

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

**Categorical Exclusion
LUP Maintenance Action
DOI-BLM-WY-R010-2016-0005-CX**

January 2016

PREPARING OFFICE

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Worland Field Office

BLM



Categorical Exclusion
LUP Maintenance Action
DOI-BLM-WY-R010-2016-0005-CX

January 2016

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

1. LUP Maintenance Action	1
1.1. Background	1
1.2. Land Use Plan Conformance	1
1.3. Compliance with NEPA:	2
1.4. Approval and Contact Information	2
2. Categorical Exclusion Rationale	3

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 1. LUP Maintenance Action

This page intentionally
left blank

1.1. Background

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-WY-R010-2016-0005-CX

BLM Office: Worland Field Office

Proposed Action Title/Type: Land Use Plan (LUP) Maintenance Action

Location of Proposed Action:

Worland Field Office

Description of Proposed Action:

The Worland Field Office is proposing to update editorial errors found in Appendix B and Appendix J of the Worland RMP (September 2015) and specific Management Decision. Decisions related to these resources have not changed.

Appendix B edits will include:

- Stipulation language has been updated for records 2039, 2040, and 2044 to accurately represent the management actions found in Table 3-1.
- Stipulation language for records 2034, 2042, 2043, 4053, 4074, 4078, 4075, 4118, 4128, have been edited to update “as mapped by WGFD” to read “as mapped on the Worland Field Office GIS database”.
- Stipulation language for records 4106, 4107, 4108, 4109 has been updated to be consistent to language used in Wyoming BLM Oil and Gas Lease Stipulations.
- **Stipulation language for record 5020 (acres defined) has been updated to read “As determined by the BLM on a site-specific basis.”**

Edits to Appendix J include: pg. 405 Lands and Realty change to read “ROW avoidance area” in conformance with management record 6088 (Tour de Badlands RMZ).

Edits will also be made to Record 6012 to accurately define the area considered for disposal for expansion of the landfill (as detailed in Appendix I).

Edits will be made to Record 4008 to include the word “or”. Record 4008 will read “Allow the sale of permits to meet public demand for personal use and harvest of forest products including posts, poles, firewood, sawlogs, Christmas trees, and other vegetative products consistent with wildlife habitat requirements. After NEPA analysis, authorize commercial use for seed collections **or** for use in habitat restoration or research.”

1.2. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Worland RMP

Date Approved/Amended: September 2015

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 decision(s) (objectives,

terms, and conditions): No changes to LUP decisions are being proposed. LUP maintenance actions are allowed under 43 CFR 1610.5-4 “Resource management plans and supporting components shall be maintained as necessary to reflect minor changes in data. Such maintenance is limited to further refining or documenting a previously approved decision incorporated in the plan. Maintenance shall not result in expansion in the scope of resource uses or restrictions, or change the terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved plan. Maintenance is not considered a plan amendment and shall not require the formal public involvement and interagency coordination process described under 43 CFR §§ 1610.2 and 1610.3 of this title or the preparation of an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement. Maintenance shall be documented in plans and supporting records.”

1.3. Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9, J. Other: 1. Maintaining land use plans in accordance with 43 CFR 1610.5-4.

I considered:

The intent of the management decisions identified in Chapter 3 of the Worland Approved RMP (September 2015). No changes to the management decisions are being proposed, and therefore a LUP amendment is not necessary.

1.4. Approval and Contact Information

/s/Michael J. Phillips	1/14/2016
Worland Field Office Manager	Date

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:

Holly Elliott

Worland Field Office

101 South 23rd Street

Worland, WY 82401

Attachments:

Extraordinary Circumstances Review

Chapter 2. Categorical Exclusion Rationale

This page intentionally
left blank

Extraordinary Circumstances			
Would the proposed project....			
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?			
Yes	No	Resource	Rationale
	X	Wastes (Solid or Hazardous)	The proposed action would have no potential for generation of hazardous waste.
	X	Public Health or Safety	The proposed action will not pose any risks to public health and safety.
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas?			
Yes	No	Resource	Rationale
	X	Sole or principal drinking water aquifers	The proposed action is administrative in nature. Subsequently no significant impacts would be associated with approval of this action.
	X	Prime farmlands	
	X	Wetlands	
	X	Floodplains	
	X	National monuments	
	X	Migratory birds	
	X	National Natural landmarks	
	X	Wild/Scenic Rivers	
	X	Wilderness Areas	
	X	Park/recreation/refuge lands	
	X	Historic or Cultural resources	
	X	Other ecologically significant or critical areas (Wild Horses/HMA, LWCs, etc.)	
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA section 102 (2) (E)]?			
Yes	No	Resource	Rationale
	X	Vegetation	The proposed action is administrative in nature and does not have highly controversial environmental effects.
	X	Soils	
	X	Hydrology	
	X	Recreation	
	X	Visual Resources	
	X	Wildlife	
	X	Lands/Access	
	X	Travel Management	
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?			
Yes	No	Resource	Rationale
	X	Vegetation	There are no risks anticipated to resources from the proposed activity.
	X	Soils	
	X	Hydrology	
	X	Recreation	
	X	Visual Resources	
	X	Wildlife	
	X	Lands/Access	
	X	Travel Management	
5. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principal about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?			
Yes	No	Resource	Rationale:

Extraordinary Circumstances			
Would the proposed project....			
	X	Vegetation	The proposed activity will not establish precedence for future actions with potential significant environmental effects. The proposed action is administrative in nature and would not alter management decisions identified in the Worland ARMP.
	X	Soils	
	X	Hydrology	
	X	Recreation	
	X	Visual Resources	
	X	Wildlife	
	X	Lands/Access	
	X	Travel Management	
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?			
Yes	No	Resource	Rationale
	X	Vegetation	The proposed project has no known direct relationship to any other action regarding resources. The proposed action is administrative in nature and would not alter management decisions identified in the Worland ARMP.
	X	Soils	
	X	Hydrology	
	X	Recreation	
	X	Visual Resources	
	X	Wildlife	
	X	Lands/Access	
	X	Travel Management	
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by the bureau?			
Yes	No	Rationale	
	X	The proposed action is administrative in nature and would not alter management decisions identified in the Worland ARMP.	
8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?			
Yes	No	Resource	Rationale
	X	Wildlife	The proposed action is administrative in nature and would not alter management decisions identified in the Worland ARMP.
	X	Plants	
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?			
Yes	No	Resource	Rationale
	X	Vegetation	The proposed action is administrative in nature and would not alter management decisions identified in the Worland ARMP. The proposed action is in conformance with 43 CFR 1610.5-4.
	X	Soils	
	X	Hydrology	
	X	Recreation	
	X	Visual Resources	
	X	Wildlife	
	X	Lands/Access	
	X	Travel Management	
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?			
Yes	No	Rationale	
	X	No low income populations would be affected by implementing the proposed action. The proposed action is administrative in nature and would not alter management decisions identified in the Worland ARMP.	
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?			
Yes	No	Rationale	
	X	The proposed action is administrative in nature and would not alter management decisions identified in the Worland ARMP.	
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?			

Extraordinary Circumstances		
Would the proposed project....		
Yes	No	Rationale:
	X	The proposed action is administrative in nature and would not alter management decisions identified in the Worland ARMP.