

**U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management**

---

**Environmental Assessment  
Pelican Lake Treatment  
DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0113**

**PREPARING OFFICE**

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
and  
Bureau of Reclamation

**BLM**





**Environmental Assessment**  
**Pelican Lake Treatment**  
**DOI-BLM-UT-G010–2014–0113**

**Prepared by**  
**U.S. Department of the Interior**  
**Bureau of Land Management**

This page intentionally  
left blank

# Table of Contents

**Finding of No Significant Impact ..... vii**

    Pelican Lake Treatment Environmental Assessment # DOI-BLM-GO10-2014-0113 ..... vii

    Signatures: ..... vii

**Decision Record ..... ix**

    Selected Action ..... ix

    Rationale ..... ix

    Land Use Plan Compliance ..... ix

    Appeal or Protest Opportunities: ..... ix

    Approval from Authorized Official: ..... x

**1. Introduction ..... 1**

    1.1. Background: ..... 1

    1.2. Identifying Information: ..... 1

        1.2.1. Title, EA number: ..... 1

        1.2.2. Location of Proposed Action: ..... 1

        1.2.3. Applicant Name: ..... 1

    1.3. Purpose and Need for Action: ..... 1

    1.4. Scoping, Public Involvement and Issues: ..... 2

**2. Proposed Action and Alternatives ..... 3**

    2.1. Description of the Proposed Action: ..... 5

    2.2. Description of the No Action: ..... 7

    2.3. Conformance ..... 7

        2.3.1. Relationships To Statutes, Regulations, and Other Plans ..... 7

**3. Affected Environment: ..... 9**

    3.1. Water: Surface Water Quality ..... 11

    3.2. Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated ..... 11

**4. Environmental Effects: ..... 13**

    4.1. Proposed Action ..... 15

        4.1.1. Water: Surface Water Quality ..... 15

        4.1.2. Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated ..... 15

    4.2. No Action ..... 16

    4.3. Cumulative Impacts ..... 16

**5. Tribes, Individuals, Organizations, or Agencies Consulted: ..... 17**

**6. List of Preparers ..... 21**

**7. References ..... 25**

**Appendix A. .... 29**

**List of Tables**

Table 5.1. List of Persons, Agencies and Organizations Consulted ..... 19  
Table 6.1. List of Preparers ..... 23

This page intentionally  
left blank

# Finding of No Significant Impact

## Pelican Lake Treatment Environmental Assessment # DOI-BLM-GO10-2014-0113

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts (per Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0113 EA), I have determined that the proposed action will not have any significant impacts on the environment and an environmental impact statement is not required.

### Signatures:

Approved by:

---

/s/ Michelle Brown

Michelle Brown, Assistant  
Field Manager Division of  
Renewable Resources

11/3/2014

[Date]

This page intentionally  
left blank

# Decision Record

## Selected Action

**Decision:** Based on my understanding of the information contained in the *Pelican Lake Treatment EA* and my subsequent finding of no significant impact, it is my decision to authorize the actions needed to lower common carp levels as set out in DOI-BLM-GO10-2014-0113.

The following actions will be realized:

- The UDWR is proposing to minimize the common carp population to levels where other sport fisheries can be maintained at healthier levels through relative abundance and growth in all age class structures. Carp would be removed by rotenone treatments during spawning in shallow cove areas by spot treatments as identified in Figure 1 of the EA. There will not be any ground disturbance associated with this project. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Vernal Field Office, has coordinated with additional stakeholders of Pelican Lake such as the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and the Ouray Park Irrigation Company as they also manage portions of the water or water distributions within Pelican Lake. The BOR is a cooperator of the proposed project, and the Ouray Park Irrigation Company is in agreement as per the Board Meeting held in March 2014.

## Rationale

My decision to authorize implementation of the proposed action alternative will not result in any undue or unnecessary environmental degradation to wilderness characteristics, threatened or endangered species, cultural resources, or matters pertaining to Native American religious freedoms or their customs. Realization of the proposed action is in conformance with the BLM Vernal Resource Management Plan (2008) and is consistent with the Uintah County Land Use Plan. The No Action Alternative was not selected because that alternative would not meet the stated purpose and need of maintaining Blue Ribbon Fisheries and water quality within Pelican Lake.

