



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
REGION IX  
75 Hawthorne Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

December 30, 2005

Eliseo Ilano  
Bureau of Land Management  
2550 North State Street  
Ukiah, CA 95482

Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Ukiah Field Office Resource Management Plan, California (CEQ #20050374)

Dear Mr. Ilano:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the above-referenced document pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act.

The DEIS and Resource Management Plan (RMP) provide direction for managing public lands within the Ukiah Field Office planning area, which covers approximately 300,000 acres separated into nine management areas. For each resource within each management area, the document evaluates five alternatives, including a "no action" alternative, three action alternatives, and the Preferred Alternative. Each Preferred Alternative was selected via a "menu approach" from the other alternatives, and represents an effort to provide balance in managing both resources and uses of the planning areas.

EPA has no objections to the Preferred Alternatives described for each resource within each management area. Accordingly, we have rated the DEIS as Lack of Objections (LO). A *Summary of EPA Rating Definitions* is enclosed.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this DEIS. When the Final EIS is released for public review, please send one copy to the address above (mail code: CED-2). If you have any questions, please contact me or David P. Schmidt, the lead reviewer for this project. My phone number is 415-972-3988. David can be reached at 415-972-3792 or schmidt.davidp@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/ Nancy Levin for

Duane James, Manager  
Environmental Review Office  
Communities and Ecosystems Division

Enclosure: Summary of EPA Rating Definitions

## **SUMMARY OF EPA RATING DEFINITIONS <sup>1</sup>**

This rating system was developed as a means to summarize EPA's level of concern with a proposed action. The ratings are a combination of alphabetical categories for evaluation of the environmental impacts of the proposal and numerical categories for evaluation of the adequacy of the EIS.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF THE ACTION**

#### **"LO" (Lack of Objections)**

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

#### **"EC" (Environmental Concerns)**

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

#### **"EO" (Environmental Objections)**

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impact that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

#### **"EU" (Environmentally Unsatisfactory)**

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

### **ADEQUACY OF THE IMPACT STATEMENT**

#### **"Category 1" (Adequate)**

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

#### **"Category 2" (Insufficient Information)**

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

#### **"Category 3" (Inadequate)**

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

<sup>1</sup> From EPA Manual 1640, Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment.