OR 55670

Malin Christian Church Inc.
PO Box 111
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

Categorical Exclusion No. KCER-00-06

The proposed action to issue a right-of-way grant to the Malin Christian Church, Inc. for construction of a FM radio station within the Buck Butte communications site complex, atop Buck Butte in Klamath County, Oregon. is designated a categorical exclusion in 516 DM 6 appendix 5.4 E (16). The proposal has been screened and does not meet the criteria for exception under 516 DM 2.3A(3): 1. Health and Safety; 2. Unique Resources; 3. Controversial; 4. Risks; 5. Precedent; 6. Cumulative; 7. Cultural and Historical; 8. Threatened or Endangered Species; 9. Violate Law. Therefore, no further environmental analysis is required.

/s./ Melvin D. Crockett — 5-5-2000

for Teresa A. Raml — Date

Manager, Klamath Falls Resource Area

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

Klamath Falls Resource Area Project File Number - OR 55670
Proposed Action Title/Type: Communication Site
Location of Proposed Action: T. 40 S., R. 10 E. Section 20 NW¼NW¼

Description of Proposed Action: The Malin Christian Church, Inc. proposes to construct a FM radio broadcast station within the Buck Butte communications site complex, atop Buck Butte in Klamath County, Oregon. Effective radiated power would be 500 Watts.

Applicant (if any): Malin Christian Church, Inc. PO Box 111 Klamath Falls, OR 97601

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: /s./ Tom Cottingham Tom Cottingham
Realty Specialist

Remarks: The proposed action is provided for on page 67 in paragraph 4 under the heading **Other Land Use Allocations**.

PART 2: NEPA REVIEW

A. Categorical exclusion review. This proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion under 512 DM 2, Appendix 1._____(CX number) or 516 DM 6, Appendix 5.4 E (16) (CX number). It has been reviewed to determine if any of the exceptions described in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2, apply.

Signature of Reviewers: __/s./ Tom Cottingham_____ Tom Cottingham
Realty Specialist

B. Existing EA/EIS review. This proposed action is addressed in the following existing BLM EA/EIS:
Name of Document: **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:
- The proposed action is a feature of, or essentially the same as, the alternative selected and analyzed in the existing document.
- A reasonable range of alternatives was analyzed in the existing document.
- There has been no significant change in circumstances or significant new information germane to the proposed action.
- The methodology/analytical approach previously used is appropriate for the proposed action.
- The direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action are not significantly different from those identified in the existing document.
- The proposed action would not change the previous analysis of cumulative impacts.
- Public involvement in the previous analysis is appropriate coverage for the proposed action.

Signature of Reviewer: _____Tom Cottingham
Realty Specialist

Remarks: References to the proposed action are found on the following pages of the KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS:

Part 3. Recommendation/Rationale

Recommendation: I recommend that a communication site right-of-way be granted to Malin Christian Church, Inc. for a period of 10 years ,with an option to renew, across T. 40 S., R. 10 E. Section 20 NW¼NW¼. The grant should be made under the authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761) and subject to the terms and conditions in 43 CFR 2801 and rental payments as determined by 43 CFR 2803.1-2. The grant should also be subject to the mitigations set forth in the application and concerns raised by existing users of the Buck Butte Communication Site.

Rationale for Recommendation: The proposed action meets the criteria for categorical exclusion in 516 DM 6, Appendix 5.4 E (16), and

none of the exceptions in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2, apply. Further, the action is in conformance with the Klamath Falls Resource Area Resource Management Plan, Approved June 1995 June 1995.

/s./ Tom Cottingham_____Tom Cottingham
Realty Specialist Date 5-5-2000

PART 4. 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:

None

Authorized Official: _/s./ Melvin D. Crockett_____ Date: ___5-5-2000
for Teresa A. Raml
Manager, Klamath Falls Resource Area

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.