## Land Use Plan Compliance

Realization of the proposed action is in conformance with the existing Vernal Resource Management Plan (2008) and is consistent with the Uintah County Land Use Plan.

## Appeal or Protest Opportunities:

The decision or approval may be appealed to the Interior Board Of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR 4.21. Within 30 days of receipt of the decision, an appeal must be filed to: Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of Hearings and Appeals, U.S. Department of the Interior, 801 North Quincy St., Suite 300, Arlington, Virginia, 22203. A copy of the notice of appeal must also be filed in the Vernal Field Office at 170 South 500 East; Vernal, Utah, 84078, as well as with: Office of the Solicitor, 125 South State Street, Suite 6201, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84138. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

If you wish to file a petition for stay pursuant to 43 CFR 3150.2(b), the petition for stay should accompany your notice of appeal and shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied,
2. The likelihood of the appellants success on merits,
3. The likelihood of irreparable harm to the appellant or resources if the stay is not granted, and
4. Whether the public interest favors the granting of the stay

**Approval from Authorized Official:**

---

/s/ Michelle Brown	11/3/2014
Michelle Brown, Assistant Field Manager Division of Renewable Resources	[Date]

# **Chapter 1. Introduction**

This page intentionally  
left blank

## **1.1. Background:**

Pelican Lake is located approximately 25 miles southwest of Vernal, Utah in Uintah County. Pelican Lake has been historically known as a world class bluegill fishery and is identified as a Blue Ribbon Fishery by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR). Utah Blue Ribbon Fisheries are environmentally productive waters that sustain healthy fish populations and provide benefit to local economies. Other known fish to occur within the lake are channel catfish, black bullhead, largemouth bass, smallmouth bass, tiger musky, green sunfish, common carp, and white sucker. The lake covers approximately 1,126 surface acres and provides 11,850 acre/feet of irrigation storage for nearby farmers and ranchers.

Pelican Lake was sampled by the UDWR in 2013 to evaluate largemouth bass and bluegill relative abundance, growth, and health. In result, the condition of both fish species was considered poor and below UDWR's objective level for all age classes. In addition, the UDWR has identified high levels of carp within the lakes system which can degrade the lakes system.

## **1.2. Identifying Information:**

### **1.2.1. Title, EA number:**

Pelican Lake Treatment

DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0113 EA

### **1.2.2. Location of Proposed Action:**

Uintah County, Utah

Township (T) 7 South (S), Range (R) 20 East (E), Section 19, 20, 21, 28, and 29;

Salt Lake Base and Meridian

### **1.2.3. Applicant Name:**

Division of Wildlife Resources

1594 West North Temple

Salt Lake City, UT

## **1.3. Purpose and Need for Action:**

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to not eradicate, but lower common carp population levels to where other fish species can self-sustain in healthier levels through relative abundance and growth in all age class structures.

## **1.4. Scoping, Public Involvement and Issues:**

The proposed project was posted to the ePlanning NEPA Register March 27, 2014. A BLM interdisciplinary team reviewed the proposal and identified and analyzed the resources that would be impacted by the project. Their review, and the issues identified, are documented in Appendix A, *Interdisciplinary Team Checklist*.

# **Chapter 2. Proposed Action and Alternatives**

This page intentionally  
left blank

## 2.1. Description of the Proposed Action:

The UDWR is proposing to minimize the common carp population to levels where other sport fisheries can be maintained at healthier levels through relative abundance and growth in all age class structures. Carp would be removed by rotenone treatments during spawning in shallow cove areas by spot treatments as identified in Figure 1. There will not be any ground disturbance associated with this project. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Vernal Field Office, has coordinated with additional stakeholders of Pelican Lake such as the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and the Ouray Park Irrigation Company as they also manage portions of the water or water distributions within Pelican Lake. The BOR is a cooperator of the proposed project, and the Ouray Park Irrigation Company is in agreement as per the Board Meeting held in March 2014.

