, apply.

Signature of Reviewers: Kathy Helm

B. Existing EA/EIS review. This proposed action is addressed in the following existing BLM EA/EIS:
Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary (KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS)

Date Approved: **June 1995**

This EA/EIS has been reviewed against the following criteria to determine if it covers the proposed action:

1. The proposed action is a feature of, or essentially the same as, the alternative selected and analyzed in the existing document.
2. A reasonable range of alternatives was analyzed in the existing document.
3. There has been no significant change in circumstances or significant new information germane to the proposed action.
4. The methodology/analytical approach previously used is appropriate for the proposed action.
5. The direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action are not significantly different from those identified in the existing document.
6. The proposed action would not change the previous analysis of cumulative impacts.
7. Public involvement in the previous analysis is appropriate coverage for the proposed action.

	Initials	Date
SSS Animal Surveys	_GS_	_9/3/99_
Botanical Surveys	_LW_	_8/31/99_
Cultural Review	MCK	_8/31/99_
Other Reviews	_____	_____

Signature of Reviewers: Kathy Helm

Remarks: References to the proposed action are found on the following pages of the KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS: ROD R-11, B-3, E-5,6,7; RMP 2-80, 2-82,4-13,G-6&7.

PART 3. DECISION. I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required. It is my decision to implement the project, as described, with the mitigation measures identified below.

Mitigation Measures/Other Remarks: Along the rocky road to the wellhouse, an uncut/unpruned buffer will be left as a screen to protect deer from road hunters and human disturbance.

Authorized Official: Teresa A. Raml

Date: 9/14/99

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING OPTIONAL PLAN
CONFORMANCE/NEPA COMPLIANCE RECORD

WHEN TO USE: The optional form may be used for documenting plan conformance and NEPA compliance for proposed actions that are categorically excluded from preparation of an EA or EIS (i.e., none of the exceptions to categorical exclusion apply) or are fully covered by an existing EA or EIS prepared by the BLM (i.e., the existing BLM NEPA document satisfies all criteria for ensuring NEPA compliance for the proposed action).

DETAILED INSTRUCTIONS: Descriptive information. Identify the BLM office, title, or type of proposed action, and location of proposed action. A location map may be attached or a description of the location referenced. The lease/serial/case file number and applicant name are completed if applicable.

PART I. PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW. Identify the name of the plan(s), or planning analysis, and the date(s) approved. The remarks section may be used for documenting any restrictions or limitations identified in the plan(s) or for referencing any other relevant information contained in the plan(s). The individual(s) who reviewed the applicable land use plan(s), usually a resource specialist(s), should surname the conformance statement. The remarks section may be used for documenting any restrictions or limitation identified in the plan(s) or for referencing any other relevant information contained in the plan(s).

PART II. NEPA REVIEW. Complete II.A. if the proposed action is on the Departmental or the BLM list of categorical exclusions (see 516 DM 2, Appendix 1, and 516 DM 6, Appendix 5). Complete Part II.B. if the proposed action is covered in an existing EA or EIS prepared by the BLM.

A. Categorical Exclusion Review. Conduct review in accordance with procedures identified in Chapter II, Paragraph B of the BLM NEPA Handbook. The individual(s) who conducts the review to determine if any of the exceptions apply, usually a resource specialist(s), should surname the statement verifying the completion of the review. The remarks section may be used to document any pertinent information about the CX review.

B. Existing EA/EIS Review. Identify the name of the document and the date approved. Generally only one existing EA or EIS will be used for ensuring coverage (usually the applicable RMP/EIS). Conduct review in accordance with procedures identified in Chapter III, Paragraph B of the BLM NEPA Handbook. Use additional pages if the review includes more than one existing EA or EIS. The individual(s) who reviews the existing EA or EIS against the criteria usually a resource specialist(s), should surname the statement verifying that the review has been completed. The remarks section may be used for any comments on the review.

PART III. DECISION. The remarks sections should be used to document any commitments being made as part of this decision such as mitigation measures or monitoring and enforcement activities associated with the proposed action which are specified in the applicable land use plan. The manager responsible for approving the action must sign and date the decision.