Figure 1. Location of Proposed Cove Treatment Areas on Pelican Lake.



### Schedule

Rotenone treatments will depend on spawning condition of carp, but will likely occur during the spring months. Prior to treatment the UDWR will gather safety equipment and personal protective equipment, display to the public and place signs around the reservoir of project activities, and gather applicator equipment. The following day, crews will transport rotenone onsite and complete the application.

### Project Safety

The UDWR will serve as or designate a project safety officer to monitor all actions associated with the project, and take corrective action to remedy unsafe activities. All personnel involved with the project have received safety training regarding chemical application and transportation

and hazards of the project. Personnel applying chemicals have passed a pesticide applicator test and have obtained their non-commercial pesticide applicator license from the Department of Agriculture and Food for the State of Utah. All personnel have reviewed the safety precautions for each product label. Project participants will be involved in identifying other hazards and actions that may jeopardize safety during the project and asked to provide suggestions for minimizing safety risks.

Each applicator will receive personal eyewash bottles. Hand wash stations for chemical spills will be placed at both ends of the reservoir. In addition, a large eyewash station, capable of rinsing for 15 minutes, as recommended per the rotenone label and a shower will be onsite.

Applicators will wear tyvek coveralls, nitrile gloves, and a half-face respirator equipped filters. Other onsite personnel will have goggles, gloves, and a respirator in case one is needed, though other project personnel will not be needed to dispense rotenone.

### Site Security

According to AFS Standard Operating Procedures (Finlayson et al. 2010), the UDWR will place signs around the reservoir denoting the use of rotenone, including the formulations used. The safety officer will be in charge of discussing the treatment with any members of the public arriving onsite during the treatment.

### Fish Disposal After Treatment

Dead fish will be sampled for length and weight post-treatment. Fish sampled will either be sunk in the lake or removed and disposed of properly.

### Spill Contingency

All mixing operations for treating lakes will be conducted within boats at the reservoir. If a spill occurs, the first priority will be to contain the spilled material. Shovels will be used for immediate containment or to channelize the spilled material into a containment area. The following actions will be taken as necessary to contain a spill on the ground:

1. Stopping the spillage at its source;
2. Diking in pools as appropriate;
3. Using materials such as clay or soil to absorb standing material or collection of standing rotenone by pump or sponge and deposition into target area;
4. Neutralizing the spill site with potassium permanganate.

The Safety Officer will be responsible for immediately reporting ground spills of liquid rotenone over 20 gallons and potassium permanganate to the following entities:

1. UDWR Regional Supervisor
2. Uintah County Sheriff's Office

## 2.2. Description of the No Action:

Under the No Action Alternative, a Pesticide Use Permit (PUP) would not be granted and BLM would not issue authorization of project activities which include chemical treatments within Pelican Lake. The current status of sport fisheries and water quality would likely continue in a downward trend as common carp populations increase.

## 2.3. Conformance

The proposed project will be in conformance of the “*Bureau of Land Management Vernal Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan*” (BLM 2008). Fish goals and objectives as stated within the Land Use Plan:

- The Vernal Field Office (VFO) will assist in implementing the strategic plan for Utah’s Initiative on Blue Ribbon Fisheries by managing aquatic and riparian habitats along the Green River, from the Ashley National Forest border to the Colorado/Utah border, for a quality cold-water sport fishery and Pelican Lake for a quality warm water sport fishery. In addition, any aquatic and riparian habitats along other waters identified as Blue Ribbon Fisheries will be managed for quality sport fisheries. The VFO will implement this initiative to the extent consistent and appropriate with the Vernal Resource Management Plan and other land use authorizations.
- The BLM will continue to implement the specific goals and objectives of all recovery plans, conservation plans and strategies, and activity level plans. Recovery Plan revisions or new Recovery Plans will also be implemented.
- As additional data are collected over the life of the RMP, land managers will continually re-evaluate population and habitat status. Management emphasis will be to accumulate ecological information and distributional data to enhance the BLM’s ability to protect, conserve, recover, and manage these species in the future.
- The BLM will work with UDWR and other partners to implement conservation actions identified in the State Wildlife Action Plan (Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy), which identified priority wildlife species and habitats, assessed threats to their survival, and identified long-term conservation action needs (per WO IM 2006-114).
- Collaborate with the appropriate local, state, and federal agencies to promote public education on species, their importance to the human and biological community, and reasons for protective measures that will be applied to the lands involved.

### 2.3.1. Relationships To Statutes, Regulations, and Other Plans

This EA is being prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for projects involving federal lands. The proposed project is consistent with all federal laws and regulations. The BLM in conjunction with UDWR will include a Pesticide Use Plan (PUP) and a permit from the NPDES.

#### Clean Water Act

On November 27, 2006, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued a final rule (71 Federal Register 68483) concluding that pesticides when applied to or near waters of the United

States in accordance with the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) are exempt from the Clean Water Act permitting requirements. However, on January 7, 2009 the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (*National Cotton Council vs. EPA*) vacated the Final Rule, thereby requiring discharges of pesticides to comply with the NPDES permitting process. Following the ruling, the EPA was granted a stay of the mandate until April 9, 2011, during which time EPA will work with NPDES authorized states to develop general permits. The effects of the project on water quality are analyzed in their appropriate sections.

## **Chapter 3. Affected Environment:**

This page intentionally  
left blank

This Chapter describes the affected environment, the current condition of the resources potentially impacted by the proposed project. This chapter sets the baseline for the impact analysis in Chapter 4.

### **3.1. Water: Surface Water Quality**

Pelican Lake is a 1,680 acre, warm water lake that contains many sport fishes. Water quality sampling is not presently conducted by the BLM; however, the UDWR recognizes the lake as a Blue Ribbon Fishery that has shown a decrease in bass and bluegill growth rates and productivity and an increase in carp populations. Carp contribute to poor water quality by uprooting vegetation and stirring up sediments during feeding, leading to increased turbidity. This in turn reduces light penetration, which can make it difficult for other fish species that rely on sight to feed. Reduced light can also decrease plant growth, and suspended sediments can smother plants and clog fishes' gills.

### **3.2. Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated**

Pelican Lake contains a variety of sport fishes such as channel catfish, black bullhead, largemouth bass, smallmouth bass, tiger musky, green sunfish, common carp, and white sucker. Pelican Lake was sampled by the UDWR in 2013 to evaluate largemouth bass and bluegill relative abundance, growth, and health. In result, the condition of both fish species was considered below UDWR's objective level for all age classes. In addition, the UDWR has identified high levels of carp within the lake which can degrade the lakes system.

This page intentionally  
left blank

# **Chapter 4. Environmental Effects:**

This page intentionally  
left blank

## 4.1. Proposed Action

### 4.1.1. Water: Surface Water Quality

This project would deliberately introduce rotenone, a natural botanical piscicide, to surface waters to kill common carp, but the anticipated impacts would be short-term and is not anticipated to completely eradicate the species. Chemicals abilities of rotenone are registered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and are deemed safe to use to eradicate fish species when applied according to label instructions.

There are three ways in which rotenone can be detoxified once applied. The first detoxification method involves dilution by other water sources. This may be accomplished by groundwater or surface water mixing with treated water and diluting the rotenone below 2.0 parts per billion (ppb) which is the threshold that requires deactivation (Finalyson et al. 2010). It is estimated that rotenone entering Pelican Lake would quickly dilute well below the 2.0 ppb threshold. The second method of detoxification involves the application of an oxidizing agent such as potassium permanganate. This dry crystalline substance is mixed with water to detoxify the rotenone. However, this is an unlikely method that will be utilized as treatments are not anticipated for the entirety of the lake, only portions of the lake. The third and most common method of rotenone detoxification is to allow the rotenone to naturally breakdown. Rotenone is susceptible to natural detoxification through a assortment of mechanisms, but warm water temperatures and exposure to sunlight are the two factors with the greatest influence on degradation rate (Ware 2002). Rotenone released into relatively warm water (~15°C) is expected to fully detoxify within 2 to 4 weeks (Dawson et al. 1991). Pelican Lake water temperatures in spring through fall are expected to be 15° C or greater as it is considered a warm water fishery. The ultimate breakdown products of rotenone are carbon dioxide and water (more information is available online at:

[http://www.dfw.state.or.us/fish/local\\_fisheries/diamond\\_lake/FAQs.asp](http://www.dfw.state.or.us/fish/local_fisheries/diamond_lake/FAQs.asp)).

In summary, a rotenone treatment would be confined to portions of Pelican Lake. Any waters discharging from the lakes outlet would have rotenone concentrations well below the 2.0 ppb threshold that requires deactivation. The BLM is requiring a PUP to be approved prior to project implementation. This project would also be conducted in compliance with the federal Clean Water Act.

### 4.1.2. Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated

The effects of carp on native fish are not well understood. Negative impacts of carp are thought to include competition for food and habitats and effects on recruitment (population replenishment). The feeding methods of carp can uproot aquatic vegetation and muddy the water. Carp have been blamed for damaging freshwater habitats and causing decreases in light penetration, dissolved oxygen and plant material. These changes may have affected native fish within the lakes system.

Rotenone would have direct impacts on some sport fishes (i.e. bluegill and largemouth bass) through fish mortality. Rotenone kills fish not by removing oxygen from the water, but by inhibiting oxygen transfer and cellular respiration. All fishes are sensitive to rotenone, but some species are more easily killed than others. Common carp are more sensitive than bluegill and largemouth bass, while channel catfish and bullheads are the most resistant (Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, 2002).

The Proposed Action will target specific carp spawning areas and is likely that other fish species may be present within or near the fringes of these treatment areas. However, other sport fishes are not likely to be in these areas in high abundance when carp are spawning and is not likely to contribute large declines in sport fish abundance so much it would impact sport fishing.

## **4.2. No Action**

Under the No Action Alternative, a PUP would not be granted and BLM would not issue authorization of project activities which include chemical treatments within Pelican Lake. No Rotenone would be applied to the lake. The current status of sport fisheries and water quality would likely continue in a downward trend as common carp populations increase.

## **4.3. Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts are those impacts resulting from the incremental impact of an action when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions.

The Cumulative Impact Analysis Area (CIAA) is defined as Pelican Lake consisting of approximately 1,126 acres. The CIAA is considered to be Pelican Lake given the dilution and breakdown factors of rotenone. As the CIAA is entirely within the lake boundaries, very few past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions have occurred or are likely to occur with the exception of sport fishing and irrigation purposes, which is anticipated to continue. Other reasonably foreseeable future actions may include an increase in recreational use so long as Blue Ribbon Fisheries are maintained for highest productivity. An increase in recreational use may occur through indirect results of the rotenone treatments as bluegill and largemouth bass will likely benefit from lower common carp population levels.

The project involves very minor adverse impacts to most resources and beneficial impacts to fisheries. When combined with the level of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, the impacts of the Proposed Action would not be of a magnitude sufficient to result in an accumulation of impacts to most resources identified in Appendix A, with exception of water quality and fisheries. Project implementation is anticipated to produce a reduction in frequency and intensity of chemical treatments and allow bluegill and largemouth bass populations to recover more fully than they would naturally due to lower population levels of common carp in the lakes system, and would be a beneficial cumulative effect.

Under the No Action Alternative, the BLM would not issue authorization of project activities on federal lands which include chemical treatments of Pelican Lake. There would be no cumulative impacts from the No Action Alternative beyond increased carp levels and decreased blue gill and largemouth bass levels.

## **Chapter 5. Tribes, Individuals, Organizations, or Agencies Consulted:**

This page intentionally  
left blank

**Table 5.1. List of Persons, Agencies and Organizations Consulted**

Name	Purpose & Authorities for Consultation or Coordination	Findings & Conclusions
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources	UDWR initiated and proposed the project to the BLM.	The UDWR has coordinated with the BLM and on the Proposed Action and PUP and is in agreement with the Proposed Action Alternative.
Bureau of Reclamation	BOR manages portions of the project area.	BOR was contacted April 4, 2014. The BOR is a cooperator on the Environmental Assessment. Coordination between the BLM and BOR has been completed. They are supportive of the Proposed Action.
Ouray Park Irrigation Company	Ouray Park Irrigation Company manages water use within the project area.	UDWR attended the Ouray Park Irrigation Company Board Meetings in March 2014. In result the Irrigation Company did not oppose the project and were in agreement with the Proposed Action.

This page intentionally  
left blank

# **Chapter 6. List of Preparers**

This page intentionally  
left blank

**Table 6.1. List of Preparers**

Name	Title	Responsible for the Following Section(s) of this Document
Brandon McDonald	Wildlife Biologist	Project Lead
Stephanie Howard	NEPA Coordinator	Quality Control

This page intentionally  
left blank

# Chapter 7. References

This page intentionally  
left blank

Dawson, V.K., W.H. Gingerich, R.A. Davis, and P.A. Gilderhus. 1991. Rotenone persistence in freshwater ponds: effects of temperature and sediment adsorption. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 11: 226-231.

Finlayson, B.J., R.A. Schnick, R.L. Caiteux, L. DeMong, W.D. Horton, W. McClay, C.W. Thompson, and G.J. Tichacek. 2000. Rotenone use in fisheries management: administrative and technical guidelines manual. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland.

Finlayson, B. R. Schnick, D. Skaar, J. Anderson, L. Demong, D. Duffield, W. Horton, and J. Steinkjer. 2010. Planning and standard operating procedures for the use of rotenone in fish management--Rotenone SOP Manual. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland.

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. 2002. Rotenone: It's Use in Fisheries Management. Published by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Austin, Texas 78744PWD BR T3200-77.

USDI - Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2008. Vernal Field Office Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan. Vernal Field Office, Utah, October 2008.

Ware, G.W. 2002. An introduction to insecticides 3rd edition. University of Arizona, Department of Entomology, Tuscon. on EXTTOXNET. Extension Toxicology Network. Oregon State University web page.

This page intentionally  
left blank

# Appendix A.

## Pelican Lake Treatment:

### DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0113 EA:

### Brandon McDonald, Wildlife Biologist:

**DETERMINATION OF STAFF:** (Choose one of the following abbreviated options for the left column)

NP = not present in the area impacted by the proposed or alternative actions

NI = present, but not affected to a degree that detailed analysis is required

PI = present with potential for relevant impact that need to be analyzed in detail in the EA

NC = (DNAs only) actions and impacts not changed from those disclosed in the existing NEPA documents cited in Section D of the DNA form. The Rationale column may include NI and NP discussions.

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
<b>RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)</b>				
NI	Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Dust and vehicle emissions would be generated during the project. However, impacts from emissions are expected to be short term (during the project only) and indistinguishable from background emissions as measured by monitors or predicted by models due to the small size of the project and the short timeframe of implementation.  Greenhouse gas emissions: No greenhouse gas standards have been established by EPA or other regulatory authorities. The assessment of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change is in its earliest stage. Global greenhouse gas models can be inconsistent, and localized models are lacking. Consequently, it is not technically feasible to quantify the net impacts to climate based on local greenhouse gas emissions. It is anticipated that greenhouse gas emissions associated with this action and its alternative(s) would be negligible.	Stephanie Howard	4/14/2014
NP	BLM Natural Areas	None Present as per RMP and GIS layer review	Jason R. West	4/2/2014
NP	Cultural: Archaeological Resources	The proposed project does not have the potential to affect cultural or archaeological resources.	Cameron Cox	4/15/2014

<b>Determination</b>	<b>Resource/Issue</b>	<b>Rationale for Determination</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
NP	Cultural: Native American Religious Concerns	The proposed project does not have the potential to affect cultural resources. No Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) are identified within the project's APE. The proposed project will not hinder access to or use of Native American religious sites.	Cameron Cox	4/15/2014
NP	Designated Areas: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	None Present as per RMP and GIS layer review	Jason R. West	4/2/2014
NP	Designated Areas: Wild and Scenic Rivers	None Present as per RMP and GIS layer review	Jason R. West	4/2/2014
NP	Designated Areas: Wilderness Study Areas	None Present as per RMP and GIS layer review	Jason R. West	4/2/2014
NP	Environmental Justice	No minority or economically disadvantaged communities or populations would be disproportionately adversely affected by the proposed action or alternatives because none are present in or adjacent to the project area.	Stephanie Howard	4/14/2014
NI	Farmlands (prime/unique)	Although irrigated farmlands are near the project area, no impact to prime or unique farmlands are anticipated because the project would be taking place on the lake itself and the chemicals would be used in accordance with manufacturer directions.	Stephanie Howard	4/14/2014
NP	Fuels/Fire Management	The project will not affect fuels projects or fire behavior.	Brandon McDonald	4/15/2014
NI	Geology/Minerals/ Energy Production	No surface disturbance. No adverse impact to geology, minerals, and energy production.	Betty Gamber	4/1/2014
NI	Invasive Plants/ Noxious Weeds, Soils & Vegetation	No surface disturbance is planned for this project, so no impacts to weeds, soils, or vegetation are expected.	Jessi Brunson	4/2/2014
NI	Lands/Access	The proposed treatment areas are located within and outside of a Reclamation Withdrawal that is managed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The treatment areas located on public lands, outside of the withdrawal, do not impact current lands and realty actions in the proposed treatment areas. One of the proposed treatment areas located in sections 20 and 21 and outside of the Reclamation Withdrawal, is located on/near private lands. Coordination with the adjoining private land owner(s), Bureau of Reclamation and the Ouray	Cindy Bowen	4-2-2014

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		Park Irrigation Company have occurred as stated in the proposed action.		
NP	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (LWC)	None Present as per RMP and GIS layer review	Jason R. West	4/2/2014
NI	Livestock Grazing & Rangeland Health Standards	The proposed project would take place on the West Pelican Lake Allotment. Livestock would not be affected by the treatment. The grazing permittee whose allotment would be affected by the treatment should be notified by the UDWR and/or BLM as a precaution.	Alec Bryan	3/27/2014
NI	Paleontology	No surface disturbance is planned so there would be no impact to paleo resources.	Betty Gamber	4/1/2014
NI	Plants: BLM Sensitive	Sterile yucca ( <i>Yucca sterilis</i> ) is known to occur within the same watershed as the proposed project. However, the project is limited to the lake surface and no surface disturbance is planned.	Jessi Brunson	4/2/2014
NI	Plants: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate	Uinta Basin hookless cactus ( <i>Sclerocactus wellandicus</i> ), is known to occur in the same watershed, and Ute ladies'-tresses ( <i>Spiranthes diluvialis</i> ) has the potential to occur on the banks of Pelican Lake. However, the proposed project will be limited to the waters of Pelican Lake and no surface disturbance is planned. Additionally, no known populations of Ute ladies'-tresses occur at Pelican Lake.	Jessi Brunson	4/2/2014
NI	Plants: Wetland/Riparian	Although this project is planned for an area that supports wetland and riparian plants, no surface disturbance is planned.	Jessi Brunson	4/2/2014
NI	Recreation	Part of the Pelican Lake SRMA, carp fishing is not common in this area. See purpose and need	Jason R. West	4/2/2014
NI	Socio-Economics	No impact to the social or economic status of the county would occur as a result of the project due to the small size of the project and it s goal to maintain fish populations at the UDWR target levels.	Stephanie Howard	4/14/2014
NI	Visual Resources	No impact to VRM or VRI. Non-Surface disturbing	Jason R. West	4/2/2014

<b>Determination</b>	<b>Resource/Issue</b>	<b>Rationale for Determination</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
NP	Wastes  (hazardous/solid)	Hazardous waste: No chemicals subject to reporting under SARA Title III in an amount equal to or greater than 10,000 pounds will be used, produced, stored, transported, or disposed of annually in association with the project. Furthermore, no extremely hazardous substances, as defined in 40 CFR 355, in threshold planning quantities, will be used, produced, stored, transported, or disposed of in association with the project.  Solid Waste: No solid wastes would be produced as described in the proposed action.	Brandon McDonald	3/27/2014
NI	Water:  Floodplains	The BLM recognizes the entire project area as being within a floodplain. All project activities would be within the lake system. The limited scope of the project and the implementation of state-of-the-arts for rotenone treatment which is a common practice in returning water to native fish habitat would not be expected to negatively impact waters. A Pesticide Use Permit is required by the proponent and would be a safeguard in proper application of the chemical.	Brandon McDonald	3/27/2014
NI	Water:  Groundwater Quality	“Acute exposure estimates for drinking water considered surface water only because rotenone is only applied directly to surface water and is not expected to reach groundwater”(EPA, 2007) Rotenone was reregistered by EPA in 2007 for piscicide use only.	Betty Gamber	4/1/2014
NP	Water:  Hydrologic Conditions (stormwater)	All project activities would be located within the water. No ground disturbance is proposed. Access would utilize existing boat ramps.	Brandon McDonald	3/27/2014
PI	Water:  Surface Water Quality	Potential is present to negatively impact surface water quality requiring a Pesticide Use Permit authorization and proper utilization of the rotenone chemical based on state-of-the-arts application. Rotenone application is a common practice but requires direct application of rotenone to waters. Neutralization of the chemical with the application of potassium permanganate and resulting in a fish kill that requires clean-up of dead fish post treatment. The chemical also affects macro-invertebrates of the waterway.	Brandon McDonald	3/27/2014

<b>Determination</b>	<b>Resource/Issue</b>	<b>Rationale for Determination</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
NI	Water: Waters of the U.S.	Pelican Lake is within Waters of the U.S. and subject to environmental laws. All project activities would be within the lake system. The limited scope of the project and the implementation of state-of-the-art rotenone treatment which is a common practice in returning water to native fish habitat would not be expected to negatively impact waters within Pelican Lake. A Pesticide Use Permit is required by the proponent and would be a safeguard in proper application of the chemical.	Brandon McDonald	3/27/2014
NP	Wild Horses	No herd areas or herd management areas are present.	Brandon McDonald	3/27/2014
NI	Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)	There may be migratory birds nesting and/or foraging near the project area; however, project activities are not anticipated to impact nuptial behavior or cause nest abandonment. Rotenone treatments will be applied from a boat and not where birds will likely be nesting. An accumulation of impacts to wildlife resources will continue to occur within Pelican Lake as it is a recreational area.	Brandon McDonald	3/27/2014
PI	Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated	All project activities would be within the lake system. The limited scope of the project and the implementation of rotenone treatments is a common practice with fish biologists to return water to native fish habitat would not be expected to negatively impact habitat. Though rotenone treatments are targeting common carp some sport fishes such as green sunfish, small mouth bass, large mouth bass, may be impacted on the edge of the treatment area.	Brandon McDonald	3/27/2014
NP	Wildlife: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed or Candidate	In accordance with site visits and district files there are no known threatened, endangered, proposed, or candidate (including sage-grouse) species, including their associated habitats, within the project area.	Brandon McDonald	3/27/2014
NP	Woodlands/ Forestry	No woodlands present in project area per review of agency GIS.	David Palmer	4/9/2014

**FINAL REVIEW:**

<b>Reviewer Title</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Environmental Coordinator	Stephanie Howard	11/3/2014	
Authorized Officer	Michelle Brown	1/3/2